

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, November 7, 1958.

Opening Prayer read by Mr. Speaker.

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

HONOURABLE DUFF ROBLIN (Premier): Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to lay on the table of the House, a return to an address to his Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor on the motion of the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

HONOURABLE STERLING R. LYON (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to lay on the table of the House a return to an order of the House, No. 8, on the motion of the Honourable Member for St. George. I do this on behalf of the Honourable, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

HONOURABLE ERIC WILLIS, Q.C. (Minister of Agriculture and Immigration and Acting Minister of Public Works): Before the orders of the day are reached, I would like to lay on the table of the House a return to an order of the House, No. 6, on the motion of the Honourable Member for Springfield.

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

MR. D.L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I think this time that as I begin a reply to the Honourable, the First Minister's motion, that I can very sincerely congratulate him on the very fine presentation that he made this morning. I do that without having my tongue in the cheek at all because I certainly share the view with other members of the House that the Honourable, the First Minister, is one of the best speakers in the House, even when he is sticking closely to his notes. And I think that the Honourable, the First Minister shares with the Honourable, the Member for Carillon the distinction of being at his very best when he is delivering a speech where he can be seen in person and that is when he is most effective. I think it's better that way than even the copy of when it's transcribed.

MR. CAMPBELL - (Continued)

I, of course, haven't had the copy before me to look at and I am not complaining about that at all because for all that I need to say on this occasion, I think that I was able to follow the Honourable gentleman closely enough that I neither needed to see a transcript or take any great length of time for preparation.

It is noteworthy for the Honourable Members to realize that in this session we have had several quite important matters to deal with. Other sessions, when special, so-called, sessions were called so far as the government is concerned, they were usually called for one purpose only. And that makes quite a difference in the amount of attention that the members have to pay to the discussions in this House; and if in some cases our presentations have suffered from lack of preparation, it has, perhaps, been because they have been having to cover so many different subjects.

Now, I think on this morning's effort that my honourable friends, the First Minister, differed from the tradition that has been mentioned in this House on a few occasions since we met, about the orator who shouts very loudly when he feels that the argument is weak. I've watched my Honourable friend for some years and I think he's in the reverse character, and when he feels he's got a good strong argument he's very aggressive, even provocative, and shouts pretty loudly, pretty emphatic. But when he thinks that his argument is pretty weak, he adopts a pretty conciliatory tone, and I was interested to note this morning how conciliatory it was right from the start because, I am sure that, though the presentation was good, I freely concede that, the presentation was excellent, certainly lengthy enough, yet it seems to me that it left a great deal to be desired so far as content is concerned. And that was true with regard to the financial report that my Honourable friend gave, and to many other matters as well.

I do not intend to take the time of the House at this moment to follow through the various matters that were covered by the Honourable, the First Minister; but I do think there are certain things that should be mentioned at a time like this because even though the Honourable gentleman says that no budget, as such, is being presented at this session, yet the fact is that this is taking the place of the budget debate and that is always one of the most important of all the debates that take place at any session. And when my honourable friend went through, as he certainly was not only within his rights to do, but it was very proper for him to do it, a resume of the financial situation as it obtains at the moment. That was appropriate and proper, but I think there that he omitted one of the points that he might very well have referred to. The honourable gentleman mentioned the fact that in this year the latest estimates from Ottawa of the amount expected to be received by this province from the federal government, under the tax sharing arrangement, for this fiscal year that we're in, is 34 million dollars odd, just over \$34,000,000. And he mentioned that the amount budgeted for when we last met here

MR. CAMPBELL - (Continued)

early this spring was \$33,000,000 - 33 $\frac{3}{4}$  odd, and he pointed out that this was a little bit higher. He made some reference to the fact that there had been a diminution from what was originally mentioned as coming, but he didn't dwell on that point to the extent that I think he might have, because it's extremely important in the financing arrangements of this province. Here we have the fact that my honourable friend might very well have mentioned, that the amount that was thought to be coming to Manitoba was more than \$3,000,000 in excess of what it had amounted to the year before. The year before it amounted to 32 and three-quarter million dollars, in round figures, so that we were to have had 3 million four on top of that; and now we're down to where, instead of well over 35 million dollars, that we now are back down to 34 million dollars, just over that amount. In other words, the amount that was supposed to be coming to Manitoba has been, according to my figures, more than cut in two, and at the present estimate, very, very little higher than what we budgeted for last spring, taking into account some of these factors that I'm sure have been overlooked at Ottawa. Now that's a thing that I would think the Honourable the First Minister and also in his capacity as Provincial Treasurer, would have wanted to comment on. Why did the federal government lead us so far astray in their early telegram on this all-important subject? Following upon a federal-provincial conference where we, the various provinces, had tried our level best to get them to implement promises that had been made in most specific terms about a better deal for the provinces. And then, having to leave after a short two-day session because it was stated that what they had called us there for was to discuss, to just get our ideas so they could talk them over, so they could consider our plans. And then we left, and later on were advised by wire that we would get this considerable increase, not all that we had asked for, it's true, but at least a considerable increase, and then we have had to watch it grow smaller and smaller and now shrink to the proportion that we, in our estimate last spring, had foretold because of the various factors that were involved. I wouldn't be surprised, Mr. Speaker, that you'll find that when the final figure emerges, because this after all is still an estimate, it will perhaps be as low as the one we estimated last spring or even lower.

I would think that perhaps too, my honourable friend in his position as First Minister of this province, with the responsibility of taking care of the needs of all the important, other spheres of government here, municipalities, school boards, etc., would have commented too on the fact that the federal government has not come even close, I should perhaps say, not even made a beginning effort, to implement their promises with regard to assistance to the municipalities. Because we had the fact that after the campaign had been conducted across Canada, whereby the municipalities were referred to by the present Prime Minister of Canada and the present Finance Minister, the municipalities being referred to as the forgotten people, that they were starved financially, and his clear promise held out that something of great value would be done for them. We had the spectacle

MR. CAMPBELL - (Continued)

of the municipal representatives foregathering at Ottawa to ask for the assistance that had been so definitely promised to them. And what were they told? They were told something that in my opinion would have been a very very proper thing to have told them, if it hadn't been for those promises that had been made; because they were told of the fact that the federal government had its own great commitments, it had its own huge financial responsibilities to consider, and in effect they were told that because of these that nothing could be done for the municipalities. And, if that had been the stand that was taken from the start with either the provinces or the municipalities, I for one would have found very little complaint with it. But I certainly do find complaint with any government, federal or provincial, and regardless of what its political character is, that makes these exaggerated promises before an election campaign and during an election campaign and then comes along and can't, or won't fulfill them.

I think, Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, and I may speak because I not only believe it sincerely, but I hold a great conviction upon the subject, that one of the things that is endangering our democratic system today is the habit of politicians, of going out and promising to the people things that they should know they are not going to be able to fulfill when the time comes. That's the kind of thing that strikes at the very root of our democratic institution because it breaks down the faith of people in their government. I am not going to accuse my honourable friend of having failed too badly as yet, because up-to-date I certainly give my honourable friend, The First Minister, credit for what he was claiming credit for this morning, that he has worked very hard. He has worked hard. I give him nothing but good marks in that regard. He has worked hard. Several of his minister, I think, have worked hard.

I would pause once again to compliment the Honourable the Minister of education on the excellent showing that he has made in regard to the presentation here in this House and in the Committee of the very important bill that he has introduced. I'm afraid that I couldn't, if he had been in his seat, I couldn't have extended my congratulations quite to the same extent to the Minister of Public Works. But some of the ministers have worked hard, some of them, particularly the First Minister himself and his desk mate on his left, have been great at getting out around the country - I think not only our country, but some country - advertising themselves and the government and going very, very far afield, and that's work too. They have worked hard. I am not criticizing them in that regard. I am not charging them yet with having failed too greatly in some of the promises that they have made; but I do say that they'd better be mightily careful to do their level best to implement these promises because it's a thing that the public is becoming increasingly interested in, and increasingly aware of the many deficiencies of politicians in this regard.

Then I come to the other point that I think should be mentioned once again, Mr. Chairman, and that is what the honour-

MR. CAMPBELL -(Continued)

able, the First Minister has said, and if there is anybody in this House who can make a good case out of very little material, it's my honourable friend, and yet I think he has failed lamentably to make out a case of why this special session should have been held at all; with one exception and that one exception I grant him is a good one. The one exception is the fact that they had promised it, and because they promised it, then I am all in favour of them having held it. That was the only need, in my opinion, for this special session, because we didn't need it to deal with the work program; that work program could have gone ahead just as well. The Honourable, the First Minister, reported quite correctly this morning the War and Post War Fund could have been by action of the government itself and used for that purpose, and properly so. I'm quite in favour of that.

The Education Bill, important though it is, and I admit the amount of work that has been done with regard to it, but it's not going to come into effect as far as its financial provisions are concerned until the new fiscal year; and it could have been, in my opinion, it could have been dealt with just as well. My Honourable friend will say that he wants to get ahead with the organization, but the organization could have proceeded. It has been pointed out this morning that the funds are there to proceed with the organization and the program could have been advanced even without the bill itself, but it told the public, while the program was being advanced, what was the intention to introduce later on. The same with the Industrial Development Fund, apart altogether from whether I agree with it in principle or not, or in practice or not, whether it should have been done by somebody else; there again, even though I do not pretend to be enthusiastic about that bill, yet the fact is that it was promised and because it was promised, I say that it is right for the government to implement it. But not necessarily now. No need of a special session for that purpose. And the same with the Agricultural Credit Bill. But the one reason, the one good reason for the special session, in my opinion, was because it was promised and so that is a good, a real good reason.

Then, as far as the Funds are concerned - it was proper for the Honourable, the First Minister to give us a report about the financial standing of the province as of now. But even more important than that, Mr. Speaker, - even more important than that, was to tell us about what plans and programs the government has for implementing these pieces of legislation that we have passed at this House. Because one of them - one to which I have referred two or three times already - the Education Bill, envisages huge expenditures. I am not complaining about that but I do think that it's only proper that the House should be taken into the government's confidence with regard to the measures that will be adopted to supply the money for these increased grants - - and I am not asking where's the money going to come from. I am not asking that. We know where the money is going to come from; the money is going to come from the taxpayers of the province of Manitoba, and when my honourable friends over here have criticized me through the years saying that I have always asked where the money is coming from. I've never asked

MR. CAMPBELL - (Continued)

that question. I know where the money is coming from. What I have asked, and what I ask now is from whence is the money going to be raised, because the financial report that my honourable friend gave this morning indicates that the current revenue position does not leave any elbow room whatsoever, and this is a major increased expenditure. I know that we have had the question answered, where the money will be taken from with regard to the other bill. Winter work, that's fine, from the Post War Fund. I quite approve of that. But that didn't need a special session to authorize that. Industrial Development Fund, to set up the capital amount from the Post War Fund; that's quite okay. The Agricultural Credit from the same source, and the Roads program, that's the other real reason, I think, for the special session, besides the promise, was that the government wanted to make this big splash about a Road program. They wanted to try, and pretend that it is a new look in the Road program, something new was being offered. That has fallen pretty flat. But at least we were told where they were going to get the money. They were going to borrow it. That's all right, that's all right, no complaint about that. But when we come to the expenditures for the most important bill of all of this past year, no report at all. About where the government proposes to levy that tax upon the people of this province. Now the Minister will say that he'll tell us at the new session, I suppose. Well, we could have been told about the bill at the next session, just as well as this one. And when the bill is put through at this session, and has been put through, then I maintain it was the duty of the government to tell us at that time how they were going to raise the revenue - not where the money is coming from but how they were going to raise it from the taxpayers of the province of Manitoba. All of these others, their statement has been made, the House should be told with regard to this particular measure what tax will be introduced.

So far as the road program is concerned I don't intend to debate it at any length at all. We had a good bit to say on it before; we could have said much more. That program, did somebody say, was put before us because they wanted to authorize work this fall. What nonsense, Mr. Speaker, what absolute nonsense. If the government had wanted to authorize work this fall, they could have authorized it without any trouble whatsoever. How much work can you do this fall, - from the time that this session was called? If there was an opportunity for doing work then the government had a perfect right to authorize it to be done. Open tenders this fall so that the work can be started earlier, Mr. Speaker? How many people do you think are going to tender when the ground is frozen or covered with snow or both? How many will? I predict, Mr. Speaker, - I am not going to indulge in some of the interesting bets that have been going on, - but I will predict that with the exception of bridges and work of that kind that can be proceeded with and that could have been proceeded with, certainly without any need of this session, with the exception of such work as that; I predict that the amount of extra work that will be done this fall shall be infinitesimal. No need, whatever. But what was the important

MR. CAMPBELL - (Continued)

thing was that it was thought by the Minister, and I am sure knowing his tendency for exaggeration and flamboyance, that it was thought that this would make a great appeal to the people, to announce a new look in the road program, and that that was the real reason for introducing it at this time. Well, no wonder it fell kind of flat, but I think that has been sufficiently dealt with.

Then my honourable friend, the Leader of the House, gave a report, as it quite proper for him to do and he gave a good report, with regard to the activity of the government, what they have been doing. And once again, I say that I certainly don't need him or anybody else to convince me that he is a good hard worker. He is a hard worker. Certainly they've been active. He went to great pains to say that the government have been active. I am sure they have - no complaint on that regard at all. And the report that he made was interesting, and well done. It was interesting for a great many things. It was interesting for the numbers of study and survey and investigations and assessments and inventorying and such like, that are still going on. When my honourable friends, the ones of them who were here before, when they sat over here they had their ideas on these things; they knew how they should be done; they were only waiting to get into office in order to do these things properly. But now what do we have, a whole catalogue of hopes and ambitions and plans and programs and surveys and studies and investigations that are still being made. I don't want to take time to go over them individually but I think we should recount some of them. And I am not trying to give my honourable friend's actual words because I simply couldn't take them down in all instances, but I am quite sure if any of you will want to take these down and then compare them with the written record when it comes out that you will find that they are very, very close.

There is a survey in progress in the Red River drought area down here, not a drought area but the water shortage area, to deal with the shortage of water. But, Mr. Speaker, that's been before us for some time. And my honourable friends' last year knew what to do about that one. Then there has been a report in the meantime, - a very intensive report - and they had that one in their hands; the thing that was needed was action, not another survey. And the survey is going to be made by Dr. Gabrielson re game men, another survey. I don't know how many of those we have had; anyway, there is going to be another. There is going to be a survey for study of the freight rates on the Hudson's Bay. Well, I wouldn't think that would need much of a survey. There again, action is needed. There's an inventory (that, I guess, differs from a survey) - there is going to be an inventory of the tourist situation. Legislation on these matters will be here the next time we meet. I am always a little suspicious about that phrase, "the next time we meet" because I keep wondering if my honourable friend doesn't intend to follow the practice of his chief down in Ottawa, and get what he thinks like a pretty popular session of hands and refrain from bringing in a budget; refrain from disclosing the actual financial position which the province faces, and then try and arrange that the next

MR. CAMPBELL - (Continued)

time we meet will be after an election. Well, I don't know, but anyway we're promised legislation on these matters will be here when next we meet.

Then my honourable friend says another plan which we are developing -- it's developing this one, this plan -- will coordinate the activities for the development of our natural resources - or words to that effect, I can't guarantee to get them exact. Then we have in mind to establish a separate authority - I think that is in regard to the natural resource development too.

And the parole system. Very shortly now we will complete our plans. Also have plans under study re the six-month prisoners -- also plans under study. We are hoping - here we get into hopes instead of surveys and inventories - we are hoping to provide for an increase in the health units. That again may not be the exact wording but I am sure the 'we are hoping' phrase is correct. Must provide convalescent accommodation. I think that's right, but I recall very, very well my honourable friend himself having a plan a year, or maybe it was two years ago when he was speaking from over at this side, he had a plan for the convalescents. Certainly I am sure that the Honourable, the Minister of Health and Welfare will agree that something like that is necessary. But I suggest to you, and also the rehabilitation one which comes right after, I suggest to the First Minister and to the Minister of Health and Public Welfare, that you can't make that plan fully effective no matter how hard you try, until you manage to persuade the government at Ottawa that they must include this kind of care under the hospitalization plan. Because it's just simply unrealistic, Mr. Speaker, to believe that people in these times, with the attitude that so many folks have of wanting the fairy godmother called the Government to carry so many of their costs for them. --that if they are guaranteed of having full payment made for them while they stay in hospital, whereas they or their families will have to be responsible for them when they move to another type of convalescent home or nursing home -- it just stands to reason, that you are going to have a great resistance to that kind of a move. And we have repeatedly pressed that upon the federal authorities. I suppose likely my honourable friends have too, and I suggest to them they'll never make that plan fully effective until they get something done along that line. We are making plans - here we have more plans - for rehabilitation hospitals. We intend to bring in a measure - I think that's on rehabilitation hospitals - and when we next meet we are going to have something on Workmen's Compensation. Well, I freely forgive my honourable friends for that one being only in the planning stage because the report was received just a day or two ago. Even with my acknowledged record for acting extremely quickly, I would not expect final and complete action on that one in that length of time. Even I mightn't have acted on it that soon. But a study is underway of municipal problems. Well, surely the municipal problems don't need any further study. Surely, they've had study enough. My honourable friend, the Acting Municipal

MR. CAMPBELL - (Continued)

Commissioner, isn't such a great studier as some of his colleagues, I think, but whoever is studying this, I imagine has had lots of time; and I think if we're going to have a session we are entitled to know what is going to be done about some of these acts. And we are studying the situation re appeals. Like my honourable friend, I am not sure of the correct name of the board but most of us know what he meant. They are studying that one too. This is the most studious group of people I have ever heard tell of, Mr. Speaker. Talk about hard working, well, if these folks were still in university they would certainly get top marks for studiousness. Then there is going to be a complete review on the pension plan. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to give my honourable friends credit. We've got one area of accomplishment here, there's one thing that they didn't have to study; they didn't have to put underway an investigation; they didn't have to take an inventory; they have one accomplishment to their credit. They've sold the race track bonds. Well now, that's something. They got rid of them, and my honourable friend, the First Minister, was very interested to point out that these bonds had been picked up on election day. That's right. We had made a promise to these people that we would, under certain circumstances, take those bonds and we implemented that promise. True, there was a lot of criticism over the fact that we had entered into this arrangement. The reasons for us doing it were mentioned several times. We had hoped and we had expected that private concerns were going to take these bonds and, Mr. Speaker, I am sure they were a good buy. But when it came to the time that an election was due and that had not materialized as we had fully expected it would, the only fair thing to do was to implement our promise and while I confess that as far as I'm concerned, I didn't expect that a new Government was coming in, that it was only fair to the people with whom we had made that engagement that it would be honoured to the letter, and we so honoured it. And there's no point whatever to them being taken over on election day except that it was the implementation of the pledge that we had given. Well, anyway, my honourable friends got rid of those. That is the one accomplishment that didn't take any serious study or delay, and I think that would not be very difficult to do because I believe, Mr. Speaker, judging from the attendances, the support that the venture has received that they are a very good investment indeed and should have been very easy to accomplish.

Then my honourable friend, the First Minister is very proud of the saving in interest that has been made to the municipalities and all I have to say about that is that I would like to see an equally good arrangement made for the farmers of this province. I think they deserve just as good a program as the municipalities do, and we tried to get a better deal for them.

And then the Honourable, the First Minister came to report upon the department that he himself administers. We got the extremely interesting information that 35 studies are underway by the treasury board. Well, I wasn't surprised to hear that because I believe my honourable friend, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is a member of the treasury board and if he is, I would expect to have a lot of studies going on. But

MR. CAMPBELL - ( Continued)

35, in addition to all these that we've mentioned. Surely one of them, with 35 going on, Mr. Speaker, surely one of them could have been reported. Surely one of them would have been ready to tell us what has happened or is happening.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have only the matter to mention that I began with and that is that I maintain that in this debate that there should be a full disclosure of the financial situation of the province. We've had the current position. I think we're entitled to know what is the future position and the future position inasmuch as we have passed this Bill re education demands that we should be told what measures are going to be taken to raise the money for the large grants that are contemplated thereunder. And without that it's noteworthy that my honourable friend concluded an almost two-hour address without getting around to that point at all, almost two hours and never one word about what's going to happen in the future with regard to these financial commitments. I know, Mr. Speaker, that it's a mighty popular thing apparently in these times to be spending a lot of money, to be promising to spend a lot of money. I know that the man who has the responsibility of going out and collecting the taxes to pay for the expenditures such as that is never as popular, and I suggest that the two should be always combined. When you tell people that you are going to do this and that and the other thing, for goodness sake, let's be honest with the people of this province and not try to pretend to them that there is some magical way that governments can get money without it costing anybody anything. And the thing to do is tell them at the time how this money is going to be raised, not where it's coming from. Keep telling them that, sure these services and any service that we say is worthy and needs increased expenditures, then it's right to give them. But don't pretend that they get them free. That's one of the greatest difficulties of the present day in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, and I shudder to think of what is going to happen in Canada if the politicians keep on pretending to the people that there is any such thing as painless taxes. You just can't have the increased services without additional impositions on the people and, of course, in a growing economy you can pay some of these things by the increase in productivity. And, if that is the hope here, I say to my honourable friend that the figures that he has given up-to-date do not reflect it as yet, but whatever the reason is, let us have it, because I maintain that it's not fair to this House or to the public to put through legislation of this kind envisaging such large expenditures and withhold the information as to how the money is going to be raised. That kind of tactics is similar to what we had with the road program. It's a big show but no evidence of accomplishment as yet at all, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that at the conclusion of this debate, the honourable the First Minister must repair the serious omission that existed in his address of this morning and tell us the rest of the financial story.

MR. D. SWAILES (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, we did indeed have a very interesting and a very encouraging picture painted for us this morning by the First Minister. The picture that he

MR. SWAILES - (Continued)

pointed out what I said earlier in this session, that it's a very good thing for a people to have a minority government because a minority government must be on its toes and must do its utmost to please the majority of the people. And the program that was outlined was really a very encouraging one. It's rather ironical I think it's very ironical, that the possibility of implementation should be out of the funds that have been accumulated by the previous government. This again, I want to refer to this again as a promissory session, and again refer to the promissory session that was held in Ottawa last winter. At that time the Prime Minister of Canada, without waiting to be defeated in the House, declared that the situation had become intolerable and dissolved parliament. They had an election, they were returned with an overwhelming majority, and what has been the results? The federal government has failed in the implementation of the promises he made and instead of being an intolerable situation for the Prime Minister, there has developed an intolerable economic situation for hundreds of thousands of families of the people in this country. Now the intentions of the government may be good, I have no doubt on earth that they are. But I doubt very much whether they will be successful, whether they will be any more successful than the efforts of the federal government as long as they pin their policy to a profiteering economy. I say again, that if they do so, their plans will fail here in the provincial field just as they have failed in the federal field. But I do want to say this, that to the extent that the First Minister and his group, the First Minister and his cabinet and his party, to the extent that they do take the economic front from the platform of the C.C.F. to that degree they stand a chance of implementing their policy successfully.

Now, yesterday I had the pleasure of hearing Lester Pearson and he outlined very dramatically the economic progress that is being made by the Soviet Union and what can be understood by the fact, the very fact that they have been able within 30 years to accomplish industrial development which has taken Britain and the rest of the western world something like 180 years to accomplish, indicates to some extent the efficiency of that particular system.

Now I have mentioned the matter of economic anarchy that exists to some extent in the western world. I do not support, for one moment, the dictatorial policies of any group in any part of the world, either in the political field, or the industrial field or the economic field, but I do want to point out this, that there is a middle way between the way of economic dictatorship and the way of economic anarchy, which is the way of the social democratic economic development. And again, if this government and if the government at Ottawa will follow those lines, then there is every possibility of their economic programs being implemented successfully.

I was rather amused to notice that on a couple of occasions the Honourable, the First Minister used to term "a five-year plan". It was rather interesting to see to what extent a government is planning, to the extent of every phase of government, provincial

MR. SWAILES - (Continued)

and federal in Canada and in the United States, being obliged whether they like it or not, to follow these policies of social, democratic planning.

Now the First Minister in his talk mentioned the fishing industry and I know that they have plans in view for that particular industry. Here is a situation that has been in existence for over a quarter of a century, where the whole industry is being dominated by two or three profiteering commercial concerns, with the net results of a decline in the quality and quantity of our fish and with the net result of years of impoverishment on the part of those who actually extract the fish from the lakes. And I do suggest this, that if the idea is to develop the fishing industry as a co-operative industry, that very energetic and very aggressive action will have to be undertaken. The appointment of a single fish representative was actually peanuts, really no effect whatever on the fishing industry. And I think that it would be a very good policy on the part of this government to itself become the marketing agency for our commercial fish and give every possible assistance, much more than has ever been given in the past, to educate the fishermen and to show them the ways in which they eventually can operate that industry as a co-operative industry. Then, of course, there is this fact that we have been very lacking in that particular field with respect to scientific advice, and we do need within that department more fish biologists so that there can be a thorough understanding of the condition of the lakes, the food supply, and so on, in order that we can get the best results from that particular industry.

Then, of course, we are coming to the matter of the development of our natural resources. I have spoken in previous sessions about what I considered to be the unwarranted latitudes given to the International Nickel Corporation in the development of the areas there. They are the ones who are going to benefit from the development of those natural resources, and I certainly hope that in the plans of the present government, that whatever resources are developed that every effort will be made to assure that the product of those natural resources will be enjoyed by the people of Manitoba rather than being taken away from the province and enjoyed by someone outside.

I am very pleased to note the remarks with respect to the University of Manitoba. It certainly needs all the encouragement that it can get in its development, because without any doubt we are going to have a big increase in the number of students attending our university. And this, of course, is an absolute necessity if we are going to keep our place in the affairs of the world.

And again with respect to penal reform, I feel that with the present Attorney-General there is a possibility of energetic steps being taken with respect to penal reforms.

The First Minister mentioned the steps being taken with respect to the Home For The Girls and again this is something that is long overdue. There's been so much delay and so many mistakes made with respect to this particular institution that

MR. SWAILES - (Continued)

a group of private citizens here in Winnipeg have themselves organized and purchased a home which they themselves are going to use for this purpose, without waiting for the governmental action.

And with respect to the hospital planning and the hospital accommodation generally, of course, the leader of our group outlined what we would have in mind with respect to hospital development and I am not going to repeat that.

But one thing has been brought to my attention which I think should be given some consideration to, and that is with respect to the Indian population of Manitoba. They are, of course, actually the wards of the Federal Government, but I understand that in spite of their poor economic position they are being obliged to pay the ordinary fee for the hospital service plan in order to get the hospital service accommodation. I think that this is something that should be looked into - that there should be discussion with the Federal Government so that if they do become ill, if they do need hospital service and their economic condition is so low, that the fees be paid for them in the same way that they are paid for the old age pensioners and those who are in poor economic circumstances.

The Honourable Minister mentioned the matter of improvement in the Motor Vehicle Act and I know that a lot of people are looking to that with a good deal of interest.

But there is another instance that was brought to my attention and I think this requires some change. This is the case of a widow - a widow who had a driver's license and she was driving her husband's car, along with her husband, while her husband was alive. When the husband died and she became a widow, she was advised that she would have to turn in the plates, get a new registration and pay a new license fee. I think that is absolutely uncalled for - that under such circumstances it should be possible to transfer the license without the widow having to pay additional costs.

The Minister then mentioned the matter with respect to labor legislation. I think they have been lacking here to some extent because they know the economic situation. They have been in office for four months. There has been no move so far toward the setting up of the minimum wage board in order that consideration could be given to improving that very low minimum that exists here in Manitoba, and I was disappointed with the report of the Turgeon Commission on Workmen's Compensation. The pension for widows is still at \$65.00 and for children \$30.00 and \$35.00, whereas in Saskatchewan, Ontario and British Columbia the pension for widows is at \$75.00, and I think that we could at least come up to that particular level. And further, with respect to permanent disability, that the payments for those men who were injured many years ago when the dollar was worth two or three times as much as it's worth today, those pensions are still down at that particular level and no recommendation is made by the commissioner to improve the position of that group of people.

Now I just want to deal for one moment, Mr. Speaker, with this other conservative party. I mentioned earlier that the official Opposition had made a series of blunders. I mentioned

MR. SWAILES - (Continued)

three particular blunders they have made and they certainly made the worst blunder of all since that time. I refer to the action taken with respect to the highway program. Surely, the opposition members knew that this was the real thing - that this highway program was the thing that was going to be counted on, perhaps more than anything else, to win votes and to return this government to power whenever it was decided to dissolve this House. And I think they made a terrific blunder when they played this up as much as they did in the debate, instead of letting this thing go. By their action it has assumed far greater importance than it would have done if they had let it go without that extended debate because, after all, compare it with the expenditures on highways that are being made in other provinces and have been made in other provinces. The expenditure of \$33,000,000.00 isn't so awfully exciting after all.

And again, Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude in the way I began - to point out that as long as we have a minority government, we can expect to get some good legislation; as long as we get good legislation we, on our part, will support it; that next to a C.C.F. government a minority government is the best, and I think events will show that as we progress from bad to good, that the government succeeding this minority government will be the best government the people of Manitoba could have - the C.C.F. government.

HONOURABLE CHARLES E. GREENLAY (Portage La Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to speak at any great length in this debate but there are a few points that I would like to bring out and a few things that I would like to mention.

One of the outstanding things in the speech that the Honourable First Minister gave this morning was the lack of information as to the source and the method of raising the money which was to be used to take care of the programs which they have introduced at this Session. Now there was to some extent some information with regard to the source of money which would be used for some of the projects, that is, with reference to the war and post-war emergency fund, but that is only a depletion or a use - maybe not a depletion - it is an advance from that fund, putting that fund into another particular use.

Now the honourable gentlemen went over the revenue and expenditure situation up to date, and in this regard there is very little difference - a matter of \$600,000.00 which is an improvement in the relative position for that period of the year. And this \$600,000.00 isn't a very big amount of money to set up against the price tag which would have to be attached to the programs which have been suggested here and outlined by the Honourable First Minister this morning in his talk.

I see here, Mr. Speaker, that I asked for a Return with regard to the amount of money which is in the war and post-war fund; I see that it has been given as of March 31st rather than as at this particular date, and I do not know whether there have been any changes since March 31st or whether there have not. I note also, Mr. Speaker, that this amount, as set out in this particular statement,

MR. GREENLAY - (Continued)

does not agree with the statement which was given to us by the Comptroller-General as at the 1st of July. There is some little discrepancy in it. I think it is maybe not misleading but the thing that I would like to point out is the fact that in this fund there are advances that have been made to the Power Commission and, Mr. Speaker, in making the statement at the foot of this Return that this money is readily available, it may be available, but I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that in order to make it available to be used for some other purpose than where it is being used at the present time with the Power Commission, the Power Commission will either have to take out of their reserves or they will have to issue a debenture issue and borrow money in order to turn that money into this fund to be used. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would say that that money is not readily available. It seems to me that it can be obtained - granted, but in doing that the other agency of this government will have to give up either cash or raise money by borrowing in order that that money can be used to set up another agency of this government. Mr. Speaker, I am not quarrelling with the amount which is in this particular fund, but I am pointing out some of the things, the manipulations - maybe that's not the proper word - the adjustment, the transfers that would have to be made if that money cash is going to be available to be put into some of these other projects.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another word of warning that I would like to issue in this regard. This is a fund that has been used to purchase sewer and water debentures from municipalities or to finance them as a background to guarantee the interest on the issues of debentures by the municipalities, and if this fund is depleted, Mr. Speaker, this program of guaranteeing the interest on debentures and purchasing debentures when they cannot be sold at a proper rate on the market has only been in operation for a short time and, Mr. Speaker, there is a million seven in that already. I'm sure there are others which are outstanding and it may become necessary to purchase these bonds if the municipalities are going to be able to carry out the project which they will be undertaking; and I would like to say a word of warning that there should be sufficient money maintained in this - in this fund to be able to take care of those items which I think are and should be a first charge on this particular fund. I think it is extremely important that the municipalities have this sort of background for their projects.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one other item that I would like to speak about and that is the financial situation with regard to the relation with Ottawa. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has referred to it to some extent and I do not know that I need to go into it very much further, but the thing that I do want to point out, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that we had some considerable discussion on this in the last Session and it seems to me that the members in the opposition seem to want to maintain - the opposition at that time seem to want to maintain that the Prime Minister had opened up the bag and was sure that we were going to get three million four, more money. Now, Mr. Speaker, I, at that time, I voiced some considerable doubt about that and from time to time I think there's been a couple of - either one or two

MR. GREENLAY - (Continued)

estimates from Ottawa since that time and I was taken to task quite strongly in the Tribune at the end - the middle of the summer, for having been prophesying that this fund would not come through in the full amount and I think, Mr. Speaker, that if you will look at it now, if you will check the figures, you will find that the three million four has been cut in two as at that last estimate. Mr. Speaker, there are two other quarters of the year to go by and if it deteriorates to the same extent, by the coming of the end of the fiscal year the result will be, we'll get nothing more. And, Mr. Speaker, that is the thing that we were talking about last year, and the point that we were trying to make was that we should have had a guaranteed minimum which was higher than the one which is in effect at the present time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you will look at the budget - the budget speech as printed for 1958, you will find that in that, on page 16, we say: "We have, therefore, elected to take into our own estimates for the coming year two amounts which will total \$35,755,000.00, estimated by the Federal Government as the Manitoba payment". That is the amount which they estimated on the basis of the previous year's economic situation that we would receive in this coming year.

Our nominal estimate of the payments we will receive from Canada in 1958 - '59 are \$33,755,000.00, and to bring the totals to \$35,755,000.00 we're planning to transfer \$2,000,000.00 from our deferred revenue reserve. Our \$33,755,000.00 estimate has been based on a possible corporate profits drop in 1958 of five percent, as low in the 1957 level in Ontario and British Columbia. And so, Mr. Speaker, this source of revenue seems to be slipping away and it would seem to me that when you have that sort of a thing in the offing - that sort of thing evident and we come along with a program such as was outlined by the Honourable the First Minister this morning, that there should be some attempt, Mr. Speaker, to give to the House some idea how these amounts which will be necessary to take care of these programs will be recouped. And, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the First Minister went over a long list of new projects, or expanded projects rather, because I don't know that I heard very many new ones, if any, but they were expanded and they were the same old ones with a little new price tag on them with something which will make them more expensive. And, Mr. Speaker, having sat in on preparing a budget or two for this - for the affairs of this province, I would like to say that I would think that it would be a pretty, pretty rough kind of a job to sit down with his Ministers and try to balance up the program that has been going on along with these expansions which have been mentioned, and try to make them balance without running into a deficit or levying additional taxes.

Mr. Speaker, if you run into a deficit it means that at some point, some place, this is going to catch up and, Mr. Speaker, when it does catch up somebody is going to have to foot the bill. Sure, you can defer it by borrowing; you can put it off until tomorrow or until five years from now, or ten years from now, but you've got to pay, and who has to pay? The people of this province have to dig down and pay and that was one of the things, Mr. Speaker, that back in the '30's, the late 30's, all through the '30's and the early '40's, was crippling this government, this province, and

MR. GREENLAY - (Continued)

making it very difficult to expand services here was the fact that there had been too great a debt built up, a dead-weight debt built up which had to be taken care of by the people of this province before they could start to provide for their day to day needs and the expansion of those services which they wanted and required and should have been able to get.

Mr. Speaker, that was one of the things that I think set up a background for the saying, or the attitude that the government which was in office at that time was a penurious government or a penny-pinching government. Why were they? Because the debt had been built up too greatly before that time and they had to dig - they had to dig down and spend the amount of money which was available at that time, a large portion of it to pay the debts which had been a legacy to them. And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out another word of warning - I'd just like to say another word of warning. The danger signal is out here. The Honourable Member who spoke for the C.C.F. Party just a few minutes ago said "What's a \$33,000,000.00 road program in this country? Why, it should be much bigger. It's just a small little thing, a \$33,000,000.00 road program". But, Mr. Speaker, a \$33,000,000.00 road program in one year on top of a \$24,000,000.00 program. Is that peanuts? Is that small stuff? Well, Mr. Speaker, when you get to the place where you're borrowing that much money for a dead-weight debt, then the danger signal is out. As far as I'm concerned, I think that the government should be very, very careful about going into this kind of an expansion program and this kind of a program of borrowing and building up a debt. We've had an experience just a few years ago of that and thank goodness we were able to pull out of it by careful administration. And here we are. What are we doing now? Jumping right into the pond again. Build up the debt. It's O.K. Somebody else will pay for it. Don't worry anything about that. Borrow the money. It'll put off - it'll be put off - the day of reckoning will be put off but, Mr. Speaker, I think the people of this province had a lesson, an experience which they have gone through of trying to dig down and put up enough money to pay off old debts which had accumulated which they will not soon forget, and when this kind of a program goes along, they will not be very happy about it.

Mr. Speaker, this morning the Honourable First Minister in his speech reminded me of a man that's trying to sell a business to you and first thing he does, he gets out his balance sheet and you don't hear too much at that point about the liabilities. He gets the balance sheet out and says look - we've got this here, we're going to have this fine thing, we're going to have that fine thing, and look at what we're going to do and so on. He runs down that side but he sort of skims over the liabilities which each one of those assets really create and you know, in bookkeeping, for every asset you've got a liability. So, when we get a long list of assets, you've got the liabilities run down the other side at the same time. And, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that he was selling the one side of the program this morning but he wasn't telling the other side as to the source and the methods of raising the money which will have to be raised at some time sooner or later to take care of the cost of these programs.

MR. GREENLAY - (Continued)

Mr. Speaker, that's the part that I want to stress and the fact that the revenues from Ottawa are not coming through in the way that they were supposed to have come through. And it seems to me that we should have had more information forthcoming with regard to this particular side of the program. I want to say that we, on this side of the House, are in favour of services which will benefit the people of Manitoba, but we would like to know just how the costs of them are going to be extracted from the pockets of the people of Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one other thing I would like to say a word about, only one, and that is the choice of this new Treasury Board and the new program for the Treasury Board. We have this long list of investigations and duties and responsibilities that the Board were undertaking and, Mr. Speaker, in listening to it carefully, I fail to hear anything new. They were all programs - they were all duties and responsibilities that were carried by some group or some person in the administration. Now, what is it? All of those - control of staff, control of money, control of programs, control of this, control of that, control of everything. Where is it going? To that central little group, Mr. Speaker, and the other day I was taken to task for talking about getting the power concentrated and getting it to an autocratic sort of a set-up, and I was told across the floor of the House, Mr. Speaker, that they did this in the old country in England; they did this at Ottawa; they did this (I am not sure what other places); but he neglected to say that this is the system that was employed both in Germany before the last war and in Russia at the present time. Control is brought right into the central group.

Now maybe it sounds fine for streamlining, and I am not suggesting that the Honourable First Minister is setting himself up as a dictator, but I think there are benefits, Mr. Speaker, in the fact that you have more heads than three or four sitting around to discuss and consider those various problems which are presented to Cabinet. That is the point I want to make, and while you streamline things and concentrate them, you get away from having the benefit, to the same extent, of the other advisers in the government. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that that is eliminating a lot of the sources of good advice which can be had, and has been had over the years, and I do want to say, too, that these programs, these things that they are concentrating in Treasury Board can, in my judgment, be very well taken care of by people such as they were allocated to heretofore. It seems to me that while it is being played up as a big change, a big thing, I think that this has its disadvantages and, mind you, we had a discussion the other day I believe with regard to Orders-in-Council going to a Cabinet or to Treasury Board, and I think that if they don't take much time and if they are not something contentious, they will roll through Cabinet with no great expenditure of time. But if there is something in some one of those that needs further clarification they have more people to catch those most particular points.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't propose to go on at any greater length with this and I would refer back to the road program which was very lengthy, very involved, and to me very far from clear

MR. GREENLAY - (Continued)

because of the repetition of items that were in that that were in the previous program, and so on. We have had a long discussion on that; we think that a considerable amount of it is more or less bluff and it has not been explained across the floor of the House. Like the last question, the Honourable the Minister just sat and did not attempt to answer. However, Mr. Speaker, we had a good discussion on it and we voted in favour of it, and for that reason we have passed on that and the other programs that have been presented here by way of bills and legislation. We've passed on that in this House, and we on this side of the House have supported them and have supported the road program and, therefore, if we have done that, Mr. Speaker, we would have to support the proposition - the motion to go into Ways and Means, in order to point out how this program is going to be implemented and, therefore, we will be supporting this particular motion.

(Continued on next page)

MR. PAULLEY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a brief comment or two in regard to this motion to go into ways and means. When I heard the Honourable the First Minister this morning, and listened with great intent to all that he had to say, I wondered for a little while whether or not I might have been on the banks of the Waskana in the Province of Saskatchewan listening to T.C. Douglas give his budget speech in the Legislature at Regina. As we listened, and I am sure all would agree with me on this, to the various plans and propositions that the Honourable the First Minister said that they had under consideration, it seemed to me to indicate a complete rub-off of their support of many of the advanced resolutions which we had proposed when they were sitting to our right. I think, in all fairness, that it should be said that we accept them and as has been suggested by my honourable colleague of Assiniboia, these things are necessary and these things we are glad that you are doing, and we sincerely trust and hope that the general plan continues.

As I listened to the Honourable Minister and made notes of what he had to say, I could see many items in which it would be necessary for them to receive the support at Ottawa. I hope that they are more successful in obtaining that support than the honourable friends to my right were when the government of the Province of Manitoba and of Canada were compatible to their political philosophy. But from indications thus far, of the actions at Ottawa since they obtained an overall majority, that I think that the Honourable First Minister and his colleagues are going to have a little bit of difficulty, because their situation now is different than it was at that time.

I think we could agree that it is quite in order for the administration to take advantage of the reserve fund that was created during the war period and immediately after when we could not obtain many items due to restrictions on expenditure. I think it is permissible and, in fact, I think we agree that they should use that in these days of relative uncertainty. We only trust that in the ventures that the government are going in to, such as the Farm Credit Act, and the Industrial Development, that they will be in a position to carry themselves and that the Post War Reserve Fund will eventually recoup the money for those two enterprises themselves. We note with interest, and I'm sure the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce must have had a great hand in this, that the First Minister made reference on numerous occasions to statistics and research and this. I know that that was the text of my honourable friend when he sat next to me in opposition. I also note that they have many plans; I don't know if they consulted with Molotov on one or two of them because I note that they, like the Russians, are five-year plans. And I trust that, unlike some of the plans that were suggested by my friends to my right a few years back, that they don't take five years before they become realities.

I would like to say a word or two in connection with the plea that the First Minister made in respect to the support of all of the members in this House in putting across the Public

MR. PAULLEY (Continued)

Schools Act revisions which we have made at this session. I can assure the Honourable the Minister of Education as far as I am personally concerned, and I think the same goes for all of our group here, that we will be more than pleased to do our share, as we have voted for it unanimously in this House, to get the people to understand this bill and to give them an opportunity of voting in favour of it in accordance with the facts. Sometimes on these questions of education and bills of this nature an ill-informed public vote on it with the result, too frequently in the past, that the electorate has rejected ideas which have been progressive and, in our opinion, would be all for the benefit of education.

In the Attorney-General's department, the Minister mentioned the question of the increased inmates at Headingley and that they had made provisions for another hundred culprits. Again, Mr. Speaker, in this connection I wonder whether it is not the signs of the times to a large degree that the population at Headingley, Stony Mountain and all of our penal institutions is increasing. I think we still must go back to the basic fact that it is in good times that there are less populations in our penal institutes and our efforts, while it's necessary at the present time to increase accommodation, that our efforts should be more and more directed to eliminating the need or necessity for individuals to commit those crimes in order to live.

I was also very glad to hear that the Minister, the Attorney-General is considering plans for expanded probation officers. I'm sure that if my Honourable Leader was able to be here today that he would pick on that particular item as something that he has fought for all of the years that he has been in this Legislature, and I am sure that when he reads the report, of mention of the question of expanded probation services, he will be pleased.

Coming to the question of health and welfare, there we note that either the new Minister alone, or in conjunction with his colleagues, are making advancements which have been necessary over the years. I note with interest, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable First Minister mentioned that there would be no more liens on the property of the patients at the Mental Hospital. I think this is a step in the right direction, and I would like to suggest, that in co-operation with the municipality, that some steps be taken so that the municipalities would not be in a position where they, or not be allowed, through some other financial arrangement, to place liens on the properties of their taxpayers for such things as hospital bills and doctor bills, which is the case at the present time.

While dealing with the question of health and welfare, while reference has been made in the First Minister's speech in connection with the Hospital plan, I draw to the attention of the House that at the present time there are many imperfections in the Hospital plan, particularly in regard to those Old Age Pensioners on Social Security. Now, in the Act which we passed here setting up this plan, we set out a provision that if an old age pensioner on Old Age Security could qualify under the provisions of the Old Age Assistance Act, that they would not have to pay the premium. But that is not working out that way, Mr. Speaker,

MR. PAULLEY (Continued)

at all because, as you are aware, that under the Old Age Assistance Act a person can have a certain amount of assets in excess of \$1,000.00, and in order to arrive at the amount of supplemental pension, the sum total of the assets is divided by the number of months in which the individual reaches 70 to establish the amount of the pension, and the method being used at the present time in respect to old age pensioners on Social Security over 70 is simply whether or not they may have assets of \$1,000.00. It appears to me from an investigation, that if a person over 70 has, say \$999.99, then he can qualify for the free payment of the premium. If he has \$1,000.00 he is not able to, and I would suggest to the Minister that he investigate this because after the advertisement had appeared in the paper and directed to our old age pensioners, many of them, very many of them came to the conclusion that they would qualify and no actual clear-cut pronouncement has been made in this respect. So I would suggest that that be done likewise, and also that relaxation be made in the regulations so that those who may have \$1,000.00 or more can be put on the same basis as those under Old Age Assistance between 65 and 70.

It was very interesting to hear the First Minister talk of expanded health services in regard to the polio home care and the efforts to expand the various regulations for disability allowances and the likes of that, and I earnestly appeal to him in respect to the Disability Pensions Act, that further efforts be made to Ottawa. I know that the former government were unsuccessful, but now you are bedmates with Ottawa possibly something more can be done. Because it is .....(Interjection.....) well possibly not quite that much - but it is a field of endeavour, Mr. Speaker, that much still remains to be done because there are so many borderline cases that are not receiving the consideration that I think, and many along with me, they deserve.

In the field of Labour, the First Minister mentioned the Winter Employment Bill which we accepted, and other items of minimum wage, vacations with pay and workmen's compensation, and we will await with interest the legislation, if we're here, that the government intend to bring down at the next session. He made reference, Mr. Speaker, to a meeting held between labour representatives of the union of the C.N.R. Shops in Transcona and a representative of the C.N.R. and M.P.s from Ottawa. (... Interjection)..... No, but you might relay my few remarks to him or he can pick it up from Hansard, Mr. Minister. I might say that I was very glad to hear of that meeting. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, an attempt was made to reach me on the afternoon of the meeting, to have me come here as a representative of my own trade union, the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen, but unfortunately I was away from work at that particular time and could not get here. I would commend the Minister for this meeting, but I suggest that very little may be able to be done in respect to it, and I appreciate that, for in the railroad, not only the C.N.R. but the C.P.R. as well, as indeed in many industries, we workers have become the victims of automation. We on the railroad have seen the transition in steam power to diesel power, the increased productivity of many of the machines that are being used

MR. PAULLEY (Continued)

now over those that were previously used, that many jobs and details that were formerly performed by hand are now being done by machine, and as a net result, that many men with years and years of experience are unfortunately having their services dispensed with through no reason or cause of their own, with this exception, and I must interject this, that one of the basic reasons for the reduction in staff on the C.N.R., and I'm sure it is in the case on the C.P.R. as well, has been the general reduction in revenue that is accruing due to our prevailing economic status at the present time in the Dominion of Canada. I note in reading reports of railway organizations in other parts of the continent that they are over the hill to some degree now and that their prospects are looking a little bit brighter due to some minor upturn in the United States. We have not reached that happy situation here in Canada as yet.

And I would suggest this to the Honourable the First Minister, I haven't studied completely the report on northern development, or the A.D. Little report, but I do notice in the report the suggestion of appeal to the railway management for a reduction in fares for commodity use, and I think that it's a good step in a sense, providing, of course, and I'm certainly not going to attempt to suggest that I'm speaking for management of the railway, but it does appear to me that there seems little likelihood of that at the present time due to the general situation on the railway as a whole. And then I noted, too, and here was my main point in this connection of the Arthur D. Little report, that there was a suggestion in there that if this fails that the government of Manitoba should consider taking it over as a provincial enterprise. I don't know how that appeals to the First Minister and his colleagues across the way, but I think that if they do, they may be in a position which I think that the whole of the people of Canada should be, and whereas we're fighting at all times, or most of us are fighting at all times, increase in freight rates in order to operate our railways in order to pay our railway employees the wages that they deserve, that rather than fight on the question of freight rate increases and the likes of this, as I mentioned in this House before, that our efforts should be directed as illustrated in the A.D. Little report consideration should be given to subsidizing the transportation system, where necessary, for I'm sure that if we have to adopt, in order to implement the A.D. Little report insofar as the north line is concerned, that we of the province of Manitoba will have to subsidize that railway. And as somebody of the thinking of the A.D. Little people suggest a thing like that, I think that our friends opposite should change their tactics. And while I agree most heartily that it's in the great interests of the prairie provinces particularly that our freight rates should be kept as low as possible and as I have suggested before, I don't think that that should be at the expense of the wages of those who are working on the railways.

Other matters were dealt with, Mr. Speaker; I have spoken longer than I intended to; questions were raised in connection with the municipal governments of Manitoba; I suggest to the government, as I have suggested before, that the time has come when

MR. PAULLEY (Continued)

we should give and make a complete investigation of the relationship of municipal-provincial tax structure here in the province of Manitoba. I know the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, when he was in the Premier's chair, insisted at Ottawa that the municipal government should take part in the negotiations and discussions at Ottawa with the dominion provincial conferences. And I was very glad to know that his efforts were successful, in that the municipalities were invited as observers and to take part in the outside discussions in that conference. But I would earnestly suggest that the proper step for a province which has that in mind would be to, first of all, have a wide open discussion between it's municipalities and itself on it's own tax structure basis and then unitedly go to Ottawa. Oh, I know, Mr. Speaker, some will refer back to the provincial - municipal committee which sat in 1952-53 and say that it was done there. We are now five years beyond that, the situation has changed considerably and rather than have a conference or a committee set up as it was at that time, I suggest that we should adopt here in Manitoba a full conference such as was held in Saskatchewan a couple of years ago where rather than through the municipal organizations and the executive of those associations themselves, it was a wide open conference with all members of municipal councils invited to participate. That, Mr. Chairman, pretty well lines up a few things that I thought I should say on this very important debate. As has been indicated we are going to support it. I will say this to the honourable member for Portage la Prairie; he was mentioning about the question of extracting the money from the pockets of the taxpayers, the people of the province of Manitoba - I would suggest to him and suggest to his honour the Honourable Provincial Treasurer that before they undertake consideration of further extractions of the pockets of the people of Manitoba, they do as my honourable colleague from Assiniboia suggested, consider getting into the revenues of the province of Manitoba a greater share of the profits of our natural resources.

MR. ROBLIN (Premier): Ways and Means - Mr. Speaker, if no one else cares to say anything on this motion, may I have the privilege of making a few remarks in closing the debate?

I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that as I listened to the first two gentlemen that followed me in this discussion, I had a rather curious sensation, because as I came in here this afternoon I thought my name was Duff. Roblin but I soon found out that that was a mistake, that my real name was John G. Diefenbaker, because the gentlemen opposite spent a good deal of their time giving him the very blazes. Well, Sir, that's fair; I don't object to that. In fact, I must say that on occasion I have a critical remark or two to offer myself with respect to the federal politicians and to the federal government in this country. I only observe that my honourable friends would do much better if they concentrated their attention on the business of this province and the facts that we can control in this House here. That is not to say that criticism of the federal government is not justified; that is not to say that it is not the business

MR. ROBLIN (Continued)

of this House to discuss some of the matters that concern Ottawa. I admit freely that that is the case, but I do say that our primary concern here is the facts which lie within our own control and it is to those that I would recommend the attention of my honourable friends opposite.

I have been criticized because I said nothing about the tax rental question that is before us now. Well, I will have to say there is simply nothing new on tax rentals since the last time we discussed it here. We had a very full discussion at that time and some complaint was made because of the fact that when the new federal formula was offered, it did not include any change in the floor under that system, that the guaranteed minimum remained unaltered. Well, I am the first one to admit, Sir, that I would be delighted to see the guarantee minimum tied in with the percentage increases that were granted at that time and I will support to the limit of my ability the efforts of any gentlemen in this House or elsewhere to secure that guaranteed minimum tied into the floor on tax rentals, so that if we do have an increase that the floor moves with it. We must, I think, acknowledge the fact that the way that the tax rental system has been established in this country is in such a manner that it is flexible. It moves up and down in accordance with the economic life of the country. I don't know of anybody that objects to that principle; I don't see how we could very well design a plan that other people would agree to that appointed containing a clause that would make that provision. And I freely admit that if that is the case then the guaranteed minimum ought to be tied in with the increases in the percentage. That's the point, I think, that my honourable friends opposite were trying to make this afternoon when they were complaining about the amount of the federal tax rental payment to us and I am with them 100%, make no mistake about that. I can say to this House that I have on a number of occasions inquired as to when a new tax rental conference will be held, because as we all know, the present tax rental agreement expires on the 31st of March next and while I have had no positive assurance on this matter, I have been given to understand that one will be held before the current one expires. As soon as that information comes to my hand in any positive way, that I can with assurance announce, my friends opposite can be sure that I will do so. I do not think, Sir, that I am fairly being criticized for not having made reference to the tax rental because of the fact that there is simply no new information to give and that is the situation with which we are faced today. I want to assure my honourable friends that when that new conference is called, that if we are still the government of the Province of Manitoba, we are going to do our very best to see that a more favourable formula, both with respect to floors and ceilings, is provided for the provinces of Canada and for this province in particular. And I want to say, Sir, that I will take second place to no one, regardless of the politics of the federal government at Ottawa, in defending the interests of this province in any tax rental conference, and I want that point to be clearly understood and I hope that there is no doubt whatsoever in the

MR. ROBLIN (Continued)

minds of the members of this House on that point. And I will go further and say to this House that the interests of this province, as far as I am concerned, are my main responsibility, not the interests of any other government and while we are provinces together in this country, and while there must be a measure of fraternity and co-operation between us or we don't have a nation, and provinces must recognize that fact and on occasion subordinate their own interest to the national welfare, yet we in this House have a particular job of protecting the interests of this province insofar as that may be done in conformity with the national welfare. And insofar as this government is concerned we intend to live up to that responsibility to the very best of our ability in all deals, and members opposite needn't have any fear that we are going to shield, protect, depend or speak up for anyone who acts contrary to the interests of this province provided it is within the framework of the Canadian confederation. Municipalities, municipal conference and the activities of the federal government, have been criticized this afternoon. That's the third subject for criticism but I don't think that it has much to do with the operations of the budgets of this province in the sense that the criticism was directed nor do I think that it has much to do with the conduct of this administration. It is purely a matter between the federal government and the people of Canada as such, rather than those of us who are here in this legislature with our special duties as members of this House. And I simply say, if you want to be critical of the arrangements that the federal government made or did not make, fine and dandy; I'm not going to quarrel with you, all I say is that it has very little bearing on the main points that we are discussing here today.

But there were some other points that bear more nearly on what has been said in the House in these third days of the session. We were told, for example, again that the special session was pointless, that it was brought in for no good purpose, as far as I understood the criticism that was directed, and certainly was quite unnecessary. Well, I would like to examine that statement in a little more detail. First of all, as has been generally admitted, we did promise to have it. Now, we promised to have it for certain special things. We did not say to the people of this province - we are going to have a special session just for fun - we said we are going to have a special session to do three or four specified things of which everyone is aware, and which we have done. When the votes were counted the people approved of that programme so how anyone can say that it was unnecessary to have this session in the light of that approval, I don't know. If you like to say, it is my opinion that you should not have had the session, then of course no one can quarrel. All I can say is that we made an undertaking with the electorate to have one, for certain well understood reasons, and we had it. Let's look a little deeper into the question. We are told that even in spite of that, that the winter employment bill, for example, could have been carried on without legislation. How? By regulation? By order of the Lieut. Governor in Council? By ministerial decree? And all

MR. ROBLIN (Continued)

those things which we have been chided about in this session so far. That's how it would be carried on, there is no other way. We thought it much better to lay what we properly could before the legislature in terms of a bill and in the terms of details laid down that the legislature could pass on and approve. And we think that it was proper and right to do that rather than follow the suggestion of the Honourable, the Leader of the Opposition and do this by means of regulation, order-in-council, ministerial decree. He and I agree, I think, that those sort of things should be kept to the practical minimum, well and good, but it is inconsistent to take that stand and then come along and say the winter employment bill should not have been brought in at this session - he could have done it by some other method.

Let's take the bills on industrial development and on agricultural credit - we were told that it was unnecessary to have a session to put these in - that they could have been brought in at the regular session; so they could. I won't repeat the argument I just made about our promise to the electorate and their acceptance of that promise, but I merely say that there is some advantage in getting these matters under way as we have done, because to leave it to the regular session merely means to delay in a way which we did not consider advisable the implementation of these policies.

But the really important reason, in my opinion, why we should have had a special session, even when all the other factors are considered, is the education bill. And why is that so? The reason is that in spite of the fact that no extra grants will be available before the next session of this legislature, that it is necessary to present this piece of legislation to the House, to the public and to take a vote, and those things take time. And if you consider that a lapse of time is unnecessary in the implementation of the policy of that Bill, well then, there is no reason for a special session and I will have to agree on that. But if you think that the implementation of that legislation is an important thing, should be gone ahead with, should bring the financial relief as far as that measure contained in the legislation to the people, and should give plenty of time to put these new systems into operation - then I think one must admit that it was worthwhile to have this special session, if for nothing else but the education bill that came in when it did.

And we were told that it was unnecessary to have a special session because the highway program could have been authorized without the House. Well, Sir, I won't take that responsibility. I'm conscious of the fact that this is a minority government. I'm conscious of the fact that we may enter into grandiose programs, as some call it, or picayune programs as some call it, of \$33,000,000.00, on a minority government basis. And it seemed to me much better, much more preferable, much more in keeping with our tradition, if that measure should be brought before this House in this special session rather than proceed by these other means, unexplained, incidentally, by my honourable friend opposite when he suggests that it is quite unnecessary to call this session.

Well, let me deal with a few of the other points that he says we are remiss on in our presentation in this debate. He

MR. ROBLIN (Continued)

criticizes us, or somebody did, for the return on the post-war fund and reserve. The criticism was that it wasn't quite accurate. Well, I apologize if it isn't, but all I can say is that it is exactly the same officials that served my honourable friend that serve the present government, and they prepared it from the audited statements of the comptroller general, and so I can only presume that it is correct. And if my honourable friend has a correction to make, I will bear with it, but I assure him that this information was prepared to the very best of our ability and to the very best of our skill.

Now we are told the the government hasn't produced anything new. We are told that it's the same old projects; that was the expression that I copied down; well, I suppose one could make an argument. I suppose one could say that some of the things that the previous government started we are carrying on. I have to admit that there is a continuity of human existence and it will be a sorry day for the British constitutional system when one government does not carry on the general tenure and trend of the society in which that government serves. When you get that state of affairs you can't operate a parliamentary system. I suppose it is fair to say that in introducing the farm bill that we were merely carrying on the policies of the previous administration. I wonder how that stacks up, the policies of the previous administration. When did they bring in a farm bill? Are they not the ones on farm credit that opposed it by hook and by crook? Yet that is one of the important pieces that we brought in - the same old projects we're told. Are they? The same thing with the industrial development fund - the same old project? No, Sir, those are projects which my honourable friends would not approve of. They are in the same trend of development of Manitoba, and no one, I think, would be sufficiently unfair as to say that my honourable friends did not contribute to the development of Manitoba or did not do what they thought was good and proper in the growth and development of this province. Of course they did, they are men of conscience, but I say to them, Sir, that merely to say that we are producing measures also aimed for the development and welfare of our province, and to say that it is the same old project is really not meaningful in relative terms at all, because the projects that we are introducing are ones designed for the same end that my honourable friends served, but ones which they in their time refused and turned down. So I say that that criticism does not fairly lie against us.

With respect to the school bill, I remember so well the former Minister of Education telling us that the purpose of the Royal Commission was to prove that all was not wrong with education in Manitoba. I think those are his exact words, I remember them well. He is shaking his head. I hope I am not misinterpreting the spirit of what he said when I make that remark; well, I try not to; I am doing my best not to. We haven't had the full report yet, but what we have had so far indicates that there is a great deal that was wrong with the old system and those are the things that we are trying to remedy in the legislation that we have before us now.

Now what are some of the other things that have been said?

MR. ROBLIN (Continued)

A very general criticism has been raised which I think deserves an answer in connection with the fact that the educational reforms will cost money, that the new grants have to be paid for. And some members have said that they want to have an explanation on that particular point. Some have gone further, some have said that not only the educational grants, but all the new schemes and plans and what-not that have been laid before the House today will require to be financed and paid for, and they want to know how that is going to be done. Well, Sir, that is a good question and a proper question at the right time, at the right time. My honourable friends opposite, the Leader of the Opposition, the honourable member for Portage la Prairie, have both been Provincial Treasurers in this government and they know perfectly well that when you assemble the final picture on your provincial finances, it is done in consideration of all the facts that are going to go into your budget. We are six months removed, Sir, from the next provincial budget in this province, and for me to attempt at this time to estimate or to predict or to guess what that is going to be in the kind of detail that my friends have suggested is, I think, not only wrong and impossible to do, but I think improper, because our time to justify our financial measures and to say where the money is coming from and who is going to pay for it, will clearly be when these matters come before the House for approval, in terms of the estimates, and we intend to carry it out at that time. But I am going to say something more; I wouldn't like my honourable friends, nor would I like the general public, to form the impression that in proposing the measures that we have, both in the field of education, or in developing these other programs which we have in mind, that we have been unconscious or that we have ignored, or that we have overlooked, the necessity of paying the bill. Such is not the case. I can tell them, and this is all I will tell them, that the preliminary studies that we have made, although I know my honourable friend is allergic to anything so complicated as a study, he told us so in some detail, the preliminary studies that we have made indicate that we can undertake the things that we are intending to do within the financial capacity of this province. I don't know whether it is proper for me to say that I do not anticipate any increase in taxation in the next budget, but that, nevertheless, is my expectation and when the time comes I propose to demonstrate to my honourable friends opposite just what that means in terms of dollars and cents.

MR. E. PREFONTAINE (Member for Carillon): Would you have a general election before that time?

MR. ROBLIN: Well, it depends upon the conduct of my honourable friend; if he can just keep his courage screwed up to the sticking point and continue to vote against us as I commend him for doing, in accordance with his principles in this session, and if he can get some recruits, heaven only knows what may happen in terms of an election. But as far as we are concerned, we are going ahead with our plans on the assumption that we will be the government of this province, responsible to this

MR. ROBLIN (Continued)

House and responsible to the people of this province. And it is in that meaning and in that conviction, Sir, that we will frame our measures for the future of the province of Manitoba.

Now the, what else was said that requires some comment on my part? The race bonds were referred to, yes, that's right, we did sell them. We think we were right to do so. We remember the election speeches. I think the then Attorney-General, then the Minister of Education, then member for Emerson, but I excuse him because he was not in the charmed circle who knew, but some of the members of the cabinet went around saying that they thought that we would never pick them up. They didn't tell the people that a week before election day they passed an order-in-council about it saying that they would. That wasn't mentioned, and perhaps one might have thought that it would have been under the circumstances, but nevertheless, I just make that observation, the facts have spoken for themselves and events speak for themselves.

Now what is there left to reply to in the remarks that have been made? Very little, I think, Sir; a couple of wise maxims were given to us by the honourable member for Portage la Prairie, and I must admit that we have us some good advice and I say that in sincere terms. We are going to be very careful to watch the growth of the debt in Manitoba. We feel that debt for roads is perhaps not in the same classification as some other debts. It is usually called dead weight because to an extent, because roads attract increased traffic and increased tax revenue, that in that sense they are in the nature of a utility - a debate which perhaps we have had in this House before. But I want to tell him just the same that we are keeping a very close eye on the debt structure of the province because I quite agree with him that it must be within the manageable bonds so that we do not get into difficulty that we have found ourselves in in days gone by. I agree with him that the post war reserve and emergency fund is not inexhaustible, it is definitely limited. We have that fact clearly in mind, and after all that is something that we have to take account of, and our aim will be to see that that fund is devoted in a balanced way, to the purposes for which it is required.

But let me give you an illustration of what I think to be some of the difference between the way my honourable friends seem to look on that fund, and the way we do. I perhaps should tell you the parable, the story of the parable of the talents - except it is so well known that it doesn't require any repetition by me. But I remember so well the third servant who took the talent that was given to him and buried it in the sterile earth because he was afraid; and when the Master came back and asked for an accounting, the first two servants were able to show him the increase but the third man said "Lord I knew that you were a hard master and here is your talent and I give it back to you". We want to take the talents that are in that post war emergency fund and put them to work, not gaining interest on bonds - worthy though that may be - but rather in providing opportunity and employment and development for the people of Manitoba. That is our attitude toward that fund. That is why it was accumulated, we believe, and we think

MR. ROBLIN (Continued)

that is a good purpose to which we could put it.

These are rather rambling remarks, Mr. Speaker, because there were many different aspects raised during the debate. I hope I have covered the important ones that we have before us now, so I will just conclude by way of summary in saying this to the House: We accept with good nature constructive criticism from the other side. Just because a man makes a speech against the present Government is no reason to say that he isn't right. I have made too many of them myself to have any other point of view. And while in the course of debate, perhaps sometimes what might be called snappy exchanges take place between members on various sides of the House, and when it appeared in the newspaper, it sometimes appeared as if a blood feud was on or something of that sort - those things are merely done by way of stimulating an interesting discussion. And I'm not at all upset about taking the advice of the member for Portage, in question of debt; or in taking the advice of any other honourable gentlemen on the question of cutting our coat to suit our cloth - because those are all perfectly sound and reasonable observations to make.

I say to you, Sir, that in our endeavors to manage the affairs of Manitoba we are doing our best not to lose sight of those important financial and fiscal principles. We are trying to be guided by them, but we are trying to find the ways and means of making the most of what we have - and that is the policy that this Government is dedicated to. We are conscious that it is not sound to indulge in a splurge of social services or expenditures of that kind, if you do not also at the same time do something to increase the wealth producing activities of the Province. We trust that in the measures that we are contemplating, that we have a balance between those two sides of government activities. And we are conscious, Sir, that none of these things will come to fruition because we, a government, or if you group of men here, or any set of politicians, say if they would like to do it or it's a good thing; it's only done, Sir, if the people of the Province themselves believe in those things and are willing to use the tools which we provide as best we can in the accomplishment of those better things that we look for here in the Province of Manitoba.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is with that attitude of mind that this Government approaches the problems that are before us. We'll make some mistakes, and my friends opposite will find them out, and they will tell us about them - and that will be all to the good - but in the meanwhile we are going to do our very best to carry on the Queen's Government here.

Mr. Speaker asked for a voice vote and declared the motion carried. The House then resolved itself into a Committee of ways and means for raising the supply to be granted to Her Majesty. The member for St. Matthews took the chair at the request of the Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 1, Supplementary Supply: Resolved that towards making good certain further sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the Province for

the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1959, the sum of \$114,725.00 be granted out of consolidated funds. Passed.

Resolution No. 2, Capital Supply - Resolved that towards making good certain monies for various capital purposes, the sum of \$33,000,000 be granted out of consolidated funds. Passed.

Committee rise and report. Mr. Speaker, the committee of ways and means has adopted certain resolutions and directed me to report the same.

DR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, that the report of the committee be received.

Mr. Speaker presented the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. (Continued on next page)

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture that the rules of the House be suspended and that the resolutions reported from Committee of Ways and Means be now read a second time and concurred in.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved by the Honourable, the First Minister, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture that the rules of the House be suspended and that the resolutions reported from Committee of Ways and Means be now read a second time and concurred in.

MR. CLERK: Resolved that towards making good certain further sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1959, the sum of \$114,725.00 be granted out of consolidated funds.

Resolved that towards making good certain monies for various capital purposes the sum of \$33,000,000 be granted out of consolidated funds.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture that the rules of the House be suspended and that leave be given to introduce a Bill No. 10, an act to authorize the expenditure of monies for various capital purposes and to authorize the borrowing of the same and that the same be now received and read a first time.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education that the rules of the House be suspended and that leave be given to introduce a Bill No. 11, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain further sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1959, and that the same be now received and read a first time.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that the rules of the House be suspended and that Bill 10, an act to authorize the expenditure of monies for various capital purposes and to authorize the borrowing of the same be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I ought to just say that this is the usual form of bill that is introduced for the provision of this capital supply and, of course, it is only now being distributed to members so that there is no chance to read it in detail. I can give the House the assurance that it is the usual bill and it's really a proforma matter as the real debate has taken place in the other committee. So if that is satisfactory to the House,

I would ask that approval be given to second reading.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I think it's appropriate that the Honourable, the First Minister should just make the remarks that he's just made because for the purpose of the new members especially, I'm sure that there's some explanation we are not given, it would look as though we deal rather summarily with the huge amounts of money that are mentioned in the one bill. And, therefore, I think it is well to understand, in this case I heartily agree with what the First Minister has said that the debate on this bill, on these bills seems to take place in advance and once the issue has been decided, then usually there is not very much debate on the actual bills themselves and even the suspension of rules is usually agreed to. I want to say that even if the debate has appeared to be somewhat strenuous at times, that I am forced to admit that as far as the progress of these bills are concerned, well maybe, maybe this is another case where I say the government is just doing the same thing that we have done. In this case, I quite approve and the debate having taken place, I think we would be prepared to let the suspension of rules carry right through.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health and Public Welfare that the rules of the House be suspended and that Bill No. 11, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain further sums of money for the public service of the Province, for the fiscal year ending the 31st March, 1959, be now read a second time.

The same explanation, I think, I should give for this bill as well as the first one, Mr. Speaker. This one, of course, does not cover the capital items but the current items and if members of the House will turn to the back of the bill, they will see on schedule "a" a list of the items which were approved in the Committee of Supply. So this is the formal bill putting the seal of approval on what was agreed to in Committee of Supply and the preambles and the various terms in the front of the bill are those proforma ones required for the mechanics of the Treasury Department. And as we said in the former instance, the debate has taken place, approval was given in Committee of Supply so we follow through with this relatively formal bill.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, even though this bill is relatively formal, it's quite important and there are certain items in it that the members very seldom question.

MR. ROBLIN; Mr. Speaker, that thought never crossed my mind.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that the rules of the House be

suspended and that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider the following bills:

Bill No. 10: an act to authorize the expenditure of money for various capital purposes and to authorize the borrowing of the same.

Bill No. 11: an act for granting to Her Majesty certain further sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1959.

Mr. Speaker read the motion and following a voice vote declared the motion carried, and declared that the House resolve itself into committee to consider the bills. Would the Honourable Member for St. Matthews take the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 10 - an act to authorize the expenditure of money for various capital purposes and to authorize the borrowing of the same.

Bill No. 10; Sections 1 to 6 was read section by section, clause by clause and passed.

Bill No. 11 - An act for granting to Her Majesty certain further sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1959.

Bill No. 11; Sections 1 to 6 was read section by section, clause by clause and passed.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, before I suggest that the committee rise, I would just like to take the House into my confidence and say that it was my expectation to go for the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor after the third reading had been given these bills, which means that one or two items will still remain on the Order Paper. I won't do that if there is any feeling that we ought to complete those debates.

I feel disposed to suggest that it isn't necessary because most of the matters dealt with, I think all of them, have been pretty freely discussed one way or another. But I hesitate to do it without advising the Committee that that is in my mind. Unless there is any dissent of a serious nature, that's the course that I will follow.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the Honourable, the First Minister has said and I can see the position that we are placed in. So far as I am concerned, I would have no objection but I think there might be objection from the individuals who have sponsored these resolutions. I would suggest that the 'whips' should confer on the matter.

MR. ROBLIN: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman might allow us to do it in Committee.

MR. CAMPBELL: Are these gentlemen here?

MR. ROBLIN: I see that the Honourable Member for St. George is here; the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose is not; the

Honourable Member for Emerson is here; the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet is here. So there is just one poll to be heard from. Perhaps the gentleman could say what they feel about it.

MR. E. GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Chairman, I had been prepared to speak on this particular subject but I do not wish to hold up the sittings in the House, and I will let the First Minister adjourn without any objection being raised.

MR. TRAPP: Mr. Chairman, the resolution I was about to propose here is of considerable importance to the people that I represent in that particular area. The fact that the Honourable the First Minister had made mention of it in his speech here indicates that he has some knowledge of what has taken place there, and I would urge him to study the proposed resolution which would be an indication of what is required there at any rate.

MR. J. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, I feel that since the resolution has achieved its purpose, I do not think I should say any more.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I see that the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose is back. We were discussing by courtesy of the Chairman whether or not the various proposers of the resolutions outstanding, would be willing to let the matters lapse in view of the fact that we have had some debate and some indication of opinion. The other movers have agreed to do that and I now inquire if you with respect to your amendment, your motion on the Lake Winnipeg and Manitoba Board.

MR. G. MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Yes, that would be acceptable to me I think, Mr. Chairman. Now how about the one on T.V? The same thing there?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, if you please.

MR. MOLGAT: Well the only reason, quite frankly, that I brought the resolution up in the first place was to get information. I didn't know exactly what way to go about it and I thought the resolution might be it. Now you referred this morning in your statement to something about this. I presume that you are proceeding with the plans and that action is going on in this regard?

MR. ROBLIN: That's right, and if you care to - I hate to do this after what was said last night - but if you do care to see the Minister of Public Utilities, he can give you the details. That being agreeable, I suggest the Committee rise.

MR. R. PAULLEY (Radisson) Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises, there was an Order for Return for the honourable member for Fisher. I know there were some reservations in connection with that order. I don't know if the Minister of Public Works has proceeded with it, but I would suggest that if he has, or will have it, that it be forwarded to the honourable member.

MR. WILLIS: I'll be glad to mail it to him when I get the information.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record that I concur entirely with the remarks made by the honourable member for Ste. Rose on his resolution, and I urge the government to take the steps that he asked them to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the committee has considered Bills No. 10 and 11, and recommends the same without amendments.

MR. MARTIN: I move, seconded by the member for Winnipeg Centre, that the report to the Committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that the rules of the House be suspended, and that Bill No. 10 - An Act to authorize the expenditure of monies for various capital purposes and to authorize the borrowing of same, be now read the third time and passed.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Secretary, that the rules of the House be suspended and that Bill No. 11, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain further sums of money for the public service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st of March, 1959, be now read a third time and passed.

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

MR. SPEAKER: May it please your Honour, the Legislative Assembly at its present session passed several Bills, which in the name of the Assembly, I present to your Honour, and to which Bills I respectfully request your Honour's assent.

MR. CLERK: No. 2, An Act to amend the Public Schools Act; No. 3, An Act to further the Economic Development of the Province by encouraging the growth of business; No. 4, An Act to amend the Municipal Act; No. 5, An Act to amend the Companies Act; No. 6 An Act to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act; No. 7, An Act for the Relief of Denis Beaudry; No. 8, An Act to provide Assistance to Farmers in Establishing, Developing and Operating their Farms; No. 12; An Act to Authorize the Making of Agreements between the Government of Canada, the Government of Manitoba and Municipalities, for the Purpose of Increasing Employment of Persons in Winter; No. 13, An Act to amend the Veterinary Science Scholarship Fund Act.

In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these Bills.

MR. SPEAKER: We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in session assembled approach your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to her Majesty's person and Government, and beg for your Honour the acceptance of these Bills: Bill No. 10, An Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Moneys for various Capital purposes and to Authorize the Borrowing of the same; Bill No. 11, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain further sums of money for The Public Service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1959.

MR. CLERK: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, and accept their benevolence and assents to these Bills in Her Majesty's name.

HONOURABLE J.S. McDIARMID (Lieutenant-Governor): Mr. Speaker, and members of the Legislative Assembly: The First Session of the Twenty-fifth Legislature is now at its close. I desire to commend you for the faithful attention you have given to your duties, and to convey to you my appreciation of your concern for the public interest and the general welfare; for the provision of necessary sums of money for the carrying on of public business. It is my duty to thank you and to assure you that these sums will be expended by my Ministers with unremitting care to secure efficiency and economy in the work of all the departments of the Government.

In relieving you from your duties and declaring the First Session of the Twenty-Fifth Legislature prorogued, which it is now my duty to do, I extend to you a sincere renewal of my best wishes and I pray that under the guidance of Divine Providence, our Province may continue to progress in providing those things which contribute to the well being and happiness of the people of this Province.

HONOURABLE MARCEL BOULIC (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly, it is the will and pleasure of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, that this Legislative Assembly be prorogued until it shall please His Honour to summon the same for the dispatch of business, and the Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.