

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

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, April 7th, 1961.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

The Honourable Member from Wellington.

MR. RICHARD SEABORN (Wellington) introduced Bill No. 101, An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act (3).

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I have the very distinct pleasure of introducing a group of five girls of the CGIT Order. These girls are a senior group from the First Presbyterian Church in Brandon, and their ages range from 15 to 17. The girls are accompanied by their leader Mrs. Brunnen and also by Mrs. McPhall, both these ladies of Brandon. It will be of further interest to the members of the Legislature, I'm sure, to know that Mrs. Brunnen is the daughter of my desk mate the Honourable Member for Morris. It's not often my good fortune and pleasure to have the privilege of introducing a group from Brandon which, of course, is the jewel of the constituencies, which includes simply the City of Brandon, the Queen of Western Manitoba. And it is an especial privilege to have such an attractive group of young ladies. I know, Mr. Speaker, that you would like me to wish these young ladies a most pleasant and instructive visit, and also wish that they take home something of interest that they can tell their friends about. I am sure that they will enjoy the day, and since this is part of their interest in world affairs, interest in events, I know we will all wish them an enjoyable afternoon.

HON. JOHN THOMPSON, Q. C. (Minister of Public Works) (Virden): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to mention that this probably appears to be Western Manitoba's day because it is my pleasure to introduce to you and to the members of this Assembly a group of 4-H students from Elkhorn, Manitoba. I am very happy to extend a greeting to the young people from Elkhorn, the members of the 4-H Sewing Club and their leaders, Mrs. Lund, Mrs. Mitchell, Mrs. Berry and Mrs. Jones. I'm sure all of us appreciate very much the work which is being done by 4-H leaders in the province and the contribution they are making to the welfare of you young people. I want to say to our visitors that I am very happy to see them here. This is the first occasion on which I have had an opportunity of greeting a group from my constituency, and I'm most happy to extend a hearty welcome to them now and to express the hope that they will return and see us again.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, would you be kind enough to permit me to correct one word that is in Hansard of April 5th, on page 1654. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, this word may be correct, what I should have used, but unfortunately I did not use it. It says "waste". I had in mind to say a "wind in the wilderness" and not a "waste in the wilderness". Although the word "waste" may be more appropriate. I do not know, but I'd like to correct it now.

MR. W. B. SCARTH, Q. C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I think that one or other of the weebegone members who returned from Brandon should make a report.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition) (Lakeside): in shape to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the reasons, including statistical data, why the Department of Public Works ordered the erection of fences

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) limiting access to properties lying along the east approach to Lockport Bridge and did not require the same work to be done regarding the properties on the immediate western approach to that bridge.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fisher, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing: 1. The number of school bus drivers tested to date. 2. The number of rejections to date. 3. The number of drivers who, having failed the first test, have passed the test upon a second trial.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead and proposed amendment by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member for St. John's. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. DAVID ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Speaker to let this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand; Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member for Logan. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, regarding the resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan, I find that I can concur in the first three paragraphs of the preamble. I think each one of these paragraphs sets out a desirable objective. But I cannot concur in the main portion of the resolution which asks the government to extend the provisions of The Fair Wage Act to cover all construction workers in the whole of the Province of Manitoba. I believe that that would be a task which the Department of Labour could not entertain in respect of the enforcement of it. But at the same time I do believe that in the larger construction contracts to which the first part of the resolution refers, I do believe that these large construction contracts, whether they're undertaken by the government or by private individuals, that they should be covered by The Fair Wage Act. I also believe, too, Mr. Speaker, that in respect of any contracts awarded by the Government of Manitoba to any successful tenderer, that there should be supervision after these contracts are awarded to see that these contractors are paying the wages and obeying the working conditions under which the contract was granted. And for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that the motion of the Honourable Member for Logan be amended: (a) by deleting all the words after the word "wishes" in the first line of the operative part of the motion and substituting therefor the following: the Government to give favourable consideration to the advisability of amending the provisions of The Fair Wage Act to cover such larger construction contracts and to supervise and enforce all construction contracts awarded by the government to successful tenderers.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead and the proposed amendment by the Honourable Member for Roblin. I might say in looking over this amendment I found that the Honourable Member for Roblin has put "WHEREAS The Agricultural Stabilization Act" in his amendment and it is also allowed by his amendment in the original motion. And I would suggest that the House allow me to delete this from his amendment. Agreed? The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. SPEAKER: This motion stands on the Order Paper.

MR. EDMOND PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, may I just say one word and this one word will be in some form a repetition of what I said last year; this is why I will be short. Now, the amendment to this resolution addresses itself directly to the Federal Government just as the main motion that was made by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The one is completely different to the other one. I don't know why the members to your right, Mr.

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) Speaker, did not see fit to defeat the motion proposed by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. I suppose he wanted to put on record new policies or additional policies from those that were announced by the Minister of Agriculture, but here again, Mr. Speaker, we are addressing ourselves to Ottawa and seemingly know what we ourselves can do. Now as I stated last year, the First Minister in October or November 1958, made a speech to the Canadian Tax Foundation. From the reports of that speech, I liked the speech very much. He advocated at that time that we should have a Prairie Provinces Economic Council in order to promote the pooling of the brains of the three western provinces, because he said the three western provinces had peculiar problems in common to the three western provinces, and that the three western provinces should attack these problems on a common basis, like the Atlantic provinces had attacked their own problems with so much success.

Now last year you remember, Mr. Speaker, that I made a motion to the effect to try and carry into practice the good suggestion made by the First Minister, Mr. Roblin. Now I suppose the government has been very busy during the course of the past year; I'm not blaming them, because they have not established, as far as I know, this three prairie provinces economic council but I would like to reiterate the importance that this should be done. The three western provinces, Mr. Speaker, are the provinces producing the surpluses, and these surpluses are the cause why our western economy is not what it should be, why we are not getting our share of the national income, and we are living under a high cost economy. The high cost economy is proper and is good for the eastern provinces, but it's not good for us because we depend on trade, and I say that these special problems that we have in common with Saskatchewan and Alberta should be discussed fully by the best brains of the three western provinces, and I think that the First Minister was quite right three or two and a half years ago when he made his suggestion. I am sorry that he has not apparently yet acted upon them and I would urge him to do so. Now I know that the Minister of Agriculture has announced some national -- that he would establish -- he has established a national committee with respect to research and marketing, but, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that this is all that should be done because we have problems which are peculiar to the three western provinces, and in the marketing policies maybe the western provinces will be, well, out-voted, if I might use that word, by the eastern provinces. Depends on who's on these marketing boards, on these marketing committees. So, Mr. Chairman, I believe that I would like to urge again the First Minister to think in terms of Western Canada, of the prairie provinces, to get together with provinces that have the same problems as we have, with respect especially to agriculture. So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, that the amendment be amended by adding thereto the following words: "AND further be it resolved that this House is of the opinion that the government should give consideration to the advisability of trying to have established a Prairie Provinces Economic Council in order to pool the best brains of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba, to study the economic position of these provinces in the national economy, and particularly the difficulties facing the western farmers."

Mr. Speaker presented the amendment to the amendment.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable Member for Carillon a question if I may?

MR. SPEAKER: Has the Minister permission to ask the Honourable Member for Carillon a question? Agreed.

MR. HUTTON: I haven't had time to examine your resolution, but from the remarks that you made, it appeared to me that you were intimating that western Canada farmers could solve their problems without relating it to the general agricultural economy of Canada, and I wanted to ask the honourable member if this is what he intended to intimate. Is he advocating sectionalism?

MR. PREFONTAINE: No Sir, my intention is in my resolution. The wording is very clear. I am asking, as you'll find out, the First Minister to carry into practice, if possible, his own statement of intention at least, as made to the Canadian Tax Foundation in 1958 as agreed in this House last year, I believe, and as passed in this House last year, and I think that the three western provinces, if they do meet, study their problems especially the plight of agriculture, that they would relate these problems to the general situation existing in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fisher, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Leader of the CCF Party and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. A. J. REID (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, we're all concerned about unemployment and how it's affecting the economy of our country. The last figures I could get were from the Tribune of March 22, 1961. "Sky-high unemployment hit 719,000 in February which is approximately 20 percent higher than it was the same period last year, and this is 11.3 of the present labour force." And down here, Mr. Speaker, it gives the percentages of the prairies; 8.6 for Ontario; 7.1 for the prairies; but the jobless percent is 18 percent for the Atlantic provinces; 14 percent for Quebec; and 13.9 percent British Columbia. Now I'm just quoting those, Mr. Speaker, because I'm going to use that later on. And the Honourable Member for Portage, he quoted Mr. Coyne the other day, and myself too; certain sections of it I agree with Mr. Coyne and certain sections I don't. The heading I do. It's Wednesday, March 22nd of the Free Press when Mr. Coyne says, "Pay any price to alleviate unemployment in Canada." Well, that section I agree with him. Then he goes on -- he has two methods by which he wants to solve this problem -- or his suggestions -- but as he goes on further in his speech he says, "By no means should we interfere with the interest rate of finances or of banks." That part I don't agree with him.

Now I have here also, Mr. Speaker, a publication of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association which is strictly not a labour pamphlet, and, quote: "Prescription for jobs. Although recent evidence strongly supports the conclusions that the official figures may well over-state the extent of genuine unemployment by as much as a third, the fact remains that the number of Canadians in urgent need of jobs right now is unpleasantly high." And then it goes on to say, "Nobody derives any satisfaction from this situation, least of all those most directly affected." Work is as necessary to most of us as sleep, food and air, and not alone for economic reasons, as important as these are. The anxieties and hardships associated with weeks and months of enforced idleness and frustrations are surely not to be wished on anyone." Well, Sir, that's a fairly good quotation when it comes from a pamphlet like "Industry".

Mr. Twaits, President of Imperial Oil, great industrialist, speaking to the national forum -- his idea, that political action seldom solves an economic problem. Well, Sir, the First Minister in reply to the resolution of our leader on unemployment proposed an eight-point program on unemployment. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye, the aspiring leader of the Liberal Party, he also has a plan and platform on unemployment.

The point I'm trying to stress, Sir, is that the Governor of the Bank of Canada, an industrialist, Canadian Manufacturers' Organization, and all political parties are all concerned with unemployment. So, Sir, there are many different views and opinions on this subject. True, I believe much of it is impassive and abstract thinking. We must pool all our ideas and get some positive and constructive thinking and action and concentrate to solve and abolish this problem. And I agree with the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie when he says a great deal of planning and study will be necessary and required to solve this problem. But the majority of people say "Well it's impossible". Well, Sir, I don't think anything is impossible when the human mind and effort is put into it. Just a small instance; here in Manitoba, the government floated a Manitoba government bond issue and nobody ever anticipated that the overwhelming support would have materialized as it had.

The point I am trying to stress Sir, that with these ideas we should all realize that unemployment is a national emergency and crisis. You know, Sir, the process of human evolution, whether it's labour or otherwise is a slow process, but nevertheless here I disagree with Mr. Twaits when he said that by legislation we can't solve an economic problem, because, Sir, if it hadn't been for legislation passed by previous governments, on old age pension plans, unemployment insurance and other pension plans and labour legislation, that he would now be in the throes of an economic crisis that the average individual could hardly visualize. Remember in the thirties, they said we couldn't afford such a legislation because it would ruin the economy of the country. Now we take such a benefit as a matter of fact in our way of living. I am sure,

(Mr. Reid, cont'd.) Sir, that if we all concentrate all our efforts and knowledge on this one matter, unemployment, that within a short period of time we would have it solved. True, I understand, this problem is beyond the scope of any one province and there are many approaches to it, and I would suggest when it comes to unemployment, Sir, that we forget all our differences and bury our hatchet -- but not in each others skulls -- and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that our Premiers across Canada give this problem the number one priority on their agenda and then a provincial-federal conference should be called and devote the whole session to nothing else but discuss and resolve this very important subject and at least make an attempt to try and abolish it. The Federal Government, Sir, could immediately declare a national emergency or crisis as they do in time of war or disaster, and funds would readily be available to combat and tackle this problem in a constructive manner and work for a long range permanent solution. To ensure the people of Canada, Sir, their right to a livelihood of earning a living and many of our so-called economic problems also would be solved, because, Sir, in my estimation, the most important element in this world is the human element, but unfortunately business, government and financiers are all so concerned with business, government and financing that they forget all about the human element -- very unfortunate. Therein lies the solution Sir.

Also, the Federal Government could establish a fund from which provinces and cities and municipalities throughout Canada could borrow at cost to finance many needed projects throughout the country and thus help to alleviate unemployment with many years of construction that this would involve, while private enterprise, Sir, which has the initiative to promote and produce some new industries and create employment, should have access to funds from the government, both provincial and federal, at reasonable rates of interest, to induce them to expand and assist in this battle against unemployment. But, Sir, as long as this apathy exists and we just compare percentages like I read them here in comparison with other sections of Canada, like we do batting averages of ball clubs or standings of hockey teams, we won't accomplish very much. True, Sir, I realize unemployment will be with us at all times in a relatively small percentage, but regardless of what economists quote as a relative percentage that is average for any country, we won't solve it until we all definitely realize that it is the most important object and subject of modern day society to solve. In fact, Sir, I believe it is a challenge to our democratic way of living. It's like a cancer attacking a healthy body; if you don't arrest it and stop it, and cure it, it takes over. The same pertains to unemployment; this will eventually endanger our democratic way of living, when a person considers what is happening and occurring in other parts of the world in economic upheavals. After all, as I have mentioned before, Sir, what is more important than the human element of any country. It is towards this goal that all our energies must be concentrated and devoted, because, Sir, if we fail then all will be lost. Well, Sir, whether we do it by legislation or voluntarily -- then true, some groups will need a little compulsion -- we must realize that unemployment affects all of us. True, many of us think it won't happen to us, which is natural, but at the trend that the pattern is being unfolded, Sir, it may be a different story, as a quote from Shipshore News, of March, 1961: "Three milling firms will merge April 1st; Maple Leaf Milling, Toronto Elevators, Purity Flour Mills." What does that mean, Sir? It means in the field of employment, less employees would be required. Also, Sir, the group I am associated with, non-operating railways employees' group, in the period of the last ten years, we've lost in the vicinity of 50,000 individuals. True, it's been from natural causes, retirement, but the majority of lay-offs, and it still continues, were due to dieselization and automation. I recall, Sir, about reading an article about a switching yard, railroad yard, in the United States which employed a couple of hundred men previously; now with electronic equipment, all new ideas, they only have about six men running that yard from a massive switchboard. Another showing the number of employees going down all the time, Sir.

Another instance I read, Manufacturing and Parts where at least a hundred people used to work; now you walk in the place, not one individual around, not one human being; all electronic equipment, except the maintenance man if something should go wrong. Even our university, Mr. Speaker, has an unemployment office here. When I was enquiring about employment facilities and opportunities for this summer -- and I understand it's very grim this summer for students; I'm not saying maybe graduates, but students, this summer to get employment in the Greater Winnipeg area or even Manitoba. This trend, Sir, is all along the line.

(Mr. Reid, cont'd.) The human race is not being required as employees, only as consumers of goods and services by industry, but, Sir, we will definitely make poor customers if we become all unemployed. In fact, Sir, we will become what I consider, in the next decade, a nation of unemployed, while all our skills, resources and ~~ae~~ ~~forth~~ are at our finger tips to solve this problem of modern day society.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowns): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question. Sir, if this New Party were in power at the present time, do you think they could solve the unemployment problem?

MR. REID: No, Sir, I figure by calling a conference -- like I just mentioned here, all these different ideas -- I'm not saying one party's going to do it or a different party, but all the different ideas, and in this modern day society, that we don't even make an attempt to solve it; we must have the skill and knowledge, and I am sure if we all got together and attacked this problem, like originally or previously old age pensions. That was always fought against until it was passed by legislation; now it's part of our way of living. Unemployment and many other benefits, fringe benefits, Sir; that's what I figure.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Honourable Member for Kildonan another question. As we all know this strike that was supposed to be -- the non-operators that he's a member of -- was going to take place last fall and fortunately for the good of the country and for the good of everyone concerned, the government postponed that strike. I would like to ask him as a personal member of that union, would he go on strike for higher wages, or would he sooner call off the strike and carry on in the usual manner at the same salary and with the same number of employees working as there was in the past?

MR. REID: I can't answer that; I wasn't on the negotiating committee and I actually don't know what transpired. Quite a number of the employees voted against the strike, but as the majority in a democratic government, or world, or way of living rules, the majority voted for a strike and that was it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate, proposed motion, the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I ask that this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Matter stand. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Wellington. I might say that we broke off this debate at the dinner hour the other evening and I informed the House that the Honourable Member had ten minutes further speaking time and when I consulted my reference I found out that I was in error and that he has 20 minutes. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. SEABORN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The other day I mentioned that this resolution was basically an argument in favour of more government ownership, and I tried to show that the Tennessee Valley project, far from being one of the greatest acts in the history of the American people, as the Honourable Member for Brokenhead claimed, was in fact nothing less than a powerful dictatorship which had absolute control over the lives of five million or more people.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question? Why didn't the Republican Administration under President Eisenhower, which believes in free enterprise, why didn't they wipe out TVA in the eight years they were in office?

MR. SEABORN: I'm sorry, I didn't get the last part of your question.

MR. ORLIKOW: I said the United States had eight years of Republican Administration which is opposed to public ownership. Why didn't they wipe out this dictatorship of TVA while they were in office.

MR. SEABORN: Well, I'm sure you would have the answer to that as well as I would. The fact remains that it was put into effect by Congress during the war years and it is not responsible to any government body and is nominally responsible to the President. The TVA is beyond the control of any governmental body and can allocate investment and costs to the various projects in its program, and since the Presidential approval is more or less just a perfunctory

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd.) act, the Board of the TVA is virtually on its own on a question of policy. There is a saying that while the TVA drains the water from the three southern states it also drains the other 48 states as well. And this is true; the Government Corporation Appropriations Act of 1948 calls for payment to the United States Treasury by TVA of \$348 million within 40 years, or at the rate of \$87 million every ten years without interest. Yes, without interest. It is estimated, however, that the United States Treasury will have paid out in interest on these long-term loans \$174 million, and since TVA is not required to pay that interest it must come from the taxpayers instead of the users of that electricity. It is estimated that by 1993 the United States Government will have paid out \$694 million in interest on this project. And from the TVA project, Sir, you will recall that I reviewed some of the enterprises of the Saskatchewan Government since they entered office, and they invested approximately \$200 million of the taxpayers' money into crown corporations. In the Hansard of April 4th they had this two hundred billion which, of course, is wrong. Most of these state-operated enterprise could not exist in a free economy and only lasted about two or three years in most cases, with substantial losses, which had to be borne by the Saskatchewan taxpayer. Members of the same party would have us follow more or less the same course of action in Manitoba if they could. And these advocates of government ownership and operation, of means and production generally, place power and other forms of energy at the very top of their list. And they offer various reasons for this. First, they claim that these industries are clothed with public interest. Now this is absolutely true, but so were the leather tannery, the shoe factory, the woollen mill, the Fish Board, the lumber mill and all the other industries the Saskatchewan Government tried to socialize with disastrous results. In fact it would be very difficult to find any industry that is not clothed with the public interest.

The second, and indeed the most effective weapon being used to socialize the power and gas industry, is the idea that these form natural monopolies. And it is true that usually one company of this nature serves a given area or community, but this is not always the case. Even if there should be only one power or gas company, the extent of actual and potential competition is far greater than it appears on the surface. There are certain forms of direct competition that all power and gas companies must meet. They must meet direct competition from substitute forms of heat and energy. Electricity and gas, of course, are natural competitors, but in addition oil, coal, wood, bottled gas and waste steam are all competing ways of cooking, heating water, and heating houses and plants. And finally there remains the most effective competition of all. These companies must compete with everyone else for the consumer's dollar.

A few years ago the New York Public Service Commission granted the government-owned power system of Jamestown a rate increase of 18.84 percent. In their report they made this revealing statement: "In the year 1949 this Commission granted six general increases to electric utilities. Two were municipally owned and the average increase was 16.6 percent. Four were privately owned and the average was 2.8 percent. During the following year one municipality was granted a general increase in rates of 10.5 percent, and a private utility received six percent. In 1951 two privately owned utilities were granted general increases of 10.6 percent and to date during the present year" -- that was the year of 1952 -- "five general rate increases were approved, two to municipally owned utilities averaging 6.4 percent, plus Jamestown at 18.84 percent, and three to private utilities averaging 6.9 percent." This, Mr. Speaker, I think tells its own story.

Now there was some measure of truth to what the honourable member said about the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company; for one thing a government utility is able to negotiate in a much more favourable position financially. But I did not think it was quite fair to compare this utility with Alberta and Saskatchewan. The gas company pays as much for the gas here as the retail consumer pays for it in Alberta. And despite what the honourable member says, the natural gas deposits in Saskatchewan are a distinct advantage. And I think we should appreciate the fact that distribution of gas is relatively new here compared to the other provinces to the west of us. Using the same lines of argument we find the rates are correspondingly higher to the east of us.

MR. SCHREYER: Will the member allow a question?

MR. SEABORN: Afterwards, please.

MR. SCHREYER: All right.

MR. SEABORN: I understand the Gas Company is now serving approximately 80 percent of the built-up areas of Greater Winnipeg, and the consumers seem to be quite satisfied with the rate that actually averages under 90 cents per MCF. This company was given a great challenge and they seem to have met it quite successfully. According to the Free Press last Saturday, that is April 1st, the consumers rose from approximately 24,000 to 35,000 and the company expects an additional 14,000 during the coming year. They have also, according to this report, set themselves an ambitious expansion program and their capital expenditures will be in the neighbourhood of \$6 million. I know my socialist friends will not agree with me but I think this is a most creditable showing for a comparatively young company. I could not approve of this utility becoming a Crown corporation, for there are several unseen factors that must be taken into consideration. First the experience in Saskatchewan seems to indicate that the government introduces low rates for political reasons, which results in deficits in many areas, and the taxpayers are compelled to bear a load on certain phases of the operation that is definitely uneconomic. Just this year, I understand, the Minister in Saskatchewan apparently announced that gas would be extended into certain areas without the knowledge of the management of the gas company. The Minister was probably guided by political notice but it certainly does not contribute to an efficient operation, and must have created a great deal of consternation among the executives of the gas company.

To sum up, Mr. Speaker, I would say that public ownership of utilities represents a great step backwards instead of forwards. Although Manitoba has been most fortunate in the management of its Crown corporations, public ownership nevertheless does reduce competition as one giant arm of the state replaces several private companies. It means that an agency of the government with an exclusive and perpetual franchise replaces voluntary associations with non-exclusive and limited franchise. It means that instead of private companies conforming to competitive markets and economic trends, there is an agency that sets its own course, fixes its own rates, and makes up its losses by compulsory levies upon the taxpayers. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, could not support this resolution.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member, I think, said that the price which the companies had to pay in Manitoba was roughly the same as the retail cost to the consumer in Saskatchewan?

MR. SEABORN: What I said was the gas company here had to pay for the gas wholesale approximately what the retail consumer in Alberta had to pay.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, as usual, the honourable member who has just spoken is not happy unless he eats up a CCFer for breakfast, lunch and dinner. That's part of his diet, and I don't blame him. If it improves his health, he is quite welcome to it. But you've got to be sometimes a little bit reasonable, and before considering, I want to state right here, and I have stated this already before, that Saskatchewan is a government of its own. I'm not compelled to support everything they do. Conditions may be entirely different now. Naturally we take out the best -- so we do from the other provinces. We are ready and willing to commend some of the Ministers if they do a good thing. And the question is the accusation that the CCF whatever they do, either here or in Saskatchewan, is only for political reasons, I don't think that this accusation -- it's time that we should forget about it. It's history -- 25 or 30 years ago they could have probably made this statement. Nowadays it has not yet been proven that any party, or any individual, works for political expediency. And if this is true, then perhaps I could make the same accusation against the honourable member. He's here; whatever he does, he belongs to the Conservative Party, I'm sure not because he is religiously inclined to be a Conservative. I won't believe it. I don't think I should say it, Mr. Speaker; I'll take it back. But I don't think it's right he is there for -- if you call it political, sure we are political; we want to create a better world to live in. We want to create a better progress to live in. We want to do away with unemployment if possible. We want to help the other part of the world who go to bed hungry almost every day. And then he can say political.

We have been accused we are political because we suggested something for the old age pensioners in the last 20 or 25 years. We are accused of politics. And what happened? The very same that accuse us for politics has increased the pension now to \$44.00 from \$20.00 and I hope they still get \$75.00. Call it politics if you wish. The very fact that this government has accepted the principle of public ownership; it may not be in everything, it may not be in the

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) sale of groceries, but they have public ownership in the liquor and beer business. They are public ownership, because they realize that they could control it better and probably control the price and still make a profit. It has taken a quarter of a century to satisfy the government of the day that they should take over the Hydro, and everybody remembers when the Winnipeg Electric Company charged 20 cents a kilowatt hour for power and then when the City of Winnipeg decided to build a public ownership Hydro supply, that the price dropped gradually up to one cent, and the people don't pay any more than one cent today. We've got to remember the time that it was 20 cents a kilowatt hour, there was one house in 50 had hot water. Now they all have hot water, and they all have sanitation; they all have their convenience because the City of Winnipeg or the Province of Manitoba -- it's immaterial -- public body had decided that they could serve the people better by public ownership, reduce the rates, give them the comfort, give them the facilities, give them health, give them sanitation, for less money than the private companies charged. So they've taken over finally now. The Hydro is public ownership. Why? Because they cannot substitute hydro. It's an essential thing. It isn't like going to a grocery store and if one charges higher they could go somewhere else. There's only one hydro outlay in this province, and the government of yesterday and the government of today have realized this. If they'd have left it in private ownership, thousands of the farmers now who are getting electrification would have never had it because it would be impossible for them to pay. What happens now in the last ten years? The Hydro electrification has been paying hundreds and hundreds of farmers for the power. They were entitled to the same privileges as the city. During the unemployment they all came to the city. They went back to the farm because of hydro electrification which made the life of the farmer's wife and the farmer much easier, more comfortable and more pleasant. We have other things; we have the water supply. What would have happened at Montreal? We know from experience in Montreal about 15 or 18 years ago when the water was supplied by private ownership. What happened then? The city had to take it over, because public ownership is the only way that you can serve the necessary utilities to the people.

We have many other things here in this public ownership, and that particularly if he would come up and say, here now, let's have private ownership in liquor, or let's have private ownership in something else which is not essential, very essential, then there might be an argument, but gas is essential; it's part of the Hydro, and why should we give away the profits to a couple of shareholders? Why? The same argument applied to the Hydro. Why should we do it? This is a very essential thing. First of all they could protect the people of this province who are paying the bill; the money goes outside of the province. And secondly they could guarantee them a continued supply of gasoline or hydro power and so on. There was a time that they objected to any other public ownership. We have road building. We still have contractors. We urged for years and years that the province can build the roads as good and as cheap and perhaps with better protection than the contractors. Let the contractors come into the province and work for them. But I'm not going into other things. You could find a dozen things that I don't advocate the province to own. But things like gasoline, things like gas; for God's sake I don't think -- our generation that's growing up now will definitely condemn us for not taking over after we have so many utilities, utilities, to take over the gas distribution. So I say to the honourable gentleman that I am sure inwardly if he sits down somewhere and thinks about it, he'll be sorry for his statement. Why he makes it, I really don't know. I really don't know. What would have happened to the Symphony Orchestra in the city if the province or the city -- I'm combining them together -- would not have taken it over and give the people the pleasure of listening to music? -- (Interjection) -- soften their hearts a little. I'm complaining that they're not giving enough to the Symphony; that they have to struggle and the same about everything else. I think culture, essentials, necessities for the people of this province should be taken over to see that they get it; they get the service and they don't pay too much for it. I'm sorry that every time I have to do a little quarrelling with the honourable gentleman but sometimes I feel that it is either a hobby or his work that his life be dedicated to stop progress of this world.

MR. SCARTH: Will the member permit a question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. GRAY: Yes.

MR. SCARTH: From what source did the Honourable Member for Inkster learn that electrical power used to be 20 cents per kilowatt hour in Winnipeg?

MR. GRAY: Pardon me, I haven't heard the last part. What is it?

MR. SCARTH: Through what source did the Honourable Member for Inkster ascertain that electrical power in Winnipeg used to be 20 cents per kilowatt hour?

MR. GRAY: I'll bring you the municipal guide and it will show you down there. I'm making this statement and I'll back up this statement by the municipal manual, the of the Hydro since 1906.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member from Morris. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. GEORGE JOHNSON (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate proposed by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, I would like the indulgence of the House that this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate on second reading of Bill No. 20. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. D. WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to speak at any length on this bill today. As has been pointed out before in the House, there isn't very much that has not already been said here, but I would like to say that I think that our visit to Brandon yesterday, which was very well represented by members from the urban centres, should have quite an effect on the outcome of this bill and how it is voted on, in that members, I think, learned a lot of our problems yesterday at the Brandon Fair. It was well pointed out there to them yesterday the efforts the farmers are making in the promotion of agriculture, and I would say in this respect that a lot of questions were answered. I think one I recall was one member from the city found out the difference in what we generally know as foundation stock on the one hand and just ordinary grade beef cattle on the other.

A very important, in my opinion, aspect of this problem was brought to the attention of the House the other day when the Honourable Member from Assiniboia, when he suggested that this House was split right down the middle on the margarine issue. Now I think, Mr. Speaker, that I could go farther when I say that in assuming that the province is well represented in this House, that the province therefore is split right down the centre on the margarine issue, and I would like to make what I believe to be a fair analysis of the situation that now exists within the province in regard to this question. First, let me point out that to develop and to maintain a strong and united province we must have understanding between the urban and the rural peoples of Manitoba. Now we in the rural areas know that the economic standing of the people in urban Manitoba is absolutely essential to the development of agriculture within the province and to the maintenance of a standard of living in the rural areas. We are dependent on the urban centres for a large portion of the marketing of our goods, our grains, our beef, our poultry, dairy products, garden products and so forth. We are very dependent on the urban centres. We realize it, but at the same time, Mr. Speaker, we feel too, that the urban centres are equally dependent on the rural areas, in that annually millions of dollars of good are absorbed in the agricultural industry. I refer to almost everything that we use in our everyday life and in our farming and in our dairy industries; goods that, of necessity, must either be manufactured or distributed through wholesales and retails in the urban centres, and further I suggest that this volume of revenue which passes through a portion of the City of Winnipeg has an effect on the standard of living of all levels of people within this area. Passing this bill, in my opinion, will have no economic benefit to these people. On the other hand there can be no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the lifting of the ban on the colouring of margarine would have a damaging effect on the agricultural industry of Manitoba, and therefore I suggest would reflect on all people within our province. I believe we should vote this bill down. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The honourable member is closing the debate.

MR. SEABORN: There are one or two things I would like to say before I begin, Mr.

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd.) Speaker, -- (Interjection) -- It's an Irish way of putting it. First of all I would like to express my appreciation to all the members of this House for their co-operation the other day to try and get this bill proceeded with, and I'm sure that they will understand that circumstances prevented this and will forgive me if I was unable to do so; and secondly, I would like to thank the Honourable Member from Assiniboia for his very kind remarks. It seems, Sir, that anyone who undertakes to sponsor a bill of this nature falls heir to a legacy of ridicule and becomes a subject of great suspicion. I understand all of this, for all my predecessors suffered more or less, a like treatment. However, I have on more than one occasion been subjected to the left-handed compliments from the Minister of Agriculture in regard to my musical ability that seem to have no other object but to disparage my capabilities in other directions. Now Sir, I am exceedingly proud of my profession for it took me many years of real hard work and a great expenditure of money to reach the proficiency that I desired, far more I would suggest than was needed for practically any other profession represented in this House. I hold my degree in Arts as well as in Music, and I also have my certificate in Accountancy; I have proved my ability by climbing to the top ranks of musical endeavour in this country and I was Concert Master of every orchestra I was ever associated with since the age of 15 years old and I held that position with the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra for over 12 years until I relinquished it for my present position as Musical Director for the new television station. I would like to point out to the Honourable Minister that musicians have been very successful in other fields of endeavour, and when he or anyone else attempts to disparage the abilities of a musician they indirectly cast their ridicule upon one of the greatest musicologists in this world, Albert Einstein, or one of the greatest organists who ever lived, Schweitzer; and Paderewski, who was one of the greatest pianists, became the Premier of Poland; Fritz Kreisler was a noted medical doctor and also a world famous violinist. Spalding is another great violinist and head of the great sporting goods manufacturing company -- I could name many, many more. Now the Honourable Minister should know that our Premier prides himself, and I think justly so, on his musical ability too. We are pleased that he holds a membership card in our Winnipeg Musicians' Association which is a very fine union indeed, and it was our Premier who once sponsored a bill to remove the ban on coloured margarine too. I am merely following in his distinguished footsteps. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture always showed the utmost deference and respect to our Premier, and I am sure that since he now knows that the Premier and I share musical ability, and have exactly the same attitude towards this unfair ban on margarine, that he will start to show me some measure of respect he is so quick to offer his Leader. I might say that the Honourable Minister was only too happy to utilize my talents for the benefit -- for his benefit in his constituency two or three years ago, and therefore I find his innuendoes somewhat amusing. To return the compliment I would suggest that the Minister is probably a fairly capable farmer, but I certainly question some of his statements regarding butter. He tried to prove that margarine could not stand on its two hind feet like Bossy the Cow, that noble steed of his that gives us this wonderful high-priced butter, and of course he knows that were it not for the taxpayer the farmer would be left holding the bag both literally and figuratively. But he doesn't admit this, not in this speech anyway. Now I must not forget the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. Besides being an apt pupil of the Honourable Minister, he's also a very prominent member of the Butter Advisory Committee of Canada -- no wonder he is so

MR. R. G. SMELLIE (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I must challenge the honourable member's statement there; I have absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with the Butter Advisory Committee of Canada.

MR. SEABORN: Well, Mr. Speaker, it must have been an old letterhead that I saw the other day, but -- (Interjection) -- well okay, I'll accept this, but it certainly had Mr. Smellie on the bottom of the letterhead.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Speaker, for the honourable gentleman's information, there are more than one Robert Smellie and there are more than one Robert Smellie who live in Russell, and I have no connection whatsoever with the Butter Advisory Committee.

MR. SEABORN: Well, this is very good to know. He tried to cast reflections, however, on the letters I received by intimating that the letters he received were completely unsolicited, and completely forgot that the Joint Agriculture Committee spent many thousands of dollars trying to get the people to write, not only to him, but to the other members of this Chamber.

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd.) I must acknowledge their assistance too, for I received quite a quantity of mail through these advertisements. They were kind enough, you see, to give my name and address and it certainly helped a great deal. However, I must correct an impression the Member from Birble-Russell seems to have received. I will admit that I did mention that I had about 1,000 letters with me when I opened the debate, but that was not all by any means. At the moment I have over 2,200 letters and cards from the rural areas and roughly 4,500 to 5,000 letters from the city. This is at the last count. There have been others since then, but if we consider the excellent brief by the Canadian Association of Consumers which so far everyone has chosen to ignore, we do have an impressive body of our citizens who do support my stand on margarine and want this discriminatory ban removed.

One of the country ladies sent me an advertisement from the Family Herald and Weekly Star. I am sure the Honourable Minister of Agriculture will appreciate this because it fits in so beautifully with his arguments about the wonderful God-given natural colour of butter. Now the ad depicts a man slamming the table in a great fit of temper saying, "Great Caesar, do I have to eat butter that looks like lard?" and underneath it says, "No sir, just make sure that Dandelion Brand Butter Colour is added to cream next time. When Dandelion Brand Butter Colour is added to cream you can always be sure that your butter will always be an even golden yellow shade, the shade that appeals to the eye and appeals to the appetite. Try this pure all-vegetable colouring; it makes butter tempting, picks up the appetite. A big 35 cent bottle containing your year's supply for the average farm family can be bought at any drug, grocery or general store. Made in Canada by colour specialists, it meets all pure food laws." Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems a pity that the Dandelion people should waste their time and money advertising a product that is not needed by the dairy people; it seems they have a terrible time churning and churning and churning, trying to get the colour out of butter, and I can't help thinking of the well-known jingle, seeing the Minister is so musical, "I wonder where the colour went" -- for it seems so appropriate for such a totally irresponsible and misleading statement.

Then the Minister read a letter from the Edible Oil people in Altona. It seems they were asking him to refrain from dragging their name into this controversy this year but he just couldn't resist it. Last year these people were most eager to contribute information to the Walnes Commission on behalf of margarine, and the year before inserted large ads in almost every paper in the province in full support of pre-coloured margarine. It is the same with the soy bean growers in Ontario. Two years ago I received a wonderful letter from them telling me how the colouring of margarine would benefit the farmers who grow edible oil seed crops. Perhaps the Minister would know whether these people have really changed their minds or whether they have been effectively silenced. Having spared some of the pressure the dairy industry can exert, I would rather suspect the latter is true. Then the Minister really enjoyed himself; he had found an article so obviously biased in favour of the dairy industry that he was able to splash around in great glee, and why not? This Dr. E. M. McHendry who incidentally is on this Butter Advisory Committee, seeing that our friend is not on it any more, and another doctor, Dr. Nadeau, I have been advised is very prominent in the dairy circles in the United States, but I did notice that the Minister was very, very careful to keep away from the neutral board of investigation set up by this government and headed by Dean Wainnes, even when he was reminded of it. I must say that the only thing I did agree with in his entire discourse was the statement that he was too fat. But alas, we are so directly opposed in many things, we would probably disagree to what area of his anatomy he is alluding to.

Now Sir, I do not intend to either support or refute the arguments for or against my bill. I feel that I should let some of these country people express a few. I know that you will ask me to table these letters, Mr. Speaker, but I'll just go through about half a dozen just to give you the feeling of the people, and I know my friends across the way will enjoy the first one. It comes from Stonewall -- (Interjection) -- What, do you want me to be here all day? "I am not a woman but a widower, so have to do the cooking the same as all other women. I resent having to mix the colouring and feel that it's a ridiculous imposition. I also realize that it's pure politics that's held it up so long. If it's brought before the House and loses, I, for one, will feel the Roblin Government didn't want the change any more than Campbell did and they won't get my vote at the next election. I'll vote for the New Party."

The next one was from Crystal City. Mrs. Sim, Sr., is a widow over 80 years old,

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd.) nearly blind, partially crippled. She has to have the assistance of either of her two sons to perform the nasty chore of colouring her margarine for her. She and they "as property owners wish to put in their votes for coloured margarine. Thank you" and it's signed by Mrs. Sim. This one -- "For the past 33 years I have lived in Manitou so know why many country members still do not want to vote for coloured margarine. It is purely political, afraid of losing votes. Our storekeepers told us that more country people than town use margarine. We know they did. Many of them are writing you now hoping that by your efforts we will be relieved of the time-wasting messy business of colouring in the house. We envy the people of British Columbia who can buy their beautifully firm coloured margarine ready for the table. Colour has to be carefully done; if warmed more than necessary to soften, the flavour is changed and somewhat spoiled. This would deter some from using it, which probably is the aim of the anti-colour sect. Our representative is steeped in tradition, so do your best. I hope you will be known in history as the one who liberated the women of Manitoba from the slavery of colouring margarine."

I can't resist reading this one: "Cartwright, Manitoba -- I'd like to add my approval to your fight for coloured margarine. My husband has a stomach disorder and finds margarine agrees with him better than butter, but how I detest the business of colouring it. Believe me I really give Abe Harrison the once-over every time I have that job to do." Well, I won't read any more, Mr. Speaker, I'll just read this one, because they're pretty well representative, but this one is from Minnedosa. "The controversy between the butter and margarine industries has aroused my interest. I feel that you are in your rights in asking for coloured margarine. Before I go on any further I would like to point out that I am a farmer's wife. The surplus of the millions of pounds of butter is not due to the competition of the margarine, but lies in the fault of the dairy industry itself. If the government and the dairy industry were to inspect the premises of most of the cream shippers they would find that they have millions of pounds of butter which, in my opinion, is not fit for human consumption. Most of these barns should be condemned from producing dairy products as these products are produced under most unhygienic conditions and could not possibly pass the health laws. Quite probably the government and the dairy industry are unaware of these situations; they should be inspected by the health authorities as you'll find in most cases such barns could not pass the test for milk contracts and are therefore doing the next best thing, shipping cream. This is not fair for the cream producer should pass the same test as milk producers. All dairy products should be inspected at the premises and pass the health test. When this is done we'll have no butter surplus to worry about, yet we will all have good clean butter which will be fit for food and not afraid of competition." Well, I won't read it all, it's but I just want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that every member in this house has constituents who desire the colouring of margarine at the factory level. I'd like to ask them, are they going to completely ignore them or do you think that they are worthy of their consideration as well as the others who oppose this bill. In some areas the support for coloured margarine is quite substantial, yet the members consistently throw this bill out and will not even give it the consideration of a hearing in committee. This is not right for this is the only bill that I know of that is prevented from going to committee, and I can assure you that it will never be solved this way. If I'm not alive next year to bring this bill before the House and present it on your doorstep, another member will, and it will haunt you until you meet the question head on and find out whether this can be resolved in some way. It will never be done in the Chamber. It must go to committee, Mr. Speaker. Therefore I do hope the members will endeavour to find out the facts for themselves and give it their approval at this stage.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member for Wellington table the letters that he

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

MR. SEABORN: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House second reading of Bill No. 20, An Act to amend The Margarine Act.

A standing vote was taken, the results being:

YEAS: Messrs. Batzley, Carroll, Christianson, Cown, Desjardins, Evans, Gray, Groves, Harris, Hawryluk, Hillhouse, Ingebrigtsen, Johnson (Assiniboia), Lissaman, Lyon, Martin, Orlikow, Peters, Reid, Roblin, Scarth, Seaborn, Stanes, Weir, Witney and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Campbell, Corbett, Dow, Froese, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hutton, Johnson (Gimli), Klym, McKellar, McLean, Molgat, Prefontaine, Schreyer, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Strickland, Tanchak, Thompson, Wagner and Watt, and Mrs. Forbes and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 26, Nays 25.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, had I of voted I would have voted for the bill.

Mr. Speaker declared the motion carried.

MR. SEABORN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if this bill is going before law amendments committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 42. The Honourable Member from Winnipeg

.....
MR. SEABORN: According to the slip that I had it was the Agriculture Committee, and I think most of us would prefer it to go to law amendments if it's permissible.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I think that it will have to go to the Agricultural Committee. It normally would. All members of the House whether members of the committee or not may attend, and speak, take part in this debate, and also when it comes back to the House for Committee of the Whole stage here, all members may not only speak, but vote on it again.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 42, the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, that Bill No. 42, An Act to amend the Winnipeg Charter, 1956, and to validate by-law No. 18547, be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, the first section of this bill provides for a change of the City of Winnipeg's boundaries in exactly the same manner as was provided for the change of the boundary of Tuxedo, so that the narrow strip along the east side of Assiniboine Park which is now used as a roadway in Tuxedo will be incorporated into the Town of Tuxedo. Section 5 removes exemption of public hospitals from realty taxation. The City of Winnipeg feels that as the Winnipeg hospitals are used by many people from outside of this city that they should not be required to subsidize the hospitals. Section 7 provides that in assessing gas transmission lines to the gas company. There was a court ruling recently which stated that the assessed value of a gas line would be the value of the material only, and that is not very satisfactory. Section 9 provides that when business tax or liquor licenses is added on to restaurant licenses and where the restaurant has more than one type of license, that the higher the business tax levied at the higher rate in respect of the three different licenses will apply to the whole of the restaurant. The City of Winnipeg thought that they had this power under the present charter but some dispute has arisen and they want this matter cleared up. The city claims that it is impractical to try and divide a restaurant up into three different sections for the purpose of applying three different rates of taxes for liquor licenses. Section 11 makes provision with regard to the operation of the water utility which is necessary because of the fact that from now on there will be no Greater Winnipeg Water District levy against the land. At present the city is allowed to make a profit equivalent to the amount of the Greater Winnipeg Water District levy which last year was \$391,000. As this levy no longer exists the city asks permission to make a profit equivalent to 1 mill which this year is equivalent to \$450,000 and you will notice from that that there is only a very small difference in the profit to be allowed to this utility -- a difference in effect for this year of about \$59,000. Actually the Water Utility made no money last year and this year it will operate at a loss unless rates are raised. Section 13 makes provision for a County Court Judge acting as the person or the commission that will decide compensation when land is taken for lane openings. This is necessary because with Metro the Board of Revision has been done away with insofar as the City of Winnipeg is concerned. Section 22 will enable the city to borrow money without reference to the ratepayers for replacing or repairing any buildings or public works belonging to the city that has been destroyed or damaged by fire or by any other cause whatsoever. Section 23 provides that by-laws to borrow money may be approved by a

(Mr. Cowan, cont'd.) majority of the ratepayers instead of three-fifths as at present. This passed Council without a recorded vote. There was no determined opposition against this change.

Section 24 provides that the City of Winnipeg may borrow money for capital purposes from parties other than banks pending the issue of debentures. Section 27 widens the powers of the Sinking Fund Trustees with regard to the distribution of their surplus earnings and provides that funds may be used to replace fire losses and to pay losses on debentures from discount or exchange. Section 29 enables the City of Winnipeg to establish a fund for the purposes of self-insurance with regard to fire losses. In the years from 1942 to 1958 the City of Winnipeg paid \$121,232 in fire insurance premiums and in that same period collected in claims only \$18,242 or about 15 percent of the amount of premiums paid. The City of Winnipeg feels that it can save its taxpayers money if it sets up this self-insurance fund. The city may do this; there's provision for them doing it. They don't have to set up this self-insurance fund; it will be up to City Council.

Section 31 provides for the deletion of a clause which stated that the city might pass laws prohibiting female persons from being employed in business owned or operated by Chinese. This particular section of the Charter has never been taken advantage of and no such by-laws were ever passed and the city now asks that it be deleted from the Charter.

Section 35 simply makes it clear that the Board of Police Commissioners may charge for accident reports, and Section 36 simply validates a by-law of the City of Winnipeg whereby certain employees of the city -- the water district and the sanitary district, although they have been transferred to Metro -- will still have pension rights in the City of Winnipeg pension scheme and their contributions will go into the present City of Winnipeg pension fund.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry) I'm not going to speak at any length. I'm just going to make one statement to the effect that we certainly have reservations with respect to one section of the bill dealing with taxation relative to hospitals, and while we won't oppose the bill at this stage, certainly that section at least will be opposed when we get into Law Amendments.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection of this bill going to second reading so we could get explanations to many of the sections, but my few remarks -- I just want to mention one or two on the general principle of the bill. One or two items. In the first place for the last 20 years since I'm a member of this House, I have, every year when a bill from the City of Winnipeg came up for ratification, suggested to the City of Winnipeg that they should ask for a Home Rule Charter. I could have made a record of this little comment because they're coming in -- there's one or two important items it's true -- but they're coming in with little things which they find in the Charter, they should be changed, which I think that could be entrusted to the City Council, 18 members and the Mayor, who are elected by the public, elected every two years, and I think are just as capable as we are, to decide on small matters which come up from day to day. The main powers they already have; they've been getting it from here for the last 50 years, and little details should not be occupying the time of this House to ratify it. However they find, through the wisdom or otherwise, not to ask for a Home Rule Charter because they want this House that in case some progressive book in the Council will decide on something and if, in their opinion, an opinion of some of them, that it may be too radical or too progressive, they want this House to be their champions or their guard. So we'll let it go and I suppose next year I'll probably have to make the same remarks if I'm here. Now, they are now suggesting ratification on money by-laws and they want to reduce, or improve, the system for which we have been fighting for years and years, as far as I'm concerned, even in Council, of requiring 65 percent of the ratepayers, the ratepayers only -- a ratepayer is the person that owns property not a person leasing the property. And now of course they came and they said a straight majority will do. This is a crust, but if they could not change it, maybe change it in committee, then of course we'll have to accept, it's an improvement of the evil we have now. Imagine, I imagine at least, that everyone residing in the City of Winnipeg pays taxes -- even the young men under 18 who works, buys a suit, buys clothing, buys food, goes to a show; and every cent he spends contributes directly or indirectly to the Treasury of the City of Winnipeg and they help the other business people to pay taxes, and particularly those who live in homes. Take for instance a block of 40 or 50 or 60 suites. Sixty people pay rent. In order to pay their rent,

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) their taxes are direct to the City of Winnipeg, they give it to the landlord and the landlord collects from them, takes out his part of the profit and the taxes are paid to the city. Actually, actually this man who owns the 40 suites or 50 suites has no more right to exercise the will and the wish of the other 48, and the result is more blocks are being built, more people are deprived from having their say whether a certain amount of money should be paid for certain improvements, for certain buildings, whatever you may have. I'm not paying direct taxes Mr. Speaker, and I have no voice if the people of Winnipeg wanted to build something, or wanted to create a fund for improved condition, or wanted to pave the streets or wanted to build a hospital. I cannot exercise, although I am paying rent, and I'm helping my landlord to pay my taxes. So as I said, this is a little improvement and as a rule like with every other thing we'll have to take it piecemeal. But while they have objected to this very idea for years, they're coming up now, and I hope it won't be long and they'll realize that every man residing in Winnipeg contributes to Winnipeg and contributes to the welfare of the city and has a right to express an opinion on it.

Next thing is they're coming here now asking for the right to borrow money other than from the bank. Well there's one good thing this government has done; they showed the way to the municipalities how they could get money without standing on the knees before the investors or the banks, although it's taken them a long time to do it. But the success of the loan in this province has awakened the larger municipalities, and now they'll know how to get money in a dignified way and the interest goes to the same people that are paying the taxes and they realize that's important, and this I'll very gladly support it. The same applies to the self-insurance. This has been advocated for a long, long time by us. Instead of paying out hundreds of thousands of dollars of premiums you could have easily have put aside in a trust fund every year a certain amount and now carry their own insurance instead of paying out, as I said, taxpayers' money, hundreds of thousands of dollars to private companies. Finally, is this which I'm not clear, and I hope that the mover would probably correct me, as to section 31. Do I take it that this legislation that you are asking -- is the mover here

MR. COWAN: It's not to put it in; it's to take it out of the bill. . . . It's to take it out

MR. GRAY: I just wanted to be sure that this here Section 31, is taken out from the present by-laws that the city has. Will you explain 31 again please?

MR. COWAN: Thirty-one has the effect of taking this subsection out of the Winnipeg Charter, which subsection provides that the city may pass by-laws to prohibit females from working for Chinese persons. The City of Winnipeg never passed any such by-laws. They never took advantage of this section, and now they're asking that it be taken out of the Charter. No by-laws were ever passed under this subsection.

MR. GRAY: It gives them the right to pass a by-law at any time if they feel like it. All right, we will deal with it later on then. We'll deal with it in committee. But it looks on the surface, it doesn't look so good when the word "Chinese" -- (Interjection) -- I know they want to try and take it out. I mean it doesn't speak well for the city to have this in the Charter for years. However, as I said I'm supporting it to go to second reading and down there probably will ask a few more questions.

MR. F. GROVES (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I realize that it's very difficult in a bill of this size to pick out one underlying principle. There are two, I think, matters in this bill on which I would like to speak very briefly. One is the provision or the request to remove the exemption on public hospitals in the city. I think we have to keep in mind that in considering this request to make these hospitals taxable in the City of Winnipeg, that we will tend to push up the cost of the Manitoba Hospital Service Plan. The city is endeavouring in this request to transfer their financial responsibility in this regard to the province and we can be sure if this happens that it will be the forerunner of other similar requests by the other municipalities in the province. I think that this section should certainly receive serious consideration in the committee. I think too that this points out one of the bad features of a government operated compulsory scheme such as our Manitoba Hospital Service Plan. That is that there are attempts by municipalities, by voluntary organizations and by individuals to try and load costs onto the taxpayers in this respect. Costs that were formerly absorbed by these municipalities and by the organizations concerned and by private individuals, so I think that that's something we should keep in mind. This request is one of the penalties that we are paying for having our

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.) . . . Manitoba Hospital Service Plan, or having a government compulsory scheme such as the Manitoba Hospital Service Plan. There's also a request in this bill to have a majority vote only on money by-laws rather than three-fifths as it is at the present time, and I think that when we're considering this request, particularly if we grant it, that we should be prepared as members of this House to grant the same concession to the other municipalities in the province.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 49. The Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party.

MR. PAULLEY presented Bill No. 49 - An Act to provide a Charter for the City of Transcona for second reading and requested that it be referred to Municipal Affairs Committee.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like an opportunity to say a few words in connection with this bill. To the citizens of Transcona this is a very important occasion. This year is also a very important year in the history of our town. I am pleased Mr. Speaker, to be able to draw your attention to the gallery slightly to your right, to the right of your own Speaker's Gallery, where there are a number of citizens of the Town of Transcona who are interested in the bill before us, and also -- and foremost among them Sir, is the Mayor of the Town of Transcona.

I'd like first of all Sir, to give a brief history of the town. The town was formed in 1911, incorporated in 1912. At that time it had a population of somewhere in the neighborhood of 500 people. An indication Sir, of the growth of Transcona is that just about 10 years ago there was a population of some 6,500 and as of this date, 1961, approximately 13,800 people are in the Town of Transcona. The name Transcona, Mr. Speaker, is a concoction of the word "national transcontinental". The national transcontinental railway built its shops in Transcona and Transcona received its name as a result of a contest that was held, and the trans is the first part of transcontinental and the "cona" of course is the first part of the other part to make the word Transcona. For many years Sir, it was considered that Transcona was purely a railroad town, because practically the only industry in the town was the Canadian National Railways which as we know was formed as a result of many private railways going bankrupt. Because of the fact that the town relied on the resources of the railway in the main for the employment of the citizens, the destiny of the town was adversely affected when the situation of the railways were in adverse circumstances and prospered in times of prosperity. The net result of this situation was, Mr. Speaker, that from time to time the town was in dire financial circumstances. The railway being a nationally owned railway and the right of Her Majesty was not subject to taxation and no revenues accrued to the town from this huge installation until a few years ago, legislation was passed at Ottawa and also here in Manitoba which made it permissible for taxation of railway properties in general, and when railway properties became taxable the C. N. R. felt obliged then to pay a grant in lieu of taxation to the Town of Transcona. I may say Sir, that this was accepted, with thanks, by the town and the amount while still not nearly sufficient to pay for the services that are rendered to the railway, nonetheless the amounts have been increased somewhat. I am glad to note too, Mr. Speaker, that insofar as the railway industry itself is concerned in the Town of Transcona, that it has just a few weeks ago, completed extensions to the plant in Transcona to the extent of approximately \$3 million. There is now consolidated in the Town of Transcona the major repair facilities of Canadian National Railways for the whole of western Canada.

Of recent years particularly the last four or five years, there has been a change in the financial basis in the town because of the fact that certain industries are now located in the Town of Transcona. We had had for a number of years the Dominion Malting Plant on the south side of the town; but since as I say, these last four or five years, a number of large plants have located in Transcona. One of them, Sir, the Griffin Steel Company was built at an expenditure of some \$3 million. We also have now in the Town of Transcona the western distributing centre for International Harvester, and under construction at the present time is the plant of the Catell Products Limited that the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce referred to the other day. Due to increasing building and construction in the town from a base of railway employees insofar as the residents are concerned, the employment and sources of revenue of

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd.) the ratepayers has been broadened so that we no longer are in a position where we have to rely solely on the destiny of the railway and this gives us a more stable basis for our financing. As a result Sir, of many of the difficulties that the town encountered in its years -- over the years, the town was placed under the supervision of the Municipal and Public Utility Board. It has for the last number of years continued under the supervision financially of the Utility Board, now the Municipal Board -- but about nine years or so ago, there was a refunding of the municipal debt in Transcona and since that time it has been permissible for the town on application to get out from under the supervision of the board.

This year, as I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, the town is celebrating its Golden Jubilee. During the week of June 10th to June 17th arrangements are being made to have a bang-up celebration in the town. -- (Interjection) -- June 10th -- the week of June 10th to 17th, Mr. Premier. During that week there will be many activities to celebrate our Golden Jubilee. Another thing Mr. Speaker, I'd like to draw to the attention of the House that is being attempted and will be carried through insofar as the town is concerned, which indicates that we not only have interests in many fields but we feel an obligation to help provide for the education of some of our younger folk. With that objective in mind Mr. Speaker, at the present time, funds are being raised to create a \$20,000 educational fund so that the interest from the fund will over the years assist some youngster to carry on insofar as education is concerned. I extend Sir, to you, to the First Minister, his Cabinet and all of the members of this House a cordial invitation on behalf of the Mayor and Council of Transcona to join with us in celebrating our golden anniversary in the week of June 10th to 17th.

Now Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to briefly give an outline of the town itself. As far as the bill before you is concerned, it contains no special provisions whatsoever. Some may wonder why there is reference to one section, section seven, dealing with the orders of the Winnipeg Suburban Municipal Board and the Municipal Board relating to the Town of Transcona. The Town Council feels that in this 50th year of our birth that it would be proper to start out without having to be under the financial supervision of the Municipal Board as it is at the present time. We will start out with a clean slate, knowing and realizing that the future of the town is assured, that while the past had many pitfalls and over its past history, it had its ups and downs, the future of Transcona looks very, very bright. I think it is a bright spot in the Province of Manitoba and I beseech the support of every member of the House to have enacted this bill which will make the great and thriving Town of Transcona Manitoba's youngest city.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, lest there be any worry in the mind of my honourable friend, the Leader of the CCF Party, I hasten to assure him that I rise not to debate or join in argument with him, but to join rather in the felicitations that he has expressed on behalf of his home town, Transcona, which we hope will shortly become a city and will no longer be referred to as his home town, but rather his home city.

At the outset Mr. Speaker, I should like, on behalf of the government, if I may, to accept the Honourable Leader of the CCF's kind invitation for those on this side of the House, and I know his invitation extended to the whole House, to attend the 50th anniversary celebrations of the City of Transcona as we expect it will be in June of this year, and certainly we look forward to joining with the Leader of the CCF Party and the other good citizens of Transcona on that very notable occasion in the life of that city. I rise then Sir, only to say that we certainly join with the Leader of the CCF Party in noting this occasion in the life of the City of Transcona. He perhaps best of all, of all the members of this House, can speak with knowledge and with, I am sure, considerable emotion and feeling about the development of Transcona. I think I should mention of course, the fact that is known by most of us, that the Leader of the CCF Party was the Mayor of that town for some considerable time, has given distinguished service to the town in municipal capacities and while sometimes we have areas of disagreement in this House I think, by and large, we would agree that he is still giving distinguished service to his town in this Assembly. So while we may want to look at some of the sections of the bill, I don't think that there will be anything of a substantive nature that will require too much debate or attention when the bill gets into committee, and I rise only to join with him in paying tribute to Transcona and wishing it every success in its new status as the youngest city of Manitoba.

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

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface) presented Bill No. 53 - An Act to Amend the St. Boniface Charter, 1953 (1) for second reading.

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

MR. ALEXANDER presented Bill No. 55 - An Act to provide for the incorporation of the Village of Inglis for second reading.

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

MR. STANES presented Bill No. 60 - An Act to Amend The St. James Charter for second reading.

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

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 61 - An Act to Amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act (1) for second reading.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, the amendments proposed by this Act are necessary in order that the corporation of Metropolitan Winnipeg may be able to properly carry on its duties as given to it in the Metropolitan Winnipeg Act. The corporation is not asking for jurisdiction over any new items; it is simply asking for additional powers to carry on the powers which it has already been given and to clarify various matters.

Section (1) provides for the payment of expenses of council members who are required to travel outside of the metropolitan area and for payment of entertainment expenses, not exceeding \$10,000.

Section (2) authorizes the council to give their Executive Director, or some other person, authority to hire employees. At present council itself has to hire every employee and that is not very practical when you consider that council has thousands of employees.

Section (6). At present the Act requires that there shall be two different assessment values for farm lands, one for local taxes and one for Metro. The municipalities concerned have found this very cumbersome and section (6) provides that the municipalities may raise the same money from farm lands by using the one assessment but by making a separate levy at a reduced rate. The new section (2) (a) limits the time for appeals where a taxpayer or a municipality is making an appeal in respect of the assessment on farm land or is making an appeal in respect of an assessment where the taxpayer feels that he shouldn't be assessed for particular services. The original Act didn't put any limit on the time within which such appeals could be taken. The new subsection (5) provides that if the Municipal Board should find that an injustice has been done and that someone has suffered damages by reason of the assessment made, that the Municipal Board may order compensation to the party who has been wronged. At present the only power that the Municipal Board had was to declare that Metro was wrong in making such assessment.

Section (7). At present the Act requires that if Metro takes a part of the business tax, it takes a proportion of the present tax levy. This year it has taken one-half. This is not equitable as some municipalities don't have a business tax and the rate of business tax on types of businesses varies from municipality to municipality. When this amendment comes into effect, Metro will be able to assess each municipality with an amount, so that each municipality will pay to Metro an equitable business tax based on the business establishments in each municipality, and based on a uniform business assessment which will be established by the Assessment Department this year. This section also provides that on the passing of a by-law for business tax no personal property used in connection with carrying on of a business shall be taxed excepting a gas transmission line.

Section (10) is an amendment which makes debentures a joint and several obligation of the corporation and area municipalities instead of just an obligation of the corporation. This will help Metro to borrow money at lower rates according to investment advisors, and it will save money to all taxpayers. Metropolitan Toronto has a provision similar to this.

Section (18) provides that payment may be made out of pension or superannuation funds to widows of deceased pensioners, where the amount is \$500 or less. This is similar to present provisions in the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba pension scheme.

Section (19) permits a member of an assessment board of an area municipality or of Metro to be a member of a Board of Revision.

Section (21) is a section inserted to amplify and clarify the general planning authority of

(Mr. Cowan, cont'd.) the corporation.

Section (22) provides that the Board of Adjustment can give relief only in respect of zoning and town planning schemes. This section was so worded formerly that it provided that the Board of Adjustment could give relief almost with respect to any regulation or order made by Council, but it can only make adjustments or give relief with respect to zoning or town planning matters. This section is also important in that it gives Metro Council power to amend existing zoning and planning regulations until Metro Council establishes a development plan or until Metro directs that any such existing regulations shall cease to have effect and it prohibits any area municipality from altering such zoning or planning regulations.

Subsection (e) under Section 22 makes provision for the licensing of electrical and plumbing contractors which the City of Winnipeg does now. It is felt that this will have the result of improving the standards in the whole area and it has been of great value to the City of Winnipeg.

Section 24 provides for the appointment of a building commission. This building commission will concern itself with safety measures with regard to buildings. I might say that at the present the City of Winnipeg Building Commission consists of three aldermen, three citizen members, the City Engineer, and the Deputy City Engineer.

At the top of the next page we have a printer's error in that the first two lines on page 17 should be the second and third lines on page 18 and vice versa. The Sections make no sense as they are printed now. I'd just like to repeat that -- the first 2 lines on page 17 should be in place of the second and third lines on page 18 and vice versa.

Section 27 provides for the membership of the Board of Adjustment. At present, The Metropolitan Act says that the Board of Adjustment will consist of three council members. Metropolitan Council considers that this Board of Adjustment will have a great deal of work to do. It may take up practically all the time of the members of the Board and that three council members simply haven't got the time to carry out this work, so that the proposed amendment will permit the Board of Adjustment to consist of five persons, none of whom is a member of council or a director or other officer or employee of the corporation.

Section 29 makes provision that where the corporation assumes jurisdiction over a highway, as provided herein, it acquires by that act title to and possession and control of traffic control signals, traffic signs and other traffic control devices located on or immediately adjacent to the highway; and that it will have jurisdiction over parking meters and street lighting facilities that are located on the highways or the arterial roads, we might say, that Metropolitan Corporation takes over. It is the intention to carry out the original act in that Metropolitan Winnipeg will have control over traffic, and with regard to traffic control on streets that are not arterial streets, it is the intention that the municipalities will be charged for this service. Metropolitan Winnipeg will rent city signal facilities which will be enlarged to look after all traffic controls in the Greater Winnipeg area. They will also be renting street lighting facilities from the Manitoba Power Commission. With regard to parking meters, it might be pointed out that the revenue that the Metropolitan Winnipeg will receive from parking meters -- it is not a great sum. The estimated revenue for 8 months for this year on the arterial roads is \$112,000; the estimated expenses \$49,830; leaving estimated net revenue of \$62,170.

Section 30 contains a very important amendment enabling the Metropolitan Council to adopt, by resolution, regulations concerning the parking, standing and stopping of vehicles and also the erection or removal of stop signs or yield signs. This is a similar power to that now enjoyed by the City of Winnipeg.

Section 32 makes provision for voluntary payment of penalties for the infraction of regulations adopted by the Metropolitan Council respecting the stopping, standing or parking of vehicles or the failure to stop at a stop sign or yield sign.

Part 7 of the act relates to the Metropolitan Waterworks System and Part 8 relates to the Metropolitan Sewage Disposal System; and Sections 34 to 47 of the bill refer to amendments of these parts. These amendments provide briefly for adding pumping stations to this part and deeming pumping stations to be works for the production, treatment and storage of water.

Section 42 provides for the inspection of local works, local water courses, private drains or private sewers which are proposed to be connected to the Metropolitan system.

Section 45 makes provision for delegation of the issue of the license required under Section 169 which states that without a subsisting license from the Corporation, no person shall

(Mr. Cowan, cont'd.) directly or indirectly discharge or drain or cause to be discharged or drained any sewage into any body of water in the Metropolitan area or in the additional zone; or deposit rubbish or other similar matter within two chains of the normal high water mark of any body of water in the Metropolitan area.

Section 47 clarifies the flood control section of the act, Section 182, with reference to the application of the Diking Authority Act. The remainder of the sections amending Parts 7 and 8 clarify the jurisdiction of the corporation and are required to enable the corporation to efficiently carry out its duty of establishing and maintaining and operating a Metropolitan Waterworks System and a Metropolitan Sewage Disposal System.

The remainder of the amendments refer to the general powers of the corporation and are required either to clarify the workings of the corporation under the act or to amplify the powers of the corporation with regard to the collection of fines, settlement of claims, authority to recover costs on legal actions in the same manner as other municipalities have under The Municipal Act or under a City Charter.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I'll only be a minute or two. It is no use fighting with something that we have created, and perhaps it requires more time. It seems to me that the powers they originally had -- with this bill, if approved, they will have all the power in the world now in every municipality and city in Manitoba -- in every urban or rural municipality; outside of firing the men on the Council in Winnipeg. They have taken practically everything away from them, even such a small thing as lights and meters and so on. I think -- I hope I'm wrong, I hope it will work out well -- personally, at my age I cannot wait that long to see this body taking over the work of 19 municipalities and doing away with the public representatives because they've nothing to do, absolutely nothing to do, nothing left for them to do if this is passed. I've always suspected, and this is thinking aloud for which there is no offence, there's those -- and I'm not blaming a single one of this province at all -- but those originators years ago that have been planning the Metro system of government had one thing in mind, the same thing that the City Council had for years; namely, they want to see a day where there is one Commissioner or one Manager will administer the City of Winnipeg and perhaps the other larger municipalities. It was -- I also say again I have no proof of this, but might as well tell you what I was and am thinking -- to minimize or reduce to as few as possible the elected public representatives responsible to the people from the larger municipalities. Now is it any wonder that from this bill, you will see they have every little thing from soup to nuts. Everything they are taking over, and who knows but what they will come with another 30 page or 40 page bill next year. The \$10,000 I am not criticizing -- I want you to believe me but just as an example for travelling for the Council, and the City of Winnipeg also has a large sum of money for their travelling to conventions and so on. The result is that it comes out from the same taxpayers of which the Leader of the Official Opposition is crying day in and day out. There will come a time -- I don't know -- they'll maybe start believing him.

The only comment I want to make, and I'm speaking for myself, if the Bill is passed, I think we are giving them too much power for the moment before they have shown what they can do or what they cannot do; and in the meantime, taking away the rights of the people who have elected representatives to the City Council, to the School Board; take away all their power, take away everything that they now have. Then if you compare this bill to the bill of the City of Winnipeg, introduced by the same honourable gentleman, you will find that both are asking for many of these same powers. So all I have to say, Sir, is I hope I am wrong; I hope that this Metro will not be a second autocracy.

MR. SCARTH: Mr. Speaker, I don't always disagree with the Honourable Member for Inkster as he suggested the other day. -- (Interjection) -- Now I may put you on the spot Mister. There are, Sir, certain provisions in this bill which as far as I am concerned will have to be explained as I do not see the necessity or the philosophy for them at the present time. However, when it does come time for committee, I have no doubt that members of Metro will come forward and say why they seek these additional powers or these amendments. There are, however, certain provisions in this bill which obviously Metro should have at the present time, Mr. Speaker. In view of that, it is my humble submission that the bill should go to committee where it may be considered.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 63. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. J. A. CHRISTIANSON (Portage la Prairie) presented Bill No. 63 - An Act respecting The City of Portage la Prairie, for second reading.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 81. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. SEABORN presented Bill No. 81 - An Act to Amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act (2), for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SEABORN: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that is requested by the City of Winnipeg. On the part of the subsection of Section 4 of the Metro Bill which the City Council feels should be repealed and states as follows: "Subject only to the authorization of the Municipal Board, give financial assistance in any form to any area municipality that the Metropolitan Council in its absolute discretion deems to be in need of such assistance." It is felt that despite the fact that any assistance given by Metro to an area municipality is subject to the authorization of the Municipal Board, this provision gives Metro certain powers regarding the incidence of taxation in the Metro area beyond that which should be given to any municipal body created by the province.

Section 35 of the Metro Act provides for the distribution of the cost to the area municipalities for the services provided by Metro on the basis of equalized realty assessments. There is a relatively unimportant modification to this in Section 36 which has to do with agricultural lands in suburban municipalities where the inhabitants have not enjoyed the services provided by the municipality in which they live. There's also an important modification of Section 35 and Section 37 which permits Metro to require each area municipality to pay over a proportion of its industrial and commercial taxation. In the city's opinion, this Section 37 has been arbitrarily employed by Metro in 1961 when it obtained approval of the Municipal Board to take half the business and personal property taxes collected by the area municipalities. The city contends that a proper formula should be devised for Section 37 and then, when approved by the province, made statutory. If this were done, the distribution of Metro costs to the area municipalities would be practically all on a statutory basis with the exception of the slight modification included in Section 36. But the provision referred to under Section 4 of the act could completely upset the statutory distribution of Metro costs at the discretion of Metro Council and municipal boards. Now the Charter of the City of Winnipeg carefully restricts the powers of the council to give a taxation advantage to any one person or group of persons. For example, the Winnipeg Council cannot interfere with the Assessment Commissioner in his work of making assessment. Also, when a levy has been made on a property benefited by the construction of a local improvement council, it has no power to remit these levies until they are fully paid. Exemptions from taxation are statutory except where council is empowered to exempt, by by-law, properties of certain charitable organizations. The Council of the City of Winnipeg therefore believes that only one authority, and that is the Provincial Government, should have the power to vary the incidence of taxation upon any group of taxpayers in the Metropolitan area, and therefore, requests that the above provision be repealed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Honourable Member a question. Is it the case, as he said, that the City of Winnipeg had asked for this amendment?

MR. SEABORN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's true.

MR. CAMPBELL: Then, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask if it's in order if -- has the Council of Metro asked for it?

MR. SEABORN: No. This is the City Council of the City of Winnipeg.

MR. CAMPBELL: May I ask if there was discussion between the two, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SEABORN: Not as far as I know, Sir.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, I certainly don't intend to oppose the bill going to second reading, Mr. Speaker, but I would just like to put in my own disclaimer in this regard that I do not think, unless some reasons can be advanced that I haven't heard so far, that this would be a desirable change.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I think I should also indicate for the record that there may well be reservations concerning this amendment on our part, and we would like to see the bill go to committee where it can be more fully discussed. We will not oppose it at this reading.

MR. GROVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't hear your seconder.

MR. GROVES: Winnipeg Centre.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, we've reached the Government business and I would now ask you to call the second readings of Bills 75, 82 and 84.

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 75, an Act to amend Certain Provisions of the Statute Law (2), for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I think although this is a Bill which is short in the number of its provisions, it is an important Bill insofar as the Legislature is concerned and indeed insofar as all citizens of Manitoba are concerned. You will note from the explanatory note contained in the Bill that the purpose of it is to remove from a number of stated statutes of Manitoba a present prohibition which purports to prohibit the use of the prerogative writs of Mandamus, Certiorari or injunctions from different Acts in Manitoba.

I think the honourable members, some of them, would probably appreciate a short definition of what these prerogative writs are and the effect that is given to them by the courts. I think Earl Jowett once defined prerogative writs and orders as "processes issued upon extraordinary occasions on proper cause being shown. They are the writs or orders of procedendo, mandamus, prohibition, quo warranto" -- I haven't used that word for some time-- "quo warranto, habeas corpus and certiorari. To these might be added injunction."

For our present purposes these are the ones with which we are principally concerned; namely, mandamus, prohibition, injunction, quo warranto and, above all, certiorari. These orders of the court were formerly writs. They were commonly called prerogative writs because they were deemed to be an exercise of the Royal Prerogative. These writs were issued by the courts to protect the subjects of the Crown from the unauthorized acts of officials and of inferior courts and administrative tribunals; or acts, in any of them, in excess of or without jurisdiction. The power of the court to afford these remedies to persons aggrieved has long been one of the bulwarks of the liberties of the citizens of not only of the British Commonwealth but indeed of this country. Under our Queen's Bench Act, the writs are now orders of that court. One of these writs most often used is that of Certiorari whereby a superior court, such as the court of Queen's Bench, removes the matter from a court of inferior jurisdiction or from an administrative board or official acting in a judicial or semi-judicial capacity and enquires as to whether the court, board or person, has exceeded its or his jurisdiction or acted without jurisdiction. It should be noted that this prerogative writ of Certiorari is not an appeal; it is an inquiry as to jurisdiction.

Now from time to time over the years, and not only in this jurisdiction but in other provincial jurisdictions in Canada, there have been included in our statutes prohibitions purporting to deny the courts the right to review in this way, or by means of these writs, any orders or actions of any particular board or official. The courts have been very chary to protect the rights, however, of the citizens of our country. In a series of decisions the courts of Canada, including the Supreme Court of Canada, have found that these provisions generally to be ineffective to prevent superior courts from enquiring into the actions of inferior courts, boards and officials. There has been a whole host of cases on this subject matter of the law over the years. The provisions, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, are therefore of somewhat doubtful value. The question arises as to the extent to which, if at all, these ancient protections of the citizens against the arbitrary acts or acts without jurisdiction of officials, courts and other bodies, should be taken away or abated.

As I say, thanks primarily to the courts where Legislatures have attempted to denude the citizens of this protection, the courts by and large have reinstated this protection for the benefit of the citizens. That being the case, and with the long periods of decided cases that we have on this subject, it has been decided and determined that we should, by act of this Legislature, actually remove these purported prohibitions from the Statutes in which they presently exist. Therefore, this bill is brought forward for that purpose and we're hopeful that it will meet with the approval of the Legislature. We feel that it will certainly ensure that all citizens of this province will have a right to question the jurisdiction of any governmental board or any other board which any citizen feels is not acting within its jurisdictions. This is one of the ancient rights of the citizens of any free country and we feel that it is one of the ancient rights that certainly should be preserved in the Province of Manitoba.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 82. The Honourable the Minister of Labour. HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Labour) (The Pas) presented Bill No. 82, an Act to amend The Department of Labour Act, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question there are two or three points that I would like to mention very briefly. One is that we are amending the Act to enable an inspector to order an employer or an official or an employee of a company to produce documents which are required by statute under the Department of Labour, to produce these documents that are required to be kept by an employer. Apparently there has been some difficulty in the past by virtue of the fact that the inspectors have not had this provision in the act. We are also providing that vice-chairmen may be appointed to the Labour Board and where more than one vice-chairmen are appointed that one will be known as the senior vice-chairman and will act in the absence of the chairman or such other vice-chairman as may be available.

We're establishing the quorum of the Labour Board at three; either the chairman or a vice-chairman, together with one who represents employees' views and one representing employer's views. Now the board is also given the right to sit in divisions, in two or more divisions at one time. In other words they may sit in panels. This is required as a result of the increased work that is coming before the Labour Board; the people that are involved are very busy and quite often a three-man board can do everything that a seven-man board could do; it certainly doesn't require the larger numbers to make intelligent decisions. The Minister can decide in consultation with the chairman of the Labour Board what type of cases will be heard by a panel of the board rather than the whole board. Where the board is sitting in panels then the secretary will have the right to rotate the members according to a roster which he would keep enabling them to sit in panels of the board. The board is also given the right in determining the employees views, given the right to examine records, make enquiries, hold hearings or to conduct a vote in order to determine the employees' views. This of course came into question this year as a result of a decertification issue at Brandon Packers. The courts ruled that the board was not specifically given the right to hold votes in decertification and therefore the decision of the board was disallowed. We think that this is rather important that the board have this right and we're so providing for it. Now there are one or two other minor amendments. One provides a penalty for the refusal to produce documents as spelled out with this amendment; we're changing the definition of an inspector, broadening it just a little bit to include the fire commissioner and his staff, and we're also adding all those other Acts which are under the administration of the Department of Labour.

MR. GRAY: I'd like to ask just one question to the Honourable Minister. Has the Minister any power over the Board? In other words, can he in any decision that they make interfere otherwise?

MR. CARROLL: Well if that's the only question, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the Minister does not have the right to alter or change or influence the decision of the board. This is the decision of the board itself; they have these powers granted to it under the Act and certainly the Minister can in no way interfere.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 84. The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Minister of Education) (Dauphin) presented Bill No. 84, an Act to amend The Education Department Act for second reading.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think we have concluded all the business that it's expedient to consider at this time and I'm prepared to move the adjournment of the House until 8:00 o'clock on which occasion I move the motion respecting the Committee of Supply. But I would like the people in the Press before they all get away to take note of this because I think the public generally will be interested in having this information. In view of the fact that the Margarine Bill has received second reading today it is proposed to call the Agricultural Committee for 10:00 a.m. on the morning of Tuesday next, and as there is widespread interest in this matter I think it would be well if we ask the co-operation of the news media in making that fact known. 10:00 o'clock, Tuesday morning the Agricultural Committee will meet to consider the Margarine Bill. Now members will notice that the Private Bill Committee was also scheduled to meet,

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) according to today's Votes and Proceedings, at the same time. What we intend to do now is to move this committee forward to 9:00 o'clock and I would like those who are interested in the Private Bills referred, to take note of the fact that that committee will now meet at 9:00 o'clock on the morning of Tuesday next instead of at 10:00, and in its place the Agricultural Committee will meet at 10:00. If the widest publicity could be given to those changes I would indeed be grateful. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister -- oh excuse me I just suggest Sir, that you call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: I call it 5:30 and return to the Chair at 8:00 o'clock tonight.