



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



Vol. VII No. 68 2:30 p.m. Monday, April 16, 1962.

5th Session

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Monday, April 16th, 1962.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

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

MR. CLERK: The Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg leave to present the following as their third report. Your Committee has considered Bills: No. 20, an Act to amend the Insurance Act; No. 61, an Act to amend The Brandon Charter; No. 62, an Act to amend The Municipal Boundaries Act; No. 63, an Act to validate By-law No. 147 of the Village of Benito, By-law No. 362 of the Town of Swan River, By-law No. 1404 of the Rural Municipality of Minitonas, By-law No. 1679 of the Rural Municipality of Swan River, and By-law No. 128 of the Village of Bowsman; No. 67, an Act to validate By-law No. 567 of the Rural Municipality of Langford and By-law No. 1611 of the Town of Neepawa; No. 84, an Act to incorporate South Western Manitoba Lodge; No. 93, an Act to amend The Crops Insurance Test Area Act and to validate an Order of the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation and Order-in-Council 152161; No. 94, an Act to amend The Partnership Act; No. 97, an Act to validate By-law No. 4502 of the Rural Municipality of Fort Garry; No. 103, an Act to amend The Employment Standards Act to repeal Part II of The Shops Regulation Act; No. 105, an Act to amend The Local Government Districts Act; No. 108, an Act to amend The Income Tax Act (Manitoba), 1962; No. 112, an Act to amend The Animal Husbandry Act; No. 115, an Act to amend The Department of Labour Act; and has agreed to report the same without amendment. Your Committee also considered Bills: No. 48, an Act to amend The Hospitals Act; No. 56, an Act to amend the Portage la Prairie Charter; No. 59, an Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956, and to validate By-law No. 18589; No. 64, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act (1); No. 65, an Act respecting Insurance of Residents of the Province against the Costs of the Provision of Hospital Services; No. 68, an Act to incorporate Virden and District Elderly Persons Housing Corporation; No. 73, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act (2); No. 81, an Act to amend The West Kildonan Charter and to amend an Act respecting Certain Orders of the Winnipeg Suburban Municipal Board; No. 82, an Act to erect The Village of Roblin into a Town and to enlarge the Boundaries thereof and to amend The Municipal Boundaries Act; No. 91, an Act to amend The Manitoba Telephone Act; and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments, all of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notice of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin) introduced Bill No. 137, an Act to validate Certain By-laws of the Town of Dauphin and the Rural Municipality of Dauphin and to enlarge the boundaries of the Town of Dauphin.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions standing on the Order Paper.

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

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 1. Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting the provision of public housing accommodation and the rehabilitation of existing

(Mr. Chairman, cont'd.) . . . buildings for public housing accommodation to provide, among other matters, for making payments from the Consolidated Fund for: (a) contributions to the cost of preliminary work and investigations to determine the need and advisability of undertaking projects to provide public housing accommodation; (b) contributions to the cost of construction and development of projects to provide public housing accommodation and to losses arising out of the operation thereof; (c) contributions to the cost of acquiring and clearing land used for projects to provide public housing accommodation; (d) contributions to the cost of conducting special studies relating to conditions in urban areas, to means of improving housing or to the need for additional housing or for urban redevelopment; (e) remuneration to and reimbursement of expenses of members of a commission to be established to review and report on proposals for projects to provide public housing accommodation; and (f) remuneration of officers and employees required to administer the legislation.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I think the ample resolution gives an indication of the nature of the legislation being asked for. At the time of second reading I would propose to give some extended remarks on the principles of the bill, but I think it can be summed up by saying this, that it is proposed that the provincial government enter into partnership with the municipalities to take advantage of federal legislation to permit the construction of housing accommodation for those of low income in the Province of Manitoba. The other provisions of the bill will be supplementary to that, and there will be provisions to enable the municipalities fully to participate in this. I understand there is some technical legislative requirements that had to be met. I'd be very glad to try to answer any questions that would be appropriate at this stage, but I think a fuller discussion should be held on second reading and on Committee of the Whole House later.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, we will reserve our comments until we hear the Minister's statement ourselves. I'd just be curious to know whether this provision will now permit the City of Winnipeg to proceed immediately with their own plans.

MR. EVANS: It is the type of legislation to permit them -- as far as I am aware, it will permit the particular plan that they may have in mind although it has not yet been submitted. I think when it is submitted, my anticipation would be it would be eligible to participate in this new plan.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Mr. Chairman, we await with interest the legislation dealing with this matter. There are two questions I would like to ask the Minister. I presume that there will be capital funds required for this purpose; and will the needs of rural Manitoba be adequately taken care of as well as that in the urban areas.

MR. EVANS: The Provincial Treasurer has already indicated that there will be capital funds. That is not within my own branch. Any municipality which fulfills the conditions and proposes a housing plan will be eligible for consideration. The municipalities in rural Manitoba equally with Greater Winnipeg.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? -- Passed.

Resolution No. 2. Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Winter Employment Act by providing for an extension of the period of winter months during which projects may be undertaken under the Act and a consequent increase in payments to be made from the Consolidated Fund in respect of such projects.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Public Utilities)(The Pas): Mr. Chairman, this amendment is required as a result of the efforts of our Regulations Committee who discovered that we have no authority to pass a regulation declaring a half-winter month. This amendment to the legislation will enable us to cover the half month of October which we felt we had authority to cover at the time, but which we found out since we didn't.

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

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

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

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

MR. EVANS introduced Bill No. 114, an Act respecting the provision of public housing

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) . . . accommodation and the rehabilitation of existing buildings for public housing accommodation.

MR. CARROLL introduced Bill No. 136, an Act to amend The Winter Employment Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I call the Orders of the Day, I should like to introduce to the Members of the Legislative Assembly, Centennial School, on my right, consisting of 32 pupils of Grade VI, under the guidance of their teacher, Miss B. Larter. This school is located in Seven Oaks constituency and is ably represented in the House by the Honourable Mr. Wright. We're happy to see the students with us this afternoon and we hope that it will be an instance that they will long remember in their educational career, and some pleasure and profit may be the result of their visit with us this afternoon.

Orders of the Day.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I wish to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 21, dated Friday, March 16th, on motion of the Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. DAVID ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. I'm sorry I didn't give him notice but I didn't have the information until a few minutes ago. It has to do with the question of the overwork, I think, of the court reporters. I was called the other day about a case which had appeared before the courts. I spoke to the lawyer concerned this morning and he told me that before the case could be disposed of they would have to submit arguments to the Judge, and they couldn't do that until they got the transcript of the hearings. The case was heard on December 19th and they didn't get the transcript until this morning, which is almost four months. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney-General could -- I can give him the particular case if that's important -- I wonder if the Attorney-General could check and see if this is happening frequently and, if so, what can be done about this?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend could give me, perhaps by note, I'll look into the particular circumstances of the case. He will recall, of course, that in the estimates for this department we have included positions for three new court reporters, two for this district and one for The Pas, in an attempt to meet the situation of overwork or overcrowding of their agendas.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Adjourned debate on proposed motion for second reading of Bill No. 102. The Honourable the Minister of Labour. The Honourable Minister of Labour is closing the debate.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I suppose that we've heard almost everything now about this bill that we're going to hear. It's rather interesting to see how it's been described by some of the members of the House. It's been described as being ridiculous, dictatorial, that it's conceived out of ignorance or with malice towards labour. We even have our friends in the NDP associating themselves with the comments of Mr. Goodman and his scurrilous attack on the government for the audacity, I suppose, to set up the Tritschler Commission to investigate into the facts of the Brandon strike. We have other members saying that this strikes at the very heart of trade unionism. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that these statements are in no way true, because if they were, we as a government would not want to associate ourselves with this bill that's before the House. It's 100% undiluted hogwash, and I think the members that have said it, know that it is. I sometimes wonder why this smoke screen -- and I suppose the Member from St. John's and possibly others are hoping to capitalize on the confusion which will result from some of the remarks that have been made by people in this House and outside with respect to this particular bill.

The Leader of the NDP said that we have good labour relations in Manitoba, and I think every member in this House would incline to agree that we have had reasonably good relations. I would like to point out, too, that an absence of strikes is not necessarily the only indication of labour harmony or peace in the province. When a patient goes to see a doctor, the doctor doesn't say he's well and healthy just because he looks well, because we know that he may have a cancerous growth or some other ailment which could claim his life in short time; and I think that the same sort of a situation does apply in labour relations as well, because we won't have strikes in the kind of situation where you have a strong employer and probably no

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) trade union or a very weak trade union. You'll have no strikes in a situation like this, and yet labour relations may not be happy. The situation may be, in fact, very unhealthy. And what about the provisions in this bill -- the amendments in this bill that will help to clarify a situation; will help give assistance to people to organize; to ensure that agreements are passed along and that they have protection. Very little comment has been made with respect to these other sections of the bill. Some very disparaging remarks were made, rather grudgingly I think, about the section of the bill that deals with enforcement. I think in so doing the Member for St. John's did refer to the Commission report, and I think in so doing he suggested that he was probably in favour of this report of this Commission having been set up to report on the affairs at Brandon. Well, I think that this support for the Commission probably isn't shared by his friend from Elmwood.

MR. ORLIKOW: I want to say here and now that I did not intend -- and I don't think that a careful reading of my speech would give any proof to the suggestion that I was favourable to the report. I said one section of the report had merit. That's all I said.

MR. CARROLL: You feel that the report shouldn't have carried on. I take that from your remarks then that you make this afternoon.

Now the Leader of the Opposition -- I suppose one might say that he has adopted a very cautious approach to this Labour Bill, because I think you have to look pretty hard to find out just where he stands on most of the principles involved in the bill here. I would like to say this, however, that he has come up with one or two constructive ideas. He did suggest that we need more education in labour-management relations and, with this, I'm sure that we on this side of the House will agree. I'm pleased, and I'm sure he will be too, to know that we are providing a small item in the Labour Relations estimates to commence a course with the co-operation of the University of Manitoba for training in labour relations matters, so both management and labour may sit down together -- we may even include some of the clergy in this committee -- so that we can have a well-rounded approach and a better understanding of those matters which affect employees and employers. He also suggested that we should look to the Province of Ontario and follow their example in our approach to labour legislation. I would like to agree with that suggestion and say that we've already looked to Ontario. In fact, we adopted our mediator procedure, as he knows, from their legislation. We think that this will be an excellent provision in this statute. It may not be used as often as we might like to see it used, but I think it will go a long way towards eliminating the delay in those cases in which this procedure is adopted.

We have also examined the Goldenberg Report, which was a study of the labour relations in the construction industry, and we find a very interesting thing there. We find that really our legislation isn't as bad as some might think it is because they're recommending in that report several changes that are already in existence in Manitoba Labour legislation, so we're very pleased to have that reassurance that some of the things that we're doing here are progressive and are being recommended by experts in the field of labour.

I'd like to say, too, that we've also had a look at what Mr. Justice McKinnon has done -- the study which he conducted for the Province of Nova Scotia. This study took him, I think, through every province in Canada except one, and he made a very extensive search into labour legislation. He received delegations representing both sides and he boiled it down and consolidated it into a report which was presented to the Nova Scotia Legislature last year. So I think we are having a look beyond the boundaries of our province here and are attempting to gain from other jurisdictions those things which we feel can be useful in the Province of Manitoba.

But I am rather surprised that in the debate that took place last week that he charged those of us on this side of the House with anti-labour views. Well I'd like to ask him right now, which views spoken in the House here can he attribute to being anti-labour? Is he suggesting that people should not live up to their obligations that they enter into in collective agreements? Does he suggest that trade unions should not live up to the law? Are these the anti-labour views that we're spouting from this side of the House? Surely I think we're entitled to know what he considers here to be anti-labour legislation. He also had a few comments to make about the secret government-sponsored strike vote. He implied, I believe, that the government doesn't trust the trade unions. I think those may not be the exact words, but certainly that was the impression that I drew from the remarks that he said. But I believe if he goes back and has a look

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) at what was expressed at the time that the bill was introduced, I think he'll find that I made no suggestion that we didn't trust trade unions. In fact, I think I said that I didn't think that government-supervised votes would really change very many strike vote situations. The Province of B.C. says that they don't think that the government-sponsored vote does change the strike vote -- maybe one in a hundred or something like that -- a very small percentage in any case. But what it will do is remove from the area of criticism the suggestions that the labour unions are today not conducting their votes properly -- this criticism of unethical pre-strike procedures; the suggestion that people have to get up and declare themselves in public; the suggestion that the votes may be taken at times and places that aren't convenient, at times when there are very few people therein proportion to the numbers that are in the bargaining units; and all of these things. We say if this is removed, this criticism is removed, surely we must have a better relationship. If the employer is sure that the vote is a true representation, then I feel that this will be a step forward in establishing good relations, and certainly will be good in my opinion, and in the eyes of the public as well, to remove this stigma which does at the present time attach to union votes.

The Leader of the NDP says that all their constitutions call for a secret strike vote. I don't know -- he may be an authority in this field here, but I have here with me now a page taken from a book called "The Labour and Industrial Relations" by Lester. It's in the provincial library here, and it's Page 138 for anyone who would like to take the time to read it. They're discussing one particular union here, and it says: "The constitution gives its President the authority to call strikes himself without consultation or vote and to issue executive orders that are binding on all members and all locals. By such order, he may annul or set aside any or all rules, resolutions, or provisions of the union's constitution and by-laws, and substitute therefore other different provisions of his own making." It goes on to discuss this particular gentleman, and it says: "He has made frequent use of such absolute powers." Well I think this will dispel any illusion that we may have that all trade unions -- international unions have in their constitution

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, I think if my honourable friend reviews my remarks, I don't think that he can find where I said that all unions have secret strike votes.

MR. CARROLL: I accept your statement. But it does indicate, in my opinion, that there are some trade unions at least who don't go along with the secret government vote. In fact, it would appear from this that the rank and file have no say at all. The orders are made somewhere up above. Well what about the situation with respect to lock-outs. I've had an investigation done within the department and, frankly, there's only been two cases in which somebody suggested there was a lock-out. Certainly we would not want to interpret these situations to be lock-outs because in both cases an employer did close their doors, but only after the employees had walked out on an illegal strike. Then the employer closed the doors and said if this is the way you want to play games we're quite pleased to go along, so I think that we've really got no example, no case history of lock-outs in the Province of Manitoba.

Now the Member for Brokenhead said that the shareholders really have no say in these situations, and he pointed to Brandon as an example of this. Well I think he may recall that the majority owners were actually personally involved in the settlement that took place. They were here, and met in this building in fact, to make the final settlement which settled that strike at Brandon Packers; and I think you'll also find that the officers -- and that's the officers as opposed to the company -- these are the people that represent the owners -- the officers are usually pretty close to negotiation at the times when the issues are finally settled.

Now there is some suggestion of the Taft-Hartley Act having struck out a section dealing with secret strike votes. Well I've made some enquiries about this. I think two members of the NDP Party indicated that -- the Member for St. John's and the Member for Brokenhead. If that's not right, I wish they'd tell me.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may again on a point of privilege, we stated from this side in reference to the Taft-Hartley Act that the provisions of the secret strike vote did not reveal any difference, appreciably, in the percentage of the votes either for or against the strike; not that it had been taken out of the Act.

MR. CARROLL: Would the Member for St. John's and Brokenhead like to clarify what

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) ... they said at this time?

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, I made the statement that the Act had been amended. I can't say that I have the actual change here, but I think my information is correct. If the Honourable Minister says that it's not, I think I can check the record and if I'm wrong I will correct the record, but I think I'm right.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, if the Minister is asking me, I would reply that I said that in the last ten-year period that particular provision of the Taft-Hartley Act dealing with strike balloting was found to be of no great value. I don't believe I said that it had been struck out or deleted.

MR. CARROLL: Well thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the clarification there and won't make any further comment. In fact, I don't suppose my honourable friends would like to treat this as an authority, although it does say it's an exact reprint of the full text of the Taft-Hartley Act as amended by the Landrum-Griffin Act, but I noticed in looking at the front that it was put out here by the Chambers of Commerce of the United States. I'm quite sure you wouldn't want to accept this as an authority, but no doubt you will have other sources of information -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. ORLIKOW: on a par with operation freedom.

MR. CARROLL: It may be, but there is an element of freedom -- true -- in making sure that the facts you state before the House really are facts and not allegations. I think the House is entitled to know what the facts are with respect to it. I think the strike vote -- there's been some suggestion that really we elect Metro councillors with a 20% turnout and things like that. I would like to say that there is quite a difference between a strike vote and a vote to elect municipal councillors or mayors and things of that type. This may affect a part of their livelihood, but the strike vote does affect their whole future and determines whether they work in some cases or whether they don't work. We feel that this is a very important vote and one in which they should be ensured their full democratic rights as citizens. We know there are a great many people who are reluctant to stand up at public meetings, to declare themselves, to speak out openly, possibly with views that may be unpopular to other members who may be there. Our democratic rights have been developed over many centuries and I think we'll all agree that it's a pretty sound system, and if it works for electing people of this House, surely it should also apply in important issues such as this.

Now the Member for St. John's -- I'm sorry he's not in his seat because these next remarks I'm afraid are directed to him. He said that it was really important that the phrasing on the ballot should be spelled out clearly so that there should be no doubt, and I think that if he were here he would agree that he went and said: "Look at the situation in Brandon -- what confusion there was there because the issues were not clearly known." Well I think the situation in Brandon was quite different because I think in that situation they didn't even try to spell out the issues that were before the members at that time. There was no attempt in any way to tell the people there the truth about the company's offer, and when one reads the --

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question.

MR. CARROLL: Yes I would.

MR. PAULLEY: Is he aware as to whether or not the management of Brandon Packers communicated the offer to the organization concerned?

MR. CARROLL: Yes, I am aware.

MR. PAULLEY: That they did not?

MR. CARROLL: That they did.

MR. PAULLEY: Not according to the evidence.

MR. CARROLL: Well I think it's a very pathetic situation, because one who has read some of the evidence associated with this Brandon Packers strike will see the tremendous confusion that existed at that time. It was pathetic. These fellows didn't know who to trust. They didn't know where to turn because they were confused; and certainly their trade union members, from whom they should have expected guidance, were not there to give it to them.

Now the gentleman who raised this in the House, the Member for St. John's who has now returned to his seat -- was the one who brought this issue before the House and said that really the phrasing of this issue is most important. I think we all recognize that the Member for St. John's is also the Secretary of the Manitoba Labour Committee for Human Rights. I wonder

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) . . . whether this committee has ever investigated the human rights implications of this Brandon situation, because I think that this is something they might well take into consideration. Because what about the rights of Local 255 to be able to settle their own affairs; to be able to come to an agreement with the company. Surely they have the right to do that. The right is spelled out under our Labour Relations Act, that the bargaining unit has the right to determine the conditions upon which they'll settle; that this right was usurped by the international representatives of the UPWA in this case. What about the rights of those individuals? What about the rights of the trade union members as to the truth about the company's final offer? Surely there's a right there that should be investigated by the Committee for Human Rights. What about the rights of the ordinary citizens of Manitoba to the facts about that situation.

We read ads in the paper which distorted the situation -- untruthful -- handbills that were passed around the country. Certainly there was no truth here. What about the rights of your fellow trade unionists, and after all this is the Committee for Human Rights. What about their rights to the truth about the Brandon Packers situation? We read in their trade union publications some pretty badly distorted stories, and no doubt these were also communicated to their conventions in due course as well. Now what about the rights of Mr. Bojarski who was suspended, dismissed, because he questioned the handling of the strike funds? Now I don't hold any claim for Bojarski, but I do understand that he was refused admission to a meeting where he had hoped to appeal to his fellow trade unionists, or had hoped to appeal to the vice-president of the association, Mr. Dowling, but apparently was denied that opportunity. What about the rights of Mr. Cote -- Mr. Cote -- the rights to ordinary protection as a citizen, the right not to be beaten up and things of that kind. Well I'm sorry that we have no resolutions before the House now from the member opposite that might try to correct and prevent a situation like this. I don't know whether he investigated it or not. I'd like to know sometime whether he did investigate this.

Then he went on to say: "Surely you're not going to change the legislation in Manitoba on the basis of one strike involving only 115 employees." You know this sort of smacks of the kind of criticism that was attached to Mr. Ritchie, who is quoted in the report as having said he couldn't care less about Brandon -- what do 130 workers mean to our union? That was his attitude, according to the reports that have come from that situation. Well were there only 115? I'm not so sure. What about the Winnipeg Beef Company? What about the Manitoba Cold Storage? What about the Canada Packers Wilsel plant and Hull plant? What about the threat of a Canada-wide strike of Canada Packers? Surely these are all implications which resulted from this strike situation in Brandon. Were there only 115? There were quite a few other situations involved too. These aren't them all by any means. You know at the time that these men were on strike they were the saviours of labour, but now one would think that they're trying to cast them aside like an unwanted shoe and throwing them to the wolves.

I think that I would agree with the attitude of the Member from Seven Oaks who the other day said: "Surely we must try to learn lessons from situations like this." He was concerned at that time about an accident which had claimed the lives of two men in a plant, but I think we should always try to get lessons from unfortunate situations such as this. I just mention them briefly in passing because I think that there were implications far beyond the situation that existed in Brandon itself.

Now what about the business of legal entity? It's been said that this strikes at the very heart of trade unionism; that this will litigate unions to death; excessive litigation will result, forcing small unions out of business; and things of that kind. Well I just ask, where's the evidence of this kind of litigation? Surely there is really none to substantiate these sweeping charges because we've done some investigations ourselves and we can't substantiate these kinds of general charges at all. Surely the courts are able to deal with frivolous and vexatious cases that might come before them, and I think they're quite prepared to deal with the people who bring cases of this kind to them; and of course we have had an examination of the situation in those other countries where trade unions are held up as being most mature in their ability to negotiate and handle situations of this kind. We know that in Sweden trade unions have had full corporate status since 1915; that their collective agreements have been binding since that time. They have the force of law; force of a contract. In the United Kingdom something less than 15% only are without legal status. The other 85 plus percent have full legal status as far as I know.

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) We know, too, that down in the United States, since the Taft-Hartley Act of 1949, trade unions have been full legal entities; and the courts in Canada, we know, are regularly finding -- almost always these days -- that trade unions have a legal status, but in Manitoba we have the anomolous situation where there is some doubt as to what the courts will interpret.

It's a strange thing you know, the NDP's they have no doubts about this. They say: "Of course trade unions are legal entities." If they are, I can't understand what they want to fight about then, because here's a statement in Saturday's paper. It says: "We're going to fight this bill tooth and nail all the way down the line and we'll stop at nothing to have it killed," New Democratic Party Leader Russ Paulley promised today. "This will be a battle royal -- the battle to end all battles unless the government listens to reason," Mr. Paulley declared. Well that's a fair statement.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my honourable friend doesn't think I used such verbiage as "the battle to end all battles," but I assure him of my contention that we're going to battle this bill to the end.

MR. CARROLL: I'm glad to hear that, but I'm really at a loss, if the trade unions are legal entities, to know what the great objection is to this bill that's before us. You know several of the members opposite there, in their speeches before the House here, have given of this speech -- maybe not used the words exactly -- so I'd like to just have a look at it myself and mention two quotes that I picked out of it. This is a speech presumably -- or an article written by Larry Sefton. He's one of the directors of the United Steel Workers of America and this is in "The Miner's Voice." The copy is March of 1962, and he says this -- just going to take two statements out of here: "In our book of rules, co-operation is a two-way street -- the relationship of equals." And farther down he says: "Unions have never sought nor do they now seek immunity from observing the law." I think this is a good statement. It means equality of opportunity and equality of responsibility. Isn't that what he means? We all agree -- okay, fine. I think this is what our bill is intended to do -- equality of opportunity; equality of responsibility -- (Interjection) -- Well now I think I know what the real concern is. There are some friends opposite here -- they touched on it the other day -- but it came forcibly to me when I met with a group from Pine Falls last week. Their concern was that an individual trade union member might involve their union in an action, either through inadvertence or through negligence or maybe through some overt action without the authority of the union, which could involve them in a case for damages and loss. I think this is their real concern and this appears to be the key to the whole situation, and I would think that if this can be cleared up to the satisfaction of members from Pine Falls -- I even have hope now from the Manitoba Federation of Labour, and others, that this will be a happy piece of legislation.

The other concern of the members from Pine Falls was that they have a union shop agreement and the company, of course, they hire whoever they like to work in the plant, but these people must then become union members within 15 days, so really they have no control over people who come into their membership. They said supposing they hire some irresponsible individual who comes in here and stirs up a lot of trouble and then we have to pay for it. This was their concern. I did my best, at that time, to assure them that this wasn't the intention of our legislation. We're not attempting to impose any special responsibilities on employers or on trade unions with respect to their relationships with their employees or their trade union members. We've been advised that the common law gives adequate protection against unauthorized acts of individuals. This is what I have been assured. We're not trying to place any special onus of responsibility in relationships between a trade union and its individual members. I say that trade unions have nothing to fear from this legislation unless they are determined to flout the law; or determined not to live up to their contract agreements that they have freely entered into. As far as the Pine Falls group is concerned, they said they had nothing to fear from this law because they intended to live by the law. They intended to live up to their obligations under their contract. They said that if they had unions -- now this was just a small group -- they said that if they had unions that broke the law, which resulted in damage to their employer or broken agreement with the same effect, that they would be quite prepared as straight union members to accept their responsibility for it. I think that if this other matter can be cleared up, then there will be no question about them accepting this particular amendment.

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.)

Now this legislation is not intended to hamstring trade unions or to jeopardize their legitimate aims and goals -- (Interjection) -- Well if you have a suitable amendment to propose, we will be quite prepared to consider it at Law Amendments Committee. We believe that the trade unions have a very necessary role to perform and we have no fear that this legislation will in any way hamper their activities in the Province of Manitoba. Now there has been this concern about the interpretation, so we're going to welcome any of your legal counsel or any other witnesses that you would like to summon before the committee to voice their criticism of it. We'd be quite prepared to hear them; and if they have improvements to offer, we welcome those improvements because we're the first ones to say that we want this to be the best legislation possible.

Well now, the member for Lac du Bonnet and his group -- he has already suggested one change in the Act, which really doesn't change the intent or the purpose or the effect of the act at all, but it does clear it up for the benefit of those people in Pine Falls and he's going to be bringing this amendment through. He has already recommended it and I think we are quite prepared to accept it. This will remove this area of criticism that has attached to this by those trade union people who didn't fully understand the interpretation of one word in Section 14.

There has been some suggestion that we should have an extended Industrial Relations Committee that sits over for a good many months, and I think that we can't go along with that suggestion at all. I think all parties here have done some investigation of labour relations matters. I'm afraid that some people are going to have to get down off the fence whether they want to or not, and we invite all of you to bring your advisors before the committee and to voice any ideas that you feel may improve this legislation, and we offer assurance that there will be a reasonable opportunity for a full hearing and full discussion in committee stage. We believe that this is fair legislation; we believe that it will be considered as such by fair-minded citizens of Manitoba; and we hope that it will enhance labour relations in the province and I would recommend it to the House.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Yeas and nays, please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is that Bill No. 102, an Act to amend The Labour Relations Act, be read a second time.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Campbell, Carroll, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Desjardins, Dow, Evans, Froese, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Hutton, Ingebrigton, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Molgat, Prefontaine, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Tanchak, Thompson, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Forbes and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Gray, Harris, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Wagner, and Wright.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 41; nays, 8.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister on second reading of Bill No. 100. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 100 has been discussed quite freely by members of the House and, among other things, the bill deals with the matter of a review of Metro. When the legislation was first brought in, I think it was two years ago, I opposed the legislation at that time and one of my reasons was that a referendum should be held on the matter and that the legislation should not be just brought in and imposed on the people of Winnipeg and the suburban cities, and I still feel that way today. I feel that the legislation, especially the imposition of the legislation should be removed. After all, we're here to do the will of the people and, as has been indicated in this House by a number of speakers, the people of Winnipeg and the suburban cities do not want this; are not in favour of Metro; therefore, I think that that is so much more reason why a referendum should be held at this time. I don't think we have any right to impose legislation of this type on such a large group of people and to leave it there. Certainly if there is an indication that people are not satisfied, why not remove it? I cannot see the reason for the persistence of this government to keep Metro if it is not wanted. Some have advanced the argument that people -- or the electors are not qualified to

(Mr. Froese, cont'd.) . . . vote on a matter of this kind. I do not go along with that. I think that if you follow that up, it would lead us to believe that we do not believe in democracy itself.

I think the government, in the first place, has failed in its duty to inform the people of the city and the suburban cities of Metro itself before it was imposed. They should have informed the electors to know what was going on and that a new level of administration was being imposed on this area. Certainly we have all the various means of communications at our disposal and the government certainly has them at their disposal, such as the news media, the press, radio and TV, and the job could have been done quite easily and very effectively so that people would have been qualified to vote on the matter at that time. Personally, I feel that is the only way to bring about peace and understanding in this whole area and on the matter of Metro. I feel that it's better to have that vote now than later. I think this view is also supported by the Member for Lakeside. When we met with the Chairman of Metro, Mr. Bonnycastle, earlier in the year, that statement was made and I heartily agree.

The other day I was challenged by the Minister of Education to give leadership in my area regarding the divisions. I say, and I feel very strongly on this, that, to me, leadership represents something entirely different. Leadership, to me, represents that if I do believe in a thing, I will go out and fight for it; but, on the other hand, if I don't believe in it and if the people have indicated previously that they are not in favour, I think it is then wrong for me to go ahead and advocate the matter and try to convince them. Further, I dare this government to go ahead and call a referendum, and not to bait it like they did the division plan with higher grants -- inducement grants -- but to have a vote, and vote on the merits of the legislation itself and sell the program in that way.

I would be quite in favour with some of the matters mentioned by the Honourable Member for St. Vital. I believe that the powers of Metro should be curtailed, especially to the matter of capital financing. Certainly the people should have a right to vote on the expenditures that are being made, for which they are held responsible in the way of paying taxes. I also believe that the head of Metro should be an elected official and, for that matter, that Metro Council could be enlarged. Certainly if we feel that it's necessary in this House to have larger representation than Metro presently has for that same area, I think it should hold true for that level of government as well. It seems to me that this review would take the government off the hook and to take off the pressure, and they could thereby defer this indefinitely and could keep Metro going even though the people are opposed to it. I would challenge the government to have a referendum. They know very well that they are very weak in this field and are afraid to face up to the situation. They know that the defeat of Metro might indicate or reflect the lack of support for the government, and that is why they hesitate.

Mr. Speaker, I'm opposed to the bill as it now stands. I feel that a referendum should be held first. And another matter which I feel very strongly on, that there should be a date when the commission would be reporting and not leave it open indefinitely. I think most of the other aspects of the bill have been discussed by other members already, so that I need not go into detail on some other aspects. But I wish to stress this other point very strongly that, in my opinion, people and the electors of this area should be entitled to vote on the issue; that they are qualified to vote; and if they're not, that this government is responsible to inform them so that they can form an opinion of their own. How else can the members sitting in this House and how else can the members sitting on Metro Board represent those people in the government if these people have no opinion, if they cannot form an opinion. Certainly it's the duty of the government to inform the electors in this matter.

MR. EDMOND PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Chairman, as I rise to speak on this motion, I wish that I had a little bit of the ability and the command of the English language that the First Minister has, in order to make a case. He, having no case at all, put up quite a show. I only pray the Lord give me, not the courage, I think I have it, but to put in my mouth the right words to express correctly the opinions that I wish to express at the present time.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we are dealing here at this time with the most important matter that we have to face this year. There is unrest in this Greater Winnipeg area at the present time. People are wondering whether democracy is still working in this area. It's a very important question. I propose to prove to you, Mr. Speaker, at this time, that the plan that I choose to call "The Roblin Plan", that was introduced in Bill 62 in order to solve the Metropolitan

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) . . . problem in this area, is not a sound plan; that it has been condemned by the Ontario Municipal Board -- or a plan similar to this one; that this Roblin plan is contrary to the proposals of the Royal Commission, which I've called the "Sharpe Commission". It's contrary to the recommendations of the ten municipalities who were presenting a joint recommendation. It is contrary to what an experienced man would think that human nature would do when presented with the conditions that were presented to the municipal men in this province. And I would like to prove that this plan should be not expressed confidence in because, after all, this bill does nothing but this, express confidence in Roblin's plan of Metro administration. There's a lot of confusion, Mr. Speaker, not only outside this House but even in this House. Some people believe that the metropolitan idea and the Roblin plan are one and the same thing. This is totally wrong. They are horses of a different colour altogether.

In order to make my ideas clear, I will have to go into the history of this matter to a certain extent. The Honourable the First Minister has in his two main speeches, one two years ago and one this year, gone into the history. I want you to take a look, Mr. Speaker, from the start. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the first morning that I entered the office of the man who was then the Premier of this province, he told me: "Edmond, you're welcome. I'm going to put you to work immediately." It was the 29th of November. The Provincial Municipal Committee was sitting in the Council Chamber. He told me: "I won't pay you today nor tomorrow, you'll be on the payroll only on the first of December, but I'll put you to work anyway." I walked into the room and I met the municipal men as a Cabinet Minister for the first time. Hardly anybody knew in the province that I was a Cabinet Minister. I liked the atmosphere in that Council Chamber. When I saw the First Minister talking to Mr. Simonite and calling him "Charlie", and then when Mr. Simonite called Mr. Roblin, "Duff", I knew that we were working together as friends.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I'm sure my honourable friend is guilty of a slip of the tongue on this occasion. He didn't say "Duff". I'm sure he said "Doug" in those days.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Pardon me -- "Doug."

MR. ROBLIN: I'd like to tell him that Charlie Simonite does call me "Duff" in the most friendly terms, which I appreciate.

MR. PREFONTAINE: I certainly did intend to say "Doug." My tongue has this knack of slipping once in awhile.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I'm the one that should have been protesting, but I'm in a very --

MR. PREFONTAINE: Well, to go on with this work. For two days we sat; we sat later; we sat with these municipal men. We appointed a sub-committee of this Provincial-Municipal Committee -- two sub-committees -- one to look into the urban situation and one into the rural situation. Mr. Simonite was the Chairman of the sub-committee on the urban situation. We discussed all the problems, and we realized that there was a problem in Greater Winnipeg because there were different problems -- I'll come to that later -- and out of these deliberations came the idea of a metropolitan exploratory committee, and the First Minister mentioned that the other day. Mr. Simonite was under the impression that this was a job to be done by the municipalities in Greater Winnipeg. He accepted the responsibility to go to the municipalities, to collect money, according to the population, from these municipalities to carry on the investigation. He went to work with our blessing.

He reported back to us later that he had some difficulty. The City of Winnipeg was willing to put \$10,000 in the pot but that some municipalities were not willing because they were afraid maybe -- some of them -- of amalgamation or something like that. He was in difficulty and he asked us if we could do something about that. Mr. Campbell and his Cabinet agreed -- agreed to spend money on it, although this was work to be done for Greater Winnipeg. An Order-in-Council was passed appointing five men -- good men -- the Mayor of Winnipeg, Mr. Sharpe; the Mayor of St. Boniface, Mr. Van Belleghem; the Mayor of St. James, Mr. Findlay; Councillor Kushner of West Kildonan; and Mr. Bodie of East Kildonan. We knew that this would cost money to the Government of Manitoba, and quite a bit of money. We started by giving \$15,000. We went on. We allowed them to go where they wanted. We wanted a full investigation. We knew it was a difficult problem and we wanted to give them ample time. We spent \$105,000 on this

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) . . . committee to render service to Greater Winnipeg because we thought they were entitled to it; and we, at that time, even approved the idea of central planning and central control. We did approve that when we passed this Order-in-Council, and if some members do not believe that we had, why did we spend the money?

The Honourable the First Minister quoted from the Order-in-Council the other day one paragraph. I think I will quote another paragraph. With respect to the power of the commission -- "(5). If the Commission decides against recommending any amalgamation of municipal and school district units within the metropolitan area or against the establishing of any form of metropolitan government for the metropolitan area, to make such recommendations as would in its opinion provide better co-ordination and greater efficiency in the administration of municipal affairs." This is a clear indication that we had approved. We knew that we had the Metropolitan Planning Commission which could not function properly because it has no power to enforce its recommendations on the municipalities. We knew that the City of Winnipeg had two nice parks; that everybody was enjoying those parks and the City of Winnipeg alone was paying for them. We knew there were two hospitals here that the City was maintaining and everybody was going to it. We had another problem of our dormantary municipalities. We knew it was necessary to have central control and we approved it by passing this and helping with the investigation; and these men went to work. They travelled all over the world. They went to the United States; they went to Europe, England, the Scandinavian countries; they travelled often-times from Winnipeg to Toronto, because they had already a metropolitan municipality in Toronto. They could not report to us because the election of '58 had taken place before their work was through. They reported to this government in 1959 in the spring.

Now in their report they mentioned at different times the report of the Ontario Municipal Board and told us how this Municipal Board of Ontario were faced with problems over there. There had been an application to the Ontario Municipal Board by the City of Toronto for total amalgamation, and there had been an application from the Town of Mimico for the board to institute what they called a Board of Joint Management. This board was to be composed of outsiders from the municipal field. They would be elected from wards all over the City of Toronto and would administer the services independently of the municipalities.

Now this municipal board went to work. They studied the possibilities. They said that it was not the time to have amalgamation in Toronto. It would be too big a city; it would be too costly; it would not be local government. With respect to the proposal of the Town of Mimico -- that proposal is a proposal similar to the Roblin proposal, men, outsiders, elected at large -- and it said that it would not provide continuity. It would not work properly because there would be no contact with the municipal men. They would have to give them extra powers. There would be no liaison. They turned that down, and they arrived at a conclusion and presented their conclusion to the Government of Ontario, and the Government of Ontario passed a bill. It provided for a plan of administration of these common services and, in Ontario, the administration was in the hands of only municipal men. The government thought that the municipal men could do a job -- 24 municipal men. There were 13 municipalities to be served. Toronto had more of a population than all the others together, so the Legislature of Ontario gave representation of 12 municipal men on this metropolitan council and the other municipalities each got one man; so that provided for a council of 24. To these 24 was supposed to be added a chairman for two years -- or a year and three quarters -- from April to the January a year and three quarters after. This man was Fred Gardiner. He was to be elected on the first meeting after the first of January from then on. He could be elected; anyone else in the City of Toronto could be elected; but subject to re-election by these 24 municipal men every year -- that was a better set-up than we've had over here -- but the crux of the matter is that the administration would be in the hands of municipal men completely.

Now our Sharpe commission here studied the situation down there and they told us that they would have liked to have the same situation in Winnipeg, but we had 19 municipal corporations here. Winnipeg had more population than the other 18 together, and it decided that to have a council of some 37 people would be too many; would be hard to handle. I agree with them. It would be too big a council; it would not certainly function properly. They looked at all the alternatives. They did not spend much time in going into the Town of Mimico situation which apparently our Leader in this House adopted later on. I don't know if he knew the

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) . . . situation; if he knew that it had been turned down; but here is the alternatives that this commission looked into. In short then, the alternatives considered were as follows: "(1) Leave the situation as it is with the appointment of more boards and of commissions when deemed necessary." It had stated beforehand that we in Winnipeg were much luckier than they had been in Toronto, because we had some 13 boards or commissions and we had co-operation and everything was working quite smoothly, although there was room for common administration of certain services. "(2) Co-ordinate the various boards or authorities now in existence under one body, with the powers of each board transferred to such central body." This is somewhat the recommendation that 10 municipalities have made. "(3) Establish a metropolitan authority with jurisdiction over specifically designated services and leave local functions to the municipalities themselves and elimination of all boards."

MR. ROBLIN: What page is that, please?

MR. PREFONTAINE: This is Page 246 of the report and recommendations of the Royal Commission. "(4) Formation of one city under one city council; (5) A further alternative was a possible combination of some of the above or parts thereof." None of these alternatives was the alternative that has been chosen by the Premier of this Province. They did not consider it feasible that we should have a properly functioning kind of metro government that would be composed only of outsiders, because it wouldn't work.

The last recommendation of the Commission is this: "From these various alternatives, each with its advantages and disadvantages, its proponents and opponents, a choice must be made. The commission has weighed the merits and demerits of all the possibilities. It has recommended the course of action which, in its view, will best serve the community of Greater Winnipeg now and in the years to come. The alternatives have not been ignored. The Commission considered them carefully but felt that their disadvantages outweighed their advantages. It is not pretended that implementation of the recommendations of the commission will put an end to all problems of local government in Greater Winnipeg. These, like the poor and taxes, will always be with us. The Commission feels, however, on the basis of its studies and deliberations, that the course of action it proposes will turn out to be more broadly satisfactory than would any of the alternatives available. It is by this workaday criterion that these proposals must be judged."

Mr. Chairman, this report was presented in the spring of 1959. The Minister of Municipal Affairs called a meeting on November the third of 1959. The municipalities came before the Minister and they had different proposals. The proposals of the Royal Commission recommended that there should be certain amalgamations of the smaller municipalities like Brooklands and like Old Kildonan. They did not like that. Winnipeg wanted a straight amalgamation. Ten of the strongest municipalities wanted to control -- and said they were able to control their own services -- and wanted a central body instead of all the boards that they had, and the meeting was adjourned. The government, having heard these representations, took upon itself -- of course it was their duty and responsibility to study the situation. Nothing that I know of was heard of it until on February the seventeenth, 1960, this House was presented with Bill 62; and Bill 62 brought us the famous Roblin plan, a plan which ignored the municipalities completely.

In a sense, Mr. Speaker, I say that the First Minister was telling the municipal men at that time that he didn't trust them to run their own municipal affairs; that they might be too parish pumprinded or not broad-minded enough. We should have independent persons looking at the whole situation, the whole community -- men that would be elected in their parish kind of constituency and who would meet together under the chairmanship, not of anyone elected but of one appointed, and appointed in a particular way. He would not be subject to election by the ten men -- not for four years. After four years he would not have to be elected. He could be chosen by these ten men, but nobody else could. He was the only one who could be chosen without being elected. Of course they could elect one between themselves if they felt like it -- one of the ten elected could be chosen -- but as far as the rest of the population in Greater Winnipeg, unless they were elected and chosen by the ten, they could not aspire to this high honour and the high office. This was contrary, most contrary to the recommendation of the Ontario Municipal Board and to the recommendation of the Sharpe Commission. The First Minister was telling these municipal men all over Greater Winnipeg you will have no say with Metro control of

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) . . . these services, but you will have to collect the taxes; and these super aldermen or this super mayor, they will have the power to collect from you. The ten men will not be subjected to election for four years at a time. They will not have to go to the people to get their money bylaws approved, and the people of Greater Winnipeg -- well they just would have to take it. It would be mandatory -- not optional, but mandatory over everyone.

Mr. Speaker, I think that was a sad day for Manitoba -- or Greater Winnipeg I should say -- when this Bill 62 was introduced in the House and the speech was made, because it provided an unworkable plan. Do you, Mr. Speaker, think for a minute that if you had been the Mayor of Winnipeg that you would have been very happy to collect taxes and see outsiders -- ten outsiders spend part of that money that you have to give to them? No -- human nature being as it is, Mister. I could not see for one, how that could work. It's not workable. It's against what we believe that will do presented with a certain situation. I say, Mr. Speaker, that a conservation officer, who put the dummy deer in the road one night in order to attract hunters, understood human nature possibly much better than the First Minister of this province. He knew what the reaction would be. The reaction could not have been otherwise from the municipal men of this area when they were totally ignored in the setting up of this plan which is contrary to common sense in my mind; contrary to what has been done in Toronto; contrary to what the recommendation of the commission here who sat for four years recommended. They recommended eight municipal men -- the mayors of eight cities -- they would have control and six controllers with them to help them.

Now I say, Mr. Speaker, that it should not have been done. This plan should not have been accepted by this House. I know some people in this House were confused that the Roblin plan and central planning were one and the same thing -- that's confusion -- that's not one and the same thing. That's why we spent \$105,000 to arrive at a proper plan that will work -- and this plan came out of the blue here for Winnipeg. I don't know where it came from -- the brain-child of the Prime Minister and some of his advisors possibly. It's not the brain-child of the Royal Commission that we appointed or that was going on in Toronto. Mr. Speaker, I say that the five men had done a good job and that the plan in Toronto was the plan that we were looking forward to.

And then how did it work? We all know that it didn't work during this year and a half, and we have now the First Minister coming and presenting a bill, a bill which says not very much, but it stresses confidence in his own baby -- in Metro -- his own plan of administration of these common services. He says that there was common agreement except with respect to the referendum. Well I don't know, Mr. Speaker, about everyone in the House. I know that I'm one member of this House who was not in agreement with the plan itself, in principle, and on third reading -- I'm quoting from Hansard -- I had Hansard copied by our secretary and I haven't got the date on it, but I'm quoting from Hansard and I said, just before the First Minister concluded the debate on third reading: "I don't believe that any group of eleven men were ever given as wide powers as these -- elected as far as ten is concerned, and appointed as far as the other one -- elected men or appointed men will be given when this bill becomes law. They have clear sailing for four years; no responsibility to anyone, and they can force the municipalities to pay taxes to this super level of government. These municipalities, area municipalities, will have no right to refuse to pay. They will be just collection agencies for this super government. And I say that this is wrong. This council will not be an ordinary council -- an elected council for two years like the other ones. In the municipalities we have elections that come close, one to the other, because there is no opposition to keep tab on the expenses of the majority or the government. It's a different field of government altogether from the provincial field, and that's why we have elections every two years. But now we are giving these men -- whom possibly the electors will not have known much before, possibly they will be men who have no experience in municipal affairs -- we are giving these men a blank cheque to operate for four years."

"And at least the bill should not be passed without going to the ratepayers. I say that the ratepayers of the city are not informed. I say it is wrong for the members of this House to assume the responsibilities that they are assuming at the present time because they are not responsible for the majority of them -- 30 or 35 of us. We are not responsible to the electors of Greater Winnipeg. We cannot be held to account to the voters of Greater Winnipeg. I say that

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) . . . I can't see it in my heart to impose this new level of government without the people having a chance to find out more about it. It was plain at the hearing before the Law Amendments Committee" -- and this I was speaking on third reading -- "that even the municipal men themselves were not fully aware of what was involved in the bill. Many municipalities asked for a referendum -- four or five I believe asked for a referendum, and private individuals asked for a referendum. I think the suggestion of my leader" -- the present member for Lakeside -- "is a good one that the government should take it into consideration and announce that this bill would not be proclaimed before a vote is taken of the citizens, of the electors of Greater Winnipeg."

I, for one, was not in agreement with the Roblin plan. I was in favour of central control -- I've said so -- but the plan itself, I was not in agreement with. And now, Mr. Speaker, what have we got before us? We have a bill which pretends to do something -- to anticipate the work that the Committee of Review was to do and to give an extended life, I suppose, to Metro government; to try and restore some confidence in the government that the Roblin plan has established for Greater Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, I say that there had to be some excuse to present this bill -- some kind of a reason -- and I say that it was a surprise to me to hear the First Minister condemn or rebuke his children, I might say, his Chairman that he had appointed himself possibly for a long time, without cause, Mr. Chairman -- without cause. After all, what did these men do if not exactly what they were supposed to do? That's what they did. Why should they be blamed? I read from the speech of the Honourable the First Minister in 1962, February 17th: "The arrangements of the bill make it clear that it is intended that these functions will be taken over by the metropolitan authority as and when it is ready and able to do so."

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, the date is 1960, not '62.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Oh yes, did I say -- again a slip of the tongue. Pardon me -- February 17, 1960, for the record. "The arrangements of the bill make it clear" -- I will repeat it to be clearer -- "that it is intended that these functions will be taken over by the metropolitan authority as and when it is ready and able to do so. There will be an orderly transfer of these services." That doesn't mean four years time, and then this is the crux of the statement -- "The procedure followed is to have the council pass a by-law requesting the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to give authority for the transfer of the particular service and on approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council that transfer proceeds." It seems, Mr. Speaker, that they could not proceed with taking over the services without an order from the Governor-in-Council being passed. Did the First Minister and his Cabinet refuse to pass the Order-in-Council or did they act contrary to the provisions of the act and the statement of the First Minister? This, to me, is very hard to understand. Did he expect these men who had employed a high-priced Executive Director to sit there and wait?

Nowhere in this speech of the First Minister of any other speech that I have read, a statement that we expect that four years would elapse before these services are taken over. I'm quite sure that the expectation was that they would take over the services as soon as they were ready. In fact, that's what is said here.

Mr. Speaker, I was so surprised when the First Minister the other day said that he thought that they had gone too far too fast. When he joined with the tormentors of Metro, I was so surprised. I could hardly understand my ears, if my ears were reporting his words properly to my mind. Mr. Speaker, I was astounded. But after analyzing this situation, I came to the conclusion that maybe this was understood between Mr. Bonnycastle and Mr. Roblin. Here I am guessing a little bit, but I think I know human nature to quite an extent, because immediately after having said that he was blaming these men for having gone too far too fast, he quickly went on to say he expressed his full confidence in Metro -- in Mr. Bonnycastle. I think that he was ready for both of these statements -- Mr. Bonnycastle I mean -- because the Premier had to come with some excuse before this House to justify calling this committee three years in advance. There has to be a justification, and possibly there had to be a sop to the people of Greater Winnipeg -- kind of a sop to indicate that he was not too happy with his children, the Metro boys. Possibly that's it. It has been stated, and by those who approved the Roblin plan of administration, that he did not react in panic; did not cut the wings of Metro or appoint new men on Metro; but I say that he acted in panic to a certain extent. He did not cut the wings, but he, bringing about this review much before the time that is proper and reasonable, if he's

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) . . . satisfied with Metro as he says he is, it's much too soon. They haven't had time -- a year and a half -- and some problems have not been taken over; some services have not yet been taken over, I understand. I think it might have been a sop to the people of Greater Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker, when he attacks Mr. Bonnycastle and his men, I think to my mind it was. I'd like to use the French language here and say that it was le comble de l'ingratitude -- le comble de l'ingratitude sinon de l'effronterie -- possibly the height of ingratitude, and to translate the other word might be insulting and I don't want to be insulting -- impudence, possibly, would sound better -- for him to rebuke his men for having done what they were expected to do. He acted somewhat in panic but he acted also in anger. And why did he act in anger? Because I say, Mr. Speaker, everything seems to go wrong with him and his Metro; everything seems to go wrong especially because the municipal men seem to fail to cooperate. -- -- had been told that the reason mayors had been invited to meet with the Premier and discuss the question of possibly sitting as advisors with the Metro men; here again, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the First Minister must have been somewhat naive to think that these men would accept to sit with the Metro people not as equals but as stage boys or bell boys. No, Mr. Speaker, they should not have expected that at all. Do you see the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg an elected and re-elected mayor sit there just as an advisor knowing very well that his advice is not worth the paper that it's written on or the word spoken by him, or the Mayor of St. Boniface or the Mayor of St. James? Certainly he could not expect these men to accept to sit as mere advisors, and apparently he was not very happy about that. If he had known human nature a little more, he would not have made these proposals, I'm sure, because he would have known that they would have been turned down. And Mr. Speaker, I think he acted in anger, and there are quite a lot of people who think along those lines. I see the First Minister laughing. I would like to read here from the Tribune of April 10th, just one sentence. After seeing that the First Minister had not reacted in panic they go on to say this: "About the only thing the government proposes to do with this bill is to give these critics a chance to spell out their charges against Metro and to back up these charges with facts and figures -- if they can." That's about all that there is in this bill. And this bill is addressed to the municipal men who have been accusing and criticizing Metro. Then the Premier says -- in the first he says, "You boys put up or shut up; you have a committee to listen to you."

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, would my honourable friend just make it clear that he's reading an editorial written by somebody else. That person has no more ability to read my mind than has my honourable friend.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Well okay, but I think I have some understanding of human nature and I believe after all I will analyze with you what you propose to study with your famous Commission of Review. It's turned to be a commission rather than a committee but this is not too important. But is it plain for anyone who has knowledge that this is what's going to happen, a dog fight, a real good dog fight when this committee sits.

And with respect to the matters that this committee would look into -- the airing or ventilating of grievances. Is it necessary, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to have a commission to sit to listen to the ventilating of grievances? I do not think so. What will it do? It will be worse than ever.

Now if I can find that page with respect to -- oh, I'm in 1960; I should look in 1962. Here it is, on page 1569, here is apparently the references that this board will be given. "We expect that they may give particular attention to certain difficult problems that we have been grappling with recently, such as this matter of liaison and co-operation." Is it necessary to have a commission to look into the fact that there has been no co-operation in those years and what can they do? They're dealing with human nature. It may perhaps examine the question of boundaries, as to whether the patterns of growth that recent studies have been concerned with justify the present metropolitan boundary. Has there been much criticism with respect to boundaries? Small potatoes; not necessary to pass a bill to look into this situation and appoint a commission. But then this is the crux of it. Perhaps it might even go so far as to examine the impact of Metropolitan Government on the area municipalities. Well that's something but it's not sure now; it may even go as far. But as he explains, and twice he repeats, . . . ventilates grievances. But we're coming now to the important sentence in the whole speech and it is this one: "I would just like to conclude" -- that was after 5:30 that day after he thanked the members that we had

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) . . . given him more time -- "I would just like to conclude very briefly and say this, that we feel that the principles of all metropolitan administration are sound." That's the crux of the whole matter. It's in that light that we have to look at this commission that might be established -- this "hands off the principles of our metropolitan administration." But it goes further: "We are open to conviction that there should be changes in method or in detail." Method or detail. Are we going to have a commission to look into method or detail? Is it necessary? Mr. Speaker, I for one cannot see it. And who will be on that commission, Mr. Speaker? I could see the honourable -- the four members sitting up there when the First Minister was speaking -- Mr. Bonnycastle and three of his strong men. I realized when the speech was over that they were very happy men. They had been expressed confidence by the First Minister of Manitoba. They knew there was a commission coming. Possibly they did not know who would be on that commission but they knew perfectly well of certain men that wouldn't be on the commission. They knew that the elected and re-elected Mayor of Winnipeg would not be on that commission. They knew that the Chairman of the Finance Committee of Winnipeg, Mr. Crawford, a man who knows his onions quite well and could advise on finance, they knew that he would not be on the commission. They knew also that the Mayor of West Kildonan, the man that knows more about these problems than any man living in Winnipeg, in Manitoba, in Canada and possibly anywhere else, about these problems. He would not be on that commission. They knew that and they were going away happy. Now lo and behold, the other day I get the Winnipeg Free Press -- and I read it every day and every line that concerns politics and "Under the Dome" and things like that -- and, lo and behold, I read: "Committee squashed by mayors" and at the back of it it says that the First Minister has asked the 19 municipalities to submit to him a panel of names to be appointed to this commission. We in this House knew nothing about that. I read that three or five men will compose the commission -- we knew nothing about that.

And here is something else: "Among the names being circulated are H. Carl Goldenberg, Montreal, economist and municipal consultant." Well, I don't know if this man will be on that commission. It's possible, because if he has recommended that the provincial government should contribute about \$5 million now to Metro and in order to save Metro, he said maybe if he had further pressure, maybe he would agree to dish out \$5 million to save the baby, I don't know. What about Fred Gardiner? Fred Gardiner has been mentioned. Will we ask Fred Gardiner to come here and referee a dog fight between municipal men and Metro, or look into boundaries, or maybe look into the impact of certain services. I don't know for one, Mr. Speaker. I understand Mr. Fred Gardiner -- he has told me when I was a Minister and I met him in Montreal that he was, after all, in favour of straight amalgamation in Toronto although he was the head of the metropolitan board. But he personally favours straight amalgamation. Well will he be the chairman? Maybe the present government might be saved if Fred Gardiner came here and recommended straight amalgamation, I don't know. The third name is Thomas Findlay, Mayor of St. James. I'll pass no comment on him. But this was surprising to me when I read these names in the Winnipeg Free Press, the paper that is generally well-informed; really they're better informed than we in this House are at times.

No, Mr. Speaker, this bill with its clause to have this review three years ahead of time, doesn't mean anything at all. It says that the First Minister was bankrupt of ideas - bankrupt of ideas. He has nothing serious to offer at all. It will focus the attention of the people certainly away from him, from his government and to the municipalities and to Metro for awhile. Well, for how long, I don't know. But it can't be too long. The atmosphere is very well charged. There has been last March an election with respect to a vacancy on Metro. There has been something we have never seen in this province, a strike of the voters -- a strike of voters. And I say to the First Minister now that he should have five of these Metro councillors re-elected. It's two years now. He should rotate them. Put the ten names in a hat; have five of these men elected this fall. Do you want continuity? If you have an election on the ten two years from now, they might be all kicked out. Where would be the continuity? I can't see it. But I say that we should have five men elected this fall, and I predict to him that if he does that there'll be a general strike of the voters. Not that they don't like the men but that they don't like the set-up, they don't like Metro.

What does the bill mean? This House is fully aware what it means, that this House

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) expresses confidence in the Metro plan as proposed by Mr. Roblin. What is it the NDP Party says? They're in favour of central control-- central planning -- I am too, but I don't like the plan and that's what you will be supporting when you vote "yes" as you said you would. --(Interjection)-- You haven't finished? Who hasn't finished then?

MR. E. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): We haven't finished.

MR. PREFONTAINE: You haven't finished? Well apparently the big guns are finished anyway. Excuse me, Sir, you are one. I shouldn't have said that. I apologize. You are one, but you're in the wrong party, that's the trouble. I repeat, those who believe in Roblin's way to administer these services will vote for this bill -- vote "yes". Those who don't believe in Roblin's way will vote "no". There are alternatives, everybody knows. If we vote "no" that doesn't mean that we favour amalgamation. There is the Toronto way. There is the Sharpe way represented by this Commission. There is the municipal way, proposed by ten municipalities. We should get rid of this idea that it's either the Roblin way or amalgamation. It's totally wrong, unacceptable. I see the Honourable Member for St. Vital -- he's against Metro; he's against even government policy. He would like to improve it now with this commission, but in order to do that he has to vote confidence in Metro. Doesn't he realize that, Mr. Speaker? Two years ago when this bill came before the House I considered it was rotten -- it wouldn't work. Did I spend much energy in improving the bill? I did not. I thought it was a rotten egg and that a rotten egg cannot be improved. Now the Honourable Member from St. Vital votes against government policy. He says that the chairman of Metro should have been elected. I agree with him. I wouldn't like to be in the shoes of the chairman of Metro. When the mayor of Winnipeg, an elected person, can tell him as he said a week ago, "When I make a mistake I'm responsible to my electors, but when you make a mistake you're responsible to no one." This is not the fault of Mr. Bonnycastle. It's the fault of Bill 62 -- it's the fault of the father of Bill 62. It's too bad to put a man in such a position where he can't answer back. Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable Member for St. Vital, if he knew the parliamentary system a little more, I think that he would walk across the floor of the House because he's opposed to government policy. This has happened to me once, Mr. Speaker. I know what I'm talking about. I have made a speech in this House criticizing the government policy -- pardon me, is it close to time? I hope not -- criticizing government policy on carrying on in coalition in peace time. At the end of my speech I addressed myself to Mr. Speaker and I said, "Mr. Speaker, would you be kind enough to find a place for me across the floor of the House for the next sitting of the Legislature?" I did not want to be told by my Leader who was leading a responsible government, that I should possibly not appear in caucus again. I knew my job when I opposed government policy was to walk across. You're supposed to be a friend of your leader, Mr. Member for St. Vital, not embarrass him but help him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! I don't think you should criticize the Member from St. Vital. Direct yourself

MR. PREFONTAINE: Well I was giving a lesson in democracy. Well, I'm a little older than him and I hope he'll take it in good part.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what is going to happen on this bill? The government will show a united front. I'm sure there are a lot of backbenchers who are not too happy to support this bill -- to support the Roblin plan of Metro administration. They were very, very courageous two years ago when they denied a referendum on this. "We are ready to stand and be counted," and the members of the NDP Party were very courageous too. They were ready, all prepared to stand up and be counted on this plan. Well you may have the chance before very long. I don't know. Maybe that would be the best thing that could happen, in this whole area, that some of us will stand up and be counted pretty soon, Mr. Speaker. I know the government will be solid. The CCF are going to be embarrassed, irrespective of the laughs and the statements, because after all they will be known as having supported the Roblin plan; all over the Province of Manitoba they will be known tomorrow morning. This is confidence in Metro as it is, not changed. Who says it will be changed after this commission has sat? When the First Minister says that the principle is 100%. Who says that? Somebody has stated with respect to the Member for Deloraine, that he recommended a change and go to the recommendations of the municipalities, but this involves the whole scrapping of Metro and the terms of reference will not

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.) . . . provide for the whole scrapping of Metro, we've been told, Mr. Chairman, and I say that I respect the opinions of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, I believe. He said to the First Minister, "I'm supporting this bill to give you more rope to hang yourself."

MR. ORLIKOW: I said that.

MR. PREFONTAINE: From St. John's -- pardon me, yes. And Mr. Speaker, I think that the honourable member was weaving himself a rope to possibly hang himself with his attitude on this. This can be a pretty long rope and it might hang quite a few people. They are building on quicksand. I don't want to be a party to building on quicksand. This won't work. It has not been recommended by anyone. It's just a shot in the dark -- brainwave. Now, Mr. Speaker, what about the Liberal Party? The Liberal Party was divided. Yes, it was divided two years ago. That's the privilege of the Opposition. It's not the privilege of the government. The government has to be united -- has to have some authority, because they are making the laws and every one of their policies is a firm policy -- it can't be otherwise. The Opposition does not have to come here with a firm policy on every subject that comes before this House, maybe five years before an election, maybe four years, three, two or one. That's ridiculous. It's a misconception that some people have that the party in opposition has to come out with a firm policy all the time. It is. The opposition has that privilege that the government hasn't got. --(Interjection)-- Yes, when the time of the election is the time for a firm policy, over here, irrespective of the fact that the First Minister -- this I have not seen for some twenty years, for the government to insist on a vote, and call for a vote, as the First Minister did even this afternoon and he's been doing that. To me this is childish. Does he want the Opposition to jack up the government? Does he want to be able to say if something goes wrong, "Well we were supported by the Opposition." Does he want to say that? Why doesn't he stand on his own feet? We never had anything like that in the past. This is only since this young man has assumed the position that he has now. As far as I'm concerned I think I'm right parliamentarily speaking that the Opposition can't -- they have no firm policy to bring before this House.

A MEMBER: They should have.

MR. PREFONTAINE: No, they don't have to. They don't have to; and the Honourable Leader of the NDP Party knows very well that I'm speaking common sense, and I say that the Liberal Party will have a policy when the time comes. I don't know what the policy will be on this subject. I don't know what it will be. I'm not speaking for the Leader of this party on this matter. If I have anything to do with it the policy for taking care of Metro problems will be to place our confidence in the municipal men. There are many, many Charlie Simonites around Greater Winnipeg here in the municipal offices, on the municipal councils, and they can handle their problems. I would not -- if I have anything to do with it, if I can, prevail on my Leader to do anything about this problem, and I think I can to a certain extent, I would see that we place our confidence in the municipal men.

Mr. Speaker, just one last word. We are ready to stand up and be counted. As far as I'm concerned, I am. I was two years ago and I am again, and I'm ready to stand up and be counted in an election, and I'd like to run in the City of Winnipeg, but I'm debarred from doing that because I don't want to leave my good people down there. Mr. Speaker, this is so important that maybe we should look at this situation. The Free Press or the Tribune said the other day that the government had a tiger by the tail. I believe they have a tiger by the tail, and it reminds me of the cartoon that I saw in a newspaper some time ago. It was with respect to a big bull who was travelling at full speed and he had a rope on his neck and behind him was a man with one hand on the rope and the other hand on the tail, and he goes by one of his neighbours and the neighbour says, "Joe, where are you going?" And Joe says, "Well ask the bull. He's driving." With respect to this matter I think that this problem is driving the First Minister. It is driving him possibly into a general election very soon. Maybe that's the only thing that will clear the air and that will restore a little confidence in the people of this area. I'm not challenging him. It's not my duty -- not my responsibility -- but as far as I'm concerned this is a problem that requires solution and solution soon. We can't allow it to be procrastinated as it might be. This might take one, two years and in the meantime we might have a provincial election with the First Minister saying, "Well after all the committee is handling this." Attention will be focused someplace else.

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.)

Now, Mr. Speaker, I thank the members and I thank you for having listened to me. I spoke my mind from the bottom of my heart. I hope that my words have been understood for what they are worth. I know that the First Minister is going to mow me down immediately. He's much more able than I am, but it did not deprive me from speaking my whole mind. I think he has made a mistake. I think he's not ready to correct it. I think he will have to eat a little bit of humble pie some day possibly, and do like his colleague, the Minister of Education, who admitted that he had made a mistake the other day, and it certainly was refreshing to hear him make the statement. But at the present time Greater Winnipeg is in a mess. Something must be done about it, and I hope that we in this House will do our share to do something about it.

. Continued on next page.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, this House established the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg. The majority of the Liberals including their Leader, all the members of the NDP Party, and the government, supported this bill. It was a bold step and it resulted in the establishment of a new government; we have found out that it is not perfect, and it certainly is well in order that after it has been in operation for some time to now check upon it and see if we can make it operate a little bit better. We need the review. A corporation of Metropolitan Winnipeg was something that was recommended by the various municipalities when they made their submissions to the Greater Winnipeg Investigating Commission in 1957. It was recommended by the commission itself. It was recommended by the municipalities again when they made their submissions to the Law Amendments Committee in November, 1960. They all asked for a Metropolitan Corporation to look after Metropolitan services, excepting the City of Winnipeg which asked for amalgamation. They weren't clear on exactly what they wanted but they did want a metropolitan government which would look after metropolitan services, and from time to time investigations had been undertaken by many other metropolitan areas on this continent which resulted in similar recommendations. These include studies of the metropolitan areas of Los Angeles, Kansas City, Miami, St. Louis, Chicago, Sacramento, Des Moines, Milwaukee, Vancouver, Toronto, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Montreal and San Francisco. In addition, state legislatures have been studying problems of metropolitan government in New York, Michigan, Texas and Colorado. However, because of the difficulties involved, metropolitan governments have been established in the urban areas in only Miami, Toronto, and Winnipeg. Only yesterday, I was reading about the difficulties in Cleveland where with a population of 1,700,000 they have 105 governing bodies, and this is a big problem.

This is a problem which is recognized throughout this continent and it has been found to be a good idea, but it is a problem to determine the best form in which this metropolitan government should be established. In Manitoba we saw some of the faults of the Toronto set-up where there are two classes of councillors, one half being the aldermen of the City of Toronto who could, comparatively speaking, devote a great deal of time to their job, and the other half being the reeves and mayors of the municipalities who could not devote very much time to their job as they were very, very busy men looking after their jobs as reeves and mayors in their respective municipalities. Also, in Toronto we found another fault in that one reeve would perhaps in one case be representing 5,000 voters, and another reeve might be representing 300,000 voters. And so we didn't want to copy the Toronto setup where they haven't got representation by population and where they have two types of councillors. We sought to avoid these disadvantages in Winnipeg and we set up the ten metropolitan divisions -- each with equal number in population, no particular councillor would represent a particular municipality, and each councillor would be on equal basis with the other councillors -- he wouldn't have another job as was the case in Toronto where we had the 12 mayors or reeves, each very, very busy men.

This seemed like a good idea, but it hasn't worked out as well as one would hope. It seems to be that the chief fault of the Winnipeg setup is the lack of liaison between the metropolitan council and the municipal councils. Furthermore, metro councillors are not the tax collectors and they represent divisions twice the size of our provincial constituencies, so are far removed from the taxpayers. They do not seem to be very careful with the taxpayers' money. They seem to be more concerned with spending millions and being able to say, "Look how many millions we have spent on water mains and sewers; look how many miles of pipe we have laid." They seem to be determined to make everything as perfect as possible regardless of the cost.

For instance, Greater Winnipeg got along very well with reservoirs of a capacity of 58 million gallons until last year, and last year an additional reservoir with a capacity of 80 million gallons was constructed, a capacity greater than the previous reservoirs together. Now, although this large reservoir was only completed last year, Metro has decided another large reservoir of similar size must be completed at once and it must be covered at an extra cost of \$1 1/2 million. The other two large reservoirs in Greater Winnipeg have operated satisfactorily without being covered and other cities have had the same satisfactory experience with uncovered reservoirs. Last year metro council boasts that it expended \$6 million in metro streets. It is hard to realize that all this money was expended, but as one drove through

(Mr. Cowan, cont'd) Metropolitan Winnipeg last summer one observed time and again curb lanes being renewed; curbs being renewed -- curbs and curb lanes which had lasted for years and, while not perfect, were in pretty good shape and could last for many, many more years to come. We had, too, the proposal of Metro council to spend \$4 million on the St. James bridge and underpass; we had the metro council hiring their personnel at higher salaries than paid by the City of Winnipeg, paid to the Deputy Ministers of the Province of Manitoba who have greater responsibilities for a larger population, and we have Metro approving of an expenditure of some \$27 millions to be spent over 10 years on water services, and \$38 millions to be spent over the next 10 or 12 years on sewage disposal services. Now it's nice to have these services perfect, but taxpayers, I think, would put up with some inconvenience to have lower taxes or to have a halt in the constant raise in taxes.

A few days ago I visited a family in East Kildonan where the father is a caterpillar operator when he can get work, and a truck driver if he can't get work as a caterpillar operator. They have five children and they live in a very, very modest 5-room bungalow with 3 bedrooms built about five or six years ago, and last year their taxes were \$443.00. That is quite a lot of money for quite a small house and they are very concerned at the height of taxes and they are worried. I would think they would be quite willing that Metro would go a little bit slower in trying to make everything so perfect and in spending so many millions of dollars. It has been suggested in this House or it's been suggested to this House, that amalgamation is the answer, and when I was on city council I went along with that idea. However, when the representatives of the municipal governments appeared before the Minister of Municipal Affairs in November 1959, I was impressed by their sincerity, their ability and their unanimity in opposing amalgamation. I was also impressed with their very great interest in keeping costs as low as possible for their local taxpayers. Certainly if we had amalgamation cost to the suburbs would be increased, for Winnipeg standards would be extended to other municipalities. If the people of the suburbs don't all want concrete roads with curbs, concrete lanes, their boulevards cut for them, a kindergarten, a fire department with men on duty for only 42 hours a week, why should these services be imposed upon them? Some municipalities have policemen who also serve as firemen, helping to reduce their protection costs. Furthermore, suburban councils, or council members -- council committees -- check usually on every welfare case. This is not done in Winnipeg, so that no doubt higher welfare costs and more fraudulent welfare payments result in the City of Winnipeg. If there is inefficiency in a small municipality, it is soon noticed because of the few employees involved. In the large municipality with large departments, inefficiency is easily covered up and it is hard for city aldermen to know which of their departments are operating efficiently and which are not. That municipal costs can be kept down better in smaller municipalities is evidenced by a table on page 189 of the report of the Greater Winnipeg Investigating Commission, which shows that in 1956 the average operating per capita cost in the suburbs was about half the cost of Winnipeg. For instance, the figure for Winnipeg was \$98.40 as compared with \$44.37 for St. Vital. In every item of cost listed, the cost per capita was lower in St. Vital.

Not many municipalities have made definite proposals as to how Metro council should be set up. However, the joint brief submitted to the Greater Winnipeg Investigation Commission by the corporations of Assiniboia, East Kildonan, Fort Garry, North Kildonan, St. Boniface, St. James, St. Vital, Transcona, Tuxedo and West Kildonan did make recommendations. They recommended that each municipal corporation should have at least one member on the Board and that no single member corporation should be able to control the Board. That was back in 1957. When they made presentations to the Minister of Municipal Affairs in November '59, they made no such joint recommendation and they differed in their recommendations as to what they wanted. But maybe that is the submission that we should look at.

In order to satisfy this submission and in order to keep down costs and provide better liaison and co-operation between municipalities and metro, and to maintain the principle of representation by population, I suggest a different form of Metro council, a council on which each municipality would be represented. In the past, municipal council representatives have co-operated and worked together in a friendly manner on many inter-municipal commissions and boards for the improvement of the whole of this area, and I am sure they would do it again as members of a metropolitan council. On page 21 of the report of the Greater Winnipeg

(Mr. Cowan, cont'd) Investigating Commission there is this statement: "It is to the credit of the Greater Winnipeg community at large, that the spirit of inter-municipal co-operation appears to have been more evident here than in almost any other area which the commission studied. Studies recommending metropolitan councils of various types in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area, California, Des Moines and Milwaukee, all proposed that councils be made up -- that is the metropolitan councils -- be made up of representatives of the municipalities involved. I suggest that present metro councillors be replaced by councillors who are elected members of municipal councils and that each municipality be represented; the agenda for each meeting of the metropolitan council be distributed among all councillors in the area prior to their local council meeting so that the municipal representative on metro council would be expressing the opinion, not only for himself, but of fellow councillors on many questions; each council, other than Winnipeg, to be represented by one person and Winnipeg to be represented by four persons -- one from each ward and a fourth representative. Councils would appoint deputies for each representative so that a council would always be represented at a metro council meeting. When a councillor, other than a Winnipeg councillor voted, his vote would not count as one, but his vote would count as the population of his municipality in metro, which population figures would be brought up-to-date each year. In this way we would have representation by population exactly and not have the criticisms that we have in Toronto where one councillor, when he votes, he represents only 5,000 and another one a third of a million. Winnipeg's population, I suggest, would be taken as being equal to all the suburbs combined and each of the four Winnipeg representatives, when voting, would cast a vote equal to one-quarter of the Winnipeg vote. We would have the Winnipeg vote accordingly being equal to the vote of all the suburbs combined so that Winnipeg alone could not force its will upon the suburbs. And the suburbs if they should gang up on Winnipeg would not together be able to impose their will upon the City of Winnipeg. In the event of a straight division vote between the city and the suburbs, the chairman would cast the deciding vote. It might be that you don't think that that is a safety valve of a large enough size. Maybe it should be that when they are divided almost equally that in order for something to carry, it should be supported not only by the chairman but by one of the suburbs in addition to the City of Winnipeg if otherwise the City of Winnipeg would be alone on one side. But something could be worked out so that there was some safety measure so that neither Winnipeg would dominate the suburbs nor the suburbs together dominate the City of Winnipeg. --(Interjection) -- and don't suggest any veto. The council then would consist of 19 councillors from the suburbs and four from the City, and a chairman, or a total of 24. I think a chairman being appointed by the provincial government would certainly be in order. And work of the councillors could be divided into three main committees of seven or eight members with one Winnipeg representative on each committee. In this way, the work load would be spread and each committee would be sufficiently large so that it would be very representative and council would most likely approve of most of the recommendations. This is the procedure now followed in the City of Winnipeg and it works very well. Each councillor would become especially familiar with one-third of the work. At present Metro Council is so small -- just a chairman and ten councillors -- with sometimes only seven councillors present at a meeting, they cannot very well divide up the important work. As a matter of fact, Metro Council Finance Committee consists of all members of council so that they realize themselves that they cannot give to two or three members the job of deciding on important questions.

While the present Metro Council consists of very many good men, the proposed council should also have good members because they would have been elected twice -- once by the voters and secondly, by their fellow council members. If council was not satisfied with its representative, the representative could easily be replaced instead of having to wait for an election for another two years or longer as the case might be. If a Metro councillor died or resigned, no special by-election would have to be held to replace him as he would be replaced by a new member selected by council instead of being selected directly by the electorate. If we had this, Mr. Speaker, I submit that we would have representations by population quite truly, excepting for the fact that Winnipeg's voting power would have to be taken as being equal to the suburbs. And as the suburbs grew, their voting power would be changed accordingly. We would not have to have a redistribution because each member would vote the population of his particular municipality. Each council would be represented on Metro so that each would have a say in the

(Mr. Cowan, cont'd) matters affecting it and that is, I think, very important. And that is one of the things that the municipal councillors are wanting. They're each wanting a say and they would each have a say. Even though the Member from West St. Paul wouldn't be able to cast very many votes, he would at least have his say, and the councillors and people in that municipality would have the satisfaction of knowing that their case had been presented to Metro Council. We would save some expenses too in connection with salaries of Metro councillors, and the cost of Metro elections and Metro by-elections. Of course, I think that the men that serve on Metro Council would be paid something extra, but not \$3,600.00. We would have a council, I submit, more concerned with expenditures and taxes, as the council would consist entirely of representatives of municipalities which actually collect the taxes. Generally speaking, it would seem that councillors of smaller municipalities are more concerned with expenses than those in the larger municipalities. We might look at too - this commission, I hope, would look at, too, the question of whether or not it is essential that the five municipalities that have a portion of their areas in Metro government, whether or not it is necessary that they stay in Metro -- the municipalities of McDonald, Rosser, West St. Paul, East St. Paul and Springfield. Because they do not receive many of the Metro services and because they are not built up, it would seem that one or more of these municipalities could very well be left out of Metro providing Metro maintained planning control in these areas. The size of the Metro Council would be reduced accordingly.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I submit that we have found out that the Metropolitan Corporation that we in this House set up is not so perfect, and that it would be a good thing for a review, and that we, working together, might be able to make a more perfect metropolitan government in this Greater Winnipeg area in order that Winnipeg may be planned for the future so that it will grow in the best interests of the citizens of this area.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. CARROLL presented Bill No. 117, an Act to amend The Electricians' Licence Act, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, this is one of a series of bills to help to modernize some of the labour legislation. In this bill we're trying to recognize the specialization that's taking place in our electrical trade. At the present time, the Act only recognizes journeymen and limited licences. We're proposing to add to these a master electrician's licence, which will require a man to be a journeyman for at least two years and then pass examinations in design or layout. We're adding a limited maintenance licence to enable a person to do maintenance electrical work in a place of his regular employment; setting up a limited appliance repair licence; a limited specialized trade licence which will apply to such things as gas and oil burner installers and in elevator and hoist repair work and work of this kind where people have specialized in particular trades and are doing electrical work in connection with it; also an electronics equipment serviceman licence to recognize people who are doing service work in the field of television and radio. We're providing also for a temporary journeyman's licence to enable us to recognize people who come into this province temporarily from other jurisdictions where the standards are acceptable to us here. We're also making the limited appliance repair licence and the electronics serviceman's licence apply in the Greater Winnipeg area and in the cities throughout the province, and it will apply in municipalities only where a vote of the municipal council requires that only licenced people perform within their jurisdiction. We're also expanding the size of the board to include people in these other specialized trades, and a few other items of that kind. Most of these ideas have come from the trade themselves. We've discussed it with various representatives of employers and employees and utilities people and they seem to be in fairly general agreement on the provisions of this bill.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I notice that subsection 3 begins by saying: "Subject to the Manitoba Hydro Act and to subsections 2 and 3" etcetera. The Manitoba Hydro Act, I think -- I just want to check this with the Minister -- protects the Hydro customers, and I'm thinking mainly of rural areas and particularly farm buildings including the home -- it protects the owner of those buildings that he can, subject to a plan drawn up with

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) Hydro authorities, do his own wiring or have someone else do that wiring for him. I wanted to be sure that the protection in that regard still exists, because I'm conscious of the fact that even though the Electrical Association as such is probably not very much in favour of that being done, because they are inclined to think that only the master electricians or journeymen electricians should do that kind of work, I have always had the feeling that provided the Hydro authorities check the program before it is entered upon and then have authority to inspect the work before they make the connection with their systems, that the persons and property are abundantly protected by that method. So I'd want to be sure that that is continued.

Then I noticed that -- I think it's in the Manitoba Hydro Act, some expression such as this -- that once the Metropolitan Authority, Metro for short, has proclaimed Part IV of their Act which is the one, I believe, dealing with planning, that Metro then takes over -- this is the way I read it -- that Metro takes over the authority for electrical installations as well in that area. And I was wondering in that case, is the protection that I'm speaking of for the homeowner who wants to do his own work or to have some local person do it, is it still maintained? Because my recollection is that under the Hydro Act they still have the electrical distribution in everything but Winnipeg proper so far as the Metropolitan area is concerned. When the Minister closes the debate I'd be glad to have any comment that he can make on those points.

MR. CARROLL: no further questions, Mr. Speaker. As I understand it, there's been no change in this provision. An individual can still do work on his own premises. I understand that Metro are now doing electrical inspection work in the metropolitan area at the present time, and this provision still prevails in this area. I would hope, though, that you might raise the question again in committee stage so that we can have the experts just further assure us on this matter.

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

MR. CARROLL presented Bill No. 121, an Act to amend The Building Trades Protection Act, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, this just provides new safety measures for some of the new techniques that are being developed in the construction industry. It also changes the name of the act from The Building Trades Protection Act to The Construction Safety Act. It is an attempt to give greater protection to construction workmen.

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

HON. JOHN THOMPSON, Q. C. (Acting Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Virçden) presented Bill No. 123, an Act to amend The Municipal Act, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, there are several provisions in this bill. As usual, the provisions in an amending municipal act seem to be numerous. In this case we have amendments to various sections and there are several principles involved, and I should mention some of them. If I happen to omit any in which honourable members are interested I would be glad to attempt to answer afterwards.

Among other things the bill provides for photographing of documents so that documents of the municipality may be preserved in film. It empowers a rural municipality to acquire by lease or purchase, but not by expropriation, gravel or stone for the use in the maintenance and construction of highways, and to acquire gravel and stone outside the limits of their own municipality. The bill authorizes the municipality to make grants to a branch or association for retarded children, a power which hitherto has not existed, in respect of each child attending a school for retarded children from the particular municipality.

A further provision is the removal of the necessity of a notice. The present notice is 30 days, and this removes the necessity of a notice to owners of adjoining land for the removal of trees or shrubs along highways. This has been made necessary in road and highway construction in municipalities and it refers only to rural municipalities -- that is, they may remove trees or shrubs in road building without giving notice to adjoining owners.

A further section clarifies the law respecting the authority of cities and towns in suburban municipalities to install parking meters and charge fees for parking. There is, I am

(Mr. Thompson, cont'd) advised, in the present act a doubt as to the authority of many towns and cities in suburban municipalities to collect fees for parking by way of parking meters. Under the present act they have the right to regulate and control parking but there may be a doubt as to the right to install meters and to charge for parking, so that this amendment clarifies that doubt and gives them the right to do so.

A further amendment provides that disputes between municipalities respecting the maintenance and improvement of joint roads -- if there's any dispute in that respect it may be submitted to the Municipal Board.

A further amendment regarding money by-laws states that a money by-law which requires a vote of the ratepayers shall be submitted to the Municipal Board for approval after first reading, and before third reading two weeks shall elapse after the vote of the ratepayers has been declared. This latter provision allows time for a recount. The first provision which says that the Municipal Board shall have a look at the by-law after first reading simply removes an inconvenience which has existed, and that is that money by-laws have gone to the ratepayers and then were submitted to the Municipal Board who found a defect. This will remove that problem.

A further amendment respects the procedure on challenging a vote taken on a money by-law. It says that the judge may order a by-law to be submitted again to a vote and may fix the date of that vote.

A further amendment respects the removal of the requirement that expenses of supervision of a municipality which is under the supervision of the municipal board, the expenses which under the present law should not exceed one tenth of one percent of the total debenture debt of the municipality and of the school district debt, shall be removed. We had conflicting legislation in that respect. The Municipal Board Act said that it should be one eighth of one percent which we removed by a recent bill. This one said one tenth of one percent and these will be deleted.

A further change in municipal administration is provided in another amendment which requires a municipal corporation to make estimates each year when it is drawing up its estimates and budget, of all capital expenditures which it proposes for the calendar year. At the present under the existing legislation, every municipality must set up its estimates for operating expenditures. Now we're providing that also each municipality should establish its proposals and its estimates for capital expenditures, and if as a result of their activities during the year it is the desire of any municipality to expend in excess of its capital expenditures they must, as they do in the case of current operations, they must go to the Minister for approval of any increase over the estimates.

A further amendment to the Act covering several sections sets up new legislation respecting the auditing of municipal finances in our municipalities. There are not many basic changes in the law in this respect. One is that we are changing the name of the chief of the auditing staff who has been known as Provincial Municipal Auditor to the Director of Municipal Audits, but the most important change in this legislation which is before us, is that there will now be permitted a commercial audit of municipalities. Up until now the law has said that there must be a full and complete audit of every municipality. This matter has been taken under advisement by the municipal organizations of the province and they established a committee some time ago, comprised of representatives of the Union of Municipalities, of the Urban Association, of the Secretary-Treasurers Association of Manitoba, and were joined in that committee by the Auditors Association of Manitoba, and they proposed this amendment. We also had it examined by the Comptroller-General of the Province who felt that a full and complete audit was not required of our municipalities and that the commercial type audit would be quite satisfactory. It is the type used generally in the business world and in commercial and industrial enterprises. It is a shorter audit. One of the main reasons for introducing this type of audit was that it would be less expensive to municipalities because the work of auditors is done normally by the hour and it would take less time. The discretion is with the Minister of Municipal Affairs to decide, in the cases of the municipalities, whether the general audit should still be used or whether the commercial type will be satisfactory. That discretion remains with the Minister.

Now there's one other amendment which I might mention, which was somewhat controversial last year. I believe it came in with an amendment to the Winnipeg Charter -- or no, it

(Mr. Thompson, cont'd)came in as an amendment to the Municipal Act -- and it provides that a municipality may withdraw from the Parks Board provisions of the Municipal Act, and according to the amendment which we are proposing, there must be a vote of the ratepayers to decide whether a municipality can withdraw from the Parks Board provisions, and this will affect all municipalities including the cities under charter such as the City of Winnipeg and every other municipality in the province.

Those are some of the main items in this bill and if any evidence in this respect is required I hope we can provide it in committee.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): I realize that under second reading we cannot deal with particular sections, but there's one or two on which I would like to make some enquiries. Number one, in connection with the auditors -- we have some small municipalities that have had a secretary-treasurer for years looking after all their books and accounts, and probably knows the routine business better than one who has a C. A. after his name -- whether the amendment is necessary to have the title attached to one who does the work. I realize in a larger municipality it is necessary, but here in my humble opinion you are adding an expense to a smaller municipality that has had a man for twenty or twenty-five and sometimes thirty-five years doing this particular work. That's my question number one. Number two -- why speak to the ratepayers again? Now we have changed the law in certain cases where a change could be made, like the Parks Board, withdrawing from the Parks Board, can be made by a majority of the people and not particularly the ratepayers. I think that it's an old discussion we've had here for years and years that the one who pays the rent is a citizen and has the right to vote because instead of paying his taxes direct to the landlord, the landlord collects the taxes and pays it for him. Still this landlord who had many -- four or five or six hundred suites in any community, or the majority of the suites why should he, one individual, have more power than his tenants who are giving him the money. All he does is a messenger boy to take the money from the tenant and take it back to the tax office. I don't think that the word "rate-payers" should be eliminated but perhaps we can discuss it in committee. Outside of this, Mr. Speaker, I feel that this bill, with the amendments is definitely progress to the welfare of the municipality.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. THOMPSON: I wonder could I answer the honourable gentleman in committee on these matters? I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that I omitted one item inadvertently which might be considered of importance, and that is -- may I refer to the section, section 31 in the following, respecting the tax provision which confirms the principle that assessment of business tax and real property tax shall be on the basis of equity. That is, if they're equitable; if the business tax is equitable, they shall not be disturbed, but I'm sorry that I omitted that in looking over the provisions of the Act, and I'd be glad to deal with it further in committee.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of Supply.

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

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department VI. Agriculture and Conservation. Resolution 26, Item 1. Administration passed?

HON. GEO. HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to comment on some of the remarks that have been made on agriculture and I think the first matters I would like to comment on are the statements of philosophy, if you can call it that, on the part of some of the members with regard to agricultural policy. I seem to be viewed by different members in a different light. One member sees me as looking at agriculture through rose-tinted glasses; others see me as taking a pessimistic view of agriculture. The Honourable Member for Lakeside thought that a defeatist attitude was probably an accurate estimate of my outlook upon the industry --

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd)(Interjection) -- Yes. Now, whatever things, names that people could call me, I doubt if they would ever accuse me of being a pessimist or a defeatist. I certainly am most optimistic for the role of agriculture in the future and especially for the role of western agriculture, and I think that Manitoba farmers have probably by reason of their location, the nature of the weather, and the soil resources that we have to use in this part of the prairies, that we have a key role in the future economy of Canada, and that we can look forward to not only serving this country in the production of foodstuffs, but serving other countries.

I must say at the outset that I like the approach of the Honourable Member for Lakeside -- I think that he knows somewhat of what he talks on this subject of agriculture. At least, I was happy to see that he has renewed his faith in the future role of agriculture because I recall so well that a couple of years ago he seemed to feel that agriculture was really in the doldrums -- I think that was the word he used to express the situation -- that agriculture was in the doldrums, and I feel reassured to hear him say that agriculture had something in Manitoba and in Western Canada, had something to look forward to, because although I don't believe that agriculture is in the doldrums, I do agree with him if he would moderate that statement and say that we are in difficult times, because we are in a period of adjustment.

Now when speaking about the situation that agriculture finds itself in, I must refer to a statement that was made by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead about the question of the exodus of farm people from rural areas and into the city, and just challenge some of these remarks that he made because, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Brokenhead equates the exodus of farm people to a failure of farm policy, and equates it with the worst interests of the rural community. Now I don't really believe that he believes this, because in his professional vocation he's read enough history to know what happens if there isn't adjustment in the rural community.

MR. SCHREYER: Don't quote from the Deserted Village.

MR. HUTTON: Oh no, I don't need to quote from the Deserted Village. The man who wrote the Deserted Village was regretting the exodus of people. I think that we don't have to have nearly so much to fear. When you consider the facts of the situation that each year in Manitoba we have about 1,500 young people coming up who are eligible, who would be eligible farmers, and we have about 600 farms available for them -- would you have us divide those 600 farms in such a way that we could accommodate these 1,500 young people? Would you want to back up these young people and these farmers into the rural community where there isn't a sufficient resource to give them the kind of life that you and I and every one of us and they want for themselves? Well, this is the alternative. You must have an exodus from agriculture, and taking into account the tremendous changes in science and technology, it becomes more urgent that we find an easy out for the people who cannot find an adequate position in the rural community. Is it any advantage or of any benefit to a man to encourage -- by policy to continue on under circumstances which hold out no hope for improvement of living standards; for improvement of services. I cannot understand people who say that the rural community is a less attractive place to live in today because there has been a consolidation of land, because there are less people living in a given area. My children go to better schools; my neighbours enjoy better services; services that the community of yesterday just couldn't afford to give them. Health services. Communications. Even the churches are better off in a sense, in this respect that in years gone by when the farm was more self-sufficient and the dollar wasn't so important, we grew our own fuel, we raised our own horse power, we produced pretty well all our own food; the need for money wasn't nearly as great, and there wasn't nearly as much left over either. There wasn't as much money to contribute to educational services, to health services, to communication services, to social services in the community. There wasn't. The things that we enjoy in the modern day farm community we couldn't have 30 years ago -- even 20 years ago. It's because of the consolidation that has gone on and the fact that there is more left over that we are able to afford these things. I'm not a pessimist because I don't decry the fact that young people find their place in the sun in another vocation. I know what the alternative would be. The farms would be divided up -- (interjection) -- oh yes. Oh well, you can't mean anything else. You can't mean anything else. You divide the land resource into smaller parcels and the people have to make do with less. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead, Mr. Chairman --

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