



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



Vol. VII No. 85 9:30 a.m. Monday, April 30, 1962.

5th Session, 26th Legislature

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
9:30 o'clock, Monday, April 30th, 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, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg me to present the following as their fourth report. Your committee has considered Bills No. 96, An Act to amend The St. Boniface Charter (1953); No. 104, An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act; No. 109, An Act to amend The St. Boniface Charter (1953); No. 111, An Act to amend The Mines Act; No. 113, An Act to amend The Predator Control Act; No. 115, An Act to amend the Operating Engineers and Firemen Act; No. 117, An Act to amend The Electricians' Licence Act; No. 118, An Act to amend The Fires Prevention Act; No. 119, An Act to amend The Fish Dealers Act; No. 121, An Act to amend The Building Trades Protection Act; No. 122, An Act to amend The Well Drilling Act; No. 123, An Act to amend The Municipal Act; No. 126, An Act to amend The Coat of Arms and Floral Emblem Act; No. 127, An Act to amend The Public Utilities Board Act; No. 128, An Act to amend The Landlord and Tenant Act; No. 130, An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act; No. 132, An Act respecting the Town of Winkler; No. 133, An Act to amend The Expropriation Act (2); No. 134, An Act to amend The East Kildonan Charter; No. 135, An Act to amend The University Act (2); No. 136, An Act to amend The Winter Employment Act; 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, and has agreed to report the same without amendments. Your Committee has also considered Bills No. 90, An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act (2); No. 100, An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act (1); No. 106, An Act to amend Certain Provisions of the Statute Law and to correct Certain Typographical Errors in the Statutes; No. 107, An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956; 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 Minister of Industry and Commerce 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

Committee of the Whole House

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider the proposed resolution standing in my name.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, are we not calling Orders of the Day first?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, Orders of the Day will be called in the proper sequence; that's after Committee of the Whole for the introduction of this resolution; then we have Orders of the Day.

MR. MOLGAT: because it appears differently on the Order Paper.

MR. ROBLIN: Page 2. Top of the page you'll see Orders of the Day.

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 Roblin in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved whereas this House has received the Report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders recommending that the Committee be authorized to sit during the recess after the adjournment or prorogation and that the reasonable expenses of the members of the Committee be paid:

Therefore be it resolved that the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders examine all regulations to which The Regulations Act applies filed under that Act after the 9th day of February, 1961, and before the 15th day of February, 1962, and make its report thereon to the first Session of the Legislature held in the year 1963; and that the Committee have power to sit during recess after adjournment or prorogation;

(Mr. Chairman, cont'd.)

And be it further resolved that the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay from the Consolidated Fund the amount of such reasonable out-of-pocket expenses of the members of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders, necessarily incurred by them in attending the sittings of the Committee during recess as are approved by the Comptroller-General.

MR. LYON: The Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution, recommends it to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has adopted a certain resolution and has asked me to report the same.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Rupertsland that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce that whereas this House has received the report of the Standing Committee Thank you.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd just like to say that the next item on the agenda is the Committee of the Whole Stage and the Clerk tells me that he has prepared a list of the bills that were approved in Law Amendments last Saturday which he can distribute, and which, if I have consent, I would suggest be considered in Committee of the Whole at the same time with these other bills.

MR. MOLGAT: It's acceptable to us, provided the Leader of the NDP --

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): It'll give me an opportunity to wake up, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: if I may. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Public Works. The other day in committee when discussing his estimates, I'd asked for a breakdown of the planned expenditures in the proposed program this year in various departments, for example, concrete, gravelling and so on, and he undertook to give this to me. I don't expect to have it now. I just would like to be sure that before the House rises, we will be getting the information.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Acting Minister of Public Works)(Minnedosa): I should have corrected that later on because it's felt by the department that these expenditures should not be broken down and that we shouldn't give the totals of the individual types of contract, so I won't be able to supply the Honourable Leader of the Opposition with the information.

MR. MOLGAT: Will the Minister be able to supply us with the mileage under each section?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, yes I will if it's not already done. Is it not in all cases done on the program?

MR. MOLGAT: But it's sometimes grouped. For example, it may be base concrete and in other cases it's just concrete and it's rather difficult to total --

MR. WEIR: total amount for the honourable member.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Public Works. There was also a question of mine that I don't think was answered. The Minister told us that at a future date he would give us the policy of the government on the government-owned cars and I don't think this was ever answered.

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I didn't reply to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface during my estimates it was an oversight, because it had been my intention to, to advise him that the policy came under Treasury and to ask him to ask the question under Treasury. Now if I neglected to do that, I'm sorry but it ran in my mind that I had said that it came under Treasury and was to be asked there, so I'll have to refer any comments to the Provincial Treasurer.

MR. DESJARDINS: the Leader of this House if he will say a few words on that before the session is over.

MR. ROBLIN: If my honourable friend will ask the question, I'll do my best to answer it.
MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker the question was: the government to give us their policy or this new policy apparently that they put into effect a few months ago on government-owned cars. This was asked during the Public Works and I get this answer now that it's under the Treasury.

MR. ROBLIN: What new policy, Mr. Speaker? I'm not quite sure what my honourable friend is driving at.

MR. DESJARDINS: The new cars. There was a report in the paper -- not the new cars I mean the new policy -- there was a report in the paper a few months ago that there was a new policy as far as the cars that the employees were driving home and so on.

MR. ROBLIN: I think I know what my honourable friend refers to. What happened was that as we do from time to time we change the regulations with respect to the use of government cars in an endeavour to tighten them up and make sure that we get the most economical use of these cars. There have been several moves of this sort since we came into office and there was one that's just come into effect, I think, on the 1st of April, which is a revision of the previous policies. And, furthermore, they've been put down in a little book which drivers are in each car, and which drivers can read and carry around with them. If any member would like to have a copy of the little book I can see that he gets one.

MR. DESJARDINS: appreciate that very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Public Utilities. During the consideration of his estimates, I believe he promised that he would distribute copies of the new handbook of the Motor Vehicle Branch. I wonder if he would do that.

MR. LYON: I'll have them sent up this morning, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself to consider the bills reported from the Law Amendments Committee.

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

Bills No. 66, 95, 120 were read a third time and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 90 taken page by page, Page 1 - passed; 2 - passed.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): on Item 14.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4 as amended passed. 5 - passed.

MR. STANES: Mr. Chairman, there's one amendment which I have; there's another amendment which I thought I'd receive by this time on the old item 14 -- section 14 -- new 17. The amendment which I have is under section 8 after the word "board" in the 26th line there to be added "other than an order made under subsection 2 of section 82." And another amendment in the next line where it's got "ten days" -- that "ten" to be amended to "fourteen". Now there's another amendment, Mr. Chairman, which is affecting (a) at the beginning of that section and I haven't yet got that amendment.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I propose that you deal with all of that bill except section 14, and we can leave that for a further occasion when the amendments are completed for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sections 1, 2 - passed --

MR. ROBLIN: Pass the whole bill except section 14.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): one where some further consideration is being given by interested parties and they were working out an arrangement together were they? That would be very good, I would think.

MR. CHAIRMAN: take it all in sections. 5 - passed; 6 as amended passed; --

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, the bill page by page except clause 14.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5 - passed; 6 as amended passed; 7 as amended passed; 8 - passed; 9 - passed; 10 - passed; 11 - passed; Section 14 (a) - passed.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I think we're holding Section 14.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes.

MR. ROBLIN: The rest of the Bill may be passed, but hold Section 14.

MR. ROBLIN: I've just been informed, Mr. Chairman, by the Law Officer that section 14 is now complete and perhaps if we can read the amendments to section 14, we can deal with them too.

MR. CAMPBELL: been agreed on by the people to whom it was referred.

MR. ROBLIN: I understand that's so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause (c) of subsection 1 of Section 83, of the Act, as amended by striking out the words "in the additional zone" in the second last line and last line of that clause, and substituting therefor the words "other than dwellings located in areas zoned for agricultural uses."

Remainder of Bill No. 90 read and passed. Bill No. 96 was read page by page and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 100 -- 1 as amended, 2 as amended, passed --

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, I would like to amend Bill No. 100 as follows: Section 2(10) of the Act is amended by substituting after the word "year" the figures "1962"; in place of the figures "1965"; and substituting the word "shall" in place of the word "may" in the second line. Add new subsection (c) -- calls for a referendum to be held to ascertain the desires of the citizens governed under this Act with such referendum to be put in such manner as will avoid confusion or coloration of the question in order that the committee created can be governed by the citizens' wishes in reaching their deliberations.

Mr. Chairman read the amendment and put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

Remainder of Bill No. 100 read and passed. Bills Nos. 104, 106, 107, 109, 111, 113, 116, 117, 119, 121, 122, 123, 126, 127, 128, 130, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137 were read clause by clause and section by section and passed.

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

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker the Committee of the Whole has considered certain Bills and directed me to report as follows: Bills Nos. 66, 95, 120, 96, 100, 104, 106, 107, 109, 111, 113, 116, 117, 118, 119, 121, 122, 123, 126, 127, 128, 130, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137 without amendments; and Bill No. 90 with amendments and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

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.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the report of the Committee be not now received with respect to Bill No. 100, an Act to Amend the Metropolitan Winnipeg Act (1) and that it be referred back to the Committee for further consideration, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone.

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

MR. E. I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, in reference to Bill 123, it was agreed in Committee that there would be an amendment brought in. I was just from the office of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and his Deputy and they're just working on it -- an added clause to the section in regards to auditor's report. I wonder if that could be taken under consideration, Sir.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think we will have to wait -- I'm speaking to the point of order which I guess my honourable friend is raising. I think he should wait until the third reading of the bill is proposed. I'm not aware of this. It should better have been raised in Committee but I think that we could probably hold the matter in third reading of the bill. It could be adjourned at that time for consideration.

MR. DESJARDINS: call the Yeas and Nays on the last motion. I didn't realize that the -- I thought that the last speaker was speaking on this.

MR. SPEAKER: I might say that I've already declared that the motion was lost and I don't see any way that we could have a division on it now. The decision has been made.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker it's quite normal -- on a point of order -- it's quite normal is it not, in the normal procedure that you say - "I declare the motion lost" and then a member gets up after you've said that and says - "The Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker".

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, but there's been an intervening piece of business between this. I would think that the honourable member might be able to accomplish the same thing on third reading.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think if we like we could have a recorded vote on Bill 100, which would probably have the same effect. Have you put the motion, Sir, that the report of the Committee be received?

MR. SPEAKER: It's been moved by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River that the report of the Committee be received. Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, haven't we given third reading to one or two bills as a result of this? Did I not hear the Member for St. Boniface

MR. ROBLIN: No, Mr. Speaker, the motion was put in the first place. It was amended by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The amendment was defeated and now we're back on the main motion. So the question is now being put.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. CAMPBELL: Which just proves that Daylight Saving is a little too early for --

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

Bills Nos. 66 and 95 were read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Third reading of Bill No. 120. The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General that Bill No. 120, an Act to Amend the Amusements Act be now read a third time and passed.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I was sick on Saturday so I am still feeling the effect. I don't think it will help anything I would say, but here is an industry which suffers for the last five or ten years from existence. This industry is going down. Many buildings are being converted to pool-rooms or billiard-rooms or anything else. While at a time when this movie industry, which is an educational industry, have invested tremendous amounts of money to build up beautiful movie homes, industries, and now they are just going down. I would not want to be the one to put in another nail to their coffin. Some of them -- very few of them -- probably could revive and carry on in the interests of many people who are still not anxious to hear the tinned musical entertainment now and would like to go to a very genuine good show. It's true that the government was kind enough to reduce the amusement tax, but I don't think it's enough for them to exist, and I would very, very respectfully suggest that this government would take into consideration firstly: the contribution which the movie industry has made; secondly, that the most beautiful expensive buildings are being sold now for anything because they cannot carry on -- at least maintain one or two or three as far as the province is concerned. I don't think there'll be very many left the next year or two in the province -- probably five or six or seven. Give them a chance to exist and make their contribution to the cultural effect of those who wanted to see a movie and have seen it for the last over a quarter of a century. I realize fully that this was decided and it's coming in now for final reading, but it's still not too late, Sir -- not too late to change the government's mind and reconsider the proper exemption of the movie industry. I would not like to make a motion to refer it for six months or to repeat it because I know it's a voice in the wilderness -- that's the only two words in English I have is "a voice in the wilderness". But nevertheless, I would appeal to the First Minister to agree to have this bill postponed for another day and give consideration to give those who invested millions and millions of dollars -- and God knows I'm not defending the capitalist class -- but nevertheless, I want to see a movie and I'm sure that if an imposition is made by the government on the Amusement Tax, most of the movies, if not all, will disappear and the cultural life of the people anywhere will shorten that much.

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

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Hamiota, that Bill No. 90, an Act to amend the Metropolitan Winnipeg Act (2) be now read a third time and passed.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I would like to point out to members that there was no representation on this particular bill. The bill was agreed by complete co-operation by all the parties concerned. It was an excellent example of co-operation.

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

Bill No. 96, was read a third time and passed.

MR. ROBLIN presented Bill No. 100, an Act to amend the Metropolitan Act Winnipeg (1) for Third Reading.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Yeas and Nayes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Those requesting yeas and nayes, please stand. Call in the members. A standing vote was taken, the results being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Carroll, Christanson, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Gray, Hamilton, Harris, Hutton, Ingebrigtson, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboine), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Reid, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Wagner, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Forbes.

NAYES: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Dow, Froese, Guttormson, Molgat, Shoemaker, Tanchak.

MR. CLERK: Yeas - 35; Nayes - 8.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

Bills Nos. 104, 106, 107, 109, 111, 113, 116, 117, 118, 119, 121, 122 were read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Third reading of Bill No. 123.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Acting Minister of Municipal Affairs, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that Bill No. 123, an Act to Amend the Municipal Act be now read a third time and passed.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain that Bill No. 123 be not read a third time but referred back to the Committee of the Whole for certain amendments with respect to municipal auditors. How's that for co-operation?

MR. MOLGAT: A marvellous indication of cross-co-operation, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the amendment carried and the Bill was referred back to the Committee of the Whole.

MR. SPEAKER: Third reading of Bill No. 126. The Honourable the Provincial Secretary.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Secretary)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that Bill No. 126, an Act to Amend The Coat of Arms and Floral Emblems Act be now read a third time and passed.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. GRAY: As this is the only peaceful resolution on the Order Paper, and not being here on Saturday, I was just wondering whether the Honourable Minister would be kind enough to tell me in three words what does it mean? I know he has spoken about it, but after he gave us our ties we forgot about it. So will he be good enough to take another minute?

MR. EVANS: I'm delighted, Mr. Speaker. A Mr. Rankine designed a symbolic tartan for the Province of Manitoba which represents a good deal of the history and the background that is woven into this province. Represented in the tartan are lines representing the intersection of the two rivers; there are symbolic representations of the mines and other natural resources of the province; and represented also are the contributions made by the Selkirk Settlers in coming to open up this province in the first times. The object is to have something that adds to the colour and interest of the Province of Manitoba, not only for tourists and visitors coming here, but also a symbol that we can come to regard as an emblem of our own to which I'm sure we'll all become more and more attached as time goes on.

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

Bills Nos. 127, 128, 130, 132, 133, 134 and 135 were read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Third reading of Bill No. 136. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Labour)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education that Bill No. 126, an Act to Amend the Winter Employment Act be now read a third time and passed.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully ask the Honourable Minister of Labour to explain in three minutes, maybe even two minutes, this Bill?

MR. CARROLL: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The purpose of this Bill is to enable the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to declare a part of a month, a winter month, for the purposes of The Winter Employment Act. Last fall the Government of Canada started a program in mid-October and we dated our Order-in-Council to commence from mid-October and we found out that we didn't have authority to declare a part month a winter month. This will make that possible in future and is made retroactive to include that half month in October where we didn't have the authority to operate.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question? Is there any plans for this bill -- any actual plans how we could relieve the unemployment situation in the winter, in this bill?

MR. CARROLL: This just merely extends the scope of the program to include part months rather than full months only.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Third reading of Bill No. 137. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Churchill that 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, be now read a third time and passed.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. GRAY: question whether the widening of the boundaries will help any candidate in the coming federal election?

MR. CAMPBELL: Don't worry about the federal, Mr. Speaker. What about the provincial?

MR. ALEXANDER: Tories on both counts.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Committee of Ways and Means. The amendment proposed by the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I say at the offset of my few remarks this morning a word of congratulations to both the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition in their presentation of their respective views dealing with the Budget of the Province of Manitoba. And too, at the offset, Mr. Speaker, I draw the attention of the members of the House to the fact that I have deliberately this morning donned the Manitoba tartan as my tie, indicating that as far as I am concerned that, given proper leadership, Manitoba has a great future. I noted that neither the First Minister or the Leader of the Opposition duplicated the wearing of this new Manitoba tartan during their presentation on the debate. So, Sir, I say that I am deliberately wearing this tie not only because I like the tartan of Manitoba but as an indication of faith in the future.

I would like first of all, Mr. Speaker, to refer to the world situation before going properly into an analysis of the budget of the Province of Manitoba. I think, Sir, that we here in Manitoba should be very much concerned with world-wide developments and present trends in international relations. We, in this group, have consistently opposed any expansion in the holding of nuclear weapons throughout the world and have persistently called for cessation of the testing of nuclear devices. It is with a great regret that we notice that the great nation to the south of us has seen fit recently to once again start testing in the open atmosphere of nuclear weapons. I do not think, Sir, that this is the way to world peace. Because as one realizes the significance of this, while the testing of nuclear warheads in the open atmosphere by the United States are being conducted in an area remote from us here in Manitoba at the present time, one cannot help but recall the fears that we had here in the Province of Manitoba and in Canada when the Russians were testing nuclear weapons sometime back because of the fear of fallout. In this particular case, the testing is being done in the neighbourhood of the Christmas Islands and the fallout, as a result of this, could adversely affect many people in an area surrounding these particular areas, and in particular, the possibility of affecting the people of Japan who were the first guinea pigs of weapons of this nature. So I say, Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that the great democracy to the south of us has once again chosen to pollute the atmosphere as the result of testing of nuclear weapons. I am vitally concerned, as indeed I'm sure that we all should be, as to the net affects; and we should lend our voices to those organizations who are dedicated to peace throughout the world to have a cessation of these testings,

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd.) . . . and we should unitedly work together to have an abolition of all weapons of warfare of this type.

I have been reading recently the activities of the Women of Canada and the Voice of Women, and we note that, as we read, the work that these women are doing; that they, through their activities, are getting expanded support in all quarters of the globe; and we should join with them and support them in their endeavours. We here in Canada should take a firm stand that, insofar as we here are concerned, that we should not permit any nuclear devices either on our lands or in the hands of our forces. We should continue our efforts to have restrictions placed and we should not allow any other nation, if at all possible, to expand the nuclear clubs in the world that we have today. It's bad enough, Mr. Speaker, when two or three of the great nations have these devices in their hands. How much more would be the chances of warfare and the use of these weapons if other nations became possessors of nuclear warheads.

It is somewhat amusing to me, and yet tragic, when one hears of the policies of the Conservative Party at Ottawa. We have the situation of one Minister declaring one thing; other Ministers declaring another; so they have no firm policy. The same goes, Mr. Speaker, for the policy of the Liberal Party federally -- absolutely no policy at all except that of expediency. I condemn both parties for their attitudes in respect of nuclear warheads. There is only one solution to the problem, and that is the absolute abolition of the question of the use or possession of nuclear warheads for the peace of the world. At the present time here in Canada, we are spending about a third of our national income for weapons of destruction. How better it would be for all of the world, and principally for us here in Canada, if more emphasis was laid on methods of obtaining peace in the world. We, of the New Democratic Party, are dedicated to do all within our power to bring about the abolition of nuclear weapons in the world and the substitution of the forces of might for those of right and justice, in order that our people throughout the whole globe may live normal lives, well-fed and well-clothed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal in a criticism of the Manitoba Budgets presented by the First Minister. We often hear in this House or have heard during this session, accusations of buttering-up. I say, Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much whether any accusation of buttering-up can be better directed than the buttering-up of the people of Manitoba as a result of the speech of the Honourable the First Minister in this House in regards to the Budget of 1962-63. For in his budget address, through the use of words, he has attempted to butter-up the people of Manitoba that all is well in the Province of Manitoba; that our future is assured. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the peoples of Manitoba were to give a firm considered analysis of the budget of my honourable friends across the way, they could not come but to the conclusion that, by a play of words, my honourable friend has tried to obscure the fact that there has been no progress in Manitoba in the year 1961 but rather that we have gone backwards and went backwards in the year 1961, and that there seems no indication in the remarks of my honourable friend that we have any hope for progress under the administration of the Conservative Government here in the Province of Manitoba. While I say we have no hopes of course, Mr. Speaker, for progress here in the Province of Manitoba under the Conservative administration, it's equally, if not more so, under the proposals, if there were any proposals, offered by the Leader of the Liberal Party here in this House in his contribution to the budget debate.

So, Mr. Speaker, I intend -- and I hope I do not take too long -- I intend to go over the budget address of my honourable friend, making comments as I go along. Even on the very first page of the budget address, my honourable friend he starts out: "However, because of the inherent strength of the economy of Canada, we emphasize our confidence in the essential outcome." He's speaking, of course, of the fact of an economic review and is tantamountly acknowledging that, only because of the inherent strength in the Canadian economy, we have confidence of the eventual outcome. We, too, in this House realize that in Canada there are inherent strengths, but the outcome and the utilization of those strengths will not be achieved by the efforts of the Conservative Party either here or at Ottawa.

My honourable friend mentions in his budget speech, on Page 2, and I quote: "I do not suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we have solved all the problems facing us. But we have resumed a forward momentum in our economic affairs and, with this resumption of a higher rate of growth and development, we have moved toward greater strength with which we may confidently and effectively meet other problems and other objectives." I want just for a moment, Mr. Speaker,

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd.) . . . to refer back a year ago to my honourable friend when he was introducing his budget for the year 1961-62 when he is talking of the rate of growth of the Province of Manitoba. On Page 13 of that "epistle of Dufferin", he indicates that the Province of Manitoba has progressed for the year under review, which was 1961, and he indicates in the speech of that year that we advanced in the year 1960 by approximately three percent insofar as our gross national product is concerned. And yet, Mr. Speaker, he stands before us in this House this year and says: "We have resumed a higher rate of growth", and then frankly admits that the rate of growth for the year 1961 insofar as the gross national product was concerned was only 2-1/2 percent. How can my honourable friend say to the people of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, that we have resumed a higher rate of growth when, in effect, we have gone back at least by half a percentage point insofar as the Province of Manitoba.

My honourable friend speaking last year said that, in effect, in order to sustain a balance in the economy, we require at least a 5% per annum in our annual growth. Last year, Mr. Speaker, the year that my friends talked of so confidently, we only reached half of the objective in order to maintain the balance, so I say to my honourable friend, right from the offset of his speech, the words that he has used belies the actual facts of the situation insofar as the Province of Manitoba and that rather, as he says, the resumption of a higher rate of growth, we have gone back in the year 1961 over that even of 1960 my honourable friend states was a year of catching up or a year of holding our own.

My honourable friend, throughout his whole speech that he gave us the other day, refers constantly to the severe test that we have as the result of the drought of 1961, and I join him in regretting that this was so insofar as the agricultural industry of the Province of Manitoba. If this were only the case in respect of 1961, Mr. Speaker, then I would say that there would be some justification for my honourable friend continuously repeating the agricultural situation of 1961 and the drought. But the fact of the matter remains that, insofar as the incomes of our farmers here in the Province of Manitoba and indeed across Canada, their picture has been constantly worsening ever since 1953. The situation in 1961 was an appalling one for agriculture here in Manitoba and in Canada, and yet my honourable friend, in his presentation of his budget, points out the year 1961 and I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that he only does it to attempt to camouflage the people of Manitoba into believing that if it hadn't been for the drought that the prosperity of Manitoba would have continued -- which I dismiss entirely. My honourable friend goes on in his speech on this line for a number of pages, where he states time after time that the drought conditions of Manitoba has resulted in our deficiencies in the province.

A year ago when my honourable friend was presenting his budget, he pointed to our increase in retail sales in the year 1960 as an indicator that we were well on the way of progress, and yet simply a note in his review of 1961 of the fact that retail sales were about 3% below 1960. No words in his speech that this is an indicator of regress rather than progress, but it was an unfortunate occurrence simply because of the drought. Yet I say to my honourable friend, that while he does mention it in passing, we have yet not felt the full effects of the drought conditions of 1961. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that everyone in this House, and indeed everyone in Manitoba trusts and prays that similar conditions will not prevail in respect of our crops in 1962, but I do say that there is no indication in the budget of my honourable friend where the government of Manitoba is going to do anything to materially help the farmers of the Province. We have contained in his speech of the other day: "We are now for the first time in many years able to encourage full planting in the absence of grain surpluses." We in this quarter, Mr. Speaker, have been for years maintaining that there should be no slackening of production in Manitoba or indeed in Canada of our grain produce because we realized then, as apparently the government opposite did not, that the day would come when our surpluses would be used up through some fortuitous event such as occurred in 1961. In addition to that, we had advocated for years that it was almost criminal that here in Canada we had been carrying surplus after surplus while a third of the world was going hungry. And now what do we have because of an unfortunate weather situation? We have the government of Manitoba saying we must lend every effort that we possibly can to increasing our surpluses -- or increasing our production, simply because of a bad year in respect of agriculture.

It shows, Mr. Speaker, how flimsy the policy of the Conservative Party has been, and it's unfortunate that it was only the result of a drought that the flimsy policies of the

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd.) Conservatives both at Ottawa and in Manitoba were revealed, because we have not got the stability; we have not got the background in respect of our agricultural products that they were attempting to tell us a few years ago. I recall Minister after Minister, so far as agriculture is concerned, recommending when we had lots of wheat that we should get lots of beef; and when we had lots of beef we should get lots of wheat. Now they are on the spot. We here in Canada did have a very vital weapon to be used in the peace of the world and, as a result of one crop failure, we have lost that weapon. And what will be the result, Mr. Speaker, if the situation repeats itself this year? It will be devastating for Canada and devastating for the world.

On Page 4 my honourable friend mentions: "our confidence in the recovery of pace in the general economy throughout 1961 was well-founded". Oh yes, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend, in his presentation a year ago, spoke of the economy of Manitoba and the future of Manitoba being assured, but as I have indicated at the opening of my remarks, our progress was in reverse in the Province of Manitoba during the year 1961. My honourable friend refers to manufacturing being an increase -- and it was. Retail sales were down. And then he uses his pet theme throughout this budget of the forward momentum in much of the processing sector of the economy. It's simply sufficiently not enough. My honourable friend's phraseology through his budget is that, in my opinion, of camouflage.

On Page 5, he's talking of construction values. Instead of saying that our construction values were about \$20 million dollars less in 1961 than they were in 1960, what phraseology does my friend use? On Page 5, he says: "Construction values remained above \$400 million in the province as housing starts rose by ten percent over 1960 and industrial building permits issued more than doubled in value over the year." Yet the facts of the matter remains, according to my friend's own figure, construction totals in Manitoba were about \$20 million less in 1961 than they were in 1960.

He states, Mr. Chairman, on the same page when he's talking of the Manitoba Development Fund, with which I agree, having created more than 1,200 new jobs. I'm not sure whether this is 1961 or since the inception of the plan, but even if it was for 1961, we're still going backwards in the Province of Manitoba in respect of creating new jobs that are required in order that we may even maintain the slow progress of former years.

My honourable friend speaks of the transitional economy wherein many new and extended undertakings are being committed for the first time. What, do I ask him, does he mean of the transitional economy? Transition from what to what? Because it is long since that we have realized here in the Province of Manitoba, if he is referring to agriculture, that the agriculture industry in Manitoba is constantly requiring less persons to operate, even though our production should be going up; and that transition has been gone, so we've passed the transitional economy in my opinion, Mr. Chairman. The time is not for transition; it's for expansion; and we're certainly not getting that expansion under a Conservative administration, as we didn't get it under the former Liberal administration in the Province of Manitoba.

My honourable friend says, dealing with the labour force: "has grown more than 6% in the period since 1957". And here I want to comment, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend loves to compare '57 with '62. I appreciate and I realize and I agree with him that the situation wasn't good in '57, but I want to tell him the situation is not much better in '62 if we take the average of the real dollar value instead of the inflated dollar value that apparently my honourable friend is using in respect of 1962. If we take a constant dollar figure, we have made no progress whatsoever in the Province of Manitoba despite the fact of the figures that my honourable friend uses.

And then my honourable friend goes on to talk of the unemployment situation here in the Province of Manitoba. One Page 7 -- where it starts out on Page 6: "Employment, while unfortunately not keeping pace with the growth in the labour force, nonetheless expanded between '57 and '61 at more than 2-1/2 times the rate of growth realized between '52 and '56." It's fine to use comparisons of figures back. I would rather say to my honourable friend, let's use figures for the future and not cast our eyes backwards, but forwards here in the Province of Manitoba. My honourable friend does appreciate, and I give him credit for this, he says: "Recent indications suggest a levelling out in the number entering the labour force as younger people stay longer at their studies in training for the more exacting demands of a modern

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . economy". He is so right, Mr. Speaker.

The Bank of Canada in its annual report likewise makes reference to this on Page 22, wherein it states: "A pause in the rate of growth of the civilian labour force attributed to the swiftness in the fall in unemployment. This stemmed in part from a further decline in the labour force, particularly rate of men, notably those 14 to 24 years of age, and to a much slower increase in the number of women in the labour force. The decline in the proportion of young men in the labour force is associated with an unusually large increase in the proportion at school". How true this is. It is true, and I'm sure everyone is glad that greater and more educational opportunities are being made available. I frankly confess and say to the government, we appreciate the fact of these expanded facilities but I also say to the government that this pause in the rate of growth, attributed to the fact of younger people staying in school longer, is going to catch up with us in a year or two. And then what answer will my honourable friends have? What excuses will they be able to offer? After all, we realize that in a year or two those who have been retained or stayed in school or in university, because in many cases because of the lack of the availability of employment, will be leaving school. And I say to my honourable friend -- what then, little man? We're not achieving the rate of growth in the Province of Manitoba to provide for our normal increase in our labour force at the present time, let alone making provision for the rate that we will expect when these young men and young women come out of our high schools and universities and enter into the labour market.

I say, again referring to the Bank of Canada report: "However, the rate of male unemployment is still considerably higher than that for women, and male unemployment rates for the younger groups are a good deal higher than the average rate for all men in the labour force." In other words, Mr. Speaker, our young men are continually growing in respect of the forces that are unemployed and no real provision has been made insofar as providing them with opportunities for the future. How can there be in the Province of Manitoba when, as I have indicated, we have gone backwards in the year 1961 over even that of 1960, and 1960 certainly wasn't a good year because we never even reached the normal rate or the anticipated rate of 5% in our advance.

My honourable friend attempts in his budget speech to indicate that because the rate of unemployment is falling and is down in January of this year over what it was a year ago, says that things are happy -- it's an indicator. We've had indicators before in respect of our unemployed. At the present time we almost have 7% of the work force of Canada idle. Is this progress? I suggest Mr. Speaker, that it is only an indication of the inefficiencies of the present types of administration that we have both here and at Ottawa. Our Committee on the Manitoba development have as an objective an annual growth of industrial employment of 1.7% in order to achieve 40,000 new jobs by 1970 -- an annual increase in capital investment to be increased by 11.3%. We're falling by the wayside even as this Committee is attempting to give guidance to the administration here present today. I will admit my honourable friend does state on Page 7: "we're still faced with a serious need to absorb new and displaced workers into new employment." I agree with him most sincerely, but I do not find any real solution contained in my honourable friend's budget for an advance in the employment situation here in the Province of Manitoba. I'd say it is a sorry picture, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable the First Minister presented so confidently the other day. He mentions the fact that we have contributed to winter works programs which provided jobs for more than 10,500 men in the aggregate since 1958 or, on an average, better than 2,500 jobs each year during the critical off-season. I say to my honourable friend, it's no longer a critical off-season, it's a critical year round season we're having in respect of employment and unemployment in the Dominion of Canada. We talk of the wastes, we talk of the need of more investment in the future, and yet at the same time, as I illustrated in introducing a resolution on unemployment, that over \$800 million during the same period that my honourable friend talks of from 1958 to 1962 -- almost a billion dollars or three quarters of a billion dollars of revenue has been syphoned off in order to pay unemployment insurance benefits in the Dominion of Canada. How much that could have meant had those that have been unemployed had been gainfully employed in the Dominion of Canada. We too, then could have pointed with pride at least to expansion and at least to provision for those who are still receiving insufficient here of the products of Canada.

My honourable friend -- again getting back to agriculture -- and I might say, Mr. Speaker,

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . if my remarks this morning are sort of disjointed, running from one picture to the other, it's only because of the fact that that was the way in which my honourable friend presented his budget speech; because it was very hard, as we listened to him, to find any continuity of a plan. My honourable friends opposite -- particularly the Minister of Industry and Commerce is always talking about plans laid out so that one step follows the other. I would suggest that he talk to his friend the First Minister because as I indicate I never saw such a jumbled up and helter skelter sort of a budget as we had this year.

So we're back in agriculture now, on Page 9. My honourable friend says "the result has been that the farming economy has not reflected the same degree of progressive strength developed in the over-all economy. The problem is not one to be solved easily or in a short time nor can it be resolved by domestic efforts alone. We recognize the urgency of need to find means to provide better prospects for the future of agriculture." I suggest to my honourable friend that my colleague from Fisher has introduced into this House ever since he came into this House resolutions aimed, at least partially, to solve the problems of agriculture, and in particular insofar as prices to agriculture. And what has been the result? On each and every occasion my honourable friends opposite have so amended the resolution to -- (Interjection) -- Yes, made it better in appearance for the government of Manitoba, but has neglected to make the situation in respect of agriculture in Manitoba better for the farmers of Manitoba. They have persistently used the sincere effort of my honourable friend and we in this corner just to butter up their own ineffective policy that they have here in the Province of Manitoba respecting agriculture. Then my honourable friend in his budget address says: "we recognize the urgency of the need to find means to provide better prospects for the future of agriculture". He recognizes that his own government, in this very statement, needs to find better prospects for the future of agriculture. And I agree with him most heartily.

And my honourable friend, again jumping back into industry, states that we need more secondary industry in the Province of Manitoba. I agree with him most heartily that we do. And now I would say to him something that he won't agree with and I feel sure my honourable friends to my right won't agree with: that if we can't get capital investment to come in here and establish secondary industries for the benefit of the people of Manitoba, then we should use public funds in order to create those things that are desirable and necessary for the people of Manitoba in the field of secondary industry in order that our natural resources here in the Province of Manitoba will be utilized for the benefit of all Manitobans and will allow us here in the Province of Manitoba to create industries that can provide required materials and required finished products to conduct trade with the European Common Market and other markets of the world that my honourable friends are suggesting that a commission should leave here from Manitoba to attempt to establish good trade relations. So I say to my honourable friends, that if you can't get it by investment of a private nature then the time has come for us here in the Province of Manitoba to establish our own secondary industries for the well-being of the people of Manitoba. And while speaking of the question of freer trade, my honourable friend mentions, on Page 10, dealing with the question of a trade mission to Europe. My friend says: "new trading patterns are developing which will inevitably affect the agricultural, extractive and manufacturing industries in Manitoba. We believe that wider and freer trading arrangements are in the interest of the people of Manitoba." I agree. And he says: "In our efforts to enhance the development of the provincial economy, we must give full recognition to these trends."

I want just for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to refer to an article which is contained in the Industrial Union Department of the AF of L CIO Union in the United States -- to an article along this point by Mr. Irving Beller, Research Economist of the International Association of Machinists, which I think is timely when we're considering freer trade here in the Dominion of Canada and in the Province of Manitoba. At the offset Mr. Beller states in his article: "The solution to almost every major problem confronting the American worker and the nation as a whole lies in a more rapid economic growth rate, a greater output of goods and services year in and year out" -- and he is referring, of course, to the United States and the same is applicable here -- "yet the United States economy has been creeping along at a rate significantly below that of other industrial nations and far below its potential." -- similar to we here in Manitoba. But the point I want to raise, Mr. Speaker, in respect of the connection to unemployment.

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) and freer trade, I think Mr. Beller touches on very very well in this particular article and I recommend it. "It is not easy for people to view the removal of trade restrictions objectively and calmly at a time when thousands are unemployed. European labour leaders have been able to give enthusiastic support to the demolition of trade barriers because they have not had to worry about unemployment. Europe has been bursting at the seams. European countries are suffering from labour shortages. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the report the other day that Manitoba is a labour surplus area. Then the article goes on: "West Germany's unemployment rate has been a fraction of one percent. It has been sending recruiting agents to other countries to find enough people to fill available jobs. European labour leaders, therefore, find it far easier to assume a statesmanlike position on the question of international trade. Any effort to mobilize support for a liberal trade policy in America must take this factor into account." And I suggest that in that article, Mr. Speaker, we have a considerable degree of fact and of truth. I want to compliment the government: on Page 11, because for the first time they are going to make contributions insofar as public housing and low rental housing in the Province of Manitoba; and we welcome, as I've indicated before, that one million one, at least, is going to be used in this endeavour and we wish the government well in their endeavours, and sincerely trust that the municipalities of Manitoba will join with the government in the provision of better housing accommodation for those who require it in Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to Page 14 of my honourable friend's budget speech where he is talking about the return of our investments in new communications, power and highway facilities as aids in the development of Manitoba which can be seen in the 1961 production value for natural resources. It goes on to state that "mineral production values alone increased by over \$40 million from the 1960 levels as Thompson and Chisel Lake activity expanded." He mentions that "the purpose of these investments in the public sector are to provide the necessary services demanded by our community and to maintain the conditions and bases for private enterprise to grow and prosper." I have no objection, Mr. Speaker, to the investment in roads and highways and hydro to assist, but I do say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Manitoba are entitled to receive in return after the development, a just return for their investments. And here in the Province of Manitoba they are not receiving it, for almost every year we have been receiving as a result of our investments, less and less in relation to our expenditures. Our revenues on the return of our mines has for years been less than our expenditures. I had a paper here, Mr. Speaker, to indicate my point, but I will refer just back to the expenditures of a year ago in the budget address of 1961 where the revenue from our mines and natural resources amounted to \$2.9 million; our expenditures for the same purpose amounted to \$3.3 million. And then again this year, the same picture holds true where our revenues and our expenditures are out of line.

My honourable friend in his budget speech points with pride to the increased production of \$40 million a year, but the relative increase in the revenues to the Province of Manitoba by comparison are insignificant. And I say that the people of Manitoba are being gyped because of this very vital factor. The Province of Saskatchewan, discounting entirely their revenues from oil which is far greater than ours in the province here so I'm not going to use them, but in the budget of this Province of Saskatchewan for an expenditure in respect of natural resources of about a million and a half dollars, their return anticipated for the year 1962-63 is about \$3.2 million. Almost twice as much revenue coming back to the people of Saskatchewan in respect of their mining resources, whereas ours is just the reverse here in the Province of Manitoba. So I say to the government, here is a field that you must take under consideration.

My honourable friends can point with considerable pride to the fact of the growth of our educational facilities here in the Province of Manitoba. They are talking on Page 16 of the new \$5 million Manitoba Institute of Technology. We all know that this will be completed or have to be completed under the present arrangements, by March 31st, 1963. I say to the government that whoever is the next government of the Dominion that they should make approaches to them to have this as a continuing matter rather than one that cuts off in any particular year, because as our growth rate continues of our young people we're going to have to make more and more provisions for their technical education.

I am going to pass over, Mr. Speaker, for the sake of brevity many of the points raised

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd.) . . . in my honourable friend's speech dealing with the expansion in the fields of health and in welfare. I agree with them. I agree, too -- and I'm sure that he would agree with me -- that the job is just really only started. There's a lot more that has to be done. On Page 18, my friend mentions that, "the outlook for 1962 is framed by the forecast of events in Europe, and elsewhere beyond the immediate context of the Canadian economy. We believe that there are ample reasons for confidence in the economic future of our province and nation in spite of obviously wide-ranging changes that must occur in our own economic environment as a result of wider influences." I suggest to my honourable friend that many changes can take place in the economy of Canada and Manitoba if we had a different approach to all of the aspects of our economic development. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that these will not come under either a Liberal, a Conservative or a Social Credit approach to the problem that we're facing here in Canada.

Dealing with the question of municipal affairs, my honourable friend, again with a wing and a prayer, says in respect of the state of our municipalities that they await with interest the findings of the Municipal Enquiry Commission. I say to him, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Manitoba should not await independent and outside inquiries into the field of municipal affairs; they should have been taking action themselves.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a few questions of my honourable friend when he's dealing with the question of dominion-provincial tax relations and the figures that he uses in his budget address. First of all, he states that "the new fiscal arrangements appear to be working out in a relatively satisfactory manner." What he means by relatively satisfactory, I don't know -- relative to what? Relative to what he had anticipated that we might get; relative to what he fought for; relative to our previous arrangements as amended in 1958? I would like to hear from my honourable friend exactly what he means by that. And he compares for the year 1962-63 that we would be receiving about \$43.4 million as against 38.9 million which represented the 1957 agreement. He speaks of the increase there. But I want to refer him back to what he had to say a year ago. He's now estimating that for '62-63 that we will receive in the new federal proposal about \$43.4 million. What did my honourable friend have to say a year ago in respect of the projections of Manitoba's comparative revenues under the tax-sharing agreements that were being entered into? On Page 28 of his report a year ago from his own Treasury Department, he indicated to us that for the year 1962-63 under the federal proposal, we would be receiving \$41,605,000 -- exactly the same amount that we were to receive under the 1957 agreement as amended by the 1958 agreement. In other words, Mr. Speaker, just a year ago my friend and his experts predicted for the people of Manitoba that we would not receive any greater increase for the Province of Manitoba under the new proposal than we did by the amended agreement of 1958. My friend uses the comparisons with the original 1957 agreement. I want to know, how come? Because these figures that were contained in the 1961 budget were pretty well verified with the October session of last year as being reasonably accurate; and yet, lo and behold, there's a \$4.4 million increase and I would like to hear the explanation from my honourable friend as to how he arrives at this particular point.

Then my honourable friend goes on, Mr. Speaker, to indicate to us of tax decreases in the Province of Manitoba. I noted with somewhat of humor, amusement, that the day following my honourable friend's address here in this House that our newspapers carried headlines of a balanced budget -- even some reductions in taxation for the people of Manitoba. And what do they amount to. What do they amount to? About four cents a month per person. What a wonderful, wonderful reduction for the people of Manitoba. And yet, at the same time, twice as much in respect of corporations. So I say to the people of Manitoba: let's not listen to the phraseology of my honourable friend; let's analyze and we'll find that his budget is severely lacking.

And again, once again, my honourable friend uses the surpluses that have been created for the purpose of balancing his budget for the forthcoming year, but instead of starting out as the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition mentioned the other day -- and I agree with him in this -- we start out with \$7,600,000 in surpluses and according to the budget of my honourable friend, we finish up with \$250,000 as a projected surplus for the year 1963. And I say this is phoney bookkeeping on my honourable friend's part.

In the estimates of revenue and income for the year 1962-63 in this budget where my

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . honourable friend says that he is looking forward in confidence to the future growth of the Province of Manitoba, what do we find in respect of some of the items that he has considered as increased revenue for the year 1962-63? He is anticipating, Mr. Speaker, a further increase of over half a million dollars in our unemployment assistance agreement between the Dominion and ourselves. Increased, I think it was from \$4 million to \$4,500,000. Is an increase in unemployment assistance of a budgetary nature an indication of faith in the future? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if my honourable friend wanted to indicate expansion and confidence for the future well-being of the Province of Manitoba rather than an increase in the amount required as the result of unemployment, there should be a lesser amount. It shows no confidence in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the address of my honourable friend.

Now, Mr. Speaker, many other points within my honourable friend's budget indicate not confidence but the lack of confidence only camouflaged by the liberal use of words. Manitoba is not, if one analyzes my honourable friend's budget speech, on the verge of expansion. It regressed last year and under the policies of my honourable friend it appears to me that rather than confidence if this is the best that the government can offer to the people of Manitoba, then we are going to go backwards once again in the Province of Manitoba, as we did last year over the year 1960, as the result of the program of my honourable friend.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a word or two in respect of my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition and his remarks in the budget debate the other day. I must apologize that I haven't had the time to thoroughly analyze his remarks -- we haven't had Hansard before us -- but it does indicate to me his remarks of the other day, Mr. Speaker, that he and his party have no plans for the future of Manitoba. I was quite amused as I listened to my honourable friend the Leader of the Liberal party berating the government because of its policies on transportation. I was amused when I heard my honourable friend's speech of the question of the freight rates between here and Churchill, Manitoba, and in order to put up competition to the railway in that area that we must construct a highway between here and Churchill. I think possibly and eventually, Mr. Speaker, it will be desirable to construct a highway between here and Churchill as that community develops and other development takes place along the road. But what actually was my friend meaning?

The other day, in a debate, my honourable friend suggested that the government of Manitoba should give consideration to purchasing the railroad from Lac du Bonnet to Pointe du Bois in order that we might have railway facilities in this area where highways are already built or are being built; and in his budget speech the other day, he suggested that we should build a highway in this particular case to compete with the railway. In other words he wants to play it safely on both sides of the fence, as his activities and his deliberations have been in this House ever since we started on St. Valentine's day of this year. I say, my honourable friend has no plans, his party has no plans for the Province of Manitoba as they have no plans in the federal field either. My honourable friends don't seem to worry about debt, or rather they seem to be worried about debt and at the same time would create a huge expenditure such as a highway to Churchill that could only be used for two or three months in a year at the present time. How inconsistent can you be! I agree, Mr. Speaker, that we should use all of our endeavours to have a reduction in the costs of transportation particularly of our export goods between Churchill and the general producing area. That was recommended to us in a report, and I believe that as the result of the recommendations some reductions have been made. But I suggest to my honourable friend the answer at this particular time when money is required for many other essential purposes, that this is not the time for that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that the time has come for me to close my few remarks in this debate. I do not think that the present administration is worthy of the confidence of the people of Manitoba. I am positive that the alternative is not my friends to my right. We have been -- for the first 40 years that the Conservatives wandered in the wilderness, it set back Manitoba over 100 years. In them the people of Manitoba surely can have no confidence, but I do not think that the Conservative government of Manitoba is conducting the affairs of Manitoba in a prudent manner. It was revealed during consideration of the estimates of the departments opposite, in many instances, that the Conservatives were not looking after judiciously and prudently, the economies of the people of Manitoba. We found as we were considering the

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) Education estimates, that in many shared-programs with the federal government they didn't know what the results were as the result of the sharing of their program. They didn't know whether their programs were achieving anything or whether they were not. In answer to a question of one relatively small item of \$67,000 of direct government-al contribution in respect of the alcohol committee, I asked whether or not any report was made as to whether this expenditure was being used in order that good may result of it, the Honourable Minister of Education had to frankly admit no report is made of this expenditure. He didn't know whether anything was being achieved as the result of this expenditure, and it's rather unfortunate, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that similar questions of this nature were not asked of other departments because this, to me was an indicator that the Government of Manitoba is not acting in the best interests of the people of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, I join, and I agree, with the opposition promoted by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition that the Province of Manitoba has not made a provision in this budget for any relief for the real property taxpayers of Manitoba. It's amply evident; admitted to, by the Honourable the First Minister, that this is so, and I presume that because of his admissions here the other day while we were dealing in the question of municipal relationships that he admitted all of this, that he is going to support the resolution of my honourable friend the Leader of the Liberal Party. But I think that the failure of the government even goes further than this, Mr. Speaker, and therefore I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the amendment be amended by adding the following words after the word "Manitoba" in the last line: "and have failed to conduct the public affairs in a prudent and progressive manner, which has resulted in the failure of Manitoba to advance in the field of social and economic development."

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Dow, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Molgat, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Prefontaine, Reid, Roberts, Schreyer, Wagner and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Bjornson, Carroll, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Hamilton, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Weir, Witney, and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas - 17. Nays - 27.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

The question before the House is the amendment to the budget speech proposed by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, that the motion be amended by deleting all words after the word "that" in the first line and substituting the following: "This House regrets that there has been no provision made in this Budget for any relief for the real property taxpayers of Manitoba." Are you ready for the question?

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

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question I wonder if I might ask the honourable member if he is not prepared to proceed now, because it would be my hope that we could probably wind up the budget debate today. If he's not prepared to proceed now I wouldn't oppose the adjournment, but I would hope that all those who wish to take part in the debate would do so this afternoon and then we could wind this debate up, so I make that request of members who intend to speak.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I will be prepared to speak later in the day today -- this afternoon.

MR. ROBLIN: This afternoon? I don't think we'd be prepared to allow the motion to stand or further adjournments after this afternoon

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that the following might be our order of business for the rest of the morning: That we turn to the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd) Selkirk with respect to Bill No. 125, and that if that is dealt with expeditiously we might then go back to the Law Amendments Committee and finish up the four or five bills we have there, this morning, so that we could deal with them again this afternoon. That would probably fill in our time fairly well this morning.

My suggestion would be for this afternoon -- when we come to the government resolutions and private members' resolutions -- my suggestion would be that the House would give consideration to proceeding with those and finishing them -- that is, no adjournments. They've been on the Order Paper for a long time. Let's deal with each one of them, have the vote, get it cleaned up as we go along, and if members would be prepared to speak and to refrain from asking for adjournments I think it would probably not be too much to ask in view of the fact that the items have been on the Order Paper for several weeks -- with one exception.

MR. EDMOND PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the First Minister whether he knows if Hansard will be available early this afternoon. We haven't Hansard for Saturday yet and I for one would like to go through Hansard if possible before the budget debate is over.

MR. ROBLIN: I couldn't tell my honourable friend the answer to that question.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether it's feasible, frankly, to go through all the resolutions this afternoon without adjournment. I wonder whether the First Minister would be prepared, where one individual may be involved in several resolutions, to allow an adjournment to this evening. I don't think it would hold the work of the committee at all. And I have a further question, Mr. Speaker. Is further legislation going to come down?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think we'd do our best to oblige any member that had a solid reason for an adjournment. All that I'm suggesting is that we depart from our usual rather unhappy custom of adjourning ad nauseam. Anyone who has a solid reason for adjournment, I don't think that we'd wish to be too dogmatic about that so we'd try and meet the wishes of any member in that respect. I do urge members, though, to do their best to complete the debates as we go along. There is no new legislation except those hinging on the Committee of Ways and Means which of course can only be brought in after that Committee has reported.

If that, then, is generally agreed, Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could proceed to this debate on Bill No. 125 and see how far we can get with that.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed. Second reading of Bill No. 125. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. DOW: Mr. Speaker, in making the adjournment of this particular bill, I did so for the Honourable Member for Selkirk and he's not here this morning, but I'm sure that if anybody wishes to speak, why -- I have nothing to add to it except holding the adjournment for the Honourable Member for Selkirk who will be here this afternoon.

MR. ROBLIN: I believe there is one speaker on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, who is prepared to proceed and after he has spoken, if no one else wishes to proceed we could let the matter stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Selkirk so that he may have an opportunity of winding up the debate.

MR. MOLGAT: agreeable to us.

MR. JOHN CHRISTIANSON (Minister of Welfare) (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I feel I should say a few words on this very important subject before the bill goes to a vote. First of all I'd like to say that I have the greatest respect for the Honourable Member for Selkirk, and I respect fully his good intentions and his very sincere concern in bringing this bill before the House. He did say one thing I think that I should perhaps clarify. He stated that the Act does not prevent the placement in the home of a third religious faith or in the home of an atheist, of a child that is a ward of the court. I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that this situation has never arisen because the courts have always interpreted the spirit of the Act to mean that the parents should, and in fact did, specify the religion, and in the case of neglect the court ruled at the time of commitment so that the child always had its parental religion with it.

Now he mentioned some problems that had been encountered in the past and he's quite right in that there have been some problems that have arisen because of the way the Act is written. These problems have, I think, been largely problems of administration and I think as our social welfare mechanism, as our child placement mechanism is improving that these problems will become very infrequent in the future. He also made some rather deep observations on the

(Mr. Christianson, cont'd) apparent moral degeneration of our society, but I think that that's far too wide a subject to be dealt with in this debate so I won't make any comments on that. This amendment, however, would have some pretty far-reaching effects because it would remove completely the right of a parent to determine the religious upbringing of his or her child. The state or the agency charged with responsibility for the child would determine the religion or lack of religion of the adopting parents. Now this may seem to some to be a desirable condition in a nation where nearly everyone was of the same basic religious faith, but such, Mr. Speaker, is certainly not the case in Manitoba. There is also the possibility that the state or the agency should elect to place the child in a home with no religious faith. Now this may still not cause too much concern in the case of children who are declared neglected by the court and are placed for adoption by the state or agency; but it can cause real concern in the case of parents who voluntarily give up their children for adoption. There seems to be a feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the placing of a child for adoption by a parent is an act of neglect. Mr. Speaker, I think this is not true in the majority of cases. Most parents, most unmarried mothers, the decision to place a child is an act of love, a means of insuring for the child a more secure life than the parent can provide, and any legislation of this nature would inhibit this decision on the part of those parents and would inhibit them further from making the decision which would be in the best interests of the child. I don't think I have to amplify on that point. I think it should be fairly clear to everyone the full implication involved in that part.

Now last year's amendments have not yet been in operation for long enough period of time to fully assess the effect that they will have on this situation, but I believe that they will go a long way to accomplish the ends that the member desires without removing completely the traditional rights of parents. Because I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that it would be in the general good to destroy this principle, I must vote against this Act.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say one word on this important matter. I would like to say that I respect very much the Honourable Member for Selkirk. I'm sorry that I was not present when he introduced his bill and I confirm what he has said that this matter has not been discussed in our caucus. The honourable member knows that some of us have fundamental objections to the bill. I respect his right to bring it, and he respects mine to oppose it. I'm not going to go into any details at all except to say that I am one who believes that the parents have a fundamental right and that when a child, according to our religion, has been baptized and vouched for by a godfather and godmother, there is a certain obligation there because the godfather and godmother have been appointed by the parents in order to look after the education of this child. Now I won't say anymore. I appreciate the reasons brought forward by the Minister. I agree nearly wholly with him especially when he says that there's a fundamental principle here that goes far, far beyond our ability at this time to deal with the whole problem. I do not believe that everything is right in the present situation, but I do not think that we should touch it in the way that this bill proposes.

MR. ROBLIN: If no one else wishes to speak on this bill, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that it be allowed to stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? Stand --

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I now, in accordance with our discussion on this matter, I will now move the adjournment of the House so that we may proceed to Law Amendments Committee. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce that the House do now adjourn until 2:30 this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't hear the hour that you adjourned it.

MR. ROBLIN: 2:30 is the time.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 this afternoon.