

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

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Friday, April 14th, 1961

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate. The motion of the Honourable the First Minister; An amendment of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition; an amendment to the amendment of the Honourable Member for St. John's. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, realizing the time and the anxiety of members to go home after 2 months of what I consider hard work, conscientious work for each and every one, I shall try and be as brief as possible. My few remarks at this time will be of no opposition to the budget speech. I'll probably take advantage of your kindness to say a word or two of something else than the budget speech. First of all I'd like to give the First Minister, instead of criticism, some credit, and I will only mention one item now, tonight, and this is the introduction of the sale of the provincial bonds, which has been such a great success. I will not say now, because I've said it already, the very same idea this old politician or statesman speaking now have suggested it for many, many years. I always realize that the credit of the people of the province and the natural resources we have is as good security as anyone can get for their investment and I confess that I have myself purchased some of the bonds with money which I got from the insurance company where the life of my insurance policy has already expired. Rather than keep it with the insurance company, who are perhaps also reliable, I have invested a few dollars with the provincial bonds.

I have already stated on many occasions my interest as a member of the Legislature is the welfare of the people. We must realize that we cannot build roads or provide medical service or operate administration of this province without somebody paying for it. So I'm going to leave the criticism already rendered of the government's policy, of its taxes and debts, to the Leader of the Opposition, though I feel it would be more fitting for me to assume the role of protecting the welfare of the people in this province on the grounds of reducing expenditures. But I realize that this is impossible.

In this budget the government has increased one commodity for tax which may work a hardship to the individual motorist. But at least it is not as painful as a sales tax which would affect everyone, as it has been talked about. While in this case the commercial motorist can adjust the rates accordingly those that they serve, whereas in a sales tax the poor, who have no interest in this, would likely suffer. So while I am not pleased with any increase in taxes I find that this is the least painful, or the less painful than the others which could have been introduced.

The only other thing that I regret about the budget speech is that the administration have not accepted our suggestion this year, and the last two or three years, of not taking over the gas industry which justly belongs to public ownership, and we read a statement the other day that the gas company after paying out all the wages, interest to the shareholders, depreciation, what have you, still made over half a million dollars profit. I think that if we would have that half a million dollars profit I would not have to quarrel, which I may have to tonight, with the Honourable Member from St. Matthews, of having a school for the deaf, mute and blind. Now this is as far as budget is concerned, and this is my only criticism that I will give tonight, because the Honourable Member from St. John's and my leader have made their case perfectly clear, and their criticism, which I hope that the government from now on until next session will take into consideration.

Now, Sir, may I say a word about our children in whom I am vitally concerned, as they are the ones who will take over the management and responsibility, not only in this province, but who will be responsible for peace and happiness the world over. I fully agree with the First Minister's intention in principle, although not altogether in fact, of helping to feed the hungry mouths of this world, and particularly the children and the parents who do not know where the next meal is coming from. I have personally experienced in the past while living in the Ghettos, there seeing thousands of people going home after a hard day endeavouring to earn enough for a meal to bring home -- and many of them had not succeeded.

There was a time in this House when I mentioned something which concerns the outside boundaries of this province. Almost everyone objected. And several years ago the Leader of the Opposition, who was then the Provincial Treasurer, was delivering his Budget, and for the first time, to my knowledge, mentioned that we cannot isolate ourselves from the rest of the

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.)....world. We must realize now that with the modern modes of transportation, if there is disease spreading in any country of this world, it may affect this province, and the welfare of the people all over the world is our concern.

Now, Sir, I worry about our youth, knowing that they are coming now to take our place in the interest of our province. The Talmudic literature teaches us the concepts of responsibility. They are: responsibility to God, responsibility to Man; and responsibility to the future. How does one heed responsibility to the future? By preparing our children for the future; and preparing the future for our children. In this session our group has tried to discharge each obligation to the aged, by resolutions on pensions, medical care and so on. Now, towards the end of the session we challenge all to review our responsibility to youth. We can prepare the future for our children by seeing that there is social justice -- a better world, and security and challenge. We can prepare our children for the future by ensuring that the highest standards of health and education are maintained. It's good insurance and it's a very good investment which should pay interest, because after all, we are not sitting here for ourselves or for the present generation. Our fathers have prepared something for us; we must prepare something for our children.

There is much of which we can be proud; our schools are progressing, our university's growing, but we should never relinquish our sacred duty to upgrade -- our duty to continually review. Does Manitoba offer an environment designed to keep the best of our natural resources-- our children? Why do most of the great American universities have Manitoba graduates on their faculties while we must import talent? The Canadian Medical Association in its current issue states that the country is faced with the problem of doctor supply, and too few applicants entering Medicine. Why? This is due to the cost of medical education -- between \$6,000 and \$7,000 for a four-year medical course. They know that to fulfil our responsibility to the future we must redouble our efforts on behalf of our youth. This should be our prime obligation.

Our obligation is to give our youth the best education possible, to provide them with opportunity, to provide them with an environment which challenges their initiative and imagination. I realize truly that we have improved the situation quite a bit during the last few years. Our contribution to the university has grown and our expense for education has grown, so I'm not criticizing what has been done but I do not think that we should rest and say that we have done the best we can. We've got to make progress and let the Minister of Education or the Honourable Minister of Health and Public Welfare think they have done a good job. I agree, I agree, but the job is not done yet, and once they have it in mind to realize that we are not through with our efforts in training for a true and democratic system, because they are the ones that will have to decide. Democracy is not -- probably to some of us -- not the best system because the minority suffers, but let me tell you something; I'd rather stand here and suffer defeat after defeat than accept any other system than the democratic system we have.

Manitoba has done much, it must continue to do much more in the future. How many of our talented youth are denied higher education because of finances? That's what the Minister of Education should put the question to himself. How many of our scientists and university graduates leave the country because of greater opportunity elsewhere? There's no more sacred responsibility than fulfilling our obligations to our children.

Now Mr. Speaker, I come to another subject which may not be strictly in order, but I think that under this subject of the budget we could speak about some other matters, and this is particularly for the attention of our Minister of Health and Public Welfare. Mr. Speaker, as to the health situation in this province, which has greatly improved over the last few years, may I take a moment to give you a brief resume of the medical system in Israel which has been in existence for the last 40 years although Israel has become a state only 13 years ago. Need I point out that Israel has always had limited resources. The land is poor and they've always had an influx of refugees whose resistance to disease has been lowered because of the hardship and suffering and poor food they have had before they came to Israel. Yet as long ago as 1912 -- 49 years back -- they recognized the need for a Health Insurance scheme, and under the name of Kaput-Cholim -- it means treating disease -- this was established. From modest beginnings the Health Insurance scheme has grown to the extent that in 1960 there was two-thirds of Israel's population given complete medical care. I repeat, two-thirds of the people are given complete medical care. They have no government system of medical care but they have what they call the

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.)....Histadrut, the Federation of Labour, who are not only guiding matters concerning labour but they are guiding everything that has to do with the worker in Israel, and there is no capitalist, there is no others but the workers in Israel.

From modest beginnings this health insurance scheme has grown to the extent that in 1960, as I said, two-thirds of Israel's population are given complete medical care. Under this insurance plan the people are entitled to medical care; convalescence care; payment for sick leave; mother and child welfare services; preventive health service; medical treatment in case of accident at work; medical attention for families; and care of the chronically ill by means of a special disability fund. Medical care embraces medical service in clinics or at home by general practitioners, specialists and nurses; hospitalization; special dental care; X-rays; medicines and drugs, even..... I said "dental care" also, which gives an idea of how complete this coverage is.

The Kupat Holim as they call it, or Health Insurance Scheme, has been expanded under the efforts of Histadrut, the Israel Labour Federation whose members now are 660,000, and constitute the primary manpower in agriculture, industry, transport and other pursuits.

The Health Insurance scheme is paid for by: federal and municipal government grants; employers contribute 2 percent of their payroll to the fund; and 45 percent of the membership fees in Histadrut are earmarked for Health Service. In other words, it is an absolutely complete medical plan which embodies almost everything from the cradle to the grave, and this is done by a small population in Israel who have taken in in 13 years a million and a half sick, undernourished people from many countries of the world who had no hope for any rehabilitation, and when they came to Israel they had to be treated medically, financially and other ways. Now here in Manitoba we do not have any contribution from the employers. Possibly this is something that the government could look into.

Israel opened its gates to whole communities and groups of immigrants without any restrictions whatsoever as regards to their state of health or illness, and a considerable number were in fact ill. As a result of such mass immigration, the health situation of the country would have deteriorated had it not been for the Health Services. Israel has taken in more immigrants in its 13 years than Canada with its population and great possibilities and great geographical Now if that country could do this I think we can all do it, and I would respectfully suggest to the First Minister in all sincerity that he-- and I'm sure he is interested in the welfare of the people of the province from the point of view of illness and sickness and health and what have you, -- send the Minister of Health and Public Welfare for a trip to Israel, and believe me, the expense will be paid back by what he will learn there, a thousand times more. I think that there's one country that a Minister of Health and probably also the Minister of Education should visit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the prorogation here of this present session which lasted two months with hard work and sacrifice of all members of this House, so I would suggest Sir, to the administration now the same as I mentioned a few days ago, that they should give the members more time to do homework and even if it lasts longer at least we would have a more -- I didn't say a constructive, but a more constructive -- and we could make a more constructive situation. To me, Mr. Speaker, this House is a Shrine. That's my synagogue. I quite often look at the statue of Moses and sometimes I see tears coming out of the bronze statue. And I'm stating here seriously I get my inspiration as to the only parliament in the world that has this statue placed, and those that are responsible for it have visualized that this world is not lost. This life in the inspiration of the great men in history can have a certain amount of help to us, and I feel that anything we do here should not be taken lightly, and generations to come will judge us what we are doing today. Now whether it's popular to oppose any government -- I don't say the government -- or not, that my honourable friend from Carillon says that it's the duty of the Opposition to oppose -- I'm not here to oppose everything. I'm here to oppose what I think should not be done, and my last words to all the members and to you, Mr. Speaker, that on prorogation -- and we're going back home -- may you enjoy your holidays in between sessions; may you be well and healthy and come back to this House on the next session whether it's this summer or next fall, come back with constructive suggestions; come back with the idea that we must, under all circumstances, maintain our democracy, and come back again, and if any arguments I or anyone else had with the other fellow in this

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.)....House, please forget it. All of us, without exception, have tried to do the best we can for our constituencies, for the people of Manitoba and for the people of the world.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Ayes and Nays please Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the amendment to the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for St. John's to the budget debate which reads as follows: "that the amendment be further amended by adding at the end of "therefore" of the following: "it has not provided for the planned and orderly economic growth of Manitoba to ensure that the people of the province will receive benefits thereof, and failed to negotiate a satisfactory tax arrangement with the Government of Canada which will ensure increased revenues for the Province of Manitoba."

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

YEAS: Messrs: Campbell, Desjardins, Dow, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Paulley, Peters, Prefontaine, Reid, Roberts, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Wagner, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Roblin, Scarth, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Watt, Weir and Witney and Mrs. Forbes and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 19, Nays 32.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The question before the House is the amendment proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to the Budget Debate.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker I suppose that tradition demands that I should say a word or two in defence of the budget in respect of the criticisms that have been made of it in the past few days. I trust however, Sir that although I had prepared a fairly detailed reply to the various points that had been made, that you will excuse me if I make this reply somewhat shorter than what otherwise might be the case. I would like to say Sir, that I appreciate very much the tone of the debate on this occasion, because I think I may say that in my view, all those who spoke in connection with this important matter did their best to do so in a reasonable and constructive way and although it is true that much of the comment that they had to make was of a critical nature, nevertheless that is what one must expect in a debate like this, and I don't think that any of those who spoke over-stepped the bounds of what one might call a relatively harmonious although naturally critical discussion of the government's financial policy. I think the thing that struck me most is, I really believe that everybody in this House, or almost everybody in this House, really approved of what we're doing. There was nobody here that said that any of our programs, with I think probably the one exception of the Greater Winnipeg Floodway, were seriously out of tune with the times, or out of tune with the needs of the province. I heard no one complain that it was wrong to build roads. There was no objection to the very large capital investments we're making in roads or in public utilities, or in water supply, or in education, or in the University of Manitoba, or in the development of agriculture, or in mines and resources, or in those other new projects which have been our responsibility and indeed our pleasure, Sir, to be responsible for. In fact one of the odd things is, even people who I rather expected to be very critical of the fact, for example, that we are borrowing money, didn't seem to mind the purposes for which it was borrowed. I think that the Honourable Member for Rhineland, who sometimes has, let me say, pretty firm views on the questioning of borrowing money, he didn't have any objections to make about it this year. He seemed to think that our money was, as we thought -- indeed as it is -- an investment in the development of our province and something which was good.

I appreciated that attitude and I must say that the same could be said for some other members of the House, but there still is this conflict of opinion between the Leader of the Opposition and myself in respect of this whole matter, because while it is true that he and his party have consistently voted for everything that we have asked for that affects our tax structure, that affects our borrowing policy, and indeed which is basic to our whole financial situation here in the Province of Manitoba, with of course this year the exception of Flood Control on

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)....which there was a matter of some difference in opinion, but we find that he has and his friends have indeed voted and supported, perhaps with some reservation but indeed they have supported, everything we've done. There have been criticisms on some matters, that I think might be described as matters of detail, but when the chips were down they were with us, and now we find that they don't like the fact that there's a bill to pay. They complain that we've raised the taxes and that the debt has increased. Well that's their right to do, but I must come back to my observation that I made some time ago that I can't understand -- and this is underlined by the question asked by the member for Winnipeg South -- I can't understand how they can reconcile in their own minds the fact that they vote for the policy and then complain about the bill.

Now, a reason was given, to be sure; a reason was given to the effect that as this is what the people obviously wanted, having voted the government into office, therefore the Opposition, the Official Opposition considered it to be all right for them to vote for it. Well of course I don't think that that argument will stand a minute's examination, because while it was true that we were put in here to carry out these programs, our honourable friends were not put in to help us. Their function is quite different. They were put in to criticize us. They were put in to advance an alternative policy of their own. Indeed they advanced that alternative policy into succeeding general elections and to the extent that they elected some members, some part of the public obviously approved of the policy that they advanced. How then can they reconcile a situation where they abandon that policy, dump it outside the door, and come in and vote for what we're doing, when they ran specifically on a platform of opposing that kind of thing and having a platform and a policy and an alternative of their own? I don't see how that can be done and then complain about the fact that there is a debt in the Province of Manitoba, and then complain about the financial consequences of what happens to be going on.

That really is my principal quarrel with the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition, that I think he's adopted a totally indefensible and inconsistent position, that he would be well advised in the future to vote against our measures if he doesn't like them; he would be well advised in the future to vote against our financial proposals if he feels that they are wrong, so that he will have a clear record of the expression of his own policy to fall back on if he decides to criticize us in what we're carrying on. So from that point of view, Sir, I really don't think that he's got justification in criticizing the financial administration in the terms of the amendment that we have before us now.

I have some notes here about the gross national product, whether its two percent or three percent. It actually is 2.1 in physical production and 3.2 in financial figures, indicating that the real advance last year was 2.1, a little more than he suggested; he's inclined to be pessimistic about these things. I have some information here about the backlog of business and work that had to be done when we came in, which he strenuously maintains didn't exist. I have it in terms of schools; I have it in terms of roads; I have it in terms of social allowances; I have it in terms of University, the Faculty of Agriculture; almost everything that you would care to mention. We can indicate the backlog of work that existed and that we had to take on when we came in. But we're not going to agree on that. He maintains there wasn't any. I think the facts indicate there were, and we'll just have to let it go at that.

I also have here a lot of information about our agricultural position. He was interested to know in what way we had advanced the proposals put forward in the speech which was delivered here a couple of years ago and which he quoted. Well if he's interested in reading the Country Guide or perhaps the Family Herald, he'll find some pretty good news comments there as to what the government has been doing. He'll find the story of the Minister of Agriculture of this province at the last Federal-Provincial Conference and I wish there were time tonight for me to read from the Country Guide of last December, 1960, in which it gives the views of Manitoba on the wheat marketing situation; on the deficiency payment question; with the competitive situation of western farmers on matters such as the premature diversification of the wheat economy, and all those matters of national interest which are bound up in the problem my honourable friend was discussing.

The Minister of Agriculture set out at the Dominion-Provincial Conference on agriculture some of the views of our province at that time. And another one of these publications -- and I mention them because they're so readily available, I'm sure everybody here reads them -- the

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd).....Family Herald of January 26th in which there's a very flattering reference, "Congratulations should go to Manitoba's vigorous young Agriculture Minister George Hutton for his action to get a national agricultural policy and marketing study going." And more to the same effect; I won't read it all. My honourable friend can blush, I discovered, and I'm afraid that if I read all this rather flattering comment about his activities he might be a little embarrassed. "Home Towns Get Down to Business," the story of the activities of my friend here, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, in the January, 1961 issue of the Country Guide, telling how we are trying to marry up agriculture with industry in the local areas of this province in order to build the economic structure, not only of the small town, but of the agricultural and producing community around. There is, of course, a great deal that could be said about our overall agricultural policy but it's so well known that I'll spare the House, Sir, any more detailed reference to it.

MR. CAMPBELL: May I ask a question?

MR. ROBLIN: Certainly.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, Mr. Speaker, the point that I wanted to ask the question on was not what had been done here, because I had admitted that my honourable friends had put forward a program that they believe in here in Manitoba. My question that I was asking at that time and I ask again, wasn't what they proposed to Ottawa, but what has come from their proposal to Ottawa.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, I think one of the most significant things that has come from those proposals, and one which I'm sure is going to have a most interesting and beneficial effect on Western economy, is the Agricultural Redevelopment Act, if that is the correct name of it, commonly called ARDA, which is now being negotiated between the provinces and the Dominion, a policy which attempts -- and I hope it will be a successful attempt -- to come to grips with some of the most basic problems of western agriculture. How to relate land use to the actual potential of the land, and the actual activity of the farmer concerned. How to get those matters of rationalization worked out through the agricultural industry and to enable those who are on the farms to make a decent living. Because one of our most serious problems is just that.

In the Interlake country, for example, we have received information that of some 1,300 farms in one area of that section, there is perhaps only room for a quarter of those people to make a decent living. Regardless of what you do with price, and that, of course, is one of the arguments that we're having with other gentlemen, that price isn't everything; that you've got to make sure that you've got a basic economic unit and in the Interlake country and many places unfortunately that isn't the case. And we hope that this ARDA legislation will help us to come to grips with that by providing federal assistance, which will certainly be useful to us and certainly assist what we're trying to do. I regard that as very important, and I think that recent progress in clearing out the stores of wheat we have in the country, recent sales, while certainly no credit should be given to us whatsoever for those sales as far as we're concerned, nevertheless they do indicate that progress is being made in freeing up the wheat surplus that has been overhanging our economy for some time. And it seems to me that those considerations, together with the ones that the Minister of Agriculture has presented to the authorities at Ottawa, indicate that we are trying to carry the message, as they say, trying to carry a constructive message to our partners in other provinces and in the Dominion, in respect to the future of agriculture. I make no claims, Mr. Speaker, that we have solved this problem because that would be manifestly untrue. But I do say that we are making a respectable and considerable effort to do our part in dealing with those matters.

Just a few comments on the savings bonds which my Honourable Friend the Leader of the Opposition didn't seem to be too pleased with. He didn't like it in the Throne Speech; didn't seem to like it much better now that we have \$40,800,000. He thinks we're going to lose money or have an expensive problem in providing a cash reserve to take care of any liquidations. There'll be liquidations, true. In British Columbia the experience has been very satisfactory. I expect it will be all right here. But it really doesn't cost us five cents to have resources available to us to provide the liquid funds necessary to take care of any encashments of these. I explained that matter to the House further -- I don't need to do it again. But it doesn't cost us anything at all. That's something that can easily be handled.

I was extremely interested to see a quotation the other day from a highly respected financial

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)....commentator called Mr. A. H. Cameron, whose writing, particularly on the Governor of the Bank of Canada, has been required reading, I think, for anybody interested in the financial affairs of the country, because he has a very pointed -- I almost said an acid pen; that wouldn't be correct. He has a very pointed and a very pungent style of writing, and I was extremely interested to see in the last issue of his news letter that the provinces, in his opinion, have probably made a pretty good deal, those of us who have used the savings bonds device, "because they might otherwise have driven marketable yields a good deal higher had they not used the savings bonds device." Those last few words are a quotation from him. In fact, you know, 130 million dollars has been raised recently by the three provinces that have tried the savings bonds system, and when you consider that weight of demand is taken off the Canadian Bond Market, I think Mr. Cameron may well have a point when he says that that relief from pressure has made the market a little more amenable and that that advantage inheres not only to provinces but also to municipal people who are borrowing as well, because if we use the regular market, we're all in the same boat. But by using the Manitoba Savings Bonds we're something like people in a credit union. I think it's quite a good analysis. We are taking the savings of our neighbours, here in the province, and we are putting them into a common pool, and we are using the money of our own people to enhance our own development and resources. And I am very happy indeed that the scheme worked as well as it did, and I think that it will turn out to be advantageous on the whole to the people of Manitoba.

Now, Dominion-Provincial relations got quite a going over. Well I'll admit that I must plead guilty to many of the quotations ascribed to me by speakers in this debate. I did make a number of speeches, in the House and out of it, in which I expressed the views of the Province of Manitoba and our sincere desire, our effort to get the best possible deal we can. And I must confess that I went to the conferences and I said the things I said I was going to say, and on several occasions a little bit more, and perhaps said things that weren't too universally approved of -- let's say that -- by those who were also attending the conference as well. But I'll have to admit that I didn't bring home as big an allocation of Federal-Provincial tax revenue as I asked for. I'll have to admit that because it's true. And I'll have to say that Duff Roblin and Tommy Douglas and Jean Lesage, the three of us, did the best we could but we all got the same share and none of us was able to succeed in convincing the Federal authorities we should have any more. So while I don't mind my honourable friends criticizing me for that, I just want them to extend their criticisms to include those other more able and more experienced premiers that were down there and whose views shared somewhat the same fate as my own. In other words, we have to face up to the fact that while we negotiate on Dominion-Provincial relations I think we must recognize -- and I don't think anyone disputes it -- that the Federal Government is the senior partner and after having done our best in negotiation, once a final proposal -- and I believe that's what it is -- once a final proposal has been made to us we have the option of taking it or not. And I think that that's inescapable no matter how it's protracted or how details of negotiations, and heaven knows these were protracted and did indeed give us plenty of opportunity to put forward our say, and there was the most frank and wide ranging exchange of views -- let me tell you about that. And we had every opportunity to negotiate, but in every negotiation there comes a point of finality, of conclusion, when we have to set down on paper exactly what the conclusions are, and that's the situation we're in.

Now, I really don't object to the Leader of the CCF Party including this in his resolution because he never recommended anything else to the House that I know of. But I'm not so sure that I think the Leader of the Opposition is on such sound ground, because about four years ago he recommended a proposition to us which for the sake of verbal shorthand I'll call 10, 9, 50. He recommended a proposal to us as being a good one. That was his idea of a good arrangement with Ottawa. And that was his proposal to the Legislature and that's what we accepted. And I think it can be said that regardless of your views of the present arrangement, that it is significantly more advantageous to the Province of Manitoba than the arrangement that was made in 1956 or '57, whenever the year was. It's more valuable to us by at least \$3 million in the present year and by a percentage that grows as time goes by. So without putting myself forward as being one who is perfectly satisfied with that arrangement, because everyone knows that is not the case, I do say it is a better arrangement than we had before, and I do say that it is an arrangement which will put the Province of Manitoba in receipt of more funds than the one that

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)....we signed and agreed to some four or five years ago.

I have a point down here about the debt but it seems to me I sort of covered that general principle; that if you want to invest in public utilities, and roads and telephones and water supplies, facilities and things like that, it's not reasonable to expect to pay for most of those things other than through borrowing. If you borrow you have a debt. If you want to call it a debt, you're welcome to it. I'd like to call it an investment. I always enjoy that repetition of a speech I made in 1952. I have to admit to my honourable friend that that's what I said. There isn't any question about it. It's right down there in black and white. But I'll have to admit to something else, and that is that I've grown wiser over the years, Mr. Speaker. I've grown a little wiser. I am a little better informed than I was then. I hope I will continue to improve. I think the man who finds he's lost the capacity to learn, or to profit by experience, is in a poor way. I hope I still am in the learning process of life. I hope I never leave it. But it does indicate one difference between my honourable friend and I, that I've changed since 1952. I don't think he's changed very much since then. I think he still holds the same views that he had on that occasion. I'll have to say that I was wrong then and I am going to admit it; I admitted it last year. I admit it this year; and if he makes the same speech again next year, which is probably a pretty fair bet, I'll probably have to admit it all over again. That's all there is to it. Sometimes you have to face up to the fact that a statement was perhaps not well advised under the circumstances. One learns; one grows; one changes one's mind. That's the situation, frankly, in which I find myself tonight.

Now Municipal taxes is a very serious matter and I, by no means, wish to minimize it; and I, by no means, wish to contradict any of the facts, because they are available to us and we have to recognize that we have a problem in Municipal taxation. It would be easy to say that compared with other places in Canada it's not very bad. It would be easy to say that compared with what we paid 20 years ago, when a dollar was a dollar, it's not more burdensome on our people than it was then. You could say all those things, and I think they would be true. Nevertheless there is, in these recent years, the problem of local taxation. I think for the government I can say that we have provided \$16.7 million in the last two and a half years since we came in, in direct and indirect aid to municipalities; and that's a very large increase in the provincial share. I think I should repeat that \$60 million, or thereabouts, of our provincial money goes in either direct or indirect support to municipalities, based on a calculation that was made by one of my predecessors in this office before we came in. I can tell you that more than half of our budget, and far more than our tax-rental payment go to the municipalities of Manitoba; but I think we must also accept the fact that the municipalities and the local governments generally have and should have financial autonomy. Schoolboards have it; municipalities have it; to a large extent the hospitals have it; and what we can do, and perhaps only what we can do, is to co-operate with them. I don't think it entirely right to say that the increase in Municipal taxation is a responsibility solely of the government of the province. I think one must recognize the fact of Municipal autonomy or schoolboard autonomy, and those other self-governing bodies that I've spoken of, who have to some extent, and a very considerable extent I think, a measure of control over their local finances. But I would be the first to admit, Sir, that this government would wish to give more help to the municipalities of this province, regardless of all those facts and circumstances, because we do want to bring what relief we can for the local taxpayer; and we are going to extend that aid just as fast as it is possible for us to do so.

Now, Sir, there are only one or two other small points that perhaps I ought to refer to. One of them is not so small, and that is the very reasonable observation offered by the Honourable Member for St. John's on public housing. He's not in his seat, but I must really congratulate him on making a constructive contribution in that respect, because undoubtedly this is not and is going to be an important problem of public finance, not only for municipalities but for the province. I look forward to the time, although I regret it is not in this Session, when we may be able to offer some more helpful views to the House in connection with this problem. This year we are only making the various beginnings in getting our bearings in this question, which has not really absorbed our attention up to the present time; but we must acknowledge its existence and we must acknowledge the fact that some account will have to be taken of the needs of public housing in this House before very long in the Province of Manitoba.

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.).....Well, Sir, I apologize to you for these few remarks because I really haven't made what you might call a proper budget reply. I suppose, under the circumstances, I would be pardoned for doing so. I've just touched on a few of the points which I thought might bear some comment; and I just want to sit down by saying that, in spite of some rather pessimistic views that have been advanced in the course of the debate about the immediate economic future of Manitoba, in spite of the element of truth there is in the remarks that were offered, I remain more convinced than ever that we will have a brightening horizon during this coming year. I am glad to see that building records -- the building permits are advancing over what they were last year. It's helpful to know that unemployment seems to have reached its peak, although I by no means want to minimize the problem that remains. I am glad to see that 1960, in spite of everything, was a good year for the province in which new records were established in many fields. I enjoyed reading this copy of the Financial Post that told about our tourist season and what's going on in the north; the farming patterns and the forest industry and all that kind of thing; that we have here a splendid province; that we have not been over-extended in our operations in recent years. We have a sound and viable economic basis on which to grow, and every reasonable expectation is that that growth will continue and that in 1961 we will resume the forward progress of the Province of Manitoba.

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

MR. CAMPBELL: The Yeas and Nays, please Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the amendment proposed by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition to the budget address, which reads as follows: "that this House regrets that the Government while greatly increasing the province's debt and taxes has, through its policies, contributed to a sharp rise in municipal debt and taxes."

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Dow, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hawryluk, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Paulley, Peters, Prefontaine, Reid, Roberts, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Wagner and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Hutton, Ingebrigtson, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Roblin, Scarth, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Watt, Weir, Witney, Mrs. Forbes and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 20; Nays, 32.

MR. SPEAKER. I declare the motion lost. The motion before the House is a motion proposed by the Honourable the First Minister, that the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Speaker, many of the speeches that we hear in this House have commenced with these words: I had not intended to speak but, in view of the circumstances, I will. Well, Mr. Speaker, my speech tonight will be the opposite. I had fully intended to speak on this debate at this time on a matter which, to me, is of great importance; but, Mr. Speaker, in view of the time; in view of what we have left on the agenda; in view of the fact that we are all somewhat tired, including the members of the press; I will not speak.

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

.....continued on next page.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, will you ask the Honourable Member for St. Matthews to take the Chair and we'll go into the Committee of Ways and Means.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member for St. Matthews please take the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that towards making good the sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, the sum of \$96,173,352 be granted out of the Consolidated Funds.

Capital Supply estimates:- Resolved that towards making good certain monies for various capital purposes, the sum of \$45,069,350 be granted out of Consolidated Funds. -- Agreed? -- Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means has adopted certain resolutions, directed me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Cypress, that the report to the Committee be received.

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

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

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CLERK: The Committee of Supply estimates: Resolved that towards making good the sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, the sum of \$96,173,352 be granted out of Consolidated Funds.

Capital Supply estimates: Resolved that towards making good certain money for various Capital purposes, the sum of \$45,069,350 be granted out of Consolidated Funds.

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

Mr. Roblin introduced Bill No. 62, An Act to authorize the expenditure of money for various capital purposes and to authorize the borrowing of same (1).

Mr. Roblin introduced Bill No. 67, An Act to authorize the expenditure of monies for various capital purposes and to authorize the borrowing of the same and to amend The Loan Act (2), 1962.

Mr. Roblin introduced Bill No. 36, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1962.

Mr. Roblin, by leave, presented Bills Nos. 36, 62, 67 for second reading.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the following Bills: Nos. 36, 62, 67, 98, 99.

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.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 36.

MR. ROBLIN: Are the Loan Acts available for distribution?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill 36, page one

MR. ROBLIN: I think, Mr. Chairman, it would be well to proceed with Bills 98 and 99 first while the Clerk is distributing the Loan Act.

MR. CAMPBELL: Bills 98 and 99 have been distributed, have they?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, they've been out for several days, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I didn't bring my bill-fold in with me. What are the titles?

MR. ROBLIN: Bill No. 98 is the Act to amend The Gasoline Tax Act and Bill No. 99 is the Act to amend The Motive Fuel Users Tax Act, that give effect to the budget statement.

Bills Nos. 98 and 99 were read page by page and passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, while these are being distributed, might I ask the First Minister just what is the significance of the latter part of the title of the bill -- "and to

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) amend The Loan Act."

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, Sir. What we are doing here is we are freeing up any amount that may be in the Post-War Emergency and Reserve Fund that were previously allocated to the Agricultural Credit Corporation or the Industrial Credit Funds. At the present time those monies have been taken from that Fund. We now wish to replace them and this bill gives us authority to do so, so that the Fund will be restored to its former position before those temporary advances were made.

MR. CAMPBELL: Is there not authority in the present Act to do that?

MR. ROBLIN: No. We thought there was but apparently not. The lawyers have been at it.

Bills No. 36, 62 and 67 were read page by page and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the following Bills: No. 36, 62, 67, 98 and 99 and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

Bill No. 36 was read a third time and passed.

Bill No. 67 was read a third time and passed.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is that Bill No. 67, An Act to authorize the expenditures of money for various capital purposes and to authorize the borrowing of the same, and to amend The Loan Act (2), 1960, be now read a third time and passed.

A standing vote was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs: Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Campbell, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Desjardins, Dow, Evans, Froese, Gray, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harris, Hawryluk, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Molgat, Paulley, Peters, Reid, Roblin, Roberts, Scarth, Schreyer, Seaborn, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Tanchak, Thompson, Wagner, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright; Mrs. Forbes and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 52; Nays, nil.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

Bill No. 62 was read a third time and passed.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is that Bill No. 62, An Act to authorize the expenditure of monies for various capital purposes and to authorize the borrowing of the same (1), be now read a third time and passed.

YEAS: Messrs: Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Hawryluk, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Paulley, Peters, Reid, Roblin, Scarth, Schreyer, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Wagner, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright; Mrs. Forbes and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs: Campbell, Desjardins, Dow, Froese, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Prefontaine, Roberts, Shoemaker, Tanchak.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 41; Nays 12.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

Mr. Roblin presented Bill No. 98, An Act to amend The Gasoline Tax Act, for third reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, just before you put the question, I would like to say a word or two in respect of this Act. I rise at this particular time because I sense that the Honourable the First Minister might tend to do what he has done in respect of his borrowing bill. I just merely want to say this, that if that was the intention I wanted it placed on the record that I would support the bill and the increase in the gasoline tax and also in the motive fuel tax, because I

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) realize that we are not going to receive revenues as a result of the national gross product going down and, as a net result, our total amount from the Dominion-Provincial relations from federal sources will be less. I accept the principle of the gasoline tax increase rather than the sales tax which may have been under consideration here in the Province of Manitoba. With those reservations, if they may be called reservations, Mr. Speaker, I would support both these bills that will be coming before this House.

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

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeas and Nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the third reading of Bill No. 98, An Act to amend The Gasoline Tax Act.

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

YEAS: Messrs: Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Froese, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Hawryluk, Hutton, Ingebrigtson, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assinibola), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Paulley, Peters, Reid, Roblin, Scarth, Schreyer, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Wagner, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright; Mrs. Forbes, and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Campbell, Dow, Guttormson, Hryhorczuk, Hillhouse, Molgat, Prefontaine, Roberts, Shoemaker, Tanchak.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 42; Nays, 10.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

Mr. Roblin presented Bill No. 99, An Act to amend The Motive Fuel Users Tax Act for third reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to repeat somewhat the comments I made in respect of the bill that has just been passed. I think we in this Assembly, Sir, must accept our responsibilities as members of this Assembly. We have passed certain legislation that requires the finances of the province. We could have also adopted the attitude of having accepted our responsibility for expenditure, evaded our responsibility when it comes to paying the tax. We of the CCF Party have, on many occasions, been accused of suggesting in this House items of expenditure while we haven't got the responsibility. I think on this occasion that we are showing our responsibility. We do not like tax increases anymore than anybody else but, as I said in respect of the gasoline tax, we feel that this tax increase is far better than having to have a sales tax here in the Province of Manitoba and we will support the bill before us for those reasons.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, my objection to this bill is even more pronounced than the former one because I fail to see the principle on which the extra differential is established between the gasoline and the diesel. I recognize that other provinces have similar legislation, but I have never been able to see the basis for it. I said earlier it seems to me that it's putting a penalty on efficiency, and certainly it will increase the costs of transportation and, to that extent in my opinion, remove the competitive position that the trucking industry now provides to the railways and, consequently, to the large proportion of our freight rate. I think this is not justified and I'm definitely opposed to the principle.

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

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeas and Nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is third reading of Bill No. 99, An Act to amend The Motive Fuel Users Tax Act.

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

YEAS: Messrs: Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Froese, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Hawryluk, Hutton, Ingebrigtson, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assinibola), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Paulley, Peters, Reid, Roblin, Scarth, Schreyer, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Wagner, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright; Mrs. Forbes, and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs: Campbell, Desjardins, Dow, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Prefontaine, Roberts, Shoemaker, Tanchak.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 42; Nays, 11.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, further orders, I wonder if I could have your permission and the permission of the House to refer to the address for papers that I believe was submitted by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead concerning correspondence between the government and Atomic Energy of Canada. We have been informed by the Government of Canada that it is not their policy to table correspondence that originates with the Crown Corporations and, therefore, we're unable, as I reserved the right to do, as I reserved my position in this matter, I must announce that we are not able to reply to that address.

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

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, this amendment is unacceptable because it implies that the present policy and program of the government is meeting the needs of physical education requirements in the province, and this is definitely not the case. I think that the statement which I've just made is one that would be subscribed to by the authorities in the field of physical education in the province. I would refer members to the recent statements of Mr. Frank Kennedy, Director of Phys-Ed at the University of Manitoba, and to statements made by the Manitoba President of the Manitoba Branch of the Canadian Physical Health and Education Association; so it would seem that the resolution which I proposed, and the amendment thereto by the Member for St. Boniface, could very well have been accepted by this government. If they really believe that their present program is going a long way towards meeting the needs, physical education-wise, then why not accept the implication of the resolution? Why be afraid of it if they are, in fact, moving with it.

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): Could I ask the honourable member a question?

MR. SCHREYER: All right.

MR. STRICKLAND: Does the resolution on the Order Paper say anything about physical education?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes it does.

MR. STRICKLAND: Where?

MR. SCHREYER: In the second paragraph it says where, Mr. Speaker, where physical fitness depends on large measure on facilities for recreation, training and leadership. This is physical education. If, as the Member for Hamiota feels, this government has the policy and program which is going toward meeting the needs of physical education in this province, then they could therefore, without fear, accept the implication of the resolution and take on the work that's proposed for them to do by the report of the Committee that was set up here sometime ago to study the needs of physical education in this province. Therefore, this sub-amendment is entirely unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker presented the motions on the amendment to the amendment, the amendment to the main motion, and the motion, and after voice votes declared the motions carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. PAULLEY: In the absence of the honourable member, may I suggest the vote be taken on this resolution, and I will be calling for the yeas and nays.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays please, Mr. Speaker.

A standing vote was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs: Desjardins, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hawryluk, Hillhouse, Molgat, Paulley, Peters, Reid, Roberts, Schreyer, Tanchak, Wagner, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs: Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Campbell, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Dow, Evans, Froese, Groves, Hamilton, Hryhorczuk, Hutton, Ingebrigtson, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assinibota), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Prefontaine, Roblin, Scarth, Seaborn, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Watt, Weir, Witney; Mrs. Forbes and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 15; Nays, 38.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The question before the House is the

(Mr. Speaker, cont'd.) resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Logan and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Selkirk. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate for the Honourable the Minister of Labour, and I believe he is just arriving in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I have the speech somewhere here in my bag, if you'll give me a moment. -- (Interjection) -- As a matter of fact, I didn't even get to hear the guest speaker tonight. I had to sneak away to get back to give this speech, Mr. Chairman. I think -- (Interjection) -- Well there's no score yet. We're on the Fair Wage, are we? Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the amendment to the resolution makes it somewhat more palatable, of course, but I don't think it still does what we would like to see done with The Fair Wage Act. I think one of the difficulties in making The Fair Wage Act apply to those areas which it doesn't apply to, even with respect to large construction contracts, would mean that it would have to apply in remote areas where of course conditions are much different from what they are in the built-up areas in the province. One of the big difficulties is to try to apply short hours of work in areas where men insist upon working much longer hours than those which are allowed under the Fair Wage Schedule. I think there is one other factor, too, that we should bear in mind, and that is that if we apply the restricted hours and pay time and a half for working longer hours, we do add substantially to the cost of our building projects in remote areas. This, of course, I think becomes somewhat of a deterrent to resource development industries which are pretty conscientious, at the present time, of cost. I'm thinking particularly of the wood products industry, the potential pulp development and so on, but also add, I think, substantially to the cost of power if we're going to apply it to electrical construction jobs. I think this, too, is one of the advantages that we as a province have, we are able to supply power at rather attractive rates to industry. For these reasons, and of course many others, we should vote against this particular resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. L. HARRIS (Logan): Yes, I'm ready to close the debate. In closing debate, I would urge the government to

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, will somebody catch my honourable friend before he gets started? We'll have to take the vote on the amendment first, Mr. Speaker, and then we can close the debate on the main motion.

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

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Dow, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hawryluk, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Paulty, Peters, Prefontaine, Reid, Roberts, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Wagner, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Balzley, Bjornson, Carroll, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Roblin, Scarth, Seaborn, Smelle, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Watt, Weir, Witney; Mrs. Forbes and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 20; Nays, 33.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost. The question before the House is the motion of the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, in closing debate, I would urge the government to give serious consideration to amending The Fair Wage Act and allow Zone A Schedule to apply to all of Manitoba. My reason for this is the difference in wages from Zone A to Zone B, which is as follows. Now I'll only give you one example here, but it goes on down along the line. Here we have journeymen asbestos workers, \$2.40 an hour, 40 hours. It comes to about \$96.00 for the week. You go into Zone B the same people, they work 48 hours, 8 hours extra, for \$98.40 a week. For that 8 hours extra they get \$2.40. We hear of people working long hours wanting extra money, so you can see it here. It takes them a while before they can get to that overtime business. You go back in the back of the book and you'll come to where men here are paid a basic wage of \$1.40 an hour. They have to work 120 hours in the two-week period before they

(Mr. Harris, cont'd.) can work overtime. Now if they get rain or anything like that for a day or so, where would they work overtime in that period of time at all. They couldn't make that amount of hours to make up that time. Unfortunately, there are employers who refuse to pay their employees a proper rate of pay as prescribed under The Fair Wage Act, and if the individual questions this, he's told that if he doesn't like the rate of pay he can take his tools and go elsewhere as there are a long list of men looking for work and who can be hired. The men concerned were employed as carpenters and listed on the books as labourers. The majority of these workers are mainly newcomers to this country and they do not always know their rights. In cases where a union agreement is in force with the employers, the employees sent out to carpenter's work on an installation are being paid the wage rate as prescribed under The Fair Wage Act. This proves that we need more policing of the Act.

In conclusion, as far as The Fair Wage Act is concerned, it is neither fair nor is there much action taken as to its enforcement. The existence of Zone A and Zone B is an iniquity, and the Act does not apply to certain large areas where building is going on. Obviously the same work should beget the same pay to be fair. Anything else makes for exploitation and abuse. The Fair Wage Act is observed more in the breach than in the compliance, and inspectors should be constantly on the job. Furthermore, all employers of labour covered under The Fair Wage Act should be obliged to make periodic reports of wages and hours, and they should be scrutinized by the department. We are witnessing more and more court actions on labour matters, which points to a need for a complete review of our legislation and its enforcement features in order to avoid abuse. Thank you.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays, please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. PAULLEY: I want to see how split they are on this one.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is the resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Logan.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Gray, Harris, Hawryluk, Paulley, Peters, Reid, Schreyer, Wagner and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Desjardins, Dow, Evans, Froese, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Molgat, Prefontaine, Roblin, Roberts, Scarth, Seaborn, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Watt, Weir, Witney; Mrs. Forbes and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 9; Nays, 44.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The question before the House is the resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, amended by the Honourable Member for Roblin, and further amended by the Honourable Member for Carillon. The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. M. E. MCKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Speaker, in the interest of all here, I think it would be best if I didn't say anything. I would just like to say that I hope that all the farmers in Manitoba have a very good crop this year, and that at the end of the year they are all happy and contented and we all come in here with few problems the next coming session in '62.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, I promise to take only two or three minutes. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, the Province of Manitoba has approached the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta on the matter raised by the Member for Carillon in his amendment to the amendment, and although no material progress has been made on this matter, I don't think that after both two years ago and a year ago that Manitoba has approached the other provinces, that we can support this amendment which infers, of course, that Manitoba has not taken any action in this regard. Another reason why I cannot support this resolution at the present time is in respect of its reference to solving the problem that exists in agriculture. I think everybody will agree that the crisis in agriculture today is in the field of marketing and this matter received a great deal of consideration by the Government of Manitoba, and after due consideration, it was

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd.) felt that the most logical approach was that on a national basis. In the interests of establishing the good faith of the Province of Manitoba at this time with the other areas and regions in Canada, in view of the fact that we are acting as hosts to a National Conference on the question of marketing and policy research here in Manitoba on the 24th and 24th of this month, I feel that I must oppose the resolution. If the events, subsequent events prove that we cannot approach our problems on a national basis, then I feel there will be plenty of time to approach them on a regional basis; but I do believe in the interests of the farmers, especially of the west, that we should strive to make every effort to achieve a national approach to this great problem, and for that reason I must oppose this amendment.

MR. STAN ROBERTS (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, last year this same amendment was brought forward and was passed in this House, that a three-western provinces economic council would be held. This is, to my knowledge, the first remarks concerning this council, the first report to this House, that any meeting had been held. If there has been any other reports concerning it, we have not heard them. This is the reason for the amendment, and the reason for bringing it forward now is that if such a meeting was held, there was no report of it. If, after having passed it last year, no such meeting was held, then it was necessary to bring forward the amendment again this time.

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the amendment lost.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Yeas and Nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Carillon to the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Roblin.

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

YEAS: Messrs: Campbell, Desjardins, Dow, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hawryluk, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Orlikow, Paulty, Peters, Prefontaine, Reid, Roberts, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Wagner, Wright.

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 22; Nays, 33.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The question before the House is the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Roblin, on a motion proposed by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. Are you ready for the question?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I realize that when you called me to order last day you were keeping with the rules, but if you had let me finish, then I wouldn't have had to speak now. However, in about two minutes I would like to deal with the remaining points which I had wanted to make regarding the amendment brought to us by the Honourable Member for Roblin. I won't deal with those points which I have already dealt with, but the one which I left off on was the matter of the proportion that labour costs account for in the farm machinery cost dollar, and I made the statement then that the relative cost of farm machinery due to labour had actually not increased in the post-war period, and I merely want to -- now that I have the figures before me -- inform the Member from Roblin that in 1946 wages made up 33.9 percent of the farm machinery cost dollar; in 1957 22.9 percent, and I have other figures here. This is taken from the C. L. C. Farm Machine Cost report and also I lifted similar figures from a report made by J. Walter Thompson, which is one of the most reputable advertising agencies and market research agencies in the continent.

The Member for Roblin made mention about the fact that we don't mention rising costs. Well, I dealt with that. I would like to refer him to my remarks last year on this same topic, and they cover almost half a page. He mentioned the need for some method of maintaining some means of regulation of price. Well he didn't put it that way, Mr. Speaker, but he mentioned the need for management and labour to get together, to work out ways and means to keep prices from rising unduly. This is a worthwhile goal and one that we certainly subscribe to. We would even go further than that in this group -- at least I would personally -- and advocate federal government using its good offices toward the setting up of a board made up of management, labour and public representatives, which function it would be to use influence and use its

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) . . . office toward keeping prices from rising. Call it price regulation if you like, but I think we've got to the point where we can certainly study this more carefully before tossing it out as some type of "silly socialism."

The Honourable Member mentioned the fact that he thinks we need support in the agricultural economy, because, as he put it, other segments of the economy get support. We have no quarrel with this argument; as a matter of fact this is the same argument that I put forward, and I would refer him again to last year and again to this year's Hansard where he will see that I made full play of this point, and I think it is an argument worth using repeatedly. I mentioned the tariff protection, oil depletion allowances to the petroleum industry, etcetera, etcetera. I must simply deal with these points, Mr. Speaker, because some of them are really -- oh yes, here is one. The Honourable Member takes exception with anyone who advocates a "food for peace" program that would be done through the offices of a government. He thinks it would be much better if this were done through a voluntary agency as individuals. There must be some disagreement between the First Minister and himself, because I see that in education, the First Minister has a resolution which provides technical education assistance to under-developed countries through the aegis of the Provincial Government. If this is all right, what's so terrible about a "food for peace" plan that is worked and marshalled through the auspices of the government.

Well there are other points. I will conclude simply by saying that the rather wordy amendment which he brought forward is in itself worthy of support. If it were a resolution unto itself, we certainly could support it, but we support it in this instance with some misgivings, because it really is a matter apart from that which I had in mind when I brought in the resolution. Now the Minister of Agriculture and the First Minister can repeat as often as they like, that the Provincial and Federal governments are undertaking programs of rehabilitation for agriculture and so on. The fact of the matter is that unless some substantial action is taken toward the improvement of the price structure for agricultural products, then the farm economy is going to hobble along, or at best not move along at as rapid a pace as it should. So while we support the amendment we regret that members opposite did not see fit to support the full implication of the original resolution, which deals with price. If they would have brought in this amendment as a resolution, we could have supported them on that, and before I sit down I would like to put on the record that No. 4 of the operative section of the amendment leaves us with a question mark. We're not sure just what is meant by the statement "to ensure that the administration of deficiency payments complements rather than hinders the efforts of Manitoba to encourage the development of a strong and sound farm economy." What is Manitoba's effort toward a sound farm economy? I hope the implication there is not for some type of factory unit. I just hope that they don't mean that. Anyway we have no way of knowing what they do mean and so we leave it in the air, but as I say we regret that the amendment was moved at this point. It should have been moved as a separate resolution.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is the resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead as amended by the Honourable Member for Roblin.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party and the amendment thereto by the Honourable, the First Minister and a further amendment by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. DAVID ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Speaker it is not my intention at this time of night to make a long speech. I would however feel somewhat remiss if I did not say something on this important question. We believe, and I think that the people of Canada believe, that this is the most important problem facing this country. We have today more unemployed than we have had since the early thirties. We had thought that the people of Canada and the Government of Canada had learnt from those years and had determined that never again would we have large-scale unemployment, but we are again faced with close to three-quarters of a million unemployed. When we moved this resolution, Mr. Speaker, we did it in language which we thought was clear, in terms which we thought were non-political, and in terms which we thought everybody in this House could agree with, and what happens, Mr. Speaker? Lo and behold, the First Minister

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) brings in an amendment which is in fact not an amendment, except technically, makes a speech in which he does, in fact, nothing but commend the Government of Manitoba and in fact the Government of Canada for the steps which they have taken. Steps that are obviously not enough to do the job. I don't think I could criticize the First Minister's speech better than was done in the Winnipeg Free Press on the day after the First Minister made his speech. It was in the editorial column -- and if the First Minister didn't see it I commend it to him. When the article started off - I wonder who wrote the First Minister's speech, because when he departed from his notes, he obviously didn't agree with it. I think this is a very good characterization of the First Minister's speech, and I can't do better than that, and certainly not tonight.

So I want to say Mr. Speaker, that I certainly was disappointed with the First Minister. I thought he had more imagination, more drive and more spirit than to simply say, "We've done enough and we can't do any more." That's pretty poor comfort for the 30,000 people who are unemployed in the Province of Manitoba today. --(Interjection)-- I beg your pardon; well it's the last night and I'm not going to be very long, so if the speaker wants to say I am out of order, I could stop now instead of one minute from now. But Mr. Speaker, seriously, it's not important whether the resolution which is passed tonight is the resolution as finally amended by the Honourable Member from La Verendrye or as amended by the First Minister, or the original resolution. It's not important if the members of this House and the people of this province and the people of Canada really mean what they said in the years after the dirty thirties that we would never again have the large-scale unemployment which we had in those years, and which I remember so vividly when I came out of school. I am afraid, however, that too many people have forgotten those years; too many people are complacent; too many governments are complacent, and I am sorry to say that in my opinion, this government is complacent. It's a sad day for the people of this province.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Yeas and Nays Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the amendment to the amendment to the motion proposed by the Honourable the Leader of the CCF, the amendment to the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

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

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

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 21; Nays, 33.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The question before the House is the amendment on the motion proposed by the Honourable the First Minister.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Can we say same division, Mr. Speaker, or reverse division? Would that be agreeable or do you want the count? Reverse division, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Reverse division. Agreed. The question before the House is the motion by the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party as amended by the motion by the Honourable Member, the First Minister.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Same division. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Honourable Member for Inkster and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, would be in favour of you putting the question. Oh I am sorry, my colleague from Inkster wanted to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker I think it would be an insult to the children which are included in my resolution, not to speak now in their defence. It's -- under the present circumstances --

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.)....I think that the resolution speaks for itself and I will not, tonight, try and read my 40 minutes reply to the Honourable Member from St. Matthews, the reverend gentleman, Mr. Martin. As you see my desk is clear. What I want to say is only this. I am very, very much disappointed in the gentleman who moved the amendment listening to his master's words and I am very disappointed that the Honourable Minister of Health and Public Welfare has ignored this resolution and hasn't said a word about it. I hope to bring this resolution again next year, but for the moment I'm absolutely -- I haven't got a strong word but I'm angry -- (Interjection) -- to -- well disappointed is not good enough; -- (Interjection) -- of the two honourable gentlemen who have ignored such a very responsible resolution.

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

MR. GRAY: Oh, yes, oh yes, oh yes. Let the public know who are their friends.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster as amended by the resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Leader of the CCF Party.

MR. PAULLEY:Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, in answering to the arguments in the negative put by the Honourable Member for Wellington I would simply refer members to page 289 of the text, Manitoba History, by Professor Morton in which there's a very concise but very accurate argument as to how in the history of Manitoba public ownership of utilities has served the public interest and served it very well. That's one point. Secondly, I would like to point out to honourable members that the Honourable Member from Wellington used some very misleading arguments when he spoke the other day. Among other things, putting it very briefly, he said that TVA was a financial drain on the United States and that it was not self-supporting, and that the reason it could sell power at low cost was because of the fact that it was a subsidized creature. I would refer members to Time Magazine, November 21st, 1960, in which the magazine, which is a bastion of free and unimpeded free enterprise, points out very clearly that TVA insofar as its power utility functions are concerned has long been a self-supporting and self-liquidating agency. He made the point that TVA is beyond the pale of responsibility-- it's not responsible to anyone. This is simply not true, and I can refer the gentleman to several books on TVA written by professors in various universities in the United States. I realize that he got a good deal of his information from a book written by a Mr. Huet Massue and he wrote that book for the Edison Electric Institute which is an association of privately-owned utilities in the United States. And while I don't like to criticize the works, printed works of others, I would be so bold as to say that this particular book, Factual Analysis of TVA by Mr. Massue is nothing much more than a piece of printed propaganda that was written for the Edison Electric Institute for their 1946 convention. It's nothing but a bunch of tripe in almost all of its pages.

Whether or not TVA is a worthwhile government agency is really not the argument here; it's whether or not we should in this province have a publicly-owned utility distributing natural gas. And I don't think that the honourable member put up one single argument other than his bias against public ownership, that should influence members here to support him. I think rather, on the contrary, that inasmuch -- and the member admitted this; he conceded this -- inasmuch as a publicly-owned utility having the government behind it would be in a better position on the money market; would be able to finance itself with money at lower interest, it seems therefore almost beyond argument that it would be in the better interest of the people of this province for the utility to be publicly-owned. And I submit that, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate standing in the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member from Minnedosa.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I took the adjournment of this debate for the Honourable Member for Springfield. I'd like to turn it over to him please.

MR. FRED T. KLYM (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, as this resolution deals with the expropriation of land for the purpose of the floodway to be excavated in the future, I wish to inform

(Mr. Klym, cont'd.) . . . the House that at this hour I would not like to start even expropriating land because I would not be very successful. I believe the people are starting to sleep. However, I just — to make it nice and sweet and short, and as I do not think very many people would like to listen to me talking for any length of time -- I wish to inform that the floodway committee, along with the administration, will look into the small landowners, the schools and the municipalities concerned where land will be expropriated and eventually a floodway excavated. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, to that effect I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dufferin, that we delete all the words after "whereas" in line 1, and substitute the following: "Therefore, the Greater Winnipeg Floodway construction will in due course present a problem for certain municipalities with respect to local tax revenue on the areas affected by that construction. Therefore be it resolved that consideration be given to the advisability of what measures may be required to deal equitably with the municipalities concerned in this matter. "

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say this, that we will accept the amendment for this session and reserve the right, unless it's specific, for the special session in the summertime to raise the matter there.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Motion as amended by the Honourable Member for Springfield.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the motion of the Honourable the First Minister, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Unless the Honourable Member for Wolseley wishes to withdraw his resolution, I will speak. Mr. Speaker, in opposing this resolution on behalf of the Official Opposition, I wish to make it abundantly clear that our opposition is not for the Colombo Plan, of which Canada is a participant and a contributor. Our opposition is solely directed to the principle that Manitoba should have its own Colombo plan as envisioned in this resolution. Now I note that this resolution has been introduced by the First Minister in his capacity of Member for Wolseley Constituency which makes it a private member's resolution and should, in the ordinary course of events, allow the government members to exercise a free choice and discretion as to how they should vote. I therefore trust that they will exercise that free choice of discretion and that they will vote according to their conscience, and in that respect perhaps I'll give them the benefit of the doubt.

I have no criticism to make of the Honourable Member for Wolseley in introducing this resolution. I do not challenge his sincerity, nor do I challenge the humanitarian motives that have actuated him in proposing this resolution. But I do say that he is open to criticism in attempting to impose double taxation on the people of Manitoba. Manitobans are also Canadians, and as such they are contributors to the Colombo Plan to the extent that Canada does contribute, and I think in view of the financial situation of the province today, and of the municipalities of this province, that it should be in the minds of every member in this House to do everything possible to relieve the tax load from our people. Now it's perfectly true, Mr. Speaker, that the amount that will be voted in this resolution is very small, and in comparison with our total budget it is still small, but I would like to point out that great oaks from little acorns grow, and that all of these schemes, although they start off in a small way, have a tendency to pyramid annually until they reach proportions that were never thought of in the first instance.

Now as I said at the beginning, our group has no opposition whatsoever to the Colombo Plan in which Canada participates. As a matter of fact I believe Canada became a participant and contributed to this plan under a Liberal administration at Ottawa. And we have no hesitation at all in suggesting to the Federal Government that if more monies are required for the purposes mentioned in the Honourable Member's resolution that these monies should be used. We're in full accord with the first part of the Honourable Member's resolution insofar as it says that education is one of the greatest factors towards human understanding and peace. We contribute to that sentiment fully, but at the same time, Mr. Speaker, we feel that this project would be much better if it were undertaken as a voluntary project on the part of some organization in the Province of Manitoba. Now I understand that the Manitoba Teachers Society at a recent meeting did adopt the principle of the Provincial Colombo Plan as suggested by the Minister, and I would suggest to that Society that they sponsor such a project, that they obtain

(Mr. Hillhouse, cont'd.) from the Department of National Revenue the necessary authority to treat donations to such a fund as charitable donations within the meaning of the Income Tax Act, and if that Society should do that, I am quite satisfied that they will find that the people of Manitoba are not lacking in their charitable instincts, and that the people of Manitoba will contribute generously to such a fund. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, if the Manitoba Teachers Society or any other society does start such a project, I myself would be willing to contribute to the full extent of my financial capabilities. I believe too, Mr. Speaker, that if this project were treated on a voluntary basis, it would show much more goodwill from the people of Manitoba as individuals than a contribution made by the Government of Manitoba to one of these countries in the under-developed nations of the Commonwealth.

Now as to the constitutional issue that is involved in this resolution, the Honourable Member for Wolseley states that he is satisfied that it is *intra vires* of the Province of Manitoba and we are just as convinced as he is, in his opinion, that it is *ultra vires*, but I submit, Mr. Speaker, with all due deference, this is not the place nor is this the form in which to argue the constitutionality of any resolution that is brought down in this House. We have courts for that purpose. Our Manitoba Court of Appeal by a very summary method could, by reference from this Government, determine the constitutionality of this resolution, and I would suggest to the Honourable Member for Wolseley in his capacity as First Minister, that such a step be taken and that in the meantime he withhold a vote on this resolution until the constitutionality of this question is determined by a court of competent jurisdiction. I'm afraid though, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Wolseley will neither in his capacity as a private member nor as First Minister of this province, accept my suggestion, and in order to place the responsibility for the expenditure envisioned in this resolution I wish to move the following amendment, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, namely

MR. W. B. SCARTH, Q.C. (River Heights): Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Yes.

MR. SCARTH: What section of the British North America Act does this resolution contravene?

MR. HILLHOUSE: 92 -- 93 rather, and 92 (2). My motion is that the resolution be amended by deleting all the words after the word "and" in the first paragraph of the preamble, and substituting therefor the following: Whereas by Section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867 and amendments thereto, in and for each province, the Legislature thereof may exclusively make laws in relation to education, and whereas by Section 92 (2) of the aforesaid Act the provincial powers of taxation are limited to direct taxation within the province in order for the raising of revenue for provincial purposes, and whereas education is one of the most effective ways by which the Government of Canada can work for human betterment and understanding among nations, Therefore be it resolved that this House urge the Government of Canada to give greater aid to the emerging countries of the Commonwealth in respect of technical education assistance.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking on behalf of M. A. Gray, the Member for Inkster only, and I want to state now that I'm opposed to the amendment not because the amendment is not right but because we are dealing with a principle, and when we are dealing with a principle I don't think there should be any amendments, either yes or no. I'm not worrying about the amount of money because even \$45,000 or \$25,000 is a drop in the ocean of the need of the people the world over today. When the resolution was submitted I wasn't even listening to the amount. Indeed the Honourable Member from Wolseley would have said \$1.00 or \$100,000; that would not penetrate with me. All I want is to adopt that principle in this House. It is suffering of the rest of the world is our concern, nothing else, nothing else. Now to bring out the technicalities, why yes and why not does not do any good to the principle. I'd like the rest of the world to know that the Province of Manitoba is with them. If you could raise \$30,000 good and well; if you could get voluntary contributions so much better; if we give them \$100,000 it is more than \$30,000. My concern is only one, and one only. To go on record that we recognize the suffering of the rest of the world.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I realize that the goal of this resolution is a very idealistic one and it's one that could inspire many in this Chamber, I am sure, to a good deal of discussion and debate here, but let it suffice for me to say at this time that we in this group subscribe in large measure, if not in complete measure, to the remarks uttered by the Member from Selkirk. Now, while we realize on one hand that the goal here is a very idealistic one, nevertheless it should be of concern to all in this Chamber that the methods we use in trying to bring this into actuality should be the proper one. Now it seems to me that we should not adopt such methods that might have us end up in a sort of a Balkanization of assistance to other areas of the world. Naturally I am just as concerned and wish just as much to help people in the under-developed countries of the Commonwealth as the Honourable Member for Wolseley or the Honourable Member for Inkster, but I believe we can achieve the same end by working in a way that will not end up in Balkanization of education assistance, and furthermore, Mr. Speaker, almost all of us here would subscribe wholeheartedly to the principles and the very idea of the United Nations. It seems to me, therefore, rather strange that we should want when we don't have to, that we should want to circumvent the world institution that we endorse so heartily. So it seems to me that the approach that we could all adopt here would be one which would have the end result which the Honourable the First Minister has in mind, but also one which would adopt such methods that would be in keeping with the constitutionality, bearing in mind the British North America Act and also one that would employ the offices of the United Nations, and so therefore Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that the amendment be further amended by adding thereto the following: And be it further resolved that this House inform the Government of Canada of its willingness to assume their share of the cost of any plan that the Federal Government may devise with the provinces for the provision of greater technical education assistance to these under-developed nations, keeping in mind the desirability of working through the auspices of the United Nations education, scientific and cultural organization.

MR. ROBLIN:.....the actual resolution, have you got it worded right? Have you got a copy of it?

MR. SPEAKER:not just too sure that this one is in order but I would.....

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, although I haven't had the advantage of reading it, Sir, as you have, it seemed to me that when the Honourable Member for Brokenhead read the proposed subamendment that he hadn't availed himself of the opportunity, perhaps, of reading the main motion, because the subamendment proposes exactly what the main motion says with the addition of the words, "United Nations". (Interjection). Well that's what I say to the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, rising to the point of order, there's one substantial difference, the reference to the United Nations notwithstanding, and that is that in my amendment I make reference to the Federal Government and the "provinces", plural, whereas the original resolution refers to Canada, the Federal Government and the "province", and I think therein lies a very, very important point.

MR. SPEAKER: It appears to be very close to the other resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Selkirk. Right at the present time I feel I can't take it under advisement because I know the House wants to move along tonight. I think maybe I would allow the amendment to the amendment, although I don't think it's exactly proper. I believe the advisability is in the other motion, is it not, and this is added on to the end of it; that covers the.....

MR. HILLHOUSE:.....states the principle of the original resolution. All that it adds is "United Nations".

MR. SPEAKER: May I have the resolution again please? May I have the other motion too? Yes, it appears to be almost identical with the original motion. On that basis I would be able to accept it.

Mr. Speaker put the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, did you accept the.....?

MR. SPEAKER: I accepted the motion of the Honourable Member for Selkirk and I rejected the motion of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. (Interjection) The vote now is on the motion of the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

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

MR. HILLHOUSE: The Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the amendment submitted by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, to the motion of the Honourable the First Minister.

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

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

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Carroll, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Groves, Hamilton, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Roblin, Scarth, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Watt, Weir, Witney. Mrs. Forbes and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 20; Nays, 32.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The question before the House: the motion proposed by the Honourable the First Minister.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I think that it's fairly well obvious that the resolution, the private member's, seems to be one in name only, and I wonder why, in view of the fact that there is already an appropriation placed in the estimates by the government, and also in view of the fact that this has been announced in the Throne Speech of last year, I wonder why this could be classed as a private member's resolution. I think that--well, it has been stated here that it was--it certainly--let's make it clear then. I'll say that I'm asking a question then.

Continued on next page.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker.....speak to this resolution especially in view of some of the debate here this evening, and I am sure that the First Minister can explain the resolution clearly to the committee, but my understanding is it could very well be a public bill or a private bill. Maybe I'll speak as the private member from Gimli seeing the others have all spoken in a private capacity up until now. We'll let the Premier close the debate and explain the matter to the committee. However I first of all want to make it abundantly clear that certain possible criticisms such as have arisen here are not really criticisms of principle. I think everyone agrees in the policy of Canada in her role in under-developed countries, to try and help people help themselves, such as the type of program we have purchased under community development. But this is the resolution which I endorse wholeheartedly, and I would go further and say that I'm willing to defend this resolution in front of any pot-bellied stove in the hustings, certainly in my area, and certainly I do this, fully aware, as the honourable members of the House are aware, of the great need to go forward in the province, in the many areas, such as mental health, retarded children, the disabled, blind and so on. Certainly we have a tremendous job here at home and we have been most cognizant of this, and so all of us here in the province certainly feel this way, but as I listen here tonight, I think one has to go back into one's own experience at times to really bring forth the point that I want to bring to the attention of the committee here tonight, and probably sometimes you have to go back to your personal experience, and I see nothing wrong with the Premier's suggestion in this resolution, and everything to commend it.

This is a token project of good will to these areas in the world that need help from the Province of Manitoba. There's nothing to prevent the people of Manitoba on a voluntary basis joining in the spirit of this resolution and adding to the expenditures which this House is considering this evening. I think many of us, at my age, remember going through high school and graduating in the middle of the depression, remember the hundreds of boys and girls in my end of the city who could not go on to University and higher studies, but overnight were in war. Many of them are buried in Hong Kong; two boys from across the street; many of my classmates and playmates; many of them went down in ships worth millions of dollars and expendable in war. Many of them went down in aircraft, and so on, and certainly the prime responsibility is in this area, through United Nations, in co-operation with United Nations, and through this type of work, the responsibility lies primarily there, and certainly the Federal Government for some years has been unanimous in this approach.

My point is that what is wrong with adding on? Surely we all remember our fathers. I remember my father and his friends speaking often and saying how badly they felt that their generation in 25 years had seen two wars, with all their terrors and heartaches. They always felt that their leaders in the political field and other fields should never have let this happen, but maybe it wouldn't have happened if we'd known all the truth. If we had given more where people needed it the most. All of us remember tales of starvation in far off lands when we were younger during the difficult years. We believe in community development; we believe in helping people help themselves. The Premier in this resolution is only suggesting that we give some technical savvy to these people in these areas, that they might maintain the wonderful name of Canada overseas, and maybe the wonderful name of Manitoba. The fact that we care -- as the Premier pointed out in his visit to the Commonwealth Conference in meeting the people from different countries and seeing their questioning eyes, "What can you do to help?" I think that it is important that we join the federal government in specific projects such as is suggested here which are primarily our own in the sense that we feel we are really doing something as world citizens, and I say what is wrong with leadership from home? What is wrong with giving to preserve this peace? As the Premier has said, and as we have repeatedly said in the House; it's a token contribution when we think of the immense problem throughout the world. And as I say, I'm prepared, and I'm sure that this legislature and succeeding legislatures in the years to come, are going to be more and more concerned with the problems in other lands, and I feel for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that despite all jurisdictional discussion and legal phraseology, etcetera, that we should enter into this resolution willingly and wholeheartedly, and I believe in this with everything I know, and I just certainly hope that the House sees fit to support this resolution unanimously.

MR. DESJARDINS: On a point of order, I wonder if I could have an answer to a question,

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) that the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell says it's not a private member's bill, and I understand that the Premier says it is. Just an answer "yes" or "no". It can't be that difficult.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I realize that sometimes at this hour of night whether it's tonight that we hope to conclude this session or otherwise, sometimes nerves get a little frayed. But I want to say that we of our group here had hoped to propose an amendment to the amendment that would have met with the satisfaction of the whole House. Apparently, Sir, you in your wisdom -- and I'm not questioning it; I can't at this time, because I wasn't in the House at the time -- I'm not going to question your decision in this matter. But I want to say this in connection with this resolution. The actual intent of the amendment that we proposed was that in co-operation with all of the other provinces and in co-operation with the Government of Canada, that through the United Nations what the First Minister proposes in his resolution would have been achieved. I want to say Sir, and I want to say this to the Honourable the First Minister, that we agree with the principle that is behind the resolution. We agree that it is up to us in what we so often refer to as the so-called democracies of the western orbit, that it is the responsibility of ours to help out those nations and those people who are far less fortunate than we are ourselves. With that we have no argument or difference. It is merely the question, or would have been the question of the method by which this may have been achieved. We have always believed that in unity there is strength.

The Honourable the First Minister, when he was speaking on the item of \$45,000 in the estimates, indicated to us that the provision was to supply three teachers, if I recall correctly, trained insofar as technical knowledge is concerned to lend assistance in some country within the Commonwealth, to assist the people in that Commonwealth whichever country it may be. How better it might have been, Mr. Speaker, had, with the joint effort of all of the provinces, we joined hand in hand to provide more in the name of Canada and this great democracy that we are so privileged to live in.

There may be questions of constitutionality. I am not a constitutional lawyer and indeed, Sir, I am not a lawyer of any description, but aside from all of those considerations, now that the matter has been resolved with the defeat of the amendment by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, I want to say to the First Minister and to this House that we are going to support this resolution, and we trust and we hope that this may be a start for other jurisdictions, now that we have established the principle -- and I think rather unfortunately -- of doing it piecemeal. I trust that other jurisdictions may add to it and show that we in Canada, while we're not doing it unitedly, are doing it anyway, so I want to assure the Honourable the First Minister of this Assembly that while there may be suspicions in some people's minds, that this may be for the glorification of himself introducing this as a private member's resolution, because after all, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a fact that it has at least not been resolved in this House whether we're dealing with a private member's resolution or a government resolution. The First Minister said a few moments ago that he's going to answer that aspect of the question of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface when he's closing the debate, and I noticed my honourable friend the Attorney-General there making a few notes. Maybe he's going to answer the question. But anyway, again, I say, Mr. Speaker, that while I think, and while we think there may have been a different approach to this, we are going to support the resolution even as it is at this time verbiage in the way it is set out, because we feel we have a responsibility; we feel that the Dominion of Canada has not accepted its full responsibilities as yet. We would have been far happier had this been a united effort of the whole of the Dominion of Canada, but because it is not, because that has not been accepted, it doesn't necessarily follow that we should oppose the resolution at least of partial aid. To use one of the phrases my honourable colleague from Inkster often uses in this House, "Half a loaf of bread is better than nothing at all."

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to burden the House for very long this evening but I do believe that some of the remarks that we have heard from the other side deserve some comment. I think first of all that the greatest thing that is made manifest by this resolution is the fact that this government is prepared to do something. It's not just hollow talk; it's not like the customary type of resolution that we get -- and I'm not saying from what side of the House -- but the ordinary type where we "hope we will do something," or "wouldn't it be

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.)....nice if we did something else," or "we've considered the advisability of doing this, that or the other thing".....

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Minister permit a question? Are you speaking of this as a government resolution or a private member's resolution?

MR. LYON: I'm speaking of this as a resolution where something is proposed to be done by all of this House when they vote for it, as I'm sure they will, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a case where not only just an idea has been formed and talked about, but where we can see the manifestation of this idea come to bear fruit within, we hope, a very short time, and so I can understand why it wouldn't commend itself, this resolution, to the Official Opposition, because they are great people for talking but not for doing. And I can understand of course, why it's a resolution that would meet full support on this side of the House because we are people who believe not only in talking, but in fulfilling what we say we want to do. And I can understand as well why it would be opposed by the members of the Official Opposition because, isn't this typical, isn't this typical of the intellectual inertia; isn't this typical of the atrophy in outlook that has typified every act of the Official Opposition during this session, so what could we come to expect in the dying moments of the session but a prolongation of this same attitude? My only point Mr. Speaker, my only regret, is that their spokesman had to be the Honourable Member for Selkirk, because I don't think that this attitude is really reflected in him as it is so much in those that sit with him, but I do say this, Mr. Speaker, and I'll deal with some of the points because I don't think that the arguments that he raised are of any account at all. I don't know of any prohibition in the British North America Act against self-preservation. I don't know of any prohibition in the British North America Act which says that charity stops at home.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Would the Honourable Minister permit a question?

MR. LYON: At the end.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Has the province any extra-territorial jurisdiction?

MR. LYON: I don't know of anything in the British North America Act, Mr. Speaker, that prevented the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition when he sat on this side of the House and when the flood water was coming up around his ears before he acknowledged the fact, from accepting millions of dollars from every other province in Canada and indeed from many states in the United States and from Europe. There was no question raised then about the constitutional validity of accepting money to help the citizens of Manitoba. Nor, indeed, was there any question nor has there ever been any question raised about the Province of Manitoba spending money for the succour of other people, and I think recently of one instance that came to our attention -- what was it, two or three years ago -- where the Premier stood up in the House one day and announced that because of the disaster in Nova Scotia, a certain amount of money was being voted to aid and assist the people of the province because of that natural disaster. I didn't hear any talk about the British North America Act and the lack of constitutionality then. My honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition when he was Premier, he voted some money, or by Order-in-Council I think when the House wasn't sitting, for the European flood disaster in 1954, quite properly. I don't condemn these actions at all. I say they were the right thing to do for the relief of people in another part of the world -- in the Commonwealth part of it, yes, but in Europe for the European flood disaster; money of the Province of Manitoba went out for that purpose. No question of constitutionality then.

So all I say now Mr. Speaker, what is proposed in this resolution is exactly the same thing. If anything, it is more poignant because the money that would be expended under this resolution would be going to support Manitoba citizens in a country of the Commonwealth. Support these citizens who are taking over there as their only weapon, not a rifle as the Honourable Minister of Health mentioned, not a gunboat or not an aeroplane -- but they're taking the weapons of learning. They're taking books; they're taking their crafts with them, trying to teach these people some of the basic ideas and concepts of handling technical machinery in this day and age, and trying to bring to them some of the qualifications that they so sorely need. Now I can't see what the objection is to that at all. I think perhaps my honourable friends are a bit piqued because this type of attitude, or this idea comes from this side of the House. I think that's the main opposition that there is to it, that Manitoba should have a First Minister who can go to a British Parliamentary Conference and there by meeting with people that he did at that Conference

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd).....come back with an idea to this province which I'm sure is going to capture the imagination of our people when they see it in operation. My honourable friend mentions again, constitutionality. I ask him, what about the money that was spent on that conference itself? Is that money spent for Manitoba? Of course not. It's spent to help this province in concert with the Federal Government, in concert with the other provinces and states within the Commonwealth, come to a better understanding one with the other. So I would suggest that as a lawyer -- and I say to him quite honestly that his main objection should not be on legal grounds, I would suggest that in any case on legal grounds his argument would fail and fall.

Now I will only add one or two more words, Mr. Speaker. I would only say this, and it's perhaps in reiteration of what was said by the Honourable Minister of Health. It doesn't matter to us in Manitoba if we have the best schools, we have the best roads, we have the best social assistance plan that any province can have; we have developing agriculture and so on. How does all of this benefit us if we are on the other hand losing the battle for men's minds within our own Commonwealth? If we can't do something as a province, in co-operation with the Federal Government -- and that's what this scheme is, in co-operation with the Federal Government -- if we can't do that, then I suggest it would be a sorry day for Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, in taking my seat, I merely hope that all members of the House will cast aside any parochial thoughts on this subject; will see the idea that is ingrained in this resolution, and will vote for it, for the betterment not only of those Commonwealth countries, but indeed, Sir, for the betterment of all members of this House and the people of Manitoba.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Question before the House a motion by the Honourable the First Minister.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Attorney-General seemed to at this late hour in the evening get himself lashed up into quite a fury and for some reason or other he decided to attack the Official Opposition. I can't remember the terms that he applied to them, but he certainly seemed to be displeased with them about their actions during this session. He seemed to say that the great redeeming virtue of the government that he supports is that they do something -- they really do something. They make up their minds to do something and they have initiative and they do it. Well, what did they do about this matter last year? We had it before us, I think the whole session last year and nothing was done about it. Absolutely nothing. It died on the order paper; it was never proceeded with. This year it has stayed right until the very end of the session and right to the very last item of business. So for a government that prides itself on doing things so quickly, so efficiently, I don't think this is the most conspicuous example that my honourable friend could have picked out if he wants to talk about the Official Opposition not being so anxious to do things. At least we try to do things that are practical and sensible, and all this talk about the idealism in this particular resolution -- and I recognize that there certainly is an opportunity here to be idealistic, and I don't decry idealism the least little bit -- but idealism can sometimes be combined with impracticality and I think this is an outstanding example of doing exactly that.

I'm not particularly interested, Mr. Speaker, in whether this is a government resolution or a private member's resolution. I don't think it makes very much difference. But there's no question in my mind which it is. Wasn't it introduced with a message? Didn't it appear in the estimates? There's no question of what it is -- a government resolution. But that's not of any great point as far as I can see in the discussion, whether it's a government resolution or a private resolution, I don't agree with the Province of Manitoba engaging in this kind of business which belongs to the nation. The idea, of course, is good; the ideal is good, of course it is, nobody can quarrel with that. What my honourable friend from Inkster and all the rest have said with regard to the necessity of helping the other countries, we all agree with that I'm sure. What the Honourable Member for Selkirk has said that we support the Colombo Plan -- of course we do. I don't think there's a person in this House who doesn't. But the question is, who, what government, what agency should do this kind of thing? And if a government is going to do it then my submission is that government should be the national government, and we don't

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.)...want, and we shouldn't have, the vulcanization of this kind of effort as the Honourable Member for Brokenhead mentioned. This is the job of the Federal Government, and if it isn't the job of the Federal Government then it's for some other agency that wants to head up a campaign and ask for donations on it. I'm not particularly interested, although I hold exactly the same views as the Honourable Member for Selkirk, but I'm not arguing the constitutional end of it only, because we could do it I suppose if we wanted to. But what I certainly am arguing is the duplication and the proliferation of government services.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that any government in Manitoba, or in the nation, needs to be watching as greatly as anything else, is, number one: the growth of their various government services -- and goodness knows they grow fast enough, whether they be federal or provincial, they grow fast enough and they cost plenty of money. The expenditures on this kind of thing can undoubtedly be justified; I agree with the arguments in that regard. But I do say that they should be handled by the national government and it is wrong, and it is inefficient, and it is costly; it's extravagant, and it is wasteful to have the different governments working at the same job. That's one of the worst things in governments these days is when we get the duplications between governments. This is a job that belongs to the Federal Government, not the Provincial Government. When my honourable friend the Minister of Health and Public Welfare said, "what's wrong with this?" I'll tell you what's wrong with it. This is not the job of the Government of Manitoba. This is the job of the Federal Government or else of some private agencies. We're not against the principle of help being extended to the people in these emerging countries -- of course we agree with the general principle -- but it's not the job in my opinion, of the Government of Manitoba to extend that aid. They should make representations if they wish to, to the Federal Government as to what should be done, and of course we should pay our proportion of the cost. We agree with that. But we should not be duplicating their efforts; and we should not be trampling in on their preserves. They're better able to do this; they're the ones that should do it.

MR. SCARTH: Would the Honourable Leader permit a question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MR. SCARTH: Does the Honourable Leader consider that this project, which will cost five cents for each man, woman and child in Manitoba, is too big an undertaking for our province?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, the principle is exactly the same whether it costs five cents per person, or whether it costs five million dollars per person. It's the principle that counts here. We shouldn't be duplicating the effort of another government. You can't do the job as well that way, and you certainly can't do it as efficiently, and you can't do it as economically. This is the responsibility of the Federal Government. Surely it's bad enough to be duplicating federal efforts any time in spheres of our own country, but when you get into the international sphere, then for goodness sake that's a sphere that belongs to the Federal Government, not to us. What would happen if all the provinces went ahead and started doing this same kind of thing?

MR. O. F. BJORNSON (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I would like to have something to say about this question because it just happens that I spent some of my life in the country which this effort is being directed to, I hope. I sit here and I wonder in all our plenty, where in our agriculture we have surpluses of every kind, most of our difficulties are how to get rid of these surplus stocks, and it takes me back to the time when I landed for the first time in this country of India.

We landed in 1942 when there was a province-wide shortage of rice and a famine that was over the entire Province of Bengal, where we were greeted by starving people begging for food, children, old men, young men, all alike. India, that particular part of India, couldn't raise enough rice to feed its people, and they thronged in from the hundreds of villages all through the State of Bengal to seek food in the bigger centres. The only reason that they had a soup kitchen in the big City of Calcutta it was said that it was easier to collect the bodies of the dead when they were in one place. My introduction to the first building that I had to visit in Calcutta was to step over the body of a dead man that laid there all day and would not be taken off to be cremated until that evening. All through when we travelled on the train through that state we heard the cry of "Canna, canna" "food, food", with women carrying babies at their

(Mr. Bjornson, cont'd)....breast. If you don't think they were dying in Calcutta, all you had to do was to take a copy of the Statesman. The box score was kept there day after day, and the figures were astounding. There were 800, 900, 1,000 per day dying in that city alone, so you can imagine what it was through the whole state of Bengal. Now this very worthwhile effort, whenever you're discussing what can be done for these underdeveloped countries, the very first thing that anyone that doesn't know anything about the country is to say they should have some education.

Now I can tell you of some of the horrors of these underprivileged countries, shall we call them, because along with all the poverty they also have all the wealth. I can take you to places where the lepers lay in the street and they rot away in their filthy disease, not one or two but 10, 15 and 20 at a time; where they round them up in a spring campaign and take them back to a lepers' area, but they drift back into town; where men walk around with a big foot that looks like an elephant's foot from a disease that he's contracted possibly in the rice fields. When you go out to see the plight of the farmer, it makes you wonder how in the world these people ever can stand this terrific strain. In their little paddy fields they have the most primitive of implements, a wooden bar with a bullock pulling it, mucking around in the soil where they have to plant the rice by hand and where they have to get the water by a man running up and down a pole and putting the water into the paddy fields to raise a meager living. They also have their men that are dedicated in government, who want to grow more food to help these people to help themselves; and I can say that this technical assistance would be of the greatest importance to the mass. You can imagine these people that have been trying to raise crops under the most primitive conditions that you could imagine, and then suddenly be faced with the problem of industrialization and buying tractors and other equipment to plow a land that looks like the hard road, and yet they have the courage to buy these by the hundreds and start a program to grow more rice for the country. We all think of India as Gandhi, Nehru, the big cities of Calcutta and Madras, but this is not at all India. It's made up of hundreds of thousands of people that never get more than probably 20 or 30 miles away from their own village. This is the true India. These are kind people and they're living under existence that you couldn't imagine.

So I would say, with all sincerity knowing the people that are going to receive our aid, that we should have a unanimous vote on this to help lift these people in some degree out of their desperation. When we hear someone say "Well it's such a small bit and Manitoba shouldn't be doing it". It's only a week ago that I travelled to Edmonton and I attended the Canada Conference of our church, and in their program -- and mark this, this was one synod only, one little portion of our particular church -- and yet out of their small budget it would make this contribution look pretty sick, that came just from our synod of the western provinces. I'm not belittling the amount that this government is putting forward, I think it's a wonderful effort; but when we say let someone else do it, the larger body of our church in America is certainly engaged in that and has been very very successful in their distribution of foodstuff to all these underprivileged countries. They have funnelled into Hong Kong, where the problem is so terrible that no one can imagine it, where people are fleeing by the hundreds of thousands in there, they have sent millions of pounds of pork and millions of pounds of other foodstuffs that are surplus here. But just imagine this, we give of our surplus. Isn't it better that we should give a little bit of our surplus and let it come from the heart? I sincerely endorse this; I can't speak strong enough for it. I haven't prepared any speech, but I certainly cannot see when I think of these people of India, whom I learned to love very dearly in somewhat extensive travels through the country, that this is a worthwhile effort. When we say let someone bigger do it, I say that all the aid that has come to India in the past has come from the missionaries and the churches in their dribbles and drabbits, here and there, and has been certainly worthwhile. I think that's all I care to say on it, but I certainly support this with everything that I have in my being.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate indeed that the session of 1961 should finish under such an atmosphere. It is unfortunate because it certainly wasn't the intention of myself or any of my colleagues, I'm sure, to have it ended like this. We were satisfied to let one of us talk for us, to tell the House how we felt and why we felt on this matter. It is unfortunate because it seems that practically through the whole session one honourable member has

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd). seen fit to try to turn everything that has been said by the Official Opposition, to try to turn it to mean something else; to try to sell us that he is the only one with any judgment, with any sense, with any charity in his heart. It is very hard to take. Now, Sir, I am not blessed with the easy flowing language as the Attorney-General but, nevertheless, I don't have to stand here and take what we have been taking through this session and especially tonight. Tonight some of us could have said that this, or might have said that this was brought in by a man that maybe had his eyes on Ottawa. We could have said that. Some people are thinking that, but we didn't say that, that maybe he wants to step a little further and use human miseries for a stepping stone. We could have said that, but we didn't think that that was right. This is too important.

Now one of our members has said for us that we definitely recognize that we have a responsibility; that it is universally recognized that certain nations, certain people are less fortunate than others; and compared to many that Canada is a millionaire. Certainly it must be accepted that all precepts of charity, of Christianity, of democracy, point to the fact that we have an obligation to the people, to the people that are not as fortunate as us. In fact, it is the very foundation of liberalism that we should see that everybody that was created equal, everybody that was created in freedom, must live in freedom. We realize that to be a free man no man should suffer economic privations to the extent that he is no longer a free man. Sir, we realize all that. We would have been satisfied to speak on the principle. It was said that we accepted this principle. Why then, Sir, drag all the miseries of human nature and try to have the Big Bad Liberals as opposing help to humanity, as opposing help to our brothers? Sir, I don't think that this is fair at all.

It was very plain the discussions were going very nicely before the Attorney-General stood up to smear what was said before, to turn into ridicule and to try to embarrass people. Why? To try to play politics on this. If this was so important, Sir, if this was so important, why wasn't it brought in last session when it was in the Throne Speech? Why did we wait until the last minute? Why was I refused a chance to read what was said and to try to reply on this tomorrow? Why? Because there's a party waiting for the members and we're talking about sufferings in this world? Yes, let's talk about suffering. Let's read, and I wish I had Hansard here because I would read the speech made by the Honourable Member from St. John's when he talked about, maybe not lepers but rats in the homes; when he talked about babies, the mother having to stay awake all night to protect her babies right here, right here in Canada. No, Sir, we not only have the duty, but every Canadian has the right to help the citizens of this world -- every Canadian, not only Manitobans -- we must do it as Canadians. We have done it and if we're not giving enough let's give more, but let's not try to play politics around here and drag human miseries in front of every people to further our cause. This is cowardice, that's what it is, and I certainly as a member will not stand for that. We were satisfied to talk about certain principles but not accuse certain people of having no heart, of not recognizing our obligation and our duties. Now if it is the time to talk about this, they are certainly not a free people that are interested in this that want to give as much as they can. Why should it be done as an obligation? You lose all merits when you're forced to do certain things. If it's just a certain amount, and if it's a show that we want, that we have our heart in the right place, well, let's not take those merits away from us.

As far as education -- we are talking about education now. All right. We pay taxes to the Federal Government, that money to provide money in the funds for the grants to education for the different provinces. We also pay taxes to the province to provide those grants to education for all children of Manitoba. We also pay direct taxes to the municipalities, direct school taxes to provide education for the children of Manitoba. Then some people, who might have a summer home that they might use one month or two months a year, they still pay added municipal taxes to provide education to their children -- to all children of Manitoba. Now a Royal Commission has said something about education, about some people in education, and those people have to pay again for the education of their children and to pay again to help the children of their own beliefs, that share their beliefs, because they can afford. So that's about five or six times, and now we're going to put another tax on education. No, Sir. If they are going to say that we are against, we are in the way, this is being done. Yes. But let's tell the people of Manitoba that if this is an issue, let's not pretend like the Attorney-

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd).....General did tonight that we are a bunch of heartless people, that the Liberals of Manitoba do not share the belief that everybody should live as free men. No, Sir, if this is politics, well it is dirty politics.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, since listening to this debate going on, I thought I should at least give my opinions on it. I think any program of this sort should be a continuing program, that just to set it up for one year wouldn't suffice. We should carry on with such a program and, therefore, that is my reason why I think it's not up to this province to do it. I think it's a Federal matter. They have the ready set up agencies to carry on these programs so I think we should leave it up to the Federal Government. I'm sure that if our municipalities started on a work like this, we in this House would be concerned, and that is just another level of government, and here we are trying to set up a thing like this. I feel that while I am all for giving on a federal basis, I know that our people back home are in support of such a program whereby under-developed countries do and should receive assistance. We have, through our many missions, a number of people out in these other countries providing educational assistance to these countries, and maybe we could support the programs through those channels rather than start up new channels which will have to be continued and on a continuing basis. Therefore, I submit that we should ask the Federal Government to carry on such a program and that we support it individually from various provinces in Canada.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I will close the debate on this subject. It is rather sad, I think, that we should have found it necessary to have any difference of opinion on this matter because I would have thought that it might have commended itself to all on its merits. I agree, though, with the impression that has been left with me by some who have spoken, that it's not going to be politically very popular to support this resolution. I've heard some members intimate that it was done for some ulterior motive, not evident in the wording of the Bill. Even my personal ambition, I think, was referred to as perhaps being the cause of this matter that is before us; and some suggestion was made that we were trying to make this into a political issue that was described as "dirty politics". I think that after the member who said all those things has a good night's sleep, he perhaps won't be inclined to reiterate them tomorrow.

MR. DESJARDINS: When I said dirty politics, I am referring to the Attorney-General's speech and nothing else. I made that clear.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, I think that the inference left with me -- well he has his back to me so I don't know whether he is listening or not -- but that really is of no consequence because I am supposed to be addressing myself to the House, not to any particular member, and I suppose that's the proper way to go at it. But it is regrettable that imputations of that sort have been made, because I think it quite unnecessary for me to assure the House that they are not true. I won't dignify the comment by a reference of that sort, but I will thank the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet for telling us something of his experience, because in my view, Mr. Speaker, nobody who has had the privilege, and I use that word advisedly, nobody that has had the privilege of seeing for himself the kind of thing that the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet was talking about and which I have shared to some extent; nobody who has met the men and women whom we are trying to help could, in my view, fail to see some merit in the proposition that is placed before us. We are told it's vulcanization, it's duplication, it's inefficient, it's wasteful, it's extravagance, and I say that is all nonsense -- all nonsense.

What is proposed, Sir, is that we should co-operate with the Federal Government. We're not asking the House to start out on some new venture that is a provincial scheme, that we're going to master-mind from here. Members know that. They were told that. This is a scheme in co-operation with the Federal Government. They are running the plan. They are providing the central direction. They are seeing to it that there is no waste, vulcanization, inefficiency, extravagance, and other expressions that were used by one of the gentlemen who spoke on this debate. What we are doing is we are providing them the teachers -- just three. I rather thought that I would be -- well I almost said ridiculed, and perhaps you could ridicule me for proposing such a really small operation, rather than blamed for it. We're not duplicating; we're not vulcanizing; we are co-operating. The Federal Government is in charge of this operation. We are supplying and paying the wages of three teachers, which I expect will be Manitoba citizens.

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd)...

The constitutional question to my mind is irrelevant. The Honourable Member for Selkirk -- I must say that it was with regret that I heard his speech tonight. If he feels it is unconstitutional, he knows what he can do about it. As far as the government are concerned, we believe it to be constitutional and we will act on that assumption. I must also take the responsibility of saying that it is a government measure insofar as money was provided in the estimates on our recommendation for it. As to the status of the resolution, it's a matter of opinion as to how you want to classify it. I don't really care. All that was intended was to provide members with an opportunity to debate the thing as we're doing at the present time. If one wants to call it a government measure, well and good; a private measure, well and good. Anyway, we will take the responsibility for it and, as I say, I realize it may not be just the most popular thing to do in some circles.

We are accused, Sir, of profiteering on human misery. I think that's a fair paraphrase. Cowardice was used -- I don't know who said that -- a foolish remark whoever said it. There is nothing very cowardly about this; nothing very brave about it either. It is simply a matter of doing what I think your heart and your brain combined tell you to do. What is the good of saying: "Let's not move until all the other provinces will do something." What's the good of saying: "Let's not move because there is somebody else that should be doing something too." All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men should do nothing. I suppose we can hardly qualify as good men, all of us in this Chamber. I certainly wouldn't put myself in that category, but I think that principle holds. All that is required for the triumph of evil is for somebody who should do something to do nothing. I think this step is merited; but I think the real merit is in this, that it perhaps somehow will enable our people, our friends, our neighbours, to realize their position in the world; to show their concern with the state of the world; to take or to feel they are taking a direct and active part in trying to do something about it. If it leads to voluntary effort such as was suggested by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, I for one shall be very happy. But I think that it is the kind of a gesture that means something to the people to whom it is extended, and which means something to the people who make the gesture. I think it is within our sphere of responsibility that we should consider this resolution favourably. Other people helped us when we were in trouble; we have helped other people in trouble. The world is in trouble. We in this province being responsible for education as we are, I think are right to co-operate with the Government of Canada who is operating this plan in sending teachers out into the world where they are needed; and I think that the House can, with a good conscience, vote for this resolution.

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

MR. PREFONTAINE: Yeas and Nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the motion proposed by the Honourable the First Minister.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Batzley, Bjornson, Carroll, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Froese, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Hawryluk, Hutton, Ingebrigtson, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Reid, Roblin, Scarth, Schreyer, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson, Wagner, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright. Mrs. Forbes, Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Dow, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Prefontaine, Roberts, Shoemaker, Tanchak.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 41; Nays, 9.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, there is a matter I would like to refer to which is not on the Order Paper, if I may have permission to do so. We passed a resolution yesterday, I think, respecting the establishment of a committee of this House to look into the livestock marketing system and, as a consequence of that, it's desirable that the House should consider a resolution now setting up this Committee. Now I have the resolution in my hand, slightly different from the copy that's been distributed. I note that this is a resolution normally submitted by way of a message from His Honour and Committee of the Whole. I think that I can say that His Honour is in favour of this resolution, but I wonder if there is any objection to skipping

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd)....the Committee of the Whole stage under the circumstances and just dealing with the resolution as a resolution. If there's any objection to that we'll do it in the full way. No objection? Well I will move as follows -- there's a slight amendment here so please listen to the change -- "Seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, WHEREAS Members of this House have by resolution urged the government to give consideration to the advisability of establishing a Committee of the House to enquire into all phases of the livestock marketing system in the Province of Manitoba; AND WHEREAS it is expedient that in the public interest to enquire into all phases of the livestock marketing system in Manitoba; THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that a Select Committee of this House be appointed to study and enquire into all phases of the livestock marketing situation in Manitoba, and that such Committee have authority to send for persons, papers and things, and be authorized to engage the services of counsel, secretaries, technical advisors, accountants, clerks, stenographers, and investigators to aid and assist the said Committee in the enquiry, and to print the evidence, proceedings and documents received by the Committee, and to sit during the recess of this Legislature after prorogation" -- which is an addition -- "and to report to the 1962 Session of the Legislature, and further, that such Committee be composed of the following members: Messrs. Shewman, Weir, Johnson (Assinibola), Roberts and Wagner; AND FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED that the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Funds to members of the said Committee the amount of such expenses incurred by the members, in attending the sittings of the said Committee during the recess, as may be deemed necessary by the Comptroller-General.

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

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, maybe we could record the fact that even at this time in the morning that there is one thing we were unanimous on.

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

MR. CLERK:

- (No. 4) - An Act to amend The Water Supply Districts Act.
- (No. 5) - An Act to amend The Fruit and Vegetable Sales Act.
- (No. 9) - An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act (1).
- (No.20) - An Act to amend The Margarine Act.
- (No.22) -An Act to validate By-Law No. 5-61 of the Town of Morden and an Agreement between the Town of Morden and Canadian Cannery Ltd.
- (No.23) - An Act to amend The Watershed Conservation Districts Act.
- (No.27) - An Act to amend The Insurance Act.
- (No.41) - An Act to incorporate Breezy Bend Country Club.
- (No.42) - An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956, and to validate By-Law No. 18547.
- (No.43) - An Act respecting the Practice of Speech and Hearing Therapy.
- (No.44) - An Act to amend an Act to incorporate Hudson Bay Mining Employees' Health Association.
- (No.45) - An Act to incorporate The Trafalgar Savings and Loan Association.
- (No.46) - An Act to amend The Credit Unions Act.
- (No.47) - An Act to provide a Charter for The City of West Kildonan.
- (No.49) - An Act to provide a Charter for The City of Transcona.
- (No.50) - An Act to amend The Fires Prevention Act.
- (No.52) - An Act to amend The Noxious Weeds Act.
- (No.53) - An Act to amend The St. Boniface Charter, 1953.
- (No.54) - An Act to validate By-Law No. 109 of the Village of Bowsman.
- (No.56) - An Act to validate By-Law No. 1659 of the Rural Municipality of Springfield.
- (No. 57)- An Act to regulate and control Funds provided for the Prearrangement of Funeral Services.
- (No.58) - An Act to incorporate Great North Savings and Loan Association.

- (No.59) - An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act.
- (No.60) - An Act to amend The St. James Charter.
- (No.61) - An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act (1).
- (No.63) - An Act respecting The City of Portage la Prairie.
- (No.66) - An Act to validate the 1961 Assessment Roll of The City of Brandon and to amend The Brandon Charter.
- (No.69) - An Act to amend The Municipal Board Act.
- (No.71) - An Act respecting The Municipal Enquiry Commission in Manitoba.
- (No.72) - An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act.
- (No.73) - An Act to amend The Expropriation Act.
- (No.74) - An Act to amend Certain Provisions of the Statute Law (1).
- (No.75) - An Act to amend Certain Provisions of the Statute Law (2).
- (No.76) - An Act to amend The Municipal Act.
- (No.78) - An Act to amend The Pharmaceutical Act.
- (No.79) - An Act respecting The Winnipeg General Hospital.
- (No.80) - An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act.
- (No.81) - An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act (2).
- (No.82) - An Act to amend The Department of Labour Act.
- (No.83) - An Act to amend The Election Act.
- (No.84) - An Act to amend The Education Department Act.
- (No.85) - An Act to amend The Health Services Act.
- (No.86) - An Act to amend The Agricultural Societies Act.
- (No.87) - An Act respecting The Farmers' Co-op Seed Cleaning Plant Limited.
- (No.88) - An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (2).
- (No. 89) - An Act to amend The Crop Insurance Test Areas Act.
- (No. 90) - An Act to amend The Law Society Act.
- (No. 91) - An Act to amend The St. Boniface Charter (2).
- (No. 92) - An Act to amend the Public Utilities Board Act (1).
- (No. 93) - An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (1).
- (No. 94) - An Act for the Relief of the Estate of Charlie Young, Deceased.
- (No. 95) - An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act (2).
- (No. 96) - An Act to amend The Municipal Boundaries Act and to facilitate the Establishment of a Nuclear Research Area.
- (No. 98) - An Act to amend The Gasoline Tax Act.
- (No. 99) - An Act to amend The Motive Fuel Users Tax Act.
- (No.100) - An Act to amend The Hospital Debentures Guarantee Act, 1960.
- (No.102) - An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956.
- (No.103) - An Act to amend The Public Utilities Board Act (2).
- (No.104) - An Act to amend The Brandon Charter (2).
- (No.105) - An Act to amend An Act respecting the Town of Souris.
- (No.106) - An Act respecting the Certification of Qualifications of Tradesmen.
- (No.107) - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act (2).
- (No.108) - An Act to amend The Dairy Act.
- (No.109) - An Act to amend The Local Government Districts Act.
- (No.110) - An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture and Conservation Act.
- (No.111) - An Act to amend The Game and Fisheries Act.
- (No.112) - An Act to amend The Teachers' Retirement Allowances Act.
- (No.113) - An Act to amend The Town Planning Act.

MR. SPEAKER: We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and Government, and beg for Your Honour the acceptance of these Bills:

No. 36 - An Act for granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year ending the 31st day of March, 1962.

No. 62 - An Act to authorize the Expenditure of Moneys for various Capital Purposes and to authorize the Borrowing of the same (1).

No. 67 - An Act to authorize the Expenditure of Moneys for various Capital purposes and to authorize the Borrowing of the same, and to amend The Loan Act No. 2, 1960. (2).

MR. CLERK: The Honourable the Administrator doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to these bills in Her Majesty's name.

CHIEF JUSTICE C.C. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Legislative Assembly: The work of the third session of the 26th Legislature has now been completed. I wish to commend the Members for their faithful attention to their duties including many hours devoted to consideration of Bills and estimates both in the House and in Committees. I convey to you my appreciation of your concern for the public interest and for the general welfare of our Province. I thank you for providing the necessary sums of money for carrying on the public business. It will be the intention of my Ministers to ensure that these sums will be expended with both efficiency and economy by all departments of the Government. In relieving you now of your present duties and declaring the third Session of the 26th Legislature prorogued, I give you my best wishes and pray that under the guidance of Divine Providence, our province may continue to provide the things which are necessary for the health, the happiness and the well-being of all our people.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Legislative Assembly: It is the will and pleasure of the Honourable the Administrator that this Legislative Assembly be prorogued until it shall please His Honour to summon the same for the dispatch of business, and the Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.