

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Thursday, May 6th, 1965.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 21 Grade 11 students from Morris Collegiate under the direction of their teacher Mr. Dyck. This collegiate is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Morris. And in the Speaker's Gallery we have as our guest this evening the Honourable Madam Claire Kirkland Casgrain, the Minister of Transport and Communications of the Province of Quebec.

Orders of the Day.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 44 approved on the motion of the Honourable the Member for Logan on April 6, 1965.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to lay on the table of the House Return to an Order of the House No. 41 dated March 31, 1965 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Carillon.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Before the Orders of the Day, je me demande Madame la Présidente si ce ne serait pas une occasion pour demander à notre distingué visiteur Madam Casgrain si elle ne voudrait pas descendre avec nous ici dans la galerie pour nos visiteurs privilégiés qui sont membres d'une autre assemblée au Canada. Je crois que la Chambre en général sera d'accord pour inviter Madame Casgrain à nous joindre.

Translation: Before the Orders of the Day, I wonder, Madam Speaker, if this wouldn't be an opportunity to ask our distinguished visitor Madam Casgrain if she wouldn't come down on the floor of the House and sit in the gallery reserved for privileged visitors who are members of another Assembly in Canada. I believe that the House will generally agree to invite Madam Casgrain to join us.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. During the debate on Shared Services the Minister indicated that he had notified interested persons who had appeared before the Committee on Shared Services that the question would be referred or considered at the meeting of the Law Amendments Committee tomorrow morning. This evening I was asked by the School District of Transcona No. 39 regarding copies of the bill, and at that particular time they were not aware of the fact that this question would be considered tomorrow morning. I want to ask my honourable friend when the notices were sent out and to whom they were sent out and was a notification sent to School Board 39 of the City of Transcona.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, as soon as the bill was tabled in the House the Deputy Minister at my request contacted the two trustee organizations, made copies of the bills available to them, notified them that the debate was proceeding in the House and it would be coming up to Law Amendments shortly. Individual boards, all of them that appeared before us, I don't believe we did contact them all, anyone that has shown interest and phoned in and so on the Deputy Minister has tried to keep informed. It's quite possible that certain people who made presentations to us before Law Amendments have not been notified directly. Our commitment really in this regard in all public school legislation has been to send copies to the organizations, official organizations such as the Trustee Associations, the Teachers Society and so on, and interested citizens, just as soon as the material is available to the House.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, may I presume then that notifications were not sent to those organizations that appeared before the Committee on Shared Services?

MR. JOHNSON: I haven't got the precise details. I spoke to the department after the debate in the House. I would have to double check on just who were notified and when.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I wonder if even at this late date it might be possible

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).....for the Minister or members of his department to contact by telephone this evening those organizations which presented briefs to the committee in order that they might be aware of the hearings of the Law Amendments Committee tomorrow morning at 10:30.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if the Minister of Labour has had a chance to check on the matters of The Workmen's Compensation Board and exemptions of corporations.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Tomorrow morning.

MR. PAULLEY: Tomorrow - fine.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Selkirk that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. The number of boards, commissions, committees, agencies established by the Government of the Province of Manitoba since 1958. 2. The name of each of these bodies. 3. The date on which they were established. 4. Which ones are still functioning and which have been dissolved. 5. The names and addresses of all members presently serving on each of the boards, commissions, committees and agencies. 6. When the members were appointed and term of appointment. 7. The individual annual salaries, allowances and expenses of all these members. 8. The total annual cost of these boards, commissions, committees and agencies.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, I think that it would be advisable to proceed with the second reading of public bills. The adjourned debate on Bill 112 I will call later this evening when the honourable member who has the adjournment is able to be here. So we could start now with second reading of Bill 130.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson) presented Bill No. 130, an Act to Abolish the Wards in The Rural Municipality of North Kildonan and to increase the number of Members of the Council of the Municipality.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I would like to say that as far as this problem is concerned I have no axe to grind and no bones to pick. It seems to me that this is a very simple bill. The Rural Municipality of North Kildonan was established in 1925. At that time the wards were almost equal as far as population was concerned, and in my opinion it was a true representation by population. As the years went by this situation changed. Some of the wards instead of growing kept getting smaller as far as population is concerned, but two in particular, the population in two in particular did increase in population. Therefore, as it stands now it seems to me that it no longer is representation according to population. It could be argued that if the ward system be abolished that then the people, the citizens of the smaller wards probably would not get the proper representation. It seems to me that this would not apply, because at the present time the reeve or the mayor of this ward has been elected at large and he does not come from an area which is densely populated. In fact he comes from a very very small ward. Therefore I do not think that that argument would be valid. This is nothing new. We know that in the past we've had similar bills here. In Transcona the ward system has been abolished. Transcona has become a city, not so many years back. West Kildonan - the same applies to West Kildonan. St. James abolished some years ago its ward system, and I presume that in the future we may be asked to do the same with other wards. I've called several people, after people interested in this bill approached me, I've called several people from these towns or these municipalities that had the ward system abolished and most of them told me that they would never wish to return to the old ward system.

To me it seems that in its present state there could be retardation of progress, because at present the Municipality of North Kildonan has a representation or is represented by five councillors and a reeve. Two of these councillors come from smaller areas and sometimes it so happens that certain people are a little parochial - and I do not know whether it applies to this municipality - and it is quite possible that it would retard progress. I cannot see what function - maybe just in case of veto - what function the reeve plays in this ward because no matter what happens he hasn't got a vote if all the councillors attend the meeting, because there are five of them and therefore no matter what happens any decision comes out and dried. At the present time there is one vacancy and I understand that there will be an election for one of

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd).....the councillors pretty soon.

I have some correspondence in connection with this. I understand that application has been made to the Department of Municipal Affairs, but for one reason or another the Minister did not see fit to take action at the time - for reasons of which I do not know at the present time - but in my opinion, I think that it would be advisable to pass first and second reading so that this bill would go to Law Amendments Committee and that this - I understand that there will be briefs, presentations for and against. I, myself, am interested to get to the root of this problem and I would ask the honourable members to pass the second reading of this bill so that we could hear what the people concerned would have to face so we could resolve it. That's my only interest in this.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, I think that perhaps I owe it to the House to give them some of the background of this matter. It arose, or first came to my knowledge on the 8th day of March of this year when I received a letter from the Council of the Municipality of North Kildonan requesting the abolition of the ward system in that municipality under Section 22 of The Municipal Act. Under this section a municipality may make application to the Minister of Municipal Affairs at any time before July of the current year, I believe the 15th of July, and the ward system in that municipality may be abolished by order of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. However, the letter which enclosed the resolution raised some doubts in my mind as to the advisability of proceeding on this matter hastily. I would like to read this letter to the House if I may. "The Council of North Kildonan passed a resolution at the last regular council meeting held on March 2, 1965 requesting the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to abolish the wards in the Rural Municipality of North Kildonan. I wish to mention that this was not a unanimous decision of Council. Councillors Charles Barry and Gordon Crozier voiced their objection to this resolution and had it recorded in the Minutes. Section 22, subsection 1 of The Municipal Act states that such a resolution, which I'm enclosing herewith, shall be in the hands of the Lieutenant-Governor before the 15th of July in any year. I trust that this request will receive your serious and careful consideration and that I will be advised of your decision." Attached to this was the resolution asking for the dissolution or the abolition of the division into wards. And below the resolution was the following note: "Councillors Charles A. Barry and Gordon W. Crozier voted "nay" and asked that their objection be recorded in these Minutes. Mayor Stanley Copp had to break the tie-vote and cast his vote in favour of this resolution and declared the resolution carried."

Because the nature of this thing raised some question in my mind I wrote back to the municipality to the secretary-treasurer, and asked him some questions, as follows: "I will acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 5th. I note that there are five councillors in the Rural Municipality of North Kildonan and the Mayor. It would appear that only four of the councillors voted on this resolution. In effect the resolution passed on the vote of the Mayor which would appear to be somewhat unusual in the circumstances. This is obviously a controversial matter and I would be unwilling to place it before Cabinet for a decision without information as to why the fifth councillor did not vote. If he was not present at the council meeting I would suggest that the matter be reintroduced when he is present in order to make sure that we have an expression of opinion from all of those concerned. Please do not understand from this that I oppose the resolution, but before presenting the matter to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council I should have evidence that a substantial number of people in the municipality favour the abolition of wards."

Since that time, Madam Speaker, the Mayor and each one of the councillors of that municipality have approached me individually and each one has told me their story - and I must confess that they do not agree - as obviously there is some controversy in this municipality. There have been some rather serious allegations as to the conduct of affairs of this municipality as well, and I don't really want to go into this matter here because all that I have would be hearsay.

I am informed that a petition has been circulated in this municipality and I have told the people who were presenting the petition that this is quite proper because Section 22 of The Municipal Act also requires the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to consider the matter of abolition of wards if there should be a petition signed by 25 percent of the resident ratepayers. This afternoon, I had placed on my desk a petition signed by a large number of people. I have not counted the numbers of people and I do not have any way of knowing at this time as to whether or not the people who signed this petition are resident ratepayers. I told some of the persons who were circulating the petition that they should take the petition to the secretary-treasurer

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd), to have him advise this House now that the matter is before the House as to whether or not the signators on this on this petition are ratepayers as required by the Act, and if so whether or not the 25 percent has been achieved in this petition. So far we haven't had any answers to any of these questions.

The sponsor of the bill is quite right. The fifth councillor had left the municipality at the time this matter was brought forward. The first two councillors who approached me after I received this resolution suggested that he had gone temporarily, that he was looking for work and that there was a possibility that if he didn't find it immediately he would be back. Since that time I am informed that he has found work in the Province of British Columbia and will not be back. He has therefore resigned and a by-election has been called which I believe will be held next week. It's a rather interesting situation. I would not like the House to think that I have any objection to the abolition of wards, because in those municipalities where we have already abolished the ward system, the system seems to work fairly well. I think also, in all fairness to the Municipality of North Kildonan, we must make it perfectly clear that there is a very much over-balanced population in Ward 1. The population in Ward 1 of this municipality is something in the neighborhood of 7,600 people and that ward has at the present time two councillors. In Ward 2, there are 2,083 people resident; in Ward 3 there are 249; and in Ward 4 there are 537. I think it's obvious to all of us that there is no representation by population in this municipality and that some change is desirable. Whether that change should be a reorganization of the ward system or the abolition of the ward system, I have no real idea at this time.

I do not oppose the second reading of this bill. I think that we should hear the parties before committee now that the matter has gone this far. I have also told the parties that if they had chosen to give me the information I requested in my letter to them of March 10th, that the matter could have been proceeded with before the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and if they didn't achieve the result they desired they could then have brought a bill before the House and had a decision of the Legislature. However, now that they have chosen this method of approach, I think they will have to be satisfied with the result of whatever committee decides after hearing the representations when they appear tomorrow.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, I'd just like to say that according to the information I have - what the Honourable Minister for Municipal Affairs has just told us, according to my information which I have, is substantially or almost completely correct and I support him in what he has said. The only reason that I rise is to try to make one thing clear and that is these allegations of strange conduct in municipal affairs in that municipality -- there are allegations about what the council is or is not doing, but the problem is one of deadlock between members of the council and I would point out that I certainly have never heard any allegations to the effect that there was some grave mismanagement. All of the members even though they are disagreeing are acting with restraint etc.; there is no vindictiveness or bitterness, etc., and while there is deadlock there is nothing to be alarmed about so far as mismanagement is concerned, etc.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. JAMES T. MILLS (Kildonan): Madam Speaker, as this area happens to be - part of it - in my constituency and the north part in Mr. Schreyer's, I feel I would just like to add a few words. It will come out tomorrow probably, why I did not present this bill this evening, but under the circumstances as outlined by the Minister of Municipal Affairs I, too, wanted more evidence, and I, too, think that the ward system should be abolished out there. But again, we did not have the evidence at the time this matter was brought up, and I, too, advised the Mayor of North Kildonan that it could be done by Orders-in-Council, but there seemed to be a rush and they wanted it done in a hurry and we had to do it this way. I'll wait until tomorrow and see what happens in Law Amendments.

One more thing, Madam Speaker, I was going to hold this up until tomorrow to ask one of the councillors. This bill was brought in by the Mayor of North Kildonan on his own say-so. I understand there was no resolution put before council - no councillor knew of this bill, or passed it at their council to be brought before us.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Madam Speaker, there seems to be a conflict of opinion as to -- I thought it was said that there was a 2-2 vote and the Mayor throwing the deciding vote. You say there was no vote taken? Is that what the Honourable Member for Kildonan said?

MR. MILLS: No, this was the first resolution that the Minister of Municipal Affairs got.

(MR. MILLS cont'd). This was later, when we held it back from going into the committee, Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and we have to bring a bill in. I agreed to bring it in to caucus, not before the House. I understand - they misconstrued this on my part. However, as you just mentioned, Mr. Barkman, that there is two resolutions should have been on this - resolution first go to Mr. Smellie and the second one asking to bring a bill in. The second resolution was not forthcoming to the council.

MR. BARKMAN: Madam Speaker, I think that since a town in my constituency went through part of the same problem a year ago - although we were fortunate in having a unanimous decision in our council to have this change made - I have some sympathy with this municipality what they may be going through. I appreciate what the Honourable Minister said that - and I feel the same, that we ought to let this go to second reading and possibly we may find out more facts.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I haven't got very much more to say. I posed the same question to the Mayor - I have a copy of the letter that the Honourable Minister just said, and I posed the same question, did you pursue it any further, did you have another vote, and he said it was no sense holding another meeting because this fifth councillor abdicated, that's the word he used, so there was no sense. Then I asked him whether - other explanations were given, he said as the Minister had admitted, he said that they were given by individual councillors, the remaining four, in person. As far as the resolution, I don't know what the law requires - the second resolution by the council asking the reeve to have this rectified in the form of a bill, I haven't seen the resolution. I thank the Honourable Minister for permitting this to proceed to second reading and hope that it could be resolved in the best interests of all tomorrow.

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

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital) presented Bill No. 128, an Act to provide a Charter for The City of St. Vital, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GROVES: Madam Speaker, there are two principles involved in this bill. Number one provides for the fixing of the rental values for purposes of business tax assessments. This does not interfere with the present responsibilities which Metro have in connection with assessments. The basic assessment for business purposes in the Metro area are pretty well uniform in the various municipalities and mention of assessment in this bill merely is asking for a further degree of uniformity with the City of Winnipeg and the other municipal areas in Metro. The bill deals mostly with rates of assessment. Winnipeg has rather a complicated formula for determining the rate of business tax assessment. In this bill the various business enterprises in the City of St. Vital are divided into four basic categories and each one of those four categories has its own flat rate of business assessment.

The second principle in the bill, Madam Speaker, provides for incapacitated persons who may wish to vote at a city election. This portion of the bill is exactly the same as was given to the City of St. James in 1961 - their Charter was amended in 1961 to give them this power to allow incapacitated voters to vote by mail. I went to the Municipal Office in St. James to find out just exactly how this had worked out. I find that they have had no problems with it. It is advertised in their proclamation at the time of calling an election and they have special envelopes, one large one in which the incapacitated voter mails his ballot to the returning officer and a smaller envelope in which the voter after having received his ballot from the returning officer by mail, seals it in this envelope, has it witnessed, and the envelope is then mailed to the returning officer and put in a special ballot box for all of these ballots and they are opened after the polls on election day. Last year only five persons took advantage of this provision in St. James and the feeling of the officials in St. James was that although very few took advantage of the privilege that no harm was done in having this provision in the bill and they are intending in the future to more widely advertise the fact that this is available.

At the end of this bill there is schedule in which it lists all of the types of businesses - practically all of the types of businesses in the world I guess, and the categories in which they would be divided for business tax purposes. I'm sure that members of the Legislature would be glad to know that the following types of businesses, if they ever did in the past, certainly in the future will not be allowed to avoid business tax in the future. Bottle washer; chicken killer; embroiderer; furnace polisher, whatever that is; horseshoer, livery stable horseshoer; livery stable; soap stamper; a boarding car contractor; whatever that is; an opera house and a music hall.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question.

MR. BARKMAN: be no name under the denturist section. Is that left out in St. Vital?

MR. GROVES: mechanic in here too.

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

MR. PAULLEY presented Bill No. 129 an Act to provide a Charter for The City of Transcona for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. PAULLEY: It's all right. I'm surprised too, Madam Speaker.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon) presented Bill No. 93, an Act to validate By-law No. 3739 of The City of Brandon for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, will there be an explanation from the member on this?

MR. LISSAMAN: Well, Madam Speaker, I have no doubt there will be a thorough examination given in committee, but very briefly - if members choose to read Schedule A, the almost very complete explanation is given - but basically and very very briefly, it provides a method of levying on the frontage on rectangular lots and providing an equitable mode of assessment for corner and triangular lots, and further provides in (2) of the schedule that the City of Brandon shall pass a by-law pursuant to provisions of Section 710 of The Municipal Act to provide an equitable mode of assessing for local improvements, corner lots, triangular, and other irregularly shaped pieces of land, which said by-law shall be subject to all the provisions relating to appeals and therefrom as provided in The Municipal Act - and so on, Madam Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the vote is taken on this, my reason for asking for an explanation is that I have received some correspondence regarding this particular bill - at least I presume that this is the bill that I have the correspondence about - and I would imagine that the Honourable Member for Brandon has had some as well and probably the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I don't intend to oppose the second reading of the bill, I'm prepared to support it going to committee, but I would hope that those people in Brandon who have objections to this bill will have been advised so that they will be in a position to be at the committee hearing. This is one of the reasons that I was anxious to have us proceed with bills so that people who have objections - because I understand from those who have been in touch with me that this particular bill is going to change the method of assessment for local improvements and some say that it will change their assessments by as much as 200 percent and that the City of Brandon does not have the right to do this unless the by-law is made retroactive.

Now in order to be fair to both parties in this I think that the committee should be absolutely certain that tomorrow morning those people in Brandon who object to this have an opportunity to express their opinions to the committee because I am sure the members have no means of judging the situation unless they do get their story. So I would hope that the Member for Brandon can give us the assurance that there has been a contact made to the people there who have objections and that they may be here tomorrow morning.

MR. LISSAMAN: Madam Speaker, in answer.

A MEMBER: The Honourable Member is closing the debate?

MR. LISSAMAN: No, just answering a question.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, when the City of Brandon first presented their bill I did receive some correspondence I believe from the same gentleman that was corresponding with the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. At the same time I believe the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party received some correspondence from this gentleman and he had the courtesy to come to the department with this correspondence to make sure that we had had notice of it and to find out whether or not this gentleman had a reasonable complaint. We had the department examine into the proposed bill and the by-law that accompanied it, at great detail, and we came to the conclusion that his complaint was fully justified and that the bill that was originally proposed by the City of Brandon, although not intentionally, did in fact do an injustice to all of those owners of irregularly shaped lots which were going to be assessed frontage on a rather unusual basis.

We therefore called upon the City of Brandon to make some examination of this and we found that they had used a method by which assessors calculate area and value of lots and they try to use the same method for calculating frontage for irregularly shaped lots and it simply

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd)..... didn't apply to this sort of calculation. The Department, some of the officers of the department, has spent some time in Brandon with the law officers of the City of Brandon and with the City Council. The whole procedure has been revised and a new by-law has been drafted for the City of Brandon and this bill now contains a new by-law which has been passed since the original bill was first presented for introduction to this House.

We have been in touch also with the person who complained to the honourable leader opposite and myself, and this gentleman, I believe, is satisfied that the procedure that will be followed from now on in the City of Brandon is correct and fair. He has no objection to the procedure outlined here. He still has some objection to this by-law, however, because it does go back and validate those taxes that have been levied and collected under previous by-laws of the City of Brandon from 1952 up until the present time. Now I don't really know how you could sort out this jigsaw puzzle, if you were to go back and try and make adjustments of each piece of irregularly shaped property in the City of Brandon covered under some dozen or 15 by-laws and for which frontage those taxes have been charged and paid and about which no one raised any objection.

MR. PAULLEY: Were there any appeals?

MR. SMELLIE: There were never any appeals. No. And so this bill will now validate all of those levies which have been made in the past and including 1965, as I understand their rates have all been set for this year. This bill will, however, and the by-law, cure the matter from 1966 on and I think that the House should give the matter second reading now and hear any parties who may wish to be heard tomorrow, but I think that it would be an impossible situation to try to go back to rectify the matter as the one objector would like us to do. I think it would open a real Pandora's box.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the participation in this debate of the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and he is perfectly correct when he says that one of the individuals concerned in the City of Brandon has been in correspondence with me. As a matter of fact, I did take leave to forward to the Department of Municipal Affairs, the correspondence that I had received in order that the matter may be clarified as far as I am concerned. I'm happy to know that the department has taken the matter under consideration; that they have had consultation with the authorities at Brandon and as a net result we have this bill before us. There is, however, Madam Speaker, one problem that rises in my mind. It appears to me from correspondence that I have had with the gentleman who has written me, that this particular bill will rectify the situation insofar as the future is concerned, namely from 1966 onward. However, in the bill itself, as the Minister has just stated, it sort of validates, to a degree at least, what has happened before, and I can appreciate the statement of the Minister that by virtue of the fact this particular by-law - by-laws referred to in the bill, have been in effect since 1952, it may be rather difficult to trace down individuals concerned and I think as the Minister says, may be a hodgepodge of owners and those who made payments in respect of the irregular assessments as far as properties are concerned.

I don't want an answer tonight, necessarily, Madam Speaker, either from the sponsor of the bill or from the Minister of Municipal Affairs, if I were in order to ask him, but I would like to know - and I'm content to leave this until tomorrow - the answer to the question that I'm now posing - I would like to know, however, what rights has a person who has been charged under the previous by-laws which will be rectified for the next year, to obtain redress from any overcharges in the past. As I understand it, the purpose of this bill is to rectify or to validate past happenings in regard to the assessment in local improvement charges on irregular properties. It may be that individuals have, in effect, paid over and above what will be their assessment for the year 1966 and onward, and the question I pose is, have the individuals concerned any redress by appeal to the Municipal Board; or, have they any redress by taking civil action against the City of Brandon for this purpose? Now, as I say, Madam Speaker, I'm not asking for an answer to my question by the sponsor of the bill this evening, or indeed from the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I'm perfectly content, being a very jovial sort of a type of individual to allow the bill to go to second reading, but I would like if at all possible, tomorrow morning to know whether or not there is any recourse for any possible overpayment under the former by-laws.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Brandon.

MR. LISSAMAN: Madam Speaker, in reply to the question asked by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I would say that immediately the bill was printed, I mailed the individual that we're discussing a copy of the bill - and of course I had no means of knowing when it

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd)..... would be in Law Amendments and I intend to phone the gentleman tonight. I am well acquainted with him. I might say that I received a letter from him stating that he was very pleased the attention that has been given his problem and raised his opinion of the way democracy works, although he didn't feel that he was in complete agreement. Knowing that the Honourable Leader of the NDP party had correspondence also from this gentleman, we discussed this the other night, and I had made up my mind to ask the very same question as the leader of the NDP had asked in committee because I would like to feel that while this proposed by-law does make things equitable and reasonable from now on, that no stone should be left unturned to provide for the rights of individuals concerned. I think we will all want the answer to that one, Madam Speaker.

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

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside) presented Bill No. 140, an Act to amend The Revenue Act (1964) for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, there are two main principles in this bill. The intention of the first principle is to make provision for the taxpayer who is in arrears to benefit from the refund legislation as well as the taxpayer who is up-to-date in his taxes. Now it may be that the statement that the Honourable the First Minister made some time ago is intended to go this far - if so, I'm very pleased that that has happened - but I was not certain whether that was the intention or not. It is the intention of this bill to place the taxpayer who is in arrears in the same position as the taxpayer who is paid up to receive the benefit of this refund.

And the second principle - and one that is not covered yet, I am certain - is to provide for the refund to be made by the municipality direct to the taxpayer by deducting it from his tax bill at the time the payment is made, with the municipality being reimbursed by the Minister. Now, Madam Speaker, I am certain that the principle needs no argument here because it's well understood. The Legislative Counsel has been kind enough to, in his explanatory note, to put down section 54 as it reads at present, and then to put the section as it would read, if these amendments were made, and I think that is very helpful in a short bill such as this. It's quite easy to do. So the matter is before the House and I think it's one that will commend itself as being expeditious and economical and direct.

Considerable has already been said in the House on this matter already and I don't intend to go over the various arguments that have been used up to date. Rather I want to read some notes of what has happened to an actual taxpayer of the City of Winnipeg within the last few days - and I'm reading now from a statement that has been given to me by a taxpayer of the City of Winnipeg who has already paid his taxes and has gone through the process that the present Act requires. I think that this will be a good way of showing the members of the House exactly what we're trying to get at in this Legislation. The following points should be noted: First, the forms that must be used by the City of Winnipeg cost approximately \$1,000 more than before the rebate plan was put into effect. Second, the forms at that time were stuffed in the envelope by machine - this is still done in the same way. This gentleman goes on to say: "I received my tax bill at 10:00 Monday morning, May 3rd. I went to the City Hall and paid my tax bill at about 11:00 in the morning of the same day. Before the rebate plan when payment in full was made at the tax office, the stub of the bill was folded back under the bill by the cashier, the machine certified both bill and stub in a single operation. On Monday morning the bill was taken to a member of staff for certification of the stub, by hand, before payment was made to the cashier. The bill was put into the machine and certified as heretofore, but because of the rebate claim form on the back of the tax bill, the stub was certified separately. When the bill was certified by the cashier and my cheque put in the drawer, the cashier took the rebate claim form which had been detached from the bill by me and placed it on a small table beside his machine. He stamped it paid and then initialled the form which had previously been signed by me. I then mailed the rebate claim form to the Provincial Treasurer on Monday evening, May 3rd, using an extra envelope and four cent postage stamp." (This gentleman is not related to me). "On Wednesday morning at 10:00 a.m. I received an acknowledgement of the claim in a form letter from the Deputy Provincial Treasurer. This form letter had the name of the taxpayer, the address and the date typed in the lower left corner. The acknowledgement was in a department number 10 envelope, sealed and carrying four cent meter postage. Now what was the increase in work involved. The printing of special tax bills at a cost to the City of about \$1,000; the certification of the stub of the tax bill by a separate person; the signing of the rebate claim form by the taxpayer; the stamping of the rebate claim form and initialling it; the mailing of the

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd). . . . rebate claim form to the Provincial Treasurer, involving the use of an envelope and a four cent stamp; the acknowledging of the receipt of the rebate form by the Deputy Provincial Treasurer involving the use of a high quality department envelope; a form letter from the Deputy Provincial Treasurer, the typing of the name, address of the taxpayer and the date on the form letter; sealing of the envelope and running it through a meter at a cost of four cents postage. This is the stage that has been reached with my tax bill but the department must yet check it, make up a cheque for the rebate, put it into an envelope - probably with another form letter, run it through a meter to fix another four cents in postage. If the government had permitted the City to deduct the amount of rebate due from my tax bill, I would have had credit for it at once; the chance of a duplicate payment would have been entirely eliminated and there would be practically no additional cost. There would have been extra work by the city in billing the government each month for the rebate granted but that would not have been very much work. In the case of my tax bill there would be little chance of duplicate payment, but where properties are mortgaged and a copy of the tax bill is sent to the mortgage company as well as to the taxpayer, there will have to be very careful checking. If the rebate was handled by the city direct there would be practically no chance of duplicate payment. Finally, the city would have been delighted to give the government credit on the tax bill for the rebate. When I receive the rebate cheque I will make a final report. "

Madam Speaker, I think that points up in a practical way just what the difference is that we have been talking about and I would recommend that this system that is suggested here is much more direct, much more economical and much better in every way. My honourable friend who gives me this information says that he is certain that the city would have been quite willing to put a notation on the form that the rebate, the refund, was courtesy of the Provincial Government if they wanted that done. I understand that that's what is done in some parts at least of the Province of Ontario. That could have been done if the government had decided to do it that way. I maintain that would be the most logical way and I recommend the legislation to the House.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, I would just like to make a couple of comments on the remarks of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. First of all I think the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer made it quite clear that if a taxpayer is in arrears with his 1965 taxes, that policy has been changed since the tax statement forms were printed and that even if the taxpayer is in arrears when he does pay his 1965 taxes, the school tax rebate will be paid on the amount of school taxes paid to the maximum of \$50 on each parcel shown on the roll.

My honourable friend also suggested that - in the letter that he read. . . . I think perhaps he might table the letter for the information of the department.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I did not record it was a letter.

MR. SMELLIE: My honourable friend was reading from a written document that he received from some taxpayer in Winnipeg. I can only presume it is a letter. I think if he's going to read from it he should be prepared to file it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Would my honourable friend like to have it tabled?

MR. SMELLIE: Yes, please.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'd be glad to table it.

MR. SMELLIE: Thank you. The suggestion was made that there is some possibility of a duplicate payment. I'm not an expert on computers, Madam Speaker, but the information that's given to me is that the system that has been evolved for the handling of school tax rebates will allow for no duplicate payments, that once the computer issues a cheque for school tax rebate for one particular parcel of land no further school tax rebate cheque will be issued by the machine for that particular parcel of land, no matter how many application forms may be received - and there may be many - because where there are multiple owners of property - let's take a case where there are five owners of an interest in one parcel of land - a tax notice will go out to each of those five persons, but when the taxes are paid, the first application which comes in for school tax rebate, the machine will issue one cheque to all of the five owners listed on the tax roll as the owners of that property and that will be the only cheque that will be issued for that property. The sponsor of this bill knows we have already received a substantial number of applications for school tax rebate. This bill purports to be retroactive, that it would go back to the 1st day of January 1965. The Honourable Member for Lakeside is one of those people who has always objected to things being retroactive and certainly this would throw the whole machinery of school tax rebates into a horrible muddle. The school tax rebates are now being processed and I am informed that the first cheques will go out on Monday or Tuesday

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd)..... of next week. It would be absolutely impossible to go back now and change the system so that the school tax rebate was made to the municipalities and the municipalities made an automatic deduction. The whole system, the tax forms were designed for payment of the tax rebate by the Provincial Treasurer to the individual. It might have been possible to adopt some different form, but no different form was adopted and the machinery is now in operation.

Madam, I think that it would be impossible for us at this stage of proceedings to consider adoption of this bill and I must therefore oppose the second reading of this bill because of the horrible involvement that would result if the bill were to pass at this time.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Madam, the Honourable Minister referred to an instance where there might be five owners, he said, or five people whose names were mentioned on a tax bill. Now how would that situation arise? Because the tax bill is issued to the assessed owner on the assessment rolls of the municipality. Is the government going to search the title to each particular piece of property to find out who has an interest in that besides the assessed owner; because if the property is mortgaged, the mere fact that it is mortgaged wouldn't show the name of the mortgagee on the assessment roll; or if there was any liens or other encumbrances, they wouldn't be shown on the assessment roll. So where would the five payee situation arise?

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, if I may, we may have five heirs of an estate each owning an undivided one-fifth interest in a parcel of land. All five of the owners of that property would be shown on the tax roll for that particular parcel. A tax notice will go to each one of the five owners, but when the school tax rebate cheque issues there will be only one cheque with all five names on it.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Yes, but there wouldn't be five notices, there wouldn't be five statements go out from a municipality because there's five owners. They just send it to one address.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Madam Speaker, the Honourable Minister described the "horrible involvement" which this bill would bring into the department involved and also spoke of the "horrible muddle" -- and these are his words, and I accept them, because we are now in a horrible involvement and a horrible muddle and I have no doubt but that if this bill was passed now at this time in its present form the horrible muddle would be much worse than it is now. I have no doubt that it would be impossible to adjust the situation retroactively as the Honourable Minister said and I would like to urge him to consider this fact, that if he waits until next year and has this same bill before him he will have another horrible muddle and it'll be impossible again to make a change.

I would be quite happy to go along with the Honourable Minister and suggest that this bill go to second reading and when it gets there an amendment be brought in changing that date at the end of the bill from January 1st, 1965 to January 1st, 1966, because the problem that he indicates is a real problem, but if notice is given to the department involved, tomorrow or the next day, that on January 1st, 1966 there shall be a change, at least next year there wouldn't be a horrible muddle and a horrible problem. I want to urge the Minister to reflect about the problems that he has had up to now and realize the problems he will have this current year with this question of a rebate - and I will not repeat what the Honourable Member for Lakeside said because he spoke very clearly and he presented the problem in such a way that I don't see that there can be any argument about that feature to it. But I want to point out a few other factors. One is the point that was made about mortgage companies making the tax payment, and today is May 6th and the Honourable Minister has indicated that applications have come in and cheques will be going out soon. In these five days I have already received a fair number of calls saying why is it I received only one copy of a tax bill and on it is an indication that in order to get my rebate I must send in both copies and get one back which I send to the government when I only have one copy. I wonder if I make myself clear, Madam Speaker. The tax bill, and we received a sample copy of it, Madam Speaker, and it is a document with one, two, three copies with carbons in between. Now imagine the problem posed to a person who receives just the top sheet - that's all he receives, one sheet - and on it is printed in red "Use second copy for school tax rebate". Now I'm not giving you an imaginary problem because I've received phone calls saying "What do I do now? I haven't got the second copy with which to apply for the rebate". And not being very quick and not being very bright it took me a little while to realize that this was a situation where that one copy, being a carbon copy, was not really the tax bill but was rather a bit of information, and that the real tax bill must have gone to the mortgage company. Frankly, I don't know under what authority the tax bill went to the mortgage company

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd).....because that tax bill had with it an official claim for rebate which I understood could only be made by the owner of the property, and yet by some direction - and I'm assuming only that by some request from a mortgage company it was decided that this bill will be sent to the mortgage company rather than the owner.

Well I think I was able to explain to the people who called me just what must have occurred and put their minds at rest, saying to them, "Well, you wait awhile and each mortgage company in its own wisdom and in its own time pays the taxes on the property with which it is involved. A mortgage company may decide to pay it this week; another being much more astute may say, "Well, we'll wait until the beginning of June", is it or the -- made the end of June, "and take full advantage of the value of money, so that we'll keep it until the last moment, pay it at the end of June"; and other mortgage companies may decide that they will wait until next July, August, September, so this taxpayer, this man who has his name on the assessment roll won't know just when that \$50 rebate is coming. I suspect he won't be sure that it's coming to him because in fact the mortgage company will be making the payment. But I think that if he had listened to the Honourable Minister and read Hansard he would be pretty sure that the rebate will be coming to him, to the owner -- but how many in this House read Hansard, much less people outside the House. As a matter of fact, listening to people in this House, they never read their own speeches, so that I doubt how many would have read the honourable minister's. However, I did because I'm interested in this problem, and I'm pretty sure he said that the cheque will come payable to the person that's registered as owner. The Honourable Minister and I have been carrying on a long term dialogue on this entire problem and now I have learned that unless people act in a proper way, filing the necessary documents before the end of this month and keep their fingers crossed, then there is no way to change that assessment roll, and the rebate will go to the person whose name is now currently on the assessment roll. So now I'd like to move on to another problem, Madam Speaker, with that introduction.

What happens with that careful person who orders his affairs in a neat and practical way and figures out that his taxes amount to \$15 a month, and decides that out of his monthly income he's going to pay his taxes so that he doesn't fall behind, and every month he'll walk into the tax office and pay \$15 per month. Out of the taxes which he will be paying for the year which I think will come to \$180, if my arithmetic is right, he will be entitled to one-half of the school tax portion, which might well be \$50; but having paid his taxes in the first month, his \$15 on account, he will have used up this document as far as I can tell and it will show that he has not paid all his taxes; it will show that he's only paid part of his taxes. And then as I understand it it's going to be pretty difficult to get a duplicate of this sheet, this official claim for rebate, and in order to collect his \$50, if he pays it monthly, he's going to have to have I assume 12 of them. So I suppose he'll worry out his problem somehow, and no doubt the Minister will send a few letters out to those people making inquiries, with metered mail, as the Honourable Member for Lakeside said. Well that's one problem. I don't understand how it's going to be handled, but somebody I presume will worry it out. They'll muddle it out in this horrible way in order to arrive at a solution.

Now, Madam Speaker, I want to make this House aware of a problem that I as a practising lawyer am meeting up with day in day out, and that is sales of houses, sales of property that are taking place, and unfortunately for the peace of mind of the lawyer they don't all change hands on January 1st, so any deal you have now has to be adjusted, taxes have to be apportioned, calculated, pro-rated, and somebody has to get credit. Until May 1st, we did not know what the taxes for this year were, so we would have to say well, if the taxes are, will be, what they were last year - and we know they won't be - then the adjustment would be x dollars and 26 cents. But there is going to be a rebate in here. Now that rebate will be one-half of the school portion of the tax up to a maximum of \$50; and if the property is low enough in value so that there's a chance that it'll be less than a \$50.00 rebate, then we're really up in the air because then we don't know what adjustment we can make at all. So we say to the lawyer on the other side, well now, either you or I will have to hang on to some money somewhere and keep it in our trust account and wait until we know the exact solution and then we'll figure it out exactly to the cent; we'll exchange the necessary funds. But then the question is now, who's going to get that rebate, that \$50.00 rebate.

Madam Speaker, I'm an authority on this because I've been in this House listening to explanation after explanation and I think I understand it. But there are many lawyers who haven't had time to find out what the situation is and they now have to rely on my say so and I say to them, well now, the cheque will come, payable to the person who is presently registered as the

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd).....owner and it'll come to him at a time after the taxes are paid. Now the vendor gives a credit for the portion of taxes - say the adjustments were made first, the vendor will give credit for one-third of the annual taxes and will be told, well some day you're going to get a \$50.00 bill or a cheque for \$50.00. Now we don't know if it's going to be this year; we don't know if it's going to be next year, because we don't know when the buyer is going to pay the taxes; but when he does pay the taxes and makes the claim for the rebate, providing you, the vendor, give to him your tax bill - because only you are the person who will have that official claim for him, so make sure that you see to it that he gets it - then eventually he'll pay the taxes and make the claim and the cheque will come, payable to you, and you will have to cash it and make the exchange.

I'm acting in a matter which I dealt with this morning and I was informed that the vendor had moved to Edmonton and I informed the solicitor for the vendor that that cheque will eventually be payable by the vendor and the solicitor said, "Well now, I don't know just where they're moving but I know they're going to Edmonton." Now I'm faced with this problem. I want to make sure they're going to Edmonton because if they're going to Calgary, I may lose them when they get to Calgary. I've now got a vested interest in that person -- I as a lawyer trying to protect my client, have a vested interest in the travelling, in the peregrinations of the vendor, and the trouble is I don't know how long my vested interest and responsibility will last because I don't know when the buyer is going to pay the taxes. It may be this year, it may be next year, but whenever - it may be the year after - but whenever it is, that vendor, that purchaser (now I'm getting confused, and you can well see why) that person is going to come back to me and say where is my share of that \$50.00 rebate, and then I'm going to have to phone this lawyer and hope that he knows where that original vendor is, who I believe now has moved to Edmonton.

Madam Speaker, the funny thing is I didn't make this up. This is an actual case and it's an actual problem, so the solution is, at least the solution I've come up with, is that I've asked the lawyer on the other side to make sure that he retains from the vendor a sum in excess of \$50.00 in his trust account, to guarantee that when this adjustment has to be made the money, will be available; and he now has to persuade his client to trust him with something in excess of \$50.00 because he needs that money in order to make sure that he will eventually get it back from his own client -- and lawyers who have to convince their own client to leave money lying around because the lawyer doesn't trust his client, doesn't keep his client very often. So that's another problem that the Honourable Minister has left with lawyers.

All of this, Madam Speaker, is just an added burden that we poor, unfortunate lawyers carry and what can we do but carry them as long as governments insist on carrying out this muddling way of accounting or taking credit for their taxes - and actually I still remember the fact that there's some \$5 million of those taxes that I'm looking for. If this suggestion carried out in this bill were enacted, and if it were made sensible, which means to take effect at the beginning of next year, then, Madam Speaker, there's no problem; really, there is no problem. It's not as if suddenly you're going to find a tenant getting a tax rebate, because we wouldn't want that to happen, that's clear - when I say that I better make sure that I say the government wouldn't want that to happen - and the government needn't fear that the co-op housing will by any chance get more than one \$50.00 rebate. The government will be able to see to it that only those persons that the government has already indicated should get the rebate, will get the rebate. And who is that person? That is the person who is the owner of the property registered as such. And that way by seeing to it that there is a rebate made when the taxes are paid and that the rebate is made in effect to the person paying the taxes - which is really the logical thing - then the municipality will send in an account to the government, the government will issue one cheque a month I suppose. Or, if I may say so, and according to the way the government is paying the school boards and the welfare departments for the money it owes, it may be one cheque a year, but at least it will be one cheque to the municipality to pay for it; and in that way it will help the government with a much simpler method of dealing with a problem and certainly help all the individuals who are involved in this \$50 problem.

So I would like to urge on the Minister that in spite of all the barbs I have thrown in his direction and the sarcasm I have used, that he reflect for a moment and consider the advisability of letting this bill go in to committee, pass second reading, consider the feasibility of bringing in an amendment, changing this date to make it effective January 1st, 1966 and then putting it through and then he will have ample time to deal with it properly. Because, Madam Speaker, if my interpretation is correct, and if the government sees the sense of what is being suggested

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd). on this side after this session ends, then we'll be gone another year - because I don't suppose they would call a special session in 1965 to take care of this problem in itself - but if they don't then they are going to have a year's delay in getting the problem remedied, and I really urge him that it won't be any loss of face at this stage I am sure, because there is no principle involved in this Bill at all. If the Honourable Member for Lakeside is under the impression that there is a principle at stake, then I would disagree with him. I think he's just suggesting a practical approach to a problem and I'm suggesting to the Honourable Minister there is no loss of face in this; let it go into second reading and when it goes into second reading, he'll have overnight to consider whether or not it is feasible to carry this through as it is, and then we could at least take care of this muddle which I see taking place this year, would at least not be repeated next year.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, I would like to make a very small contribution to the Bill that is before us and I would concur in what the last speaker has just said, that it is a practical approach to a problem, and the honourable mover of the bill and myself, as many people know - and I said I think last evening in the House - we are two people in this legislature that are 'true conservatives' when it comes to saving money. We are just trying to be helpful. We are trying to overcome a problem; we are trying to save the people of the province a little bit of money by introducing a bill of this kind.

The thing that I can't understand, Madam Speaker, the thing that I can't understand is why didn't my honourable friends opposite pay a little more attention and a little more heed to the advice that was given to them by the Union of Municipalities? I think at their last convention that was held in Winnipeg on November 24th to 26th inclusive, last, they passed a unanimous motion that the rebate be handled in exactly the same way as the Honourable Member for Lakeside is now proposing that it should be handled, and I have before me a Free Press of 18th of December last and I'm going to read part of it as you might expect.

A MEMBER: Read it all.

MR. SHOEMAKER: It starts off, the heading is "Wants Roblin to drop the Rebate". "A last ditch attempt will be made to persuade the Provincial Government to drop it's plan for school tax rebate to the individual taxpayers when the Union of Municipality delegates meets next week with Premier Duff Roblin and his cabinet". The whole article points up that the municipal men were unanimous in that this is the way it should be done. I travel over this province quite a little bit - I'll admit that I don't travel around as much as most of the cabinet ministers do - but I get around quite a little bit and I talk to quite a lot of municipal men in the province, and to them, they feel that it was a slap in the face and an insult to handle it the way that it is presently being handled. You can talk to any one of them, the very fact that it was unanimous by the municipal men they now consider that it is an insult. Why didn't the government pay some attention to what the local governments were saying in this regard?

I believe that the R. M. of Westbourne circulated a resolution in - I know they did in the area in which I live and probably it went to all rural councils in the province - asking them to back their motion. The motion was to do exactly what my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside is now requesting. On December 21st last, three days after this article appeared in the Free Press, a lengthy - well not a lengthy letter, well a fairly lengthy letter - and 7 or 8 pages of questions and answers went to every secretary-treasurer I suppose of every town, village and municipality in the Province of Manitoba signed by my honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs - 25 questions and the same number of answers relative to the school tax rebate. The letter simply states that most of the questions that are printed and enclosed were asked at the Union of Manitoba Municipal Convention and he thought it would be best for them to have the answers in written form for them.

Now question No. 22 in this group reads: "Would it not be possible to have the secretary-treasurer of a municipality deduct the allowable rebate on school levies when taxes are paid before December 31st of the year of demand so a taxpayer would not have to pay this money out. Raising this money which a person will eventually get back could in some cases prove a hardship and may prevent some people from paying their taxes up in full." That's the question that was asked. And the answer is that while it might have been possible to have handled the school tax rebate through a deduction at the source of imposition of the tax, the policy of the government in respect to the school tax rebate is set forth in the legislation relative thereto and prescribes the manner in which the school tax rebate is to be paid. There is no - what they are saying in effect is, well we have decided to do this and that's that, bang, bang and good-bye. They don't even say we are giving any consideration to your request at all. This is what we decided to do; go to blazes. That's what they are saying here.

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd).....

Now as I say it is an insult to the municipal men, and I'm going to tell you, Madam Speaker, what I think will happen as a result. I think that the municipal men, by and large, will not be nearly so inclined to conserve their resources, if this is the attitude that the government is going to take, as they would have, had the government said to the municipal men, well listen, it's municipal money, we will allow you the rebate; you do as you see fit with it; after all you are the local government. Now I maintain that it would have been a saving not only in the way it was handled, it is going to cost more the way they are doing it now. I say that the municipal men by and large would be more inclined to say, "well thank heavens, now we can save money on the one hand, we will conserve our expenditures on the other. And so, Madam Speaker, I think that - and listening to what my honourable friend the Member from St. John has to say - I think that we would be prepared to go along with his recommendations and have the Bill become operative on the first of January next year.

Now I have not consulted with my leader on this, but I think it sounds like a pretty good suggestion and I certainly hope that the House will see to it that it does go to committee and let the municipal men once again register their request and complaints on this one.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I was not really intending to speak on this Bill until something just interjected into the debate by the Honourable Member for Gladstone - Neepawa and something said earlier by the Honourable the Member for St. John's.

The Honourable Member for Gladstone-Neepawa said words to this effect that this was municipal money, which of course, indicates he has not yet - whether by design or otherwise - understood the purpose of the rebate to begin with, that is that it is designed to give a direct measure of relief to the school taxpayer. It isn't a measure of relief for municipal governments, it's a measure of relief for the school taxpayer.

Now having decided that of course, one has to - government policy requires that a decision be made as to how that was to be done. I would hope that - the Honourable the Member for Lakeside and the Honourable the Member for Gladstone-Neepawa would know of course that the possibility of following the system which is set out in this bill was open to us, as indeed I suppose there were other methods open, but it was decided as a matter of policy to follow the method which is being followed. One may put forth what arguments one wishes for any particular system that you would wish to advance, but to endeavour to surround this with a complicated series of arguments about how it's done and all that sort of nonsense, is to miss the main point.

But the one point that I did want to cover was that I really think the Honourable Member for St. John's has not been quite, well let us say this, that he has certainly given us the worst side of a problem which he believes he has, because I'm confident that he has closed out enough transactions involving the sale and purchase of real estate and prepared enough statements of adjustment to know that this poses no problem whatsoever for him whether he be acting for the vendor or purchaser, and indeed poses no more problems for him than if the system which is called for by the Bill were followed; because if the system called for by the Bill presently being considered were in force he would still have the same problem - if he thinks he has a problem - in knowing whether or not the taxes were going to be paid, and if so, when; because even under this plan the rebate would not be payable to anybody, to the municipality in this case, until such time as the taxes had been paid. But, he's failing to tell us that it's a very simple matter - you just assume if the taxes have not been paid that the taxes will be paid by the purchaser and you make your statement of adjustments accordingly. I'm sure he understands that. Just as we make our statement of adjustments in all cases. Whereas under former times when the taxes were not paid at all, one didn't have to - you didn't wait until they were paid to make the adjustment of taxes, you made your adjustments on the basis and on the assumption that they would be paid. And of course if the purchaser doesn't pay them, that will be his funeral, not the funeral of the vendor who has had the transaction closed out.

I just wanted to say, Madam Speaker, that I hope the members would not be unduly alarmed by the problem suggested by the Honourable Member for St. John's because I am more than confident that there is no problem insofar as the sale and purchase of property is concerned in this regard. The principle that's followed at present is quite clear. It is obvious of course that the principle suggested by the bill is quite clear and it's a matter of judgment as to which is the best for carrying out the intent and the principle of the basic legislation and the purposes, namely, to give a direct measure of relief to school taxpayers.

MR. CHERNIACK: permission to ask a question Madam Chairman? In the case of an adjustment being made and the taxes not being paid for some time by the purchaser, how and when will the vendor receive the rebate which will come to the vendor?

MR. McLEAN: I'm not too certain, Madam Speaker, whether all the members will be interested in this, but as I've already said, you will assume that the purchaser will pay the taxes and the vendor will therefore - and you, if you are acting for the vendor, will claim on behalf of your client; your client's share of that money. It's just as simple as that. And if the purchaser chooses at some later date to fail to pay the taxes, even though he has made an adjustment in favour of the vendor for the vendor's portion of the rebate, well that's his choice. That's something that he does of his own motion and it is of no consequence at that stage to the vendor of the property.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, does the Honourable Minister realize that that refund will be made to the vendor?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Rhineland.

MR. SHOEMAKER: question if I could. I was wondering, Madam Speaker, if it is possible, because I have heard rumours to this effect, is it possible that a municipal council can have assignment forms printed and ask the ratepayer or the taxpayer to assign the \$50.00 rebate or whatever it is - transfer it rather, from him to the municipality, and in this way the province will then pay the municipality the rebate? It would be a simple matter of having a transfer or an assignment form, I suppose, made up by the municipality.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I don't have the original legislation in front of me. My recollection is that there is a provision that it cannot be assigned.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, the Bill No. 140 which is before us, in my opinion will correct two flaws that were evidently - are evidently in the legislation that was passed last fall. One was the matter of tax arrears and the other one is to permit the municipality to deduct the \$50 amount from the taxpayer's bill and in this way give them the \$50 school tax rebate credit. The legislation that was passed last fall for a tax rebate here in Manitoba was copied from B. C.'s home-owner grant legislation. In B. C. it has worked out very well and there the municipalities are permitted to deduct the amount from the individual taxpayer's tax bill. And in this way they will this year deduct \$100 from every tax bill, with a total of \$32,830,000 as the over-all figure that the home-owners in B. C. will stand to gain in home-owner grants. This is substantially more than what the figures are in Manitoba. We have an item of 10 million in our Education Department estimates for this purpose. I think last year when the legislation was brought in, the figure was given as somewhere between 8 and 10 million. So that in my opinion, Madam Speaker, this would be a much much simpler way of giving this rebate credit and certainly in my opinion would save a lot of cost. I would like to ask the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, does the Honourable Minister agree that savings would be effected if the suggestions are followed as put forward in Bill 140? The Honourable Member for Lakeside gave a very detailed and I think very valid information in introducing the bill and it was very logical to me that savings can be effected in this way and I would like to know from the Minister whether this is not a fact, whether savings would not be effected in this way.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before you put the question, I'd like to say a few words in this debate. We seem to have two different arguments coming from the government benches tonight. The Minister who first spoke, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, said that it was too late now; it would be impossible to put this in, because it would cause the horrible muddle that he referred to, and it was simply impossible. Well of course, the answer to that is that my honourable friend got a lot of advice long before he proceeded with this policy as to what he should do. He got advice in this House last summer when the Bill was passed in the first place, because I think it's correct to say that all of the members on this side, including all the parties, objected to this method. He got advice from the municipal men in the province. It was read to him a few moments ago, again, by my colleague the Member for Gladstone. It was clear beyond the shadow of any doubt, what the municipal men thought should be done, and this was before the year 1965 started. My honourable friend had ample time to follow their advice if he so wished. But he says now, "It's too late; it would simply cause a horrible muddle and we can't do this." Well at this particular moment, he is correct to that extent. He is entirely wrong in that he had ample time before, to do it. But at this particular time, having for reasons of his own refused to follow the advice before, he shouldn't now say, "It's too late."

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd).....But at the moment, we have to accept that statement. However, my colleague who presents the bill, the Honourable the Member for Lakeside, advises me that he is quite prepared to have an amendment suggested to the section which states that this should be retroactive to January 1965 and he would be quite prepared to accept an amendment making it effective on the 1st of January 1966. So this would stop all the muddle that the Minister of Municipal Affairs sees and he could then proceed to do what he - well he didn't admit it was the right thing but he certainly didn't deny it at this stage. On the other hand, we have the argument of the Attorney-General. He takes another course, Madam Speaker. He speaks first of all and says that there's a whole lot of nonsense being talked about this matter, that this is simply a measure of relief for the school taxpayer. Well I wonder if he is referring to the municipal men of Manitoba. Is he referring to the Union of Manitoba Municipalities who in convention assembled 'unanimously' recommended to the government in very straightforward terms, that they wanted a change in the policy that the government was advocating? --(Interjection)-- Is that what my honourable friend means when he says it's a lot of nonsense, that the municipal men of this province are talking nonsense? I think the Attorney-General should go and tell the municipal men that.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege, I was not talking about the municipal people; I was taking part in the debate in this House.

MR. MOLGAT: But Madam Speaker, he said that this suggestion that it should be done otherwise is a whole lot of nonsense. Is that what the honourable member said?

MR. McLEAN: That is not what I said.

MR. MOLGAT: Well I'm sorry that I - I obviously don't have Hansard, and I won't have it for a few days, but the honourable gentleman certainly used the term "nonsense" because I wrote it down on my pad at that moment.

MR. McLEAN: Not in the context that you're using it now.

MR. MOLGAT: Well I wonder if the Minister could explain what context he was using it in? --(Interjection)-- Well, my honourable friend doesn't want to say what terms he was using it in. Well all right, fine. We'll have Hansard for the next session, I suppose. But in the meantime, it was certainly quite clear what he meant, that the discussion of doing it otherwise was nonsense, because my honourable friend took the position, Madam Speaker, that this was a matter of government policy. Now that's the very point. We are disagreeing with the government policy. The municipal men are disagreeing with the government policy. But my honourable friend sits back in his attitude of the Divine right of kings, and infallibility, and says, "This is government policy, therefore you must accept it. That's the end of it. It's government policy." Well Madam.....

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, if I may, I - on a point of privilege, if the Honourable Leader is going to perist in misquoting me, I must point out that I said, when I was speaking, that there were two different approaches and that it was good debating ground, but that we had, after considering the matter, decided on a particular approach. Now he must be fair if he's going to be referring to what I said. Because that is what I said.

MR. MOLGAT: My honourable friend said it was government policy and that was the explanation that he gave as to why this should be accepted, because it was government policy. Well, Madam Speaker, I would like to know on what basis the government policy was established. Let us look at the factors involved. Is the method that the government has adopted more efficient? Can they claim that it is more efficient for the government to insist that the taxpayer goes and pays his full amount of taxes to the municipality, then sends to the government an application for rebate, then receives a letter from the government acknowledging his application, then receives another letter from the government, presumably including a cheque and another notation about how pleased they are to send the cheque to him. Is this more efficient, Madam Speaker, than simply having the taxpayer going down to the municipal office, as he does, paying his taxes and the secretary-treasurer or the cashier saying to him, "Your school taxes amount to \$100.00, you're entitled to a \$50.00 rebate, your net bill therefore is so much money, and then have the municipality apply in bulk to the government for refund. I ask the Minister which is more efficient? Well, I think it's quite clear, it would be much more efficient through the municipality.

Secondly, is the policy that the government has adopted less costly? Are there savings to be effected in doing it the way the government wants? Well, quite obviously if you follow the same argument as that of efficiency, the plan of the government is going to cost, in the final analysis, the taxpayers of the province, substantially more money than doing it through

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd).....the municipality. A whole new mechanism has to be set up, there must be all this correspondence back and forth; the new forms that were given to us here in the House some time ago; the whole procedure internally here in the government for the control of this and the issue of the cheques, all of it a complicated, costly procedure, compared to a procedure that is already in existence at the municipal level. So surely the government cannot claim that the policy the Minister says the government has established, is more efficient. You can't claim that it is less costly.

Let's go on then. Is the policy that the government has established, is it more satisfactory to the taxpayer? Is there here an element of convenience insofar as the taxpayer is concerned where the government could quite properly say, well maybe it's costing more money but the taxpayer is getting more service. Now Madam Speaker, the taxpayer, under the present system, first of all has to wait before he gets his rebate; he has to go through the procedure himself of applying for it, getting these various letters which apparently are in the process of the things; and eventually getting his cheque. Is this in the least bit more convenient, Madam Speaker, for the taxpayer than to go down to the municipality and instead of having to pay them \$200.00, simply paying them \$150.00? He's going to have to go down now and pay \$200.00, to go through whole procedure to get a cheque back for fifty later on. Why not simply let the taxpayer do, which I'm sure would be more satisfactory to him, pay the \$150.00 and get his rebate instantly. Surely there can be no claim here of service to the taxpayers.

Well let's take another body that's involved in this. Does this method suit the municipality better? Is there here, following the policy the government claims to be following, of assistance to the municipality? Is there possibly here the answer to the government's decision on policy? Was this done to assist the municipalities? Well if that's it, they've missed the boat because the municipalities certainly have expressed themselves most forcefully. They want no part of this system and they've asked the government to change it, so it can't be because it's suiting the municipality better.

So, Madam Speaker, why is it exactly that the government wants to do this? Why is it that they've chosen this particular policy that the Minister says it set. It can't be for efficiency reasons; it can't be for cost saving reasons; it can't be from service to the taxpayer; and it can't be from service to the municipality. What conclusion then can we draw? There's only one possible conclusion, Madam Speaker, that the government is doing this for political purposes. It's the only possible reason that can be established from this. That they're going through this whole complicated procedure so they can send a cheque to the taxpayer. They're spending more money; they're having a less efficient system; they're annoying the taxpayer in the process of making his application and they're annoying the municipalities so that my honourable friends can say "We sent you a \$50.00 cheque." Well, Madam Speaker, if that's the government's policy, then I say my honourable friends, you'd better change it soon, because the people of Manitoba are fed up with that kind of policy. --(Interjection)-- Does the Minister of Mines and Resources want to say something? --(Interjection)-- Would the honourable member like to make a speech?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): You're getting free legal advice from that high priced Minister.

MR. MOLGAT: I'd be very delighted to have my honourable friend get in the debate. Very delighted. I'm sure he could find - I'm sure the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources could find some condition in Ottawa which would relate to this problem. I'm certain with his fertile mind and his lively imagination, that my honourable friend can easily get --(Interjection)--

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Madam Speaker, can I ask the speaker a question?

MR. MOLGAT: Certainly.

MR. McKELLAR: Has he ever heard of the baby bonus cheques coming from Ottawa?

MR. MOLGAT: Well, if my honourable friends would like to debate that one, I'd be very happy to debate baby bonus cheques. I appreciate that my honourable friend has recently acquired a personal interest in the subject which he failed to have in earlier years in this House and I'll certainly be delighted to take up the battle on the subject.

So, Madam Speaker, it seems to me that the government should revise its policy. It's not too late. They've made a mistake; they've jumped into a program here which is not satisfactory to the people of Manitoba; it's going to be highly inefficient; it's going to cost more

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd). money. Why not revise your policy? You're always asking for recommendations from this side of the House. You're asking for some reasonable propositions. Surely here is a perfectly reasonable proposition. We are prepared to have the bill pass second reading with the understanding that the section making it retroactive to January '65 will be changed to 1966, then we can start off next year with the new policy on a much more efficient basis and to the better satisfaction of the taxpayers of this province.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside is closing the debate.

MR. CAMPBELL: If no one else wishes to speak.

MR. MOLGAT: I think the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources wants.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'd be glad to defer to my honourable friend.

Madam Speaker, I have had a good many years of trying to catch the sense of the House and I can easily see that the logical and persuasive arguments that have emanated from this side of the House have carried my honourable friends with them, in spite of their earlier intentions, and it remains only for me in my usual conciliatory and diplomatic manner to say thank you to them for accepting this improvement in their legislation and we can make that small amendment in the Committee tomorrow. That's all I would have done except for my honourable friend the Attorney-General getting in here with a word that I'm rather fond of - of "nonsense" - and I want to agree with my honourable friend that there has been some nonsense talked, except that he got the wrong side of the House. There really is, there really is a bit of nonsense to this and that's the way, the illogical way that my honourable friends are going about it, rather than doing it in this straightforward and direct manner. I gather my honourable friends aren't going to change though and I would urge them to look at it next year and try and get this back on to the more logical way.

My honourable friend the Attorney-General says the principle is quite clear. You bet it's clear, Madam Speaker, it's very clear. We know why our honourable friends are wanting to go to all this rigamarole in order to send out a cheque to the taxpayer. I wonder if that will continue to work long? My honourable friends don't need to deny that that's the reason they're doing it because do they recall that one of the Ministers, not here at present at the moment, that one of them told us quite frankly a few years back that this was his philosophy and the government's philosophy. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture said some years ago that he was quite certain that if he had a cash register on the one hand and a filing cabinet with the names of all the farmers in Manitoba on the other, that as long as the cash register didn't run out he could keep on electing this government year after year. Do you remember that? Do you remember it? None of you do? Well, I'll read it to you. Have you asked anybody to read one of Hutton's whole speeches? -- (Interjection)-- Yes, this afternoon we hit a pretty low ebb for awhile.

On February 1, 1960, Hansard, Volume No. 4, No. 10 (a). Here's the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture speaking and he's talking about the system that was used to distribute funds in connection with crop failure that year, or crop damage of some kind, and I want to go back a little ways so as to get this in context: "So we came to the decision that the fair thing to do, and mind you it's not an easy decision to make, but the fairest thing to do was to make sure that anybody who would have qualified for PFA, had they been in an eligible area, would receive assistance under the federal-provincial plan. Now maybe it doesn't seem reasonable and logical to the rest of this House, I don't know, but it seemed like a rather reasonable and logical thing to this government. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that we must remember this, and certainly I would just love it, if I had a cash register on one hand and a filing cabinet with all the names of the farmers in Manitoba on the other. I'm quite certain that if the cash register didn't run out that I could return this government every year for a long time." In those times they were having elections pretty nearly every year. --(Interjection)--

That's been the philosophy of this government and it's been carried through to this time. And I'm sorry to see that the government, even when given the opportunity to make a change to a logical and sensible system simply take the position, this is what the government decided; it must go through. I want to warn my honourable friends that this kind of thing won't pay dividends in the long run because the public can't be fooled that easily for very long.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the second reading of Bill No. 140.

A standing vote was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Weir, and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 18; Nays 32.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, may we now proceed with the adjourned debate on Bill No. 112.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of No. 112. The Honourable the Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Madam Speaker, may I just say as a backbencher that I think history is being made today, and I feel honoured to be counted with the speakers that we've heard today. Much has been talked about and I feel many of the giants of debate have had their say, and whilst what I may have to say may not be as eloquent as you have heard today, nevertheless I would like you to know that what I have to say is sincere and to the point.

My purpose, Madam Speaker, of course in rising at this time is to speak to Bill 112. On the face of it, Madam Speaker, this bill appears to be very simple and straightforward. It calls for an addition of French as a language of instruction in schools in Manitoba. In fact, however, it raises problems of great difficulty and complexity in this province, and it bears directly on one of the basic questions being discussed in connection with the national problem of bilingualism and biculturalism. We cannot, Madam Speaker, and we should not, deal with this question in the terms of Manitoba alone. At this time in our history, the question must be considered in the national context as well. The history of bilingualism in Canada is important, in my humble opinion, to understand. The terms of our Confederation of 1867 did not make Canada a bilingual nation. What those terms did provide for was the bilingual status of French and English in the Province of Quebec and in the Federal Parliament juris prudence. It did not, however, give bilingual status to the French in other provinces throughout the nation. In 1965 however, Madam Speaker, a vital debate is proceeding as to whether changes should be made to the status of French on a national basis to give the French in other provinces the same position accorded to the English and French in Quebec. The whole question of bilingualism is now receiving more thorough consideration than it has ever had in our whole long history of this most difficult Canadian problem, and it remains, Madam Speaker, to be seen how it can best be adjusted, both in terms of the Constitution and in terms of practicability of life in the Canadian nation which is part of the North American continent.

The history of bilingualism in Manitoba itself is of equal importance in dealing with the question. In 1870, Manitoba was a bilingual province. French and English-speaking Manitobans were about equal in numbers of both French and English which was used in our schools as languages of instruction. Since 1870, however, the linguistic composition of our province has changed, Madam Speaker, out of all recognition. Today, our province could be described as a multi-lingual plural society. There is not only a large English-speaking majority, but there are also Ukrainian and German linguistic groups, very much larger than the French linguistic groups.

In speaking the other day, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface commented that teaching in French in Manitoba schools was swept away and swept aside in 1916. In saying this, Madam Speaker, he failed to mention that the Liberal Government of the day directed English to be the sole language of instruction in our schools. In recent years, however, very substantial improvements in the teaching of French as a subject has been made. Special courses are now available in the French language for both English-speaking and French-speaking Manitobans, starting at Grade 1 and going right through the school system. These improvements are a contribution, I feel, to the solution of the national bilingual problem.

May I say, Madam Speaker, that 35 years ago the Swan River Valley was predominantly Anglo-Saxon. What do we find today? A cosmopolitan area that is equalled many times throughout this province I'm sure. Yes, Madam Speaker, we have Ukrainian, German and Polish groups now in the majority, all working and striving for the common good. Many of these people, Madam Speaker, are reaching the twilight years of life. After struggle and toil

(MR. BILTON cont'd). they have retained their mother tongue and cultures. Scores of them, Madam Speaker, have never spoken an English word in their lives. For the record, Madam, I would like to acquaint you and the Assembly with the population distribution in Manitoba by mother tongue according to the 1961 census: English 584, 526; Ukrainian 85, 173; German 83, 994; French 60, 899; Indian and Eskimo 27, 571; Polish 20, 654. And added to this, Madam Speaker, the rest of the population of Manitoba is distributed over ten- not less than ten separate ethnic groups.

There is another feature I'd like to bring to your attention this evening, if I may, whilst on the subject, which I feel is part and parcel of our thinking when we are considering this matter. Throughout the North American continent commercial trade, industrial commerce, is carried on, and more important, Madam Speaker, people are intermingling through travel as never before. All this under the language of English.

Coincidentally with my remarks tonight, there are 220 million souls north of the Mexican border. Of this total, Madam Speaker, six or seven million claim the French language as their tongue. I say this simply with malice toward none. I say it simply, Madam Speaker, to illustrate the magnitude of the subject which confronts our national and provincial approach to this problem.

I do not feel that the people of Manitoba are presently fully inclined at this time toward this matter. In practical terms, Madam Speaker, the introduction of French as a second language of instruction may be a poor service to French-speaking Manitobans, if Madam Speaker, as a result they fail to learn to speak English as well. After all French-speaking Manitobans comprise only about seven percent of our population. Almost all of them expect to live their lives in a province that is basically English-speaking. That of course is no reason why they may not take legitimate pride in all aspects of their own French culture, and continue - and in particular cherish - the French language, but it does represent a practical fact that cannot be ignored if we are to consider the best interests of the children themselves. It may be that these two objectives can be reconciled in the days ahead to the practical solution and for the good of us all.

The Province of Ontario, Madam Speaker, for example, is beginning an experiment which will provide for three subjects to be taught in French with the approval of the local school board, and where there are teachers qualified to teach the subjects in French, and where there are enough interested students to make a standard size class. However, the education policy in Manitoba should, I feel, be consistent with giving our children, all our children, a good working knowledge in English, even where French may be used as a language of instruction under certain circumstances.

I believe, Madam Speaker, the attitude of the French-speaking Manitobans themselves on this question is far from uniform and united. A recent article by J. G. Vaillancourt, Professor of Sociology at the St. Boniface College -- wrote an article titled "French Manitobans" which was published in the French-language newspaper of St. Boniface on April 8th, that gives some impressions - excellent impressions - to this problem as it appears from a French point of view, and I recommend it to those that may be interested in this subject, to peruse it.

What I have said, Madam Speaker, so far goes to show that some of the problems connected with this subject are problems in themselves; that in due time will probably find their level. Who knows? No wonder, Madam Speaker, the people of Canada among whom Manitobans are of course included, are challenged today to find ways and means of accommodating the various points of view in terms of making practical sense in this world of 1965. And no wonder, Madam Speaker, that exceedingly complicated psychological, emotional and constitutional attitudes are involved. It remains for us to be firm and hold fast to some of the principles that have gone on before.

Perhaps, Madam Speaker, the experiment in Ontario of which I have spoken - which by the way is also the system used in New Brunswick - may lead the way to a fair and reasonable solution, but certainly the people of Manitoba have not yet been given sufficient consideration to the question to justify the adoption of the bill proposed. I therefore believe that it would not be wise to proceed with this bill. After all, Manitobans as a whole have a perfect right to become thoroughly acquainted with the subject matter of the proposal and indicate their wishes to each and every representative elected to this House. This in my opinion is essential for the well-being and for the good of our people throughout the length and breadth of this great province of ours.

(MR. BILTON cont'd).....

It would be equally unwise, Madam Speaker, to dismiss this out of hand. What we need, therefore, is to study the question in the light not only by our own provincial situation, but also in the light of the greater national issues. The national issues, Madam Speaker, is the thing that is worrying us all today. And the decisions that will arise from the deliberations of these national issues will surely bring something forward for the good of this great nation of which we are all proud.

Having said these few words, Madam Speaker, I have said them sincerely with malice toward no one. I have French friends; I have travelled this nation from coast to coast and I have faced the rigors of the arctic with men of that blood - and no finer men are there on this earth. And having said that, all that is left for me to do is to suggest to you, Madam Speaker, that I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Turtle Mountain, that all the words after the word "that" in the first line thereof be deleted and the following substituted therefor: "In the opinion of this House, having regard to the recent and substantial extensions in the teaching of the French language in the public school system, and in view of the multi-lingual and plural nature of our society in Manitoba, the addition of French as a second language of instruction should be studied in the light of national policy decisions which are now under review in this field, and of the particular circumstances of our own province."

MADAM SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I'd like to have a copy of this and I think before you even read this -- this is a bill and how can this be amended in this way? This is a bill and this is definitely out of order, so far as I'm concerned.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: If there's any doubt about this matter, perhaps you'd like to reserve it until tomorrow.

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to have time to study the.....

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker,at all. This is a bill. This is not a resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to have time at least to consider the motion that has been presented to me and I will give my decision at a later date.

MR. ROBLIN:proceedings, Madam Speaker. If we're finished with that subject, may I now ask you to.....

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, we're not finished with this subject. I wanted a copy of this. I think we're at least entitled to a copy.

MR. ROBLIN: We'll now ask you, Madam Speaker, to continue with the second reading of private bills on the last.....

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege. We asked for a copy of this and I think I'm entitled --

MR. ROBLIN:in Hansard and in the Votes and Proceedings.

MR. DESJARDINS: Normally when there's an amendment on this, Madam Speaker, isn't it the custom to give the different parties or the mover a copy? Will I have to wait till tomorrow to study it myself?

MR. BILTON: Madam Speaker, may I apologize to the Honourable Member. I deeply regret that I didn't have copies made. It's an oversight on my part and had I realized the point that he's bringing up I would have certainly had it typed. There's only the single copy, and again, Madam Speaker, I apologize to him most sincerely.

MR. DESJARDINS: Apologies won't help.

MR. ROBLIN: Will we proceed now with second reading of the private bills on the last page.

MADAM SPEAKER: The second reading of Bill No. -- Order, please. Order, please. Order for the whole House please. The second reading of Bill No. 133.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface is disobeying the request of the Chair. I've asked for order of the House and I intend to have it.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre) presented Bill No. 133, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate "The Interior Trust Company" for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. I'm very sorry, I did not get your seconder, due to the commotion in the House.

MR. COWAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I would suggest if the House permit me that these three bills be all referred to the Law Amendments Committee rather than the Private Bills Committee so that we may deal with them tomorrow. I trust that's agreeable.

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 134, an Act to incorporate Canadian Lutheran World Relief for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. McKELLAR presented Bill No. 136, an Act to incorporate The Brandon Area Foundation for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, may we now return to the private members' resolutions beginning on Page 5 and proceed with them.

MR. SCHREYER: Before you proceed with that I would like to put a question to the House Leader, concerning the business of the House for tomorrow. I would ask him if it is the intention to have the private bills just given second reading and the public bills that were given second reading about an hour or two ago, if it will be possible to have them come up in Law Amendments tomorrow before the Shared Services so that people who want to appear, for example, North Kildonan Council, they could appear before this.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, that will be a matter for the Chairman and the Committee to decide.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and the proposed motion in amendment thereto by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I unfortunately was not in the House when the Minister of Agriculture replied, or rather spoke on my original resolution and moved his amendment. I am disappointed in the amendment that he proposed because the amendment unfortunately knocks out completely the principle involved in the original resolution. I think it would have been much preferable for the Minister of Agriculture to have presented a new resolution carrying forward or introducing the subject that his amendment does because it really has no bearing at all on the original resolution that was before the House. I realize that it has been ruled in order and I'm not questioning that although I cannot see how it fits in the least.

The intent of the original resolution, Madam Speaker, was to do something for the small, or the term we frequently use here, "family farm", to provide some measure, some base so that the small farm would have consideration in the initial delivery of grain with a higher price for a specified amount. I wasn't seeking to specify the amount myself; I recommended a possible price but I'm quite flexible insofar as that is concerned. My concern was that there be for the small producer, a base. My reason for that, Madam Speaker, was that there is in Manitoba a real need, I believe, in a number of our farming areas, for a solid base on which the small producer can count. We've had other policies in the past; we've had acreage payments which seems to me were not tied to any particular principle, that they were rather on an ad hoc basis, there was no knowledge whether they would be paid in any year or not; whereas the recommendation that I was making would be one that would be established as a standard policy where the producer would know that this was coming to him. The reason that I was proposing that, as I say, there is in many parts of Manitoba, if we are going to maintain some of those people in farming, and while we are looking in a number of cases to moving some of

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) . . . these people into other fields of activity, the facts are that they are presently there and will be there for some time yet. I indicated this afternoon in the course of another debate, the seriousness of the problem where we have in Manitoba at the present, 25 percent of our farm families on a low income - 25 percent of them who do not sell \$2500 a year of farm products, let alone the amount of net that they make. Now surely there is a problem here and one that we should be looking at. And that was the basis of my original resolution.

Now the amendment unfortunately wipes that out completely and does not permit a vote on that first part, it goes on to other subjects altogether having no relationship whatever to the other; because what we are faced with now is an amendment declaring opposition to the recommendation of the House of Commons Committee on the subject of an eastern feed grain buying agency and the amendment comes out categorically against such a development.

Well I think there is some grounds, Madam Speaker, for expressing concern at this particular decision. We do however have to look at it from more than one point of view. I think we have to consider the position of our producers of feed grain here in western Canada, and the policy that was established some years ago -- the present government has continued it, the previous government had continued it - the policy of freight assistance for the movement of feed grain from western provinces to the eastern provinces, and to British Columbia, has certainly been a policy that has assisted the producers of feed grain in the Province of Manitoba. Because there is a danger in the eastern provinces in particular, the proximity to American corn which is just across the line from them and much closer, and the fact that they themselves are now becoming major corn producers, may bite seriously into the feed grain market that the west has enjoyed in those areas and the subsidy on that movement has been a major factor in making our grain competitive in those markets against either corn from the U.S. or locally-produced corn there. So I don't think we should simply take the position off-hand that this is bad because I think that we must consider the position of our feed grain producers.

Now switching from there to our livestock and poultry producers. This does present a problem because obviously if there is a policy of assistance on the movement of feed, making it more economical for eastern producers in the livestock and poultry area, then they are more competitive than we are in that same area on the basis of the finished product.

So I think that this is possibly where we should turn our attention here. I think to simply take the position that we are opposed without offering any other suggestion to what is being proposed by the House of Commons Committee may be a short run attitude which will not benefit Manitoba and western Canada. I agree completely that the Wheat Board has done a good job. I would not want to see the Wheat Board's position eroded. I think in fairness however, to the eastern buyers, we should be prepared to look possibly at their position. I think that a number of them look at the Wheat Board as an instrument for the western farmers and don't consider it, as we do here in the west, as an instrument of national policy. They seem to have the idea at times, judging by what I read of some of their meetings, that the Wheat Board is loaded in our favour and against them. I don't really think that this is the case but as long as they think it's the case, then there will be continuous agitation on their part and we have to remember in all these deliberations that they have the greater number. They have the larger number of people involved; they have in the final analysis, therefore, the political power which we don't have to the same extent. So I think it would be in our interest, Madam Speaker, not to take an absolutely negative attitude as the amendment seems to me to present at this time. I think what we should do instead is make some positive proposals that will tie in with the policy which the eastern producers seem to want at this time and which makes reasonable sense as a national policy - and this is where I'm disappointed in the wording of the resolution, because it is purely negative; it proposes nothing; it simply says we are against. It's a clear-cut statement that we're opposed to whatever it is that the House of Commons Committee has stated and that we declare that and that's the end of it. Well I think in fairness that the Speech from the Throne did not speak in exactly the same terms as the House of Commons Committee did. The Speech from the Throne, as Throne Speeches are, was more vague. It indicated that there would be action taken to improve the movement and marketing of feed grain in eastern Canada and British Columbia. Well this need not necessarily be bad for us insofar as our feed grain producers, any movement that can be had of western feed grains to these areas is to the benefit of the western feed producer and the barley and oat growers here in the west certainly will not stand to lose by a policy that will do this.

(MR. MÖLGAT cont'd)

Now what about our livestock people? This is where I think that we should be looking at the other aspect of it, Madam Speaker. If we are going to have a policy of subsidy on the movement of feed grain then why not look at the other side of the story and the possibility of a subsidy on the movement of the finished product? In this way I think we could achieve a national policy which will fit in with the interests of farmers in both parts of the nation. I can't see an objection from a philosophical standpoint, if you can do this for feed grains, why is it that you cannot do the same for the finished product.

So, Madam Speaker, I wish to make an amendment to the present amendment and I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the amendment be further amended by adding the word "presently" after the word "and" in the second line of the last paragraph and by striking out all the words after the word "agency" in the fourth line of the last paragraph and by adding the following after the last paragraph: "And be it further resolved that the Government of Manitoba in co-operation with the Government of Canada and other Provincial Governments develop a policy for the movement of feed grain and livestock products that will give security to the family farm in all regions of Canada."

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion .

MR. CHERNIACK: I was just worried about getting a copy, Madam Speaker. I was afraid there wasn't one.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture as amended.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition as amended.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Logan as amended. The Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam, at the outset I wish to thank the Honourable Member for Logan for introducing this resolution. I think it's timely, and I think it has been worth the time of the members of this House to hear the debate that has taken place on it. But in looking over the resolution Madam, I find that in one aspect there has been an omission. I think it is an important omission and it deals with the sociological implication of automation.

To me my interest is in whether or not automation is going to have a dehumanizing effect on man and whether it is going to completely disregard the dignity of labour. In my opinion, work is a fundamental part of man's existence which neither can nor should be reduced to almost complete insignificance. The mode of man's work is in itself an essential element in forming a person's character. To reduce a man to nothing there need only be given to his work the character of uselessness and meaninglessness. We should never use automation as a means of achieving a maximum of productivity as an end in itself. The only end that is worthwhile is the value of human beings and in the work context this means that the dignity of labour must become a reality. Work must be made significant and meaningful. This is only possible by recognizing and applying the principles of democracy, namely, the conscious participation in decision making by those in whose name decisions are made.

I realize, Madam, that this proposal implies the participation of a worker in management and that there are those who argue that such a proposal is incompatible with the requirement of modern industry and would only lead to chaos. To those who so argue, Madam, I say that such an arrangement does now apply to productivity in industry, and I see no reason why it cannot be expanded to include the human and sociological aspects. The principle criterion of industrial activity is technical efficiency for material ends. Industrial society argues that to function properly in the industrial system man must obey and adjust himself to routine; that man is by nature lazy and must be trained or conditioned to function smoothly. In my opinion, such a conception is entirely wrong. Man is not innately lazy and if an industrial worker is lazy it is almost entirely due to social conditioning and to the fact that his work is boring or unsatisfying.

Another argument is that man is only motivated by a single urge - more money and more of the things that money will buy. This, Madam, is a convenient argument but it's true is not borne out by a survey undertaken in Great Britain by industrial sociologists. In this age of automation and of greater automation to come, I feel that not only are we to find a solution to

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd) the displacement of manpower by finding new positions for those people displaced, but we must create a situation in which man gives his lifetime and energy to work which has meaning for him, in which he knows what he is doing, in which he has an influence on what is being done and feels united with, rather than separated from his fellow man. This implies Madam, that he is involved in the goals of the enterprise, that he can exercise some influence on its decisions which bear upon his work situation. In fact and in summation it means if man is not to become a mere robot in an automated society, we must find a solution which lies in co-operation and in reassuring man of his own dignity and of the fact that he is not a mere adjunct of enterprise but a free partner therein.

For these reasons Madam I feel that it is incumbent upon me to move a further amendment to this resolution, and I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside that the resolution be amended as follows: 1. By adding after the fourth paragraph of the Preamble the following additional paragraph namely: And whereas the process of automation has serious sociological implications which cannot be ignored. 2. By adding a further paragraph to the preamble immediately before the operative part of the Resolution, namely; and Whereas the aforesaid program completely ignores the dignity of labour and the social implications of automation. 3. By deleting the word "pursue" in the second line of the first paragraph of the operative part of the resolution and substituting therefor the word "modernize", and by adding between the words "automation" and "and" in the last line thereof the following, namely: by including therein a study of the best possible means of insuring that man will not become a mere robot but will retaining his natural and human dignity.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: I could not help but rise with just a scanty reading of this amendment to indicate the pleasure with which I heard the mover of this amendment and his second-er, the Honourable Member for Lakeside, support the proposal set out herein because as I was listening to the words of the Honourable Member for Selkirk I was trying to remember just what chapter of Karl Marx he was quoting. -- (Interjection) -- Well I don't object to that because it read very well and I support it but I really wonder that this comes from the free enterprise group in this House, not that I attribute to them alone the attitude of supporting the free enterprise economy but I really wondered what price free enterprise in the light of what was said, and in the light of the expressions of support for the dignity of labour, and social implications involved in labour, and I welcome, I really welcome the attitude which I really did not expect to hear from that side of the House. I don't want to prolong the debate, Madam Speaker, but I felt that it was only fitting to make the occasion when the free enterprise principle is subordinated to the principles expressed so well and so ably by the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I would like to say a word on this. I really don't think that the Honourable Member for St. John's has the right attitude on this subject. One would think from listening to him that he and his party are the only people who are interested in matters of labour. I don't really know when it was that they pre-empted that position and became the sole possessors and the sole defenders of matters of labour. I think if my honourable friend would stop to reflect and see what has been proposed in this House on a number of occasions by members of my group, including some resolutions that are before us at this stage, he will see that he really doesn't hold the position of being the sole possessor of the interest of the general welfare of the people of this province.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition had been listening to his own party's amendment, he would realize that there is more involved in the amendment than the matter of labour and the treatment of labour. What is involved there also is an indication of the party's willingness to use the state as an instrumentality, to use the state as an instrumentality of intervention in the economy in order to prevent the abuses which unregulated technological change can cause and create in this day and age in our society. So it seems to me that perhaps the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources was wrong today when he referred to the Liberal Party here in Manitoba as the dinosaur wing. It looks like now they are prepared to go from prehistoric times into the second half of the twentieth century. This is quite a change and I suppose it is to be welcomed even by those who are adversaries, political adversaries, of theirs.

Madam Speaker, I think that what the amendment points out is that the times we live in

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) necessitate all people interested in politics, necessitate them coming to the view that there is nothing wrong with the philosophy of government which says that where people's livelihood and where their dignity and where the development of their personality is concerned, there is nothing wrong at all with using the state for people, which is after all what we have been standing for for many decades now. So I think that I can embrace them and say that they can be regarded as brothers in the same sense that Stalin embraced a Japanese ambassador once and said, "I don't know why we're quarreling really, we're both Asiatics." And the same relationship applies; it might be a strained relationship, it may be a strained one, but I think that the Liberal Party, if it is only honest with itself, will have to admit that there is no room for it anymore unless it embraces social democracy. The only alternative of course is an unprincipled kind of opportunism, which I must admit my honourable friends are pretty good at at times.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the motion of the Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Weir and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 16, Nays 30.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Logan as amended.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Madam Speaker, I listened to all these debates on this resolution that I brought in here and they were very constructive. The first amendment - I thought it followed mine a little bit too closely, so something struck me in this way; it reminded me of an English song that was in the music halls years ago. I changed the word a little bit to give the Member for Roblin an idea of what I have in mind. "He is more to be pitied than censured. He is more to be pitied than shamed. He is only a man that would venture. He is only a pawn in the game." -- (Interjection) -- I could sing it too, don't you worry boys. Yes. Well, as I say, we've had good discussion on this resolution. I am very proud to say that and I'm very pleased that we've had good discussion in that way because it shows that everyone of us is interested in what is coming.

Now, I have been gathering a few facts as I go along; I have had facts here but I'm not going to touch them. I've got more here. I'll give you some of these and maybe you'll start a little thinking too, because they are going a little bit further than these facts go, yes. Just imagine if you will, that there exists on this earth of ours, one human being for every square yard of land. Imagine one man, woman or child for every square yard to city and country, mountain and desert and the frozen wastes of the Arctic. If the human race continues multiplying at the present rate, that there will be in the case, in just 500 years - and while 500 years sounds like a very long time, remember that it's very short indeed compared with the millennium of human existence; that is exactly the point. That is the danger we face. The bitter truth is that mankind today is up against a situation unique in history. Man has become what one of our greatest living scientists, Sir Julian Huxley, aptly calls the cancer of his own planet. As the wild unchecked growth of cancer cells eventually overwhelms and kills the human body, so the population explosion threatens to overwhelm and destroy the earth. If that sounds like a nightmare from some crackpot of doom, consider a few facts. It took the world until 1840 to reach the population of one billion. Less than a century later there was two billion. But in just 30 years more there were three billion and, unless controlled, the world population will reach four billion by 1975. The fastest rate of increase in population is among the have-not countries, those who can least afford it.

For example, it is estimated that in the next 15 years, by 1980, the population of Europe will have increased by 1/12, from 443 million to 479 million; that in North America, will rise

(MR. HARRIS cont'd) . . . by about 1/4, from 211 million to 267 million. But the population of Asia will jump up by about a third, from 1.8 billion to 2.4 billion; that of Africa will leap up almost half, from 303 million to 449 million; while that of South and Central America will skyrocket at almost two-thirds, from 236 million to 274 million; and in just 15 years, Ceylon's rate of increase - 3.5 million population doubles in less than 20 years; Costa Rica has the astonishing rate of 4.4 percent; its population is quadrupling in every generation. No matter how much we do, no matter how much the underdeveloped countries strain, the number of new and hungry mouths to feed, the growing demand for schools and medical services out-pace their rate of development. As the countries grow, the individual share of its wealth grows less because the number of individuals out-pace the rate of development. As the country grows the individual's share of its wealth, grows less because the number of individuals outraces the rate at which the economy is able to grow. For an example - Brazil, which is potentially one of the richest countries of the world with its vast area, more than three million square miles, its unaccounted natural resources and its relatively thin density of population, you might think that with such an advantage and with a substantial foreign aid, Brazil would rapidly forge ahead. It is not. It has a serious population problem, though by no means as serious as many other countries and it's slipping back. Brazil's population of 80 million is growing at almost 3.5 a year which means doubling in less than 20 years. Their people are spread along the lengthy Atlantic coast line in a strip about 200 miles wide. Much of the interior of the country is trackless wilderness, so far at least too difficult to penetrate and settle. Most of the Brazilians are farmers - farm labourers and sharecroppers. They are deparately poor. The productivity of the land does not keep pace with the population increase and each year they eat less and less.

So you see I'm only talking about one little country -- I wouldn't say little - but I say the population is along the coastline and we're talking about their capital city, Rio de Janeiro. I can always remember the old song going "Going on to Rio" - Going on to Rio, yes, and the squarerigger - and going down the Severn. We went out to sea to Rio - the old sailors around with their masts and sails, everything Bristol fashion, going to Rio, a beautiful place. It still is a beautiful place today but they say on the outskirts of Rio de Janeiro it is a mess. It is slums and everything else and you look and you see and they show you pamphlets of Rio de Janeiro - such a beautiful place - but I guess if we went there and we could go out and see these various places you wouldn't say it was so beautiful.

Now, Madam Speaker, we have spoken about this automation and I listened to the member for Selkirk and I say I know what he is talking about because mechanization today, we haven't got our lesson. We were shown during the thirties what could happen, but no. we don't take a lesson. We forget, we slip back and forget. That's only human. So we go along today and instead of taking lessons from the thirties we go ahead and we do the same mistakes. We figure out it's cheaper to drive human beings than it is machines.

What I was trying to point out in the first place is that we have machines, let's make use of them. We've got the world to feed. We are one of the countries that have everything and if we turn our machines over to making things for these people that have not, we don't need to worry about work. There's all kinds of work to be done, but is profit going to stand in our way?

As my colleague from Brokenhead said, we have to work, the government has to put things through, and we as a party here believe in that, although you might think we are crack-pots. I don't think so. This free enterprise is all right but I know myself from what I've read, in the industrial revolution in England, what did they do? They had to go over into China and force them to take their textile goods with guns. Now I don't think we need to do that here. If we don't take our goods, our grain, our meat, to these people that need it -- we won't have to force them with guns to take it because if we don't give them the food they'll come here and eat us up. So I would say, Madam Speaker that we have to go -- we have all kinds of grain here. We have it. And one of the members here was speaking the other day and he said when China took our grain that we of the NDP were grateful. Yes, we were grateful all right. I think the farmer was grateful here that China had taken their grain. So I would say that it would stop all of that because your granaries would have nothing in there if you were going to feed these people and that would make eventual work for everybody in this country.

"The end of crop controls and price supports policies of the U. S. farm as foreseen by Dr. Gunnar Murdoch, Sweden's noted social economist." The reason he gives: "Very much more food will be needed within a short time to avert world calamity, and much of the food

(MR. HARRIS cont'd) will have to be given free by the rich countries to the undeveloped countries." I know that is going to hit some of these people. They have to give something away. Oh boy! To provide a reasonable level of nutrition for all the world's people, the international studies estimate total food supplies must double by 1980, triple by 2000 in the world emergency which is foreseen exploding about us. Within only a relatively few years there will be a fundamental change in the way we will come to view the problem of agriculture over-production in North America. All the food that the United States, Canada and New Zealand and similar countries can produce beyond their own needs, will be required. To the North American farmers this will be a great opportunity. It is indeed foreseeable this freedom from holding back their production can make possible that they will be prosperous with less and in the end perhaps no policy efforts to keep up farm prices. Increased food aid to undeveloped countries should be internationalized. There is no reason that any country that is well off as North America, but does not produce surplus foods, should not pay its due share of food aid to the undeveloped countries. If Canada is to experience the economic growth necessary to prove this one and a half million jobs with which the Economic Council says we must have by 1970, then the buying power of the Canadian public must be augmented. The problem is not where we will get the money. The problem is, can we sell the goods and services which our economy is capable of producing. This makes two conclusions very plain. In order to survive man must find a reasonable balance between population and available resources and if we do not work out that balance for ourselves, nature will do it for us, with famine, disease and war.

That, Madam Speaker, is what I have to say on this resolution of mine and I would urge you members that you should vote for this resolution because I think it's a good resolution and one that is going to come up on us faster than we actually think it is going to come up. Thank you very much.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce that the House do now adjourn.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 9:30 Friday morning.