



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



Vol. VII No. 57 2:30 p.m. Monday, April 9, 1962.

5th Session, 26th Legislature

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, April 9, 1962

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

The Honourable the First Minister.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley) introduced Bill No. 104, An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry) introduced Bill No. 127, An Act to amend The Public Utilities Board Act.

MR. LYON introduced Bill No. 128, An Act to amend The Landlord and Tenant Act.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Labour)(The Pas) introduced Bill No. 115, An Act to amend The Department of Labour Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

HON. G. HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I think I'm standing the resolution. I think the Minister of Labour is making the motion.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House to consider the following proposed resolutions in my name and in the name of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

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

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 1, Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Electricians' Licence Act by providing, among other matters for increasing the number of members of examining board appointed under the Act, the remuneration of the members of which is paid from and out of the Consolidated Fund. Resolution be adopted? Resolution No. 2, Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act by providing, among other matters, for increases in integrated annuities corresponding to the increases that may be made, from time to time, in the pensions payable under the Old Age Security Act (Canada); and thereby increasing the charge on the Consolidated Fund. Resolution be adopted?

MR. A. R. PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): I wonder if the minister would explain, Mr. Chairman.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Chairman, the principle provision of the bill is to enable the pension payable under The Superannuation Fund to be increased in the years between 65 years of age and 70 years of age, increased for that period, and then subsequently decreased when the Old Age Security Pension begins to be payable at 70 years of age. This is done now, but the provision is to make the change to correspond with the increase in the pension, in the Old Age Pension from \$55.00 a month to \$65.00. Now there are a number of other adjustments in the bill and I don't think it is necessary to detail them, except to mention that one of them is to enable The Superannuation Fund to invest in the securities of Metropolitan Winnipeg, Metropolitan Toronto and any other city in Canada. Apart from that there are just some technical adjustments which I think are better seen at the committee stage.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the question of The Superannuation Fund, I presume there's nothing in the resolution or the bill that we'll have before us dealing with the point that I wish to make, but I wonder if the Provincial Secretary can indicate whether or not any action has been taken in respect of an attempt to make civil servants' pensions portable with other jurisdictions?

MR. EVANS: We have not initiated any action to make the pensions portable. There has,

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.) . . . however, for a year now, been a committee of senior civil servants studying the developments with the hope that when portability becomes possible that we will be able to make those provisions available for our own people the same way anybody else is. I think some of the proposals that have been made in Canada were proposed more for discussion purposes than for practical adoption. It's my view that there were some faults found in the Ontario scheme and it's just as well that this period of study has ensued so that any arrangements that are made will be satisfactory when they are brought forward. We are not in a position now to indicate that there is any action in view with regard to portability.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker the Committee of the Whole House has adopted certain resolutions and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

MR. CARROLL introduced Bill No. 117, An Act to amend The Electricians' Licence Act.

MR. EVANS (Provincial Secretary) introduced Bill No. 130, An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

Committee of the Whole House.

HON. G. JOHNSON (Minister of Health)(Gimli): Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to remind the members of the House that the Environmental Sanitation Laboratories will be open for the inspection of the honourable members at 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning and I would be glad to meet any members who wish to tour the laboratory on the 10th floor of the Norquay Building, say at ten minutes to ten in the morning. I think the honourable members will be most enlightened if they could spare the time to see this facility and certainly we would welcome the press or anyone who wishes to attend with the honourable members.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate how long this tour will take?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I would hope that it would take between half an hour and an hour. You can spend as much or as little time as you wish.

MR. D. ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Last week in introducing his estimates he announced that the teachers who mark papers will be getting an increase of from \$19.00 to \$23.50 a day. I understand that the teachers have now been told that while they're getting the increase, that the day is now one hour longer, so that the increase works out to about 10 cents per hour in the form of an increase. That's the information which I have been given, and I wonder if this is true.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Minister of Education)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, it's true that the length of the marking day will be increased. I don't know about the mathematics that the honourable member mentioned.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Committee of the Whole House.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider the bills shown on the Order Paper.

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

Bill No. 3, with section 4 as amended and the new section 8 was read section by section and passed.

Bill No. 4, with section 2 6(a) as amended read and passed.

Bill No. 5, with section 1 as amended was read and passed.

Bills No. 14, 22, 30 and 32 were each read section by section and passed.

Bill No. 33, sections 1 to 9 were read.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): Mr. Chairman, Section 9, you have the amended section?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, as amended yes.

MR. GROVES: This Act comes into force on a day fixed by proclamation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Bill be reported, passed. Bill No. 37 was read section by section and passed.

Bill No. 43 with section 2 as amended was read and passed.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, has the Honourable Member who is sponsoring this Bill ascertained the legal or moral or intellectual definition of the word "Snye"?

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I'll have to answer the Honourable Member for Lakeside that for the past two weekends, I've been trying to run this down. My father might have remembered had he been alive, but no one that I've contacted around Brandon seems to recall how the name originated. My own opinion was that it might have been derived from some Scotch or Welsh description of a small creek or something.

Bills No. 52, 54, 55, 57, 58, 69, 70, 71 were each read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 72.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I ask leave of the Committee to have this Bill stand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All agreed. Bill stand?

MR. CAMPBELL: discussions going on are there on this one?

Bills No. 75, 76 were each read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 77 Section 1, Section 2

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, the questions I'm going to raise actually have to do with the four bills I think there are of a similar nature here. I notice it's the intention to have the hours of the Court set by Order-in-Council. Presumably then there would be changed from the present hours. If that is the case, what about the staff over there -- I'm not thinking about the judges. I'm thinking of the staff and so on. Will there be some consideration made insofar as pay increase if the hours are increased?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I believe that question's already been asked and answered at an earlier stage, but I'm quite happy to tell my honourable friend that we are not certain as yet as to just what the hours will be. I believe I can make the same general response to the Honourable Leader as I did to the Honourable Member for St. George when that is known, I believe the government can be relied upon to make its usual -- deal in its usually fair way with staff involved if there is any problem arising in that connection.

MR. MOLGAT: I'm sorry if I missed the question before; I didn't realize it had been asked.

The second question I would ask then, and this relates again to the three or the four bills. These judges who will be allowed to give judgment after their term had ended. Will they then be paid on the same basis as when they are acting full-time or will they simply be paid their retirement pay as of the date that they retire?

MR. LYON: If there is any -- of course the pay is not a matter affecting the Legislature because that comes from Ottawa. I don't believe that there is any consideration to the question of salary after they retire. They retire on an effective date, their pension -- if they are pensionable -- starts on that same date, and I don't believe the question of remuneration comes into it. It's a facility to enable judges who may have a large backlog of cases building up to hear them all before their actual time of retirement and then to permit them to consider judgment for the period stated, I believe it's eight weeks, after their retirement in order that they may deliver judgment before they're right off the bench.

MR. MOLGAT: But they will not be paid during this period as judges even though they will be actually working as judges?

MR. LYON: Well, they won't be sitting as judges. They will be writing judgments on matters presumably, that took place before. That is if the situation ever arises. Some of them of course like to clean up their work before they retire and I think that is the case in most cases. This section which has always been in the act, merely adds the situation where a judge retires after reaching the age of 75. It's always been in the Act. I would imagine that the same conditions that have heretofore prevailed with respect to judges retiring on account of reasons of ill health and so on would prevail with respect to retiring on account of 75 age.

Bills No. 77, 78, 79, 80, 85 read section by section and passed. Sections 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Bill No. 86 passed - - -

MR. CAMPBELL: bill that we've been discussing with regard to the payments for predators and I know that there's another bill before the House at the present time that is changing the method we've been using up to now, but isn't it a fact that there are just two municipalities in this position this year, which rather indicates that most of the municipalities have been paying pretty close attention to the present rules and regulations? Does the Minister really think that on the basis of that excellent performance that he should decide to penalize them if they don't get their, through inadvertence, get their claims in on time?

MR. HUTTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, the intention of the -- I can't talk about this bill in that context that the honourable member has chosen to discuss it without discussing the other one. The intent of the other bill is to do away with the need for coming to the legislature for authorization to pay these. Now I would suggest to the Honourable Member for Lakeside that the fact that the municipalities must have their case brought to the legislature for authorization of payment of the certificates does in fact tend to be a type of discipline. When their requests no longer have to be brought to the Legislative Assembly then one might anticipate that there could be a laxity develop and for this reason we are asking the Assembly for the right to impose a penalty for late filing. If we were in fact coming to the legislature each year to continue to do this, then I would say there was no need for it. But where we're moving this thing from the jurisdiction of the Legislative Assembly and allowing the Minister to have the right to make these payments, then I think that some penalty is required.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, my point was that the fact that there are only two municipalities out of the large number that pay predator bounties that come before us to have their claims authorized, does not bear out the statement that the Minister made in introducing the other bill that the present system had come to mean little or nothing. I believe he even said less than nothing. My point is that even though the amounts are comparatively small that the present intention of penalizing them to the extent of half their payment is a little bit drastic considering the fact that their oversight is not very great and doesn't occur in many cases -- this year only two. That really isn't a very big problem for the Legislative Assembly and it doesn't take very long -- if the Minister and I didn't discuss this a couple of times, why it would have been all through in two or three minutes. I'd suggest to him that he consider the fact that through the years this has happened I think only through inadvertence and why penalize the municipalities even to a few dollars?

Bill No. 86 read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 87, Section --

MR. A. J. REID (Kildonan): 87, if the Minister can give us an approximate date when he'll have a definite plan and a program of this bill.

HON. JOHN A. CHRISTIANSON (Minister of Public Welfare)(Portage La Prairie): Mr. Speaker, the bill becomes law on a date fixed by proclamation but we would hope that that would be very shortly after it receives Royal assent. We are presently in the process of arranging for personnel to staff the department that will be set up and we are canvassing the community for candidates for our Advisory Committee. However, we must first have legislative authorization before any of these things can be carried very far. But I can assure the honourable member that we will be proceeding with all dispatch in the program that is envisaged here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 47, 1 passed, 2 (a) passed, (b) --

MR. CAMPBELL: 87, is it?

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, is that 87 or 47?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Bill 87.

MR. DESJARDINS:87, Section 2, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move that Section 2(a) be deleted. Now my reason for this, Sir, the Honourable Minister stated himself that they're busy getting a staff and that the government will establish the Advisory Council fairly soon. Now in Section 13 you will see that the government will have the right to define this word "amateur" and I think that this is one of the most important sections of this bill because a lot will depend on this definition of amateur sport. If you remember well, Mr. Chairman, a few years ago while we were looking at the other proposed bill for Sunday sports, we discussed this question of amateur part of the afternoon and practically all evening and we had to have a certain committee to look into that, and since then we have noted that this is still not perfect. Now there certainly will be enough time. I know that it's clear the intent of this bill what we

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . want to use this money for and as I said before, Section 13 will give the government the right to define this word, or make any changes that they want, and I feel that the government would be well advised to wait until they have the proper staff -- which is being done now -- and also until the Advisory Board can get together and study this question and probably bring in a recommendation. If you're going to bring in an advisory staff it means that you need them; that you want to listen to them, and I think that they will bring in a lot of things that definitely could help the Minister. Things that he might not have had a chance to think about and it will always be time to make this decision a little later on. There's nothing to lose and everything to gain by going along with this amendment, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the function of this legislature and of the government are to define certain matters of broad policy within which the people charged with the responsibility, the administrative responsibility of carrying out this policy can work, and we feel that in proposing this definition we are doing just that. We are laying out broad guide lines under which these people can more adequately carry out the job that we are going to entrust to them.

Now we have laid down a pretty wide definition. It means any athletic activity that is engaged in solely for recreation, fitness or pleasure, and not as a means of livelihood. Now in view of that very broad definition, we felt that we should give the Advisory Committee certain powers, and the administrative branch certain powers to perhaps restrict slightly that definition. However, it's not anticipated that there will be any great need for this but it is felt that the authority should be there to take care of differences of opinion that may arise. So, Mr. Chairman, in view of our responsibility for defining policy I think that we should leave this definition in, as it is stated here. It isn't anticipated there will be any difficulty, any conflict of the sort that arose at the previous time because this is not a matter of law; this is a matter of administrative policy, and therefore we feel that the definition should remain as we have it in the Act.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, it's refreshing to hear the Minister state that the government will finally be responsible but I think that in this case, especially in the fact that the Minister is insisting that we should have a board, that these people should have something to say. There's no reason at all that it should be decided now, except maybe that the Minister and the government want to show that they're ready to do something on their own. That is certainly very good, but this is not a case where it should be done. As I said before once we're elected here we do not become authorities, especially on these subjects here and it certainly would be well advised to wait. I can't insist, I'm only one but I'm sure that the Minister and the government would be sorry if this is not done.

Now the Minister stated that this definition is very broad. I can't see how with the word "solely", the definition can be broad. Now I don't know if the Honourable Minister realizes what this could mean. "Solely for recreation". It means that somebody that is active in sports and using his name for maybe to sell at a sports store -- that could be questioned. Because if you've studied the word "amateur" this is something that people have been debating for a long, long time. I have no ulterior motive to suggest this. The government will be the one that'll decide after discussing it with people that have had experience in this field and it might be that this definition is the best and that could be done a little later on, but I can't see why the Minister insists in keeping this in. I don't know if he thinks this is going to make him look a little better. I can't see where the reason is at all. If they want this later on after discussing it at the first meeting with the Advisory Board and the staff, it could go right in. It's not going to hurt anything, but as I said I can't insist. This is just a suggestion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 1 passed.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Sir, wasn't that -- I still want to vote on it; I'm still going to vote --

MR. ROBLIN: The member gave us a motion, Mr. Chairman, that the clause be deleted and I suppose the next step would be to put the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 1 passed; 2 (a) passed; (b) passed --

MR. DESJARDINS: Sir, I moved on No. 2 that Clause No. 2 (a) be deleted.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . understand it very clearly, Sir, the Honourable Member suggests that 2 (a) in its entirety be deleted from the bill. He makes that motion. I think we can

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) proceed to vote on it.

Mr. Chairman put the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion lost. Sections 1 to 3 and 4 as amended of Bill No. 87 were read and passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: In regard to Section 5, I would like to ask the Minister if there's any recent advice from the federal government as to the likelihood of them making the \$200,000 payment; and if so, when?

MR. CHRISTIANSON: The last communication we had with the federal government on this was the formation of a continuing Deputy-Minister's Committee of all the provinces, and these people, it is expected, will be meeting soon in Ottawa to carry forward further aspects of this. We haven't had any actual commitment from Ottawa on the amount of money, as yet.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, no doubt the Minister will have noticed the same thing that I did that recently in the House of Commons, one of the members for Manitoba raised this question asking on behalf of the Province of Manitoba if there had been any further progress made. I remember the answer as being that they expected to be able to make an announcement pretty soon. There's no further word on that, I take it?

Section 5 of Bill No. 87 passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 6 - -

MR. DESJARDINS: I would like to move that Section 6 subsection 8 be amended by striking out all the words after the word "reappointment" in line 28; that is in the first line of subsection 8. Now this is another thing that I've covered before, Sir: I feel that especially in this case where there's no payment -- these people are not receiving any salary and we're just pioneering in this field -- that it would be unwise to develop somebody, to have somebody on this Board and then, because of this subsection after two terms -- we might have somebody that is very interested; it might be a person that is not working, that is retired and that might like to give his free time for this well-worthy cause and because of this subsection, after two terms we would say "no, thanks very much, goodbye." Now there's no reason why this has to be done. Again this committee will be appointed by the government. If they feel that somebody has had enough time, even though they've been giving good advice, that this person could be changed, that's fine. They don't have to establish that everybody's in there for life. But there certainly will be certain members that they will want to keep -- certain members -- it might be the Athletic Director of the University of Manitoba and men like that who are in that field all the time. I think that there should be provision for this. This again is not tying the hands of the -- like my other amendment -- it's not tying the hands of the government. I think it's just something that will improve this Act. There's no reason why the people should stay on, as I say, on this Board for life. Some might want to retire after one term; some after two terms; but I think that we should not have anything in this Act that will force us to say: "thanks very much, we can't use you anymore", to people that are definitely bringing a good contribution. And there won't be that many that will be fully qualified and that will have the time and that will have the time and the interest; it's very difficult to find, especially as we see here, it looks like these people will not be paid, and I think that it would be a mistake if you bring something in this Act that will force you to tell them that you cannot accept their services.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, the purpose in putting in this proviso, I think there's no ulterior motive attached to it or anything like that. The council is composed of 20 members who will be regionally representative of people active in the field of amateur sport and will also allow for representation from groups who are doing work, such as the Legion or the body or other professional group such as that. At present as it stands they would have six years on the Board. They could be retired for one year and reappointed again for another six-year term, immediately after that. Now six years is quite a long time to serve on one board and there is a tendency on these boards to do the easy thing, to reappoint people. I agree with the honourable member that people who are on this board will be doing a good job or they probably won't be reappointed in the first instance, but it would seem to be administratively advisable that they should serve a six-year term and then perhaps make way for others, because really there are a tremendous number of people in the community who are active and who can serve to good purpose on the board, but if you have to rotate your membership it gives people more of an opportunity and will ensure a wider representation on the board. Now I can't disagree with what the honourable member says about people giving good service and

(Mr. Christianson, cont'd.) having to retire. This is probably quite true. But again when you're giving regional representation and a group this small in a community as large as Manitoba, it would seem that you must have some provision for rotation of the members of the group to keep it from getting too static at any time or getting people on for too long a tenure. Because new ideas are always important and I am sure that a person who had served for six years would welcome the opportunity to retire for one year, at least.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid that I do not agree at all with the Honourable Minister. It seems with his explanation that this bill is to provide a chance for 20 people; that we want a chance to rotate and give somebody else a chance. It's not that at all. Those people are important but they're not the ones that really count. Manitoba -- the people of Manitoba, the welfare of Manitoba in the field of amateur sport and physical fitness is the thing that counts, and I think it's wrong to say "give somebody else a chance", if you've got somebody that's really qualified. That's wrong and it's ridiculous. It's just not taking advantage of the people that are ready to do a job, that can do a real job, that are qualified in this field. I'm not stating -- the Minister said that there's a tendency to reappoint those people. Well it's up to him. I don't feel sorry for him. A little while ago he told us that he'd give us leadership. He could establish a policy without making this provision in this Act. He can establish a policy of having one or two terms, or one year, I don't care. But then let's not make anything in this Act force him to get rid of some people that can help him.

Now I'm sorry -- since listening to him, I'm sorry, it seems to me that the Advisory Board will not be what I thought it would be. It seems that it'll be just people from different regions and that is what I said the other day, when I did not make an accusation, but I said there was a possibility of having politics creep up in this business. It's just going to be a division, it looks like some people that'll just give recommendation to get rid of the money. Is this just an idea where there'll be a certain amount and then the people from different districts will get together and I recommend you give it to this in my district. That might be fair if this was just a grant, but this is more than a grant. This is a program that the government tells us that they will start, that they want to administer a program of all Manitoba. If it was just giving of a grant -- this Sir, is certainly not going to provide us with the leadership that the Honourable the Minister spoke of last week. I still think that it's up to him. The onus is on him. It's not that difficult to name the man. He's out there to do a job and if he thinks that the man has had enough or he's done a good job for a few years, but is not outstanding, I would suggest that this might not happen too often, but the odd time the Minister might want to retain the service of a certain very highly qualified and very capable man who's very interested.

You might say 20 members that's not very many, but if the Minister has had any experience in things like that, you will see that there'll be very few out of those 20 that will really work. There'll be very few. Oh at first it will be new, it will be terrific. But the work will be done if it's a real Advisory Committee, if it's not just people that are trying to get grants for different outfits and this is where I say, "watch out, don't let politics get into this." I'm not accusing you; I'm just telling you to be careful. But if it's a real Advisory Board the people that are really going to look into this -- because this is very important. It's important to me and I'm sure that it's important to everybody. The Prime Minister would not give \$5 million if he didn't think it was important -- not when he needs money as badly as he does right now. And I say that you should have a good Advisory Board, not just somebody that'll help you make grants. You don't need much for that, and this is where politics will come into it, and I think that you can make your own rules, you will anyway. That's what the government is there for. And you can make your own policies, but don't put something in the Act that will force you to get rid of somebody that can really help you. I'm not suggesting that you replace this by something else, or forced to stay through the two terms that they're appointed, for 25 years. I'm not suggesting this at all. I'm just giving you a chance to keep -- suggesting something that would give you a chance to keep the qualified man -- people that you would like to have, because there are just a few in a province. There's a lot of people that mean well. Volunteers you need, but there's not everybody that knows this field. You might have somebody that would move here, I mention, I'll give you an example, the man is highly qualified, let's say that Doctor Orban would move here. A man qualified like that, who's responsible for -- I don't know the title of that book, EX is it, or 5X or something like that. Well a man like that you wouldn't want to be

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . without his service for a year, and there are a few others like that.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: But we have to have this as a regional board. To suggest otherwise is just to ignore the fact that half the people in Manitoba live in Winnipeg and the other half are scattered for the length and breadth of Manitoba. And so how can you possibly build a provincial program without having regional representation? You just have to have it or you're not going to get the point of view of all these areas. The Honourable Member for Carillon was very worried that this program wouldn't reach out to the small communities. For the member to suggest that because it's going to be regional there's just going to be a group of people who are going to advise us on how to spend money and make grants and each one be grabbing for his own community, I don't think is a very realistic appraisal of the situation. From my vantage point it seems to me that this is probably a good idea at this time. If in five years time, we find that we want to reappoint the people for a third term there probably wouldn't be anything to hinder us from amending the Act to permit us to do that. But at this time and in order, I think probably it would help in recruitment of people for this Council, if they knew they were going to go on for a six-year term, or whatever, and at the end of that time they would have a chance to step aside and let somebody else come in. I think that it's a very good provision and I think it will help us in the formation of our Council. And if the fears that he expresses do materialize-- which I for one don't think they will -- we will have an opportunity at a later date to review this provision and we can always amend it before it will have any effect, because it will be some 6 years from today before this provision will actually have any effect on the operation of the program.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think probably we can leave it in now and it will probably strengthen the Act and strengthen our program for those reasons.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I wish the Honourable Minister would not insinuate that I'm interested only in the people of Winnipeg. I've never mentioned that at all, because if you do away with this amendment it wouldn't change a thing, you could still have people representing different sections of the province. But what I'm against, if you're going to have -- we'll say a certain portion, one member of this other place, one member -- you don't need that, unless it's the chance to give grants. You need people that understand the position, the problems in the City and some in the province at large, in the country. And I know that; I fully realize that. I'm not suggesting that only Greater Winnipeg benefit by this. I did not say that at all and it's wrong to try to insinuate that. I'm saying that you have a problem, a program, your problem will be the same thing in . . . as in Carillon, and be practically the same question. The only thing is people will advise as far as grants are concerned but there's a possibility that this might be a dangerous thing to do. I think that you should take the 20 best men that you have, and out of that you certainly won't find them all in Winnipeg, and let them advise you and work with them. But I still say you say that that could be changed. Well why make it then? If that can be changed, you say well "all right we can change that in 6 years." Well bring it in 6 years from now if you need it. It's the same thing. It's something that you don't need at all. I still think that you're wrong in doing that because you're not giving a chance to people that can really serve you that would like to stay maybe a little longer than 6 years. And you say that they might not be ready to accept if they feel they have to stay more than 6 years. Well they don't have to stay more than 6 years. People can resign anytime they want and they do not have to accept nomination on this at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is that subsection 8 of Section 6 of the Bill be amended by striking out all the words after the word "reappointment" in the first line, in the 28th line.

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

Remainder of Bill No. 87 was read section by section and passed. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered certain bills and directed me to report as follows: Bills No. 3, 4, 5, 14, 22, 30, 32, 33, 37, 43, 52, 54, 55, 57, 58, 69, 70, 71, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 85, 86, 87 without amendment and Bill No. 72 stand in Committee, and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. W. G. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member

(Mr. Martin, cont'd.) . . . for Swan River the report of the Committee be received.

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

Bills No. 3, 4, 5, 14, 22, 30, 32, 33, 37 were read a third time and passed.

MR. LISSAMAN presented Bill No. 43, an Act respecting the Closing Off and Filling in of the Channel of the Assiniboine River within The City of Brandon, known as "The Snye" for third reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question. The other day the First Minister asked me the origin of this word "Snye", and today the Honourable Member for Lakeside, and I'd been unable to find the meaning so after it passed Committee I went into the Library and I find that the word is quite an ancient one, the origin or derivation of the word is now unknown, but it has two meanings either one of which could have given rise to the calling of a small stream by this name. The word "Snye" is used in shipbuilding following the formation of a crooked plank and you could see that connection to a crooked stream. Then also the word was used to express "abounding" or "swarming" -- for instance, they give example of a village swarming with children -- snying with children, or a stream snying with fish. So you can take your pick as to which derivation or origin of the word might have been used here.

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

Bills No. 52, 54, 55, 57, 58, 69, 70, 71, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 85, 86, 87 were read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour for second reading of Bill No. 102. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, trade unions are a group of free citizens who by legal and democratic process band themselves together for the pursuit of honourable purposes. Trade unions are not offering goods for sale to the public. They are not engaging in any profit making services or activities. Their primary function, although not their only one, Mr. Speaker, is to enable individual citizens who happen to work for an employer, to arrange as advantageously as possible the conditions under which they will work. The contracts thus arranged are not contracts between employers and trade unions but between employers and their particular employees. Employers are morally entitled to legal redress against an employee who breaks his contract, but they are not morally entitled to legal redress against the trade union whose function was merely to provide facilities by means of which the employee could make the contract. To make it possible for an employer to sue a union rather than the employee against whom he might have a legal grievance would be to strike at the very heart of effective free trade unionism. In principle, it would be as if the Manitoba Medical Association were made legally liable for action against a medical practitioner, or a group of practitioners found guilty of unethical practices; or if the Manitoba Teachers Society were to be subject to damage claims if a staff of teachers in a high school should walk off a job. It is easy to see that such a situation would constitute an invasion on one of our most cherished rights -- namely, the right to free association, non-profit organization for the purpose of promoting social economic and political causes.

Many sincere people are misled into believing that the proposed amendments are just by the argument that trade unions are counterparts of employers' organization and therefore that what is "good for the goose is good for the gander." This is to perpetuate a serious fallacy. If a trade union were an agency which hired out its members to employers in the same manner say as secretarial agencies do for a profit the case would be entirely different; but a trade union is nothing like this, it is a voluntary, self-help organization formed by free citizens to carry on their legitimate purposes.

Trade unions are more comparable to home and school associations than to employer organizations. Home and school associations sometimes arrange with insurance companies to make accident insurance available at low rates to the parents of all the children in a given school. The low rates are not available unless a certain percentage of the parents agree to take part. Trade unions arrange with corporations and companies giving wages and conditions of work for all the members of that Union in a given plant or factory. It is unthinkable that we should introduce legislation making home and school associations legally liable if any one or more of its parent members should commit a breach of the contract with the insurance company.

(Mr. Peters, cont'd.) We would expect the company to take action which the law allows against the particular parent who had broken the contract and against all of them if they had all broke it. It should be equally unthinkable to make a trade union legally liable for a breach of contract by its worker members. It is quite obvious that if there were legislation making The Home and School Association or The Medical Association or The Teachers' Society legally liable in this way it would quickly become impossible for them to carry out vital services to their members and to the public interest. Equally, such legislation would rapidly make it impossible for trade unions to carry out their services to their members.

There has been growing in recent years a spirit of reactionary prejudice against trade unionism. So far only two provincial legislatures dominated by the obstructionist spirit of the Social Credit Party have expressed this prejudice in their statute books, but now we have the Government of Manitoba, proposing such prejudicial legislation in our province. And I say, Mr. Speaker, there is no justification for this legislation.

MR. RICHARD SEABORN (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the proposed amendments to the Labour Relations Act. I have been a member of the Union since the age of 15 years and I might say I've shared in all the fears and suspicions that frequently beset the trade union membership and I have also done my share to try and get higher returns for my labour. As long as I remained in the category of an employee such acts seemed to be perfectly natural for if we have studied many long years to be proficient, we want to receive as much financial recognition as possible. Later when I was placed in the position of an "employer" however, I began to appreciate the two sides involved in this very important question. In my present situation I find that I'm faced with a wage-scale borne by a national radio and television service supported by the public purse.

Now, I'm not saying Mr. Speaker, that the services of the members of the Union are not worth what is being asked, but it is evident that when pressure is applied against a subsidized industry there is actually no way to measure the relationship of wages to the finished product. This can and has created some difficulty to private enterprise which must rely on its own resources to meet the established wage scale successfully negotiated with a Crown corporation. So you can realize, Sir, how I'm in the delicate position of being a trade-unionist and also an employer. But out of this experience perhaps I can add something constructive to the matter before us, having shared both points of view.

It is becoming apparent that some thoughtful union leaders are beginning to see that pushing wages higher and higher, particularly in times when we have a climate of economic stagnation and unemployment, amounts to a slow strangulation of our economic system. Early last year when speaking in Brandon, Mr. Sam Goodman said that "the trade-union movement was now moving into an era where national interests were overtaking class interests and where there was a compulsion to do something about national questions." Mr. Goodman who is the vice president of the Manitoba Federation of Labour, added that "the unions were moving closer to a position of social responsibility recognizing that the question of morality is of wider significance than just the well being of the membership." Now if this information as reported in the Brandon Sun is true, we have two important admissions of the short-sightedness which had dominated official trade union policy. One is that until now unions have pursued narrow class interests, regardless of whether they coincided with or ran contrary to the national interests. The other is that until now unions paid little if any attention to organized labour's social responsibility in the unions selfish quest for the well being of their memberships.

Earlier Mr. Claude Jodoin expressed his great concern of the unemployment situation and warned against the far reaching peril of the growing ranks of the unemployed. The president of the Canadian Labour Congress stated: "it was evidence of serious trouble in our economic structure." He went on to say: "there is of course no unemployment under communism. They have full employment bought at the cost of freedom and human dignity. It is up to us to show that under our system we prefer there can be full employment without loss of freedom and human dignity." These are fine, wise words, Mr. Speaker, and is further evidence of the growing realization that the trade union movement appreciates the gravity of the situation. We are not implying in the least that the responsibility for our economic problems lies solely with the labour unions, nor are we suggesting that labour should shoulder the entire burden of the sacrifices which are necessary for restoring our economy to full health. If what Mr. Goodman

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd.) . . . says is a reflection of a changing attitude of union leaders toward labour's role in the functioning of our economic and political system, our chances of avoiding an economic and political disaster in a not too distant future may soon start improving. There may be still time to foil communist attempts at fomenting artificial class hatreds which would inevitably end up in the destruction of political freedom.

Here, Mr. Speaker, I think it is of more than passing interest that one Winnipeg union, Local 832 of the retail clerks with about 1,500 members in the Metropolitan area came out in complete support of the Tritschler Report. In the Christmas edition of the Local's bulletin, "The Answer" the editorial says: "Here we have the findings of one of the most able judges in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Justice Tritschler punches straight from the shoulder and lays the blame clearly where it belongs. If industrial relations are to improve, positive actions must be taken to implement the recommendation of this report." And more recently, Mr. William Maloney, the National Director of the United Steel Workers of America, suggested that the strike weapon may be obsolete. However, Mr. Maloney's explanation is not motivated it seems by a sense of co-operation. "It is," he says "the result of the improved standard of living and the costly medical, hospital insurance benefits which most of our members now enjoy; as well the increased cost of living, making strikes extremely expensive. When we add to this the pressure of massive unemployment", he concluded, "another incentive to legal strike breaking, strikes have become extremely difficult." This was reported in the Winnipeg Tribune of April 5th. In other words, Mr. Speaker, strikes are creating more and more hardships on the working man, another reason why this deserves our earnest consideration. Although, we must admit that industry has been unwise in its philosophy of rugged individualism and the tremendous economic power, it has wheeled it because of it. On the other hand, I believe it is being recognized that labour would be equally unwise if it tries to replace the capitalist control by a dictatorship of its own.

We can see the defects and weaknesses as manifested by management and we must appreciate that some important labour leaders are admitting there are failings in the trade union movement as well. To me, Mr. Speaker, this is a very healthy sign, for it is only as we recognize these various weaknesses can we approach the problem of industrial relations with any measure of success.

Rarely challenged is the right to strike, while everyone in the population, including the strikers themselves, will acknowledge the inconvenience and dangers of strikes, few will question the right to strike concept. The Province of Manitoba recognizes the right to strike. It is legal to strike. But there's lots involved in the strike, Sir, for we not only have the disruption of our economy which may have far-reaching effects and the natural dangers that are inherent from strikes, but we have the hardship that arises when the actual livelihood of the workers are at stake and the effects on their immediate families as we have already seen. I have acknowledged that management can be at fault, although sometimes they are influenced by circumstances beyond their control, but I also know instances where the rank and file of the union membership has been influenced against their better judgment by their officers and thus created an environment that has only aggravated the situation. I do not think I need point out the futility of comparing the vote among union members to the same act in any other organization, as mentioned by the Honourable Member for Radisson, because it must be obvious that the union vote involves the very livelihood of individual members concerned. With such vital issues at stake, I am convinced the role of a mediator will be an important one, for we must recognize that respect in regard to the common good is a two-way proposition. Business in the first place must be willing to do its share and actually set an example in this respect but it must be obvious that wages that are too high can be as detrimental to our economy as wages that are too low. If a business is in difficulties, I would suggest that it would be better to have it continue in operation at a fair wage level, than have it shut down and throw its employees into the ranks of the unemployed.

I am also in agreement with the secret vote supervised by a mutual agency, because, Mr. Speaker, I'm not naive enough to believe a few individuals would express themselves contrary to what they well know is the will of the majority, particularly by a show of hands, or by a standing vote. I experienced one strike and I know it is a time when reason is clouded by the emotions. This is undoubtedly the reason why the International Constitution of my union, which

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd.) . . . is affiliated with the American Federation of Labour, prohibits any local calling a strike, or boycott unless first sanctioned by the International Executive Board. This reveals, in my opinion, good common sense and the realization of the seriousness of any physical rupture with management. I am sure this body would agree that the issue should be placed squarely before the membership before they're asked to place their jobs in jeopardy and then have the opportunity to express their opinion freely, and by means of a secret ballot. I cannot see that such a move as contemplated by this amendment would prove to be restrictive, but is on the contrary an honest attempt to recognize the dignity of the individual, based upon a concept of the common good and the public welfare.

I am confident that the rank and file of the trade unions will favour section ten of this bill. However, when we come to paragraph three of Section 14, we arrive at the most sensitive point of these proposed amendments in The Labour Amendments Act. The Leader of the NDP Party protested that an individual member of a trade union could take action in a court of law, but he didn't enter into the difficulties that faced the member, even before he contemplates such an act, and, despite the remarks of the Honourable Member from Elmwood, there are two fundamental features of a trade union that distinguishes it from other associations. First of all the great body of the members in the trade union movement are there simply because their membership card is essential if they are to follow the particular trade they have chosen and are not members of free choice in many cases. I am not saying these men are not loyal to their union, but their loyalty is motivated by the presence of the second main feature. This is that the union has full control over the livelihood of its members and this influence enables the union to impose a system of disciplinary actions and penalties to keep the membership in line. I have no criticism of this, Mr. Speaker, because much of this is necessary, but sometimes it does happen that an individual member is treated unfairly or his livelihood is jeopardized by the action of his union. In this case he has to follow a set procedure that is not only time consuming, but can prove expensive. We will find that a member is not only discouraged from taking outside action against the local, but also against another member. For example, section 2 of article 31 of the International Constitution reads thus: "If any member proceeds in court against any local before exhausting his rights in the federation, such act shall constitute such member's resignation from membership in the federation." Again in section 4 we read, "The act of any member or members of any local, causing or planning for the issuance of an injunction or a restraining order in any matter properly within the jurisdiction of the federation, before all locals or federation laws have been exhausted, shall constitute such members or members' resignation from members in such locals wherein he or they held membership and they shall not be reinstated while such injunction remains effective." Finally in section 6 we shall find that: "The act of any member assisting another member or non-member, professionally or otherwise, in an application for a procuring of a restraining order, or a permanent injunction against the enforcing of laws of the federation or the laws or price lists of any local or locals shall constitute such members resignation from membership in such locals wherein he held membership, unless the applicant for such restraining order or permanent injunction is a member who has exhausted all means at his disposal as otherwise provided for in the laws of the federation."

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition brought forward the case of Mr. Tunney and his difficulties with the Teamsters Union, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to present another. Recently an individual protested against the remark of an international executive officer of one of our major unions, who stated, and quite rightly too, that a member sacrificed some of his personal civil rights when he joined the union. The member was endeavouring to fight against the loss of his trade through the actions of an unscrupulous contractor of the union, who was successful in persuading the trial board to believe his statements which had no substance or element of truth in them. Following the usual procedure the member appealed to the Executive Board and failing this, he then tried to reach the convention floor, his final court of appeal. This was denied on constitutional grounds and the member had no further recourse, but because his membership was so necessary that if he had any intentions of remaining in his trade, he was compelled to accept the final decision in silence. There are rare occasions when a member will appeal to the courts, but the plaintiff has never succeeded in accomplishing his purpose and such a course is most hazardous.

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd.)

Basically a trade union is mainly concerned with the main body of its membership and individualism is not without its penalties. The sole aim of the union hierarchy is not only to maintain its present position, but to strengthen it, if possible. I'm not saying this is wrong, Mr. Speaker, because I know that if it were not for the trade union movement, the lot of the working man would have been a very difficult one in many areas of our economy, but in this test of strength, it must be obvious that neither capital or labour has any right to dominate the other. Trade unions are very powerful organizations today; sometimes far greater in their field of influence and financial resources than the particular industry with whom they may be in dispute. Recognizing the responsibilities of all parties in our present complex economy I believe the unions themselves will see their legal entity as a step forward in their development and the heralding of the day in which co-operation must be the key note. A new realignment of ideas and a reconstruction of the relative positions of capital and labour must take place and be willingly accepted by all concerned. The working man will profit the most by this readjustment for the simple reason that he has been denied his rightful place in the over-all scheme of things in the past. But the burden must be shared by labour and management alike, for neither capital or labour are absolutes. They act and react one on the other in constant relationship. Both groups must come to a mutual understanding of fundamental principles based on the recognition of the dignity of the individual and the realization of the higher ends and destiny of human society, and without this concept, Mr. Speaker, I believe industrial peace will be very difficult to achieve and our hope for a sound social order will be dim indeed.

Therefore I feel this bill is a step forward in the right direction and will be acceptable to all parties concerned as they grow to accept their responsibilities in the economic field and work toward the betterment of mankind.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. ROBLIN presented Bill No 20, An Act to amend The Insurance Act, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of the bill, I think there are one or two points upon which I ought to comment. Members will note from having read the bill itself that most of it consists of amendments of a rather routine or administrative character. There are, however, two items which I think I should draw to the attention of the House.

The first is the provision in Section 4 which gives an injured party, who obtains a judgment against the person who injured him, the right to sue an insurer who has issued a liability insurance policy covering the latter. This is a change in principle. It is recommended to us by the Association of Superintendents of Insurance for the various provinces in the country, and it may be that there will be representations of Law Amendments Committee or that members of the House will wish to examine the officials on this point to grasp its full implication, but I do draw attention to the fact that this is a new principle that's being imported into the law.

The second major point that I should like to refer to is the part that increases the minimum limits of insurance in the province. The minimum limits are being increased under this bill from the former limits of \$10,000, \$20,000 and \$1,000 for personal liability and for property damage, to an all-inclusive figure for public liability and property damage of \$35,000.00. Now I think there has been some discussion over the last year or two about the limits for insurance, the minimum limits, and pretty general feeling that they were too low where they were. We have the experience of the damages that are actually being experienced in this field, the judgments given by the courts, and the general feeling, I think across the country, that the limits at present are too low.

In fact, as my colleague the Attorney-General I'm sure will point out when he brings in a companion bill with respect to the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, that other provinces across the nation are taking somewhat the same action that we are, going to \$25,000 or \$35,000 all-inclusive. The increase in the rates will certainly affect the public of the province, but not, I think,

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)

to any marked or extreme point of view. At the present time, about half the insurers already have policies written for larger amounts than the minimums that we specify under our statute, and for those that do not, there will be some increases in premiums, but according to the figures that have been shown to me, they are not excessive, ranging from a few cents to a few dollars, depending on the risk and the location in the province. But in view of the necessity of providing reasonable protection for the public who may be involved in accidents, it is deemed advisable that the House should give consideration to this increase in the minimum standards of insurance in the province. As I have intimated, my colleague the Attorney-General will be bringing in a companion piece of legislation dealing with the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, so that both the minimum limits and the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund may be kept in step. The effective date for this change of minimum limits that is proposed is July 1st, 1963, which will allow, we trust, an orderly changeover from the present minimum limits to the new ones as proposed. I think these are the main points in the bill, Mr. Speaker, and I commend it to the House.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I realize that Section 7 of the bill will not come into effect until July, 1963, and will not affect policies that are presently in force. I want to say at this time that I feel that it was high time that the limits and amounts were increased, but I wonder why the figure of 35,000 was used. I have before me two rate books and they do not list an amount of that figure. In fact, in the inclusive limit table they quote 25,000, and then 50,000, 100,000, 150,000, 200,000 and 300,000. Most of the insurance companies anticipated that there would be a change this year and, as a result of that, when the new rate books came out on January 1st, many of the companies quoted a minimum premium to cover 25,000 inclusive. In our own office we, since the 1st of January, have sold nothing less than 25,000 because that was the rate quoted. That is, it appeared that the insurance companies were prepared to issue a policy for 25,000 at the rate quoted in the rate books.

The Honourable the First Minister mentioned that it would increase the premiums slightly, and I think he's absolutely correct there. According to my rate book, the premium for 50,000 inclusive is 120% of the standard limits; for 25,000, 110%; so I suppose that 35,000 would be somewhere in between, and you could probably expect an increase of 15% or thereabouts. I realize that the insurance companies will have 14 months, I suppose, to adjust and bring out new rate books to comply with this, but perhaps the Minister could tell us why the figure of 35,000 was — or how it was arrived at and why it was decided that this was the amount.

Another question that I might ask, is that in subsection (a) of Section 222 (2)(a) it states that third party liability claims arising out of bodily injury or death have priority to the extent of \$30,000 over claims arising out of loss of or damage to property. That, I suppose, means that if there was a claim that totalled 50,000, if a judgment was awarded of 50,000, then the property damage, if there was a property damage claim say of 10,000, the insured person then would have to pay the other 5,000 himself. Under (b), of course, it just supports that and says that claims arising out of loss or damage to property have priority to the extent of 5,000. It isn't intended to place a limit of 5,000 -- that is if there was a claim by some queer coincidence that totalled 35,000 and the property damage was exactly 5,000, then it would be paid, but it doesn't place a limit I don't suppose on the -- that is if you had a claim of property damage, we'll say of 20,000, it would be paid so long as the total claim did not exceed 35,000.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, as far as we're concerned on this particular bill dealing with insurance, we're not raising many questions on the principle of the bill. We may have some comments when the Attorney-General brings in the bill increasing the amount into the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund.

I would, however, like to ask the Provincial Treasurer whether or not the amount set in this bill will be uniform in other jurisdictions so that there's complete reciprocity -- maybe this should be properly brought up in the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund -- no, this is the proper place -- for that, in order that the agreements between the various provinces will carry on. That's the only question I have at this time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, if I may close the debate and answer the questions that have been raised, I would like first of all to deal with those proposed by the Honourable Member for Gladstone. When he asks us how the rate of 35,000 was arrived at, well it was arrived at first by considering in what general area we thought the minimum limits should be raised to. That's the first consideration. Then when you get to that general area, then you ask yourself, what

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) do other people do and what does the industry recommend? And if those general considerations coincide, then you hit upon the figure that you propose. It is in that general way that the figure of 35,000 has been considered. First of all by considering what minimums-- and remember these are only minimums -- we should make it mandatory for the public to purchase, and it was concluded that something in this general area would be satisfactory. We then asked ourselves what other provinces were doing, and we found that British Columbia and Ontario were going to 35,000; Alberta going to 25,000; and no decision as yet in the Province of Saskatchewan. We then consulted with the industry and they showed a preference for 35,000, indicating that that could be purchased for only 2% more than the 25,000. So all things considered it seemed like a reasonable bargain to -- or at least a reasonable figure to strike off.

I should point out that according to the figures I have here, for pleasure drivers over the age of 25 with a five-year clear record, this increase from 10,20 and 5 to 35,000 inclusive will cost about 25¢ a month to the person who's buying his insurance. That's in Metro, which is the highest of any rate quoted. The increase for Brandon, The Pas, and the remainder of rural Manitoba is considerably less, but it's only 25¢ a month in the highest area, which is the Metro area. With respect to Class C-3, pleasure drivers over 25 years with a three-year clear record, the change in limits will cost 30¢ a month in the Metro area, with corresponding reductions in other parts of the province where the rates are lower; and for those under 25 years with a two-year clear record, it will cost them in Metropolitan Winnipeg to obtain the new rates of insurance, 50¢ a month over what it cost previously, with corresponding reductions in other parts of the Province of Manitoba. So I think when one considers the very substantial increase in protection that the general public have, that we're not really asking the drivers who insure themselves to do something that is out-of-the-way. I think that many will consider that this is a proper move at this time.

I think my honourable friend also asked me what the meaning of the clause was with respect to priorities. As I understand it, the way this clause is read, in my opinion, is that the first priority will be given to personal liability to the extent shown, and then the property damage clause will come in. But I think that only applies in cases where the maximums are exceeded, otherwise the 35,000 all-inclusive applies. But I would ask my honourable friend to renew his question at the Committee stage when we have experts present, and we can see whether my interpretation is the right one. It may well be that it is inaccurate, and I would ask him to raise the question again at which time we can settle it authoritatively.

I think the last question was one raised by the Leader of the New Democratic Party, who asked me if we had reciprocal arrangements with the other provinces. We have, and as far as I can tell, the reciprocal arrangements will extend to the new arrangements as well. We do have to clear that with them to be certain, but we have no reason to think that we will not obtain reciprocity on these rates as well. So I think those answer the questions that were raised. (Interjection) -- Oh yes. Reciprocity, my colleague tells me, is from here to British Columbia. That's the present arrangement. --(Interjection) -- Well, we haven't got anything of an official nature, but as far as we're concerned we do recognize to some degree certain other jurisdictions which have laws similar to ours.

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

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 91, An Act to amend The Manitoba Telephone Act, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the amendment contained in the bill before the House can be said roughly to embody three broad groups of changes to The Manitoba Telephone Act. The first group relates to organization of the corporation and the executive thereof; the second group relates to the borrowing provisions of that legislation; and the third group may be generally bunched under administrative changes recommended to the government by the commission.

Dealing first of all with the organizational changes, members of the House are aware, Sir, that at the present time the Act provides that there can be one, two or three commissioners in charge of the operations of the system. In fact, for many years the system has been operated by one commissioner with the advice of the Executive Committee, which is composed of the

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) Commissioner, the Assistant General Manager and the Comptroller. The new executive arrangement, which is proposed in this amending bill, follows closely that of The Manitoba Hydro Act which was approved last year by the House. Instead of the present one man commission, it is proposed in the legislation before us that the MTS will be operated by a Board of Commissioners consisting of not less than three nor more than five. Members will recall that in the case of Hydro, I believe the maximum limit is seven. All commissioners will be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. Their salaries will also be fixed by Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and will form part of the operating expenses of the system.

It is proposed by the amendment that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council will also appoint an executive officer to be known as the "general manager", with very wide managerial authority, who shall be responsible to any restrictions which the board, by resolution, may decide to impose upon him. Provision is also made for the appointment by the board of the assistant general-manager, a post which already exists, who will have the powers and authority of the general manager, either in the absence of the general manager or for various reasons, or at the request of the Minister or the general manager if circumstances may require it. Again, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may designate one of the commissioners to be Chairman of the Board, and it's provided in the amendment that the Chairman may also be the general manager of the board. Honourable members will appreciate that that is the likely course to be followed, that the Chairman and General Manager will be one and the same person. There is also a provision in the bill that a member of the Legislative Assembly may be one of the commissioners, the same as in the Manitoba Hydro bill.

Now, the second group of amendments deal with the borrowing provisions of the Act. At the time of floating of the recent MTS bond issue, consultations were had with the solicitor in Toronto for the investment syndicate handling the purchase, for the purpose of clarifying and strengthening the borrowing sections, and the following amendments were proposed. A number of these amendments, honourable members will observe, Sir, have been taken largely from The Manitoba Hydro Act and, in that respect, are duplicates of what appear presently in the Hydro Act. There are, without mentioning specific sections, I can say, Sir, that the titles of officers whose signatures are required on securities to be issued by the System are made to correspond to the titles of officers of the System as changed by the proposed amendment. Where the original subsection provided for the signatures of the Commissioner and the Comptroller, it now provides for the signatures of the Chairman and the Secretary, and changes of that nature are made in the borrowing provisions.

The necessity of manual signature of the Provincial Treasurer or one of his officers on any guarantee of the System's security is done away with, and permits the signature to be made by mechanical means. There are other sections generally dealing with the borrowing provisions which we can go into in more detail in committee if members of the House wish.

Now again, the third group of changes which are recommended from the administrative standpoint, one could deal with each of them seriatim but I would suggest that there are perhaps one or two which would catch the eye of members of the House. There is one that provides that employees must wear a badge. Well it's become a requirement now that a great number of telephone employees have identification cards, which will give more ample identification than a badge, and so it's provided that they may use either an identification card or a badge, and there are amendments of like nature in the administrative sections which honourable members might well wish to obtain more detail upon when we reach committee. I therefore commend this Bill to the House for second reading, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Minister for his statement. We will, of course, be able to go into more detail when we come along to the committee stage, at which time I presume he will have the officials of the Telephone System there. There are a number of points in which we will be wanting some clarification. The matter of the borrowing powers, I take it that from now on the Telephone System will be borrowing on its own and not through the province or not through the backing of the province. This we will want some clarification on.

The questions then about the board itself. This is a change following, as the Minister indicated, on what was done in the Hydro. We see no objection to establishing a commission of

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . this sort. We presume that the intention is to have commissioners who are not themselves directly connected with the Telephone System, but rather lay people as is the policy elsewhere. The case of the MLA who may be a member, we will assume of course that in view of the fact that my honourable friend has been made a member of the Hydro Commission, that it is the intention this time to select someone from the Opposition for that post. This, I'm sure, will be the intention of the government in this case, which is the normal procedure when we appoint committees in the House, to take from one side and then the other.

We might have some questions, Mr. Chairman, on the matter of the term of office of the commissioners. I note that there is no fixed term and that they hold office specified in the Order-in-Council by which he is appointed. It seemed to us desirable that some term be established so that the House will know what the intention is. It should, in my opinion, be the same for all the commissioners. I don't think it would be wise to have a term varying between different commissioners, and if my honourable friends of course appoint a member of our group as the MLA, we would expect that when we're over on the other side that we might want to make some changes, so we wouldn't want the appointment to be a permanent one necessarily. So I think this is something that we might have a look at. Other than that, Mr. Chairman, we have no objections to this Bill in principle and we'll have further questions when we come to committee.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I find today a very obvious coalition between the government and the Official Opposition in respect of at least one of the principles that we have before us dealing with this Bill, and that is in regard to a member of the Council or a member of this Legislature being a member of the Commission -- the Manitoba Telephone Commission.

We in this group have protested this. We protested this at the time that the Manitoba Hydro Electric Bill was before us, setting up a commission for that public enterprise. We want to protest once again that one of the provisions of the Bill is to allow one of the members of Council -- The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council -- or of this Legislature, to be a member of the commission. We have maintained that politics, in every way, shape and form, should be kept outside of our public enterprises to the fullest degree. I appreciate the fact that it might be said that the provision is that only one MLA or member of this Legislature can be a member of the Commission, but I suggest, and I'm of the firm opinion, that there should be no public representative on a commission of this nature. I note also that the person concerned who may be appointed is enabled to receive an addition to his indemnity in this Legislature, an additional amount of money for performing on this commission. If it's the desirability, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to have a representative of this Assembly on this Commission in order that there may be some liaison between the Commission and the Assembly by virtue of having a member on there. He should serve exactly in the same capacity as a member of this Legislative Assembly does in any other commission or capacity for which he is chosen from this Legislature or by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

I recall two or three debates, when my honourable friends opposite were on this side of the House, in respect to the Manitoba Telephone System. They called it "The Sacred Cow" and they were most anxious at that time to have a public enquiry into every aspect of the Manitoba Telephone System. I wonder what the opinion is today of my honourable friends opposite, now that they have the responsibility of looking into the matter of the Manitoba Telephone System. Is this one of the reasons that my honourable friends are suggesting the possibility of one of the members of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council shall be a member of the Commission of the Manitoba Telephone System? I want to say this to my honourable friend the Leader of the Liberal Party. I doubt very, very much whether any appointment to this commission of a member of the Legislature will come from this side of the House. So if he has that thought in his mind, I suggest that he dismisses it, or maybe by these few remarks of mine, it might persuade my honourable friends opposite to suggest one from this side of the House on to this Commission.

One other point I wish to make, or ask the Attorney-General in connection with this Bill deals with Section 11, which deals with the question of telephone poles and installations on a road that has been closed either by the Crown or by the municipality. This amendment -- I don't know if it's a rewording or if it's a new idea -- because it would appear to me that this would give the right of the Telephone Commission to keep telephones and telephone lines and

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd.) . . . poles on a street that a municipality may want closed for the purpose of development. It could conceivably mean, according to this amendment, Mr. Speaker, that notwithstanding the desirability of the municipality, then the Telephone Commission could keep its lines on a street that was closed by a municipality for the purpose of developing either industry or housing.

Those are the comments which I make on this Bill, Mr. Speaker. I intend, if present, and I hope to be at the time that this Bill is in committee for its consideration, to move the deletion of reference to an MLA being on this commission as I did in respect of the Hydro Commission. I think it's a departure from the time-honoured custom which we have had here in the Province of Manitoba and I regret it.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the remarks of the Honourable the Leader of the NDP, I can assure him that the particular section that he made reference to with respect to the closing of roads is a rewording, with the intent being to clear up an ambiguity that might have been present in it.

The question was asked about the internal changes in the Manitoba Telephone System. I believe my predecessor in office reported last year during estimate time that at that time, and for some months preceding his remarks, there had been an executive survey group from Bell Telephone Company of Canada looking at the internal operations of the Manitoba Telephone System. I'm happy to report that, as a result of some of the recommendations that they made, changes have been recommended and made by the present Chairman, the commissioner of the Manitoba Telephone System. This is not to suggest that these were long overdue changes or anything of that nature, but certainly changes to keep the executive operations and the general technical and administrative operations in line with the most efficient that are known across this country, and indeed on this continent.

With respect to his position, vis-a-vis MLA on the Board, this is not a breach of any tradition of this Legislature at all, because my honourable friend will recall from the debate last year that this provision was carried into The Manitoba Hydro Act -- the consolidated Act -- from the old Manitoba Power Commission Act where that provision had been for a number of years, so rather than an introduction of something new, it merely is placing this large public corporation, the Manitoba Telephone System, on exactly the same footing as the Manitoba Hydro Board. I am sure my honourable friend will agree that members of this House should not perhaps be prohibited by their membership here from contributing to the boards of other corporations, if, in fact, they have a contribution to make; and presuming that they are here, we can only presume that the contribution they make here will be equally as good as the contribution that he or she might make on the board of the Manitoba Telephone System.

The question was raised about the term of office of the commissioners by the Leader of the Opposition. That certainly can be looked at. I think the point he raised has some force to it. I don't believe there is anything else I can cover at this time. We'll be quite happy to go into any other details when the bill comes to committee.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): I wonder if the Honourable Minister could tell us where we can find the applications for that job.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Attorney-General one question. May I just preface it with a comment. He made the remark that -- I wouldn't say that he was surprised at my objections -- but he posed the question, would I not agree as to the capabilities of members of this Assembly also being members of the commission? My question to him would be, would he think that that would be so desirable to the extent of all of the members of the commission being members of this Legislature -- of the commission? All members of the commission being members of this Assembly?

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: No answer? No, I'm serious on this. My honourable -- and if he refuses to answer that's okay by me, Mr. Speaker, but I posed the question to him because he raised the question of the good qualities and capabilities of the members of this Assembly. I simply ask him, would not he agree then that all of the members of the commission should be members of this Assembly?

MR. LYON: I'll be quite happy to answer my honourable friend when we get into committee. Of course we don't usually answer hypothetical questions of that nature, but I'm sure my honourable friend, having expressed that view, will agree unanimously with us then that there should be at least one member of the Legislature on the commission.

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

.....Continued on next page.

MR. ROBLIN presented Bill No. 100, An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act (1), for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN; Mr. Speaker, I think that the members will expect some statement from me with respect to the bill that is now before the House because it is just a little more than two years ago, 1960, that a bill to provide a form of Metropolitan Government for the Greater Winnipeg area was introduced and ultimately approved by a pretty substantial majority in this House.

I suggest that the introduction of this bill in 1962, containing as it does the suggestion that we should have a review of the workings of The Metropolitan Act, provides a convenient and appropriate opportunity for members of the House, including myself, to have a discussion of the workings of the Metro concept; to identify any lessons that we have learned in its operations; and to make whatever provision may be deemed necessary for changes and improvements that experience might indicate as being required. When I introduced the bill two years ago, I think members will recall that one of the main points I tried to make clear was that this was essentially something new with us, in the nature of an experiment, and it certainly would call for the goodwill and the co-operation of all levels of government associated with the problem. I think we made it clear, and we tried to at any rate to make it clear, that we recognized that there would be the need to learn as we went, in respect to some of these problems, and we promised at that time that we would have an open mind to whatever suggestions might be received with respect to The Metropolitan Act. Indeed, as I recall, the Act of 1960 was pretty extensively amended to take into account some of the constructive suggestions that were received from the other side of the House as well as this side of the Legislature. And I want to re-emphasize again today, when speaking of the Metropolitan Corporation, that that is still our view, that we trust, open-minded with respect to the problems involved, and we solicit the constructive suggestions of members of the House, and others, with respect to this important matter.

Perhaps it's just as well to recall why we have the Metropolitan Corporation at all. There was a very clear chain of events leading up to the decision of 1960 and it started about ten years previous to that, where there was a general recognition that there was a need for a more unified co-ordination of certain important municipal functions in the Greater Winnipeg area. Indeed it was on the initiative of the Mayors of the Metro area corporations, the mayors and reeves of the various municipalities now in the Metro area, it was on their initiative that this entire process began. They at that time, as members will recall, established their own exploratory commission that made certain studies of the matter, and this commission again recommended to the government, at that time that there should be a wider and more official study. As a result of that request, the Greater Winnipeg Investigation Commission was set up and it laboured for a number of years, from 1955 to 1959, and while that was going on and after it, there were scores of inter-municipal meetings. There were very sincere and concentrated discussions with municipalities on the part of the government and by municipalities between themselves, with an effort to see what basis of agreement could be found to remedy the problems that had been exposed by the area mayors in their initial initiative and studied by the Royal Commission whose report was before us at that time.

Whatever else may be said about the matter, I think it is fair to say that there was general agreement at least on two points. That agreement extended to almost all the municipalities. It certainly extended to the three leaders of the political parties in the House at that time, and I believe extends to the leaders of the political parties in the House at the present time. And that is that two things were required. First of all, that we should provide for a measure of centralized planning for the growth and development of the physical environs of the City of Winnipeg and its neighbouring municipalities. That was the first thing upon which I think there was no disagreement; that central planning was required. I re-read the speeches made by the honourable members in the course of the debate two years ago, and a review of those speeches indicates that there was no disagreement on this point. The review that I made also confirms the second point; namely, that if one accepted the concept of a centralized plan for the growth and development of the area, that the central operation of certain services was highly desirable. In re-reading the submissions of municipalities to the Royal Commission

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd) and to others, it was pretty clear what these central services are; and The Metropolitan Act was devised principally to recognize those two central facts, about which, as I say, there was a very wide measure of agreement. I think we can say that and I think we can still say it, while reserving whatever reservations members may have about the way The Metropolitan Act is at present working, or reserving any reservations they may have about any particular part of the act, I do think that there will still be -- I trust there will still be that pretty general agreement with respect to those central points.

Now the Metro Act that we passed provided that there should be this central planning, and that it is indeed a proper metropolitan function. Indeed it is the main function, as I see it, of the Metropolitan Government, because everything else seems to flow from it; and that associated with this there should be metropolitan control over certain major roads and bridges, and I say that while conceding the ample room for difference of opinion as to what constitutes a major road or bridge, and there certainly has been a difference of opinion with respect to that subject. I refer also to the fact that transit and the supply of water and a good sewage system were also matters which seem to recommend themselves for metropolitan administration, and one could add to that the function of assessment, even though as I emphasize the assessment is still being carried out under the provisions of the charters of the local municipalities, the actual operation of it is done from the metropolitan basis. In addition to that, there were certain services of a rather secondary character such as parks and civil defence and mosquito control and items of that sort.

Now when one considers the functions that were to be transferred to the Metropolitan Corporation, I think there are two observations that I should like to make about them. The first is that essentially there is no new function involved here. Essentially, the functions that are now being performed by Metro were indeed performed in one way or another by their predecessor municipalities. What happened was that a certain minimum of functions were peeled off, so to speak, from municipal responsibility and made a metropolitan responsibility, for the reasons which I have discussed and which we have all reviewed on several occasions.

The second point that I think can be made is that the essential functions that were included as mandatory under the metropolitan system, certainly was the minimum essential functions. It was the policy of the government at that time only to transfer to the Metropolitan Corporation those functions which it conceived to be essential under the circumstances, and we have left and we still leave the transfer of any other functions to the metropolitan government to a voluntary agreement between those concerned, and I say that is still our policy because we have no plans at the present time to add to the functions of the Metropolitan Corporation.

Now, as I say, there was some disagreement on one matter. The question of a referendum was the most substantial matter of disagreement between any of us here in the House. I think that six of the honourable members in the last analysis, five from the Liberal Party and the Social Credit member, voted against third reading on this question of referendum, but apart from that, I think there was pretty well standard agreement around the House that the main structures of the bill had much to commend. Although I will be the first to acknowledge members have the right to have their reservations about particular aspects of the matter, as indeed we have our reservations on this side of the House, because as we have seen the metro plan develop in this area there are a couple of comments that I think one can, in fairness, make.

The first of these is that there has been less co-operation between the Metropolitan Corporation and the area municipalities that I for one would deem to be desirable. I think that fact must be faced. The second observation that I would make, that the Metropolitan Corporation took over and developed its various responsibilities at a faster pace than I for one had anticipated. With respect to co-operation, I would certainly like to see the Metropolitan administration make the most use that it can of the long experience of those who are in other areas of municipal government, whether they be elected officials or appointed officials. On the other hand, I would like to see the municipal officials in the area municipalities, some of them at least, more willing to recognize the logic and the necessity of those responsibilities which have been allocated to the metropolitan jurisdiction, because none of us may lose sight of the fact -- that applies to government and members of this House as well as to anybody else -- none of us must lose sight of the fact that the purpose, both of the Metropolitan

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd) Corporation and the area municipalities, is really the same. It is services to the citizens of the area and the responsibility is the same; namely, responsibility to the taxpayers of the area; and personal differences, when they arise, ought to be submerged in this overriding necessity to work for the public good.

Well, Sir, human nature being what it is, I suppose it is only to be expected that in the introduction of a new system such as the Metropolitan Corporation, which after all has not been going very long, that in the introduction of this system we do make heavy demand upon the goodwill and the understanding and the co-operative spirit of many people who are involved. And I suppose it is only to be expected that there will be growing pains -- and there certainly have been growing pains -- but I cherish the hope that as experience develops, we see our officials in these two spheres growing into and learning more of the complementary nature of their task, and that we can expect to see a pulling together in double harness as this experience and learning takes place. I know, for example, that there is the Association of Metropolitan Mayors and Reeves, and my belief is that this can be valuable and constructive instrument in improving consultations and understanding between the Metropolitan Corporation and the Metro Mayors and Reeves. The fact that the Metropolitan Corporation now distributes minutes of its committee meetings to all the area municipalities, ought certainly to improve the flow of information in that direction, and I am optimistic enough to rely on the goodwill and the good sense of all to work together more and more for the public good in this fair field and area of municipal government.

Well I also said, and I repeat it, that besides the problem of co-operation and co-ordination, Metro has developed faster than we had expected that it would. In fact when the bill of 1960 was prepared, we thought it would probably take about four years for them to work into the full scope of their responsibility, but we see that after 18 or 24 months or so, that they are almost now completely in operation with respect to the responsibilities entrusted to them. In the original Act, thinking of this four year term, provision was made for a detached and independent reassessment of the workings of the Metropolitan Statute, which at that time was envisaged for 1965, when we expected there would be a complete assumption of Metro function. But now as this assumption of functions has been more rapid than expected, one can contemplate the desirability of having this Committee of Review, this Commission of Review, because we intend it shall be a commission, to get about its job a little sooner.

But there is another problem associated with the whole of this matter which I think deserves our full consideration, and that is the question of public confidence and public support for the Metropolitan idea, as such. I believe, and I trust I am correct, that there is a substantial and impressive public support for the Metropolitan idea, although perhaps a rather silent one, but I must admit that there is another group of citizens who are vocal and active in opposition to the metropolitan conception. The charge has been made that Metro is moving too fast; that there is too little regard for the rights of the constituent municipalities; and that there is too little concern for the impact of Metropolitan policies on local taxes and on the local taxpayers. I must presume, and I do presume, that these views are sincerely held by the people who make them, but I believe that as a result, even though I myself think these views are not well founded in almost all instances, I think that, as a result, there is a danger lest there be created an atmosphere of confusion and uncertainty in the public mind which could have no other effect, I think, but to undermine the confidence and the support that we must look to with respect to the metropolitan idea.

The public must wonder how much of the controversy that has taken place is due perhaps to personalities and private differences and how much of it is due to defects in the statutory instrument under which the metropolitan government operates. It is for this reason, fundamentally, primarily -- it is for this reason of establishing that atmosphere of fact in which public understanding may grow, that we are proposing that the Commission of Review should be held before the date originally suggested. We take the view, Mr. Speaker, that a thorough ventilation of all grievances, whether they be real, or whether they be imaginary, will do much good; that we can separate in that way the solid criticism from that which is not so important; and that we can take action where necessary. We can identify the groundless complaints, where such exist, and we can identify the real complaints where such exist, and action to remedy any defects that are exposed may then be possible. I suggest to you, Sir, that under the aegis of an

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd)authoritative and independent body we may find the best way to improve and strengthen the workings out of the metropolitan idea, because without adequate public support and confidence -- let there be no mistake about this -- without adequate public support and confidence, the Metro Corporation will not be able to fulfill its proper role. I think that the work that may be done by a Commission of Review will do much to work toward the creation of that atmosphere of informed knowledge among our citizens, which I think is something to be desired in respect of this province.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that we intend to advance the date of the Commission of Review from 1965 to 1962. We propose that the Commissioners shall be appointed -- we intend them to be commissioners -- that they shall be appointed with full power under The Manitoba Evidence Act. We attach much importance that the men who man this commission should be people who command public respect for their integrity and their disinterested judgment; and we also attach importance to the fact that they should be knowledgeable in this field of local government. We think that the terms of reference should be sufficiently broad to enable thorough and satisfactory investigation of all aspects of the Metropolitan Corporation. We expect that they may give particular attention to certain difficult problems that we have been grappling with recently, such as this matter of liaison and co-operation between the Metropolitan Corporation and the area municipalities. It may perhaps examine the question of boundaries as to whether the patterns of growth that recent studies have been concerned with justify the present Metropolitan boundaries, or whether some others might be indicated. Perhaps it might even go so far as to examine the impact of Metropolitan government on the area municipalities, to see whether those economies of administration which have been hoped for, have in fact been realized by the operation of the statute as it is at the present time.

But regardless of that, we intend that there shall be the fullest opportunity for the private citizens and voters, for the area municipalities, and indeed for the Metropolitan Corporation itself, to make a public presentation and discussion of the current problems that have been experienced in the working out of Metro, and to put forward those suggestions for improvement which they may desire to do. It seems to us that a public review before a competent commission will guarantee fair play all round in respect to the differences of opinion which have been causing some trouble.

But having said that, Mr. Speaker, I want to say something more, because I want it to be clear in the minds of members that whatever the defects there may be in the working out of the Metropolitan operation, I want to reaffirm our belief that the principle of the metropolitan idea is indeed a sound one for us here and now; and that posterity as a taxpayer, or posterity as a citizen, would not be served if we retreated for instance from the principle of central control of the planning operation in this area, because that is something that affects the future growth and development of one-half of the people in the Province of Manitoba. I would suggest that good government, and good sense also, commends as necessary the metropolitan control of the various services that I've referred to, like sewer and water, major roads and bridges, transit, assessment, and the like, however difficult we may find problems of implementation. Public controversy about the workings of Metro is not to be unexpected, and perhaps it may not even be excessive, judging from the standards that have been set in the Toronto development for example. But though we confirm in this way the confidence that we have in the metropolitan principle, we do want to take advantage of the opportunity to make constructive changes that municipal officials and the public generally may be able to place before the commission that I have referred to.

I would like, Sir, and I think it only fair on this occasion, that I should express some words of appreciation for the work that is being done by the Chairman of the Metropolitan Council, Mr. Bonnycastle. I think I can say without any exaggeration that he has displayed qualities of moderation, of fair play, and of willingness to try, in what is admitted to be a most difficult problem of human relations; and I think that his record in that respect entitle him to our respect, our goodwill, and our support in the contribution that he is making as Chairman of the Council to the welfare of the citizens of this area.

So far, Mr. Speaker, I have been dealing of the problems generally that concern the Metropolitan administration and the other municipal governments in the area. I now want to take a look at the relationship between the Metropolitan Corporation and the provincial administration

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd)..... particularly in the field of finance, because that is one about which some question has been raised in this House; and indeed that is one that is taken up by the Blake-Goldenberg Report that was made with respect to metropolitan relationships in the financial field with the provincial government. Members will recall that the province was asked to revise the tax base of Metro to give them 100% of the business tax, and we were asked at the same time to provide special financial assistance for Metro from the province. I have stated previously that the government on consideration declined to accept the suggestions made, and I think that the House and the public generally are entitled to know the reasons which guided us in making this decision. I should point out that the study conducted by Messrs. Blake and Goldenberg were initiated by the Metropolitan Corporation at the suggestion of the Municipal Board. I emphasize my respect for the gentlemen concerned, as well as for the representations that Metro made in that connection, but I should also state that we received requests from others, the City of Winnipeg, for example, that the Blake-Goldenberg Report should be examined as objectively as possible. We agree with that, and we examined it in another respect as well, because we feel it can only be looked at, not in isolation as a separate problem, but only in the full context of the other municipal and local governments in the Province of Manitoba. Blake-Goldenberg had their terms of reference with respect to Metro, and in that respect one can understand their recommendations, but our responsibility is to the field of municipal government throughout the province, and it was on the basis of those studies, in the full context of municipal organization and finance, that we did not find it possible to implement the recommendations of Messrs. Blake and Goldenberg.

Here I want to read a statement, Sir, of the reasoning that we followed. It's rather involved and I think rather than just speaking from notes, I ought to read this to make sure that it is quite right. "The basic recommendations of the Blake-Goldenberg Report were that full control of the business tax should pass to the Metropolitan Corporation. The argument was advanced that business tax should have the broadest possible base in the area of commercial operations as business is economically dependent on the community, and adds by its dependence to general municipal costs. Whether urban communities exist because of its businesses or whether the businesses exist because of the community is not a matter for precise measurement, probably both influences are present. Business like everybody else benefits from municipal services, and whether they are the basis of additional costs in the community is very difficult to determine in any accurate fashion. Certainly it must be conceded that business assessment does broaden the tax base and that it yields large and certain tax revenues, relatively easy to collect and administer. To the extent that business thus more than pays its way with respect to municipal costs, its attractiveness in an area of large commercial concentration needs no further emphasis. Regardless of whether it is for reasons of special benefits derived, or on account of the costs of services provided, or those of a remunerative tax base, it is generally been accepted in Canada that business assessment is a proper factor in municipal taxation, therefore, it seems to us to follow logically that the organization which provided the services, or bears the additional costs attributable to business, should receive a share of the benefits and extra revenues arising therefrom as part of its general system of taxation. As there has been some redistribution of responsibility between the area municipalities and the Metropolitan Corporation, it may well be argued that a portion of the extra revenue derived from business assessment should therefore be allocated to the Metropolitan Corporation, as indeed has been done. However, significant and costly services to business, such as police and fire protection, for example, remain with the area municipalities. Under these circumstances it would be hard to justify assigning 100% of the business tax proceeds to the Metropolitan Corporation.

"Blake-Goldenberg suggests that where the business tax is assigned to the Metropolitan Corporation, the use of an assessment for school grant purposes, which includes the whole business tax assessment, is improper. This, I believe, indicates a lack of understanding of the part that balanced assessment, which of course includes business tax, plays for grant purposes. The use of assessment in developing a school grant formula has been to assist poorer areas in their support of standards of education more nearly equal to that of the wealthier areas. The inclusion of the real property tax, the personal assessment tax and the business tax assessment gives a measure of the financial capacity or wealth. It is not an index of revenue raised. Expenditure of revenue, whether by the Metropolitan Corporation or by an area municipality, is

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd) used for essentially the same services. Where Metro is responsible, the area municipalities are not, and vice-versa. The basis of wealth which governs the grant formula is not changed due to the introduction of Metro into the proceedings, a third party which spends part of the aggregate of the total municipal funds. It is for this reason that we cannot accept the argument that the balanced assessment is an improper measure for the distribution of school grants.

We have, at the present time, a situation where 50% of the business tax has been allocated to the Metropolitan Corporation. The balance of the corporations needs have been distributed on the basis of equalized assessment of real property. So long as no additional significant functions are transferred from the area municipalities to the Metropolitan Corporation, and none is proposed, there would seem to be no basis for the change. Only where a greater number of the more costly services were assumed by the Metropolitan Corporation, with a corresponding financial relief to the area municipalities, would there be justification for assigning, by law, an increased share of the business tax to Metropolitan Winnipeg. The report also recommended that the Metropolitan Corporation be authorized to levy and collect business and personal property taxes and be authorized to introduce, if it deemed expedient, uniform rates applied on an equalized business assessment basis throughout the area. This proposal, of course, contemplated collection of 100% of such taxes by the Metropolitan Corporation. Uniformity of business assessment has been achieved this year. It is the first step toward the objective. However, the simultaneous equalization of tax rates to the Winnipeg level could cause serious disruptions of the level of business taxation in the area municipalities. While as an ultimate aim it is probably desirable that such uniformity should be obtained, at least for the purposes of the division of costs, it is not something upon which hasty action should be taken."

But there was a related question that was raised by Messrs. Blake and Goldenberg and that had to do with provincial grants to the Metropolitan Corporation. I want now to examine the case, as I see it, for larger provincial grants to the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, and here I lay down again the same basic consideration that I spoke of previously, that this is something that cannot be considered in isolation. It is part of the province as a whole. The Metropolitan Corporation is but a part of the local government structure and its financial claims must be considered in relation to the other local governments of the Province of Manitoba. I agree, Sir, that the weight of local government taxation on local taxpayers and its relation to provincial expenditures and revenues has been a matter of very serious concern to us and to others. Local taxes have been rising, even though provincial support has been rising even faster, but there is no room for complacency in this field.

Perhaps some light can be shed on the magnitude and relationship of the problem involved in local taxes if we compare our situation in Manitoba with that to be found in other provinces of Canada, and I would like to report some figures that are derived from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1961 preliminary estimates of the financial statistics of municipal government in Canada, in a table that is entitled: "Gross Current Expenditures By Municipalities." I have reduced these figures to a per capita basis, to afford an easy means of comparison. The gross current expenditure by municipalities in 1961, on a per capita basis in the Province of Ontario, for example, was \$136.00 -- \$136.00 per person is the weight of the gross current expenditure of municipalities in that province. Calculated on a similar basis, the per capita costs of local government in Alberta is \$129.92; the per capita cost of local government in Saskatchewan is \$118.50; the per capita cost of local government in Manitoba is \$104.94. Thus we see that on this table of comparisons, the municipal local taxpayer in Manitoba is better off, on a per capita basis, with respect to Ontario by \$31.00; with respect to Alberta by \$25.00; and with respect to Saskatchewan by \$13.50.

I do not cite these facts to indicate that we are satisfied with the situation, because we're not. From fiscal 1958 - 1959 to fiscal 1960-63, direct and indirect provincial aid to the municipalities of this province has gone up over \$25 million. There has been a 60% increase in provincial assistance to the municipalities of Manitoba in the last four years -- \$25 million -- and so while we hope that further aid may be given as revenues permit, I think we can say that, generally speaking, the municipal taxpayers of Manitoba are receiving substantial provincial support; and certainly their situation is comparable with that of other taxpayers in the

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd) three provinces that I mentioned. That gives you some idea of some of the facts that one must examine in connection with the over-all weight of municipal taxes on the people of the Province of Manitoba.

Now let us look at the situation with respect to Metro and see how the metropolitan municipal taxpayer is situated. In this respect I would like to make another comparison, and this time with the only other metropolitan government in the country, namely the metropolitan system in the area of Toronto. In making these comparisons I feel that one must take the total weight of the local taxes, and what we have done here is we have taken Metropolitan Toronto's own taxes plus the taxes of the area municipalities within Metropolitan Toronto, plus the taxes that are necessary to maintain the school boards of that area. In other words, the total local pool in Toronto and compared it to the same local tax pool here in Metropolitan Winnipeg. I begin by observing that direct provincial aid as a percentage of the total area budget in Toronto, the aid the Provincial Government of Ontario gives to everybody in Metropolitan Toronto as compared to all the tax expenses in Metropolitan Toronto, is 23%. The same figure calculated on the same basis for the Province of Manitoba is 21%. We admit the difference of 2%, but I go on to point out that the per capita cost of all these taxes in Toronto, for the metropolitan government, for the area municipalities and for the school boards, the per capita taxation in that city is \$152.00. The same set of figures in Metropolitan Winnipeg, for the area municipalities and for the area school boards, is \$110.00; a difference of \$42.00, or almost I should think about 40%, based on the Winnipeg figures. I could also mention that the total combined debt of the metro area in this part of the world is very favourable, being \$115.00 per capita. It compares with Toronto at \$294.00; or Montreal at \$300.00; or Vancouver at \$306.00; or Edmonton at \$466.00. It's a matter of some gratification for me to note, that in its financial issue of today, the Metropolitan Government of Greater Winnipeg secured an interest rate of 5.217% on its issue, and that might be compared with a cost of 5.495% in a similar issue by the City of Winnipeg or a recent price of 5.58% in Metropolitan Toronto.

Now I think I should refer to the fact, incidentally and in passing, that the bond prices have been improving, so these figures cannot be looked at in isolation from that fact, but regardless of the improvement of bond prices, it does indicate the interest and confidence that people have in the present financial structure of Metropolitan Winnipeg. I am also pleased to note that the winning syndicate that won this issue contained among its partners, James Richardson and Sons Limited in this city, Osler, Hammond and Nanton of this city, as well as the Toronto-Dominion Bank and Harrison of Toronto, so I think we must say that whatever else has happened, this issue with respect to Metro looks pretty good.

I conclude therefore, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the problem of relationships in this matter of finance between the Metropolitan Government and the Province of Manitoba, that it is too soon at this present time to say that our policies are not fair and right. I might point out that road grants for everybody in the Metro area, on the five year period, 1957-60, averaged about 1.8 million and the same comparison for 1962 shows the figure to be about \$3,361,000.00. There has been substantial support in that area. So I come down to this conclusion, that the Metropolitan Corporation is not on the present showing, whatever the future may be in store for us, it is not, on the present showing, entitled to special consideration that would not be applied to non-metro areas. It seems to us that if we make any changes in the structure of provincial grants to Metro, we cannot do so without taking into account the interests of the other municipal governments within the province; and when one considers that the Metropolitan area contains within it the richest concentration of real estate in the Province of Manitoba, comprising 65 percent of the total assessed value of our province, I think that we can, with some degree of logic, conclude that it ought to be, on that showing, able to pay for its own local services.

I will therefore, say that it is for these reasons that we found ourselves unable to accept the recommendation of Blake-Goldenberg for more money for Metro, and that we conclude that a further period of time at least should be experienced before we make any changes in our present approach to the problems of Metro finances. Maybe experiences will lead to a change in the future. I, myself, am coming to the conclusion that an authoritative review of the whole field of municipal finance, including not only Metro but every other municipality, is something that has to be considered very seriously; and it seems to me that no indication, no changes in

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd)our present system of grants to Metro is indicated at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, the House has very kindly heard me for a minute or two past 5:30. If I may just detain them for another second, as I'm not able to come to the House at 8:00 o'clock promptly tonight, I have another responsibility. I would just like to conclude very briefly and say this, that we feel that the principles of our Metropolitan administration are sound. We are open to conviction that there should be changes in method or in detail with respect to the system that is in force. We think that the appointment of the Commission of Review in the relatively near future is advisable, mainly for the reason that it will provide an opportunity to have a thorough ventilation of any differences or difficulties that people have conceived with respect to the Metropolitan operation, and where those public examinations result in constructive suggestions that can improve the situation, we will have an opportunity to take the necessary action. We feel that with respect to the financial relationships between the province and the Metropolitan Government, that so far no case has been made for any radical change in the system which we employ at the present time, and we feel that that can only be looked at in the full context of municipal government within the province of Manitoba. I would therefore hope, Mr. Speaker, that the House would agree that the measure we propose, which is essentially the convening of this Commission of Review in the relatively near future, is advisable under all the circumstances and that it will lead to an improvement in the functioning of the Metropolitan Corporation in the Greater Winnipeg Area.

MR. MOLGAT: Are you calling it 5:30 Mr. Speaker, at this time?

MR. ROBLIN: I take that to be the case.

MR. SPEAKER: I call it

MR. ROBERTS: I'd like to ask a question and the First Minister said he wouldn't be here at 8:00 o'clock. Mr. Speaker, I've listened with interest to the First Minister's remarks concerning the proposed Commission of Review and the things that they will study, the municipalities, metro, liaison between the two and various other factors of metropolitan government, but surely this Commission of Review will also study the Act under which Metro operates, the Legislation under which they operate and the financial arrangement between the Government of Manitoba, the municipalities and Metropolitan Winnipeg?

MR. ROBLIN: In answer to the question, may I say, Mr. Speaker, that while I mentioned certain things that I thought the Commission might review, I hope there will be a full review of all aspects in The Metropolitan Act. We have no desire to limit the review in any way in that connection.

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