



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable Thelma Forbes



Vol. X No. 1 10:30 a. m. Monday, August 17, 1964. 3rd Session, 27th Legislature.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
10:30 o'clock, Monday, August 17th, 1964

The Sergeant-at-Arms carrying a Mace, and followed by the Speaker, Mrs. Thelma Forbes, and the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, Mr. Charland Prud'homme, Q. C., entered the House.

His Honour Errick F. Willis, Q. C., Lieutenant-Governor, entered the Chamber and seated himself on the Throne.

HONOURABLE ERRICK F. WILLIS, Q. C., (Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba):

I welcome you to the third session of the 27th Legislature of the Province of Manitoba.

My Ministers propose to place before you certain measures for the improvement of local government organization and finance in the light of the recommendations of the Michener Royal Commission and of the Metro Review Commission.

My Ministers will also place before you certain urgent bills dealing with business and credit practices and you will also be asked to make provisions for the costs incident to this session.

I pray that you may have the guidance of Divine Providence in your deliberations and decisions.

MADAM SPEAKER: Oh Eternal and Almighty God, from whom all power and wisdom come, by whom Kings rule and make equitable laws, we are assembled here before Thee to frame such laws as may tend to the welfare and prosperity of our province. Grant, Oh Merciful God, we pray Thee, that we may desire only that which is in accordance with Thy will, that we may seek it with wisdom, know it with certainty, and accomplish it perfectly for the Glory and Honour of Thy Name and for the welfare of all our people. Amen.

Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

HONOURABLE STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C., (Attorney-General): Madam Speaker, I wish to present the report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations. Madam Speaker, printed copies of the report are on the members' desks, but the committee has made certain changes to which I would direct the members' attention at this time. On the first page at the end of the first paragraph, we are extending that by adding the names of the members of the committee. Members of the House will recall that the committee consists of the Honourable Messrs. Lyon, Carroll, Steinkopf, Smellie and Messrs. Cowan, Groves, Campbell, Hillhouse, Schreyer, Wright, Froese and myself, and that will be added if this report is adopted. On page 8 of the report as it is on the members' desks, down from the top under sub clause (b) there has been an error in spelling in the word "practise" at the end of the clause under (b). It should be "practise". And then one or two items down, under (e), the word "agency" has been misspelled in the report. It is "agency". With those changes the report is presented, and the report being somewhat lengthy the members may wish to dispense with the reading of it.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): I take it, Madam Speaker, that the report will be printed in whole in the Journals.

MR. McLEAN: Yes. Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

HONOURABLE GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the report of the Special Committee on Shared Services.

MR. CLERK: Your Special Committee on Shared Services begs leave to present the following as their first report.

Your Special Committee, appointed by the House on the 15th day of April, 1964, to consider the advisability of introducing a program of shared services without detriment to the public schools, and consisting of Hon. Messrs. HUTTON, JOHNSON, ROBLIN, Messrs. CAMPBELL, MARTIN, MILLS, PAULLEY, TANCHAK and WATT met on Tuesday, June 16, 1964, Tuesday, June 30, 1964 and on Monday, August 17, 1964.

(Mr. Clerk, cont'd) At the first meeting of the Committee, the members agreed to the preparation, by the Chairman, of a working paper to form the basis of discussion for further meetings of the Committee and also as a guide for the preparation of briefs by the general public.

Your Committee devoted the second meeting to the consideration of the working paper submitted by the Chairman, clause by clause. Your Committee suggested certain corrections and amendments, and ordered that the working paper then be made available to the press and the general public. It was agreed that the working paper did not necessarily express the opinion of all members of the Committee.

Your Committee decided to hold a series of public meetings where everyone interested could make representations.

Recognizing the wide public interest in and the many implications of, the subject referred to it, your Committee agreed that no restriction would be placed upon the areas or matters which any person might wish to discuss in dealing with this subject. The first of these public hearings was arranged for August 20th and 21st, but had to be cancelled owing to the calling of the Legislature.

Your Committee has not completed its work and recommends that it be reconstituted. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Attorney-General, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion

HONOURABLE DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Introduced Bill No. 1, An Act respecting the administration of Oaths of Office.

HONOURABLE MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary) (River Heights) introduced Bill No. 4, An Act respecting Joint Stock Companies and other Corporations; and Bill No. 5, An Act to provide for Relief from Certain Unconscionable Transactions.

MR. McLEAN introduced Bill No. 8, An Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act.

MR. STEINKOPF introduced Bill No. 6, An Act requiring the Registration of Mortgage Brokers.

MR. ROBLIN introduced Bill No. 3, An Act respecting The Manitoba Centennial Corporation, The Civic Development Corporation, and the Effect of The Legislative Assembly Act.

HONOURABLE ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q.C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell) introduced Bill No. 11, An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act; and Bill No. 10, An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT. (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Some time ago I wrote a letter to him regarding the TCA Thompson Enquiry Commission requesting that the group of volunteers who had gone to the delegation to Ottawa be reconvened and work closely with the government and his advisors in preparing the brief. I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether he intends to reconvene these people and, if so, when.

HONOURABLE GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, I believe a reply has been delivered to my honourable friend's office last Friday. Whether he has received it or not, I thought it was on its way. It will be our intention to consult the delegation as far as possible. My honourable friend will recognize that the conditions laid down by the present government at Ottawa make it impossible to discuss with the general public the material contained in the Dixon-Speas report, and that places a very severe limitation upon the degree in which other people outside the government circles can be consulted with respect to this investigation.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to raise the question of the privileges of the members of this House, and I do this, Madam Speaker, not with the object in mind of delaying consideration of the business for which we are called. The point that I raise, Madam Speaker, is the right of the government, or indeed even of the Crown, to call a meeting of this Assembly at this particular time in the morning. After many long fought battles, as I read the history of democratic Parliamentary practices, the rules of a legislative body are set by that legislative body, and we are gathered here this morning, Madam

Mr. Paulley, cont'd). . . Speaker, at 10:30 a.m. contrary to the rules, in my opinion, of this House, which calls for the sittings to commence at 2:30.

Madam Speaker, we have before us on the Order Paper this morning a proposition to set aside the rules of this House in order to make it possible in the future for us to assemble at 10.30 in the morning. I do not want to appear picayune or to appear to be small in this matter, Madam Speaker, but raise this point because it could conceivably be that if this practice is continued, the members of this Assembly could be called at any time other than provided for in the rules.

Now I appreciate the fact, Madam Speaker, that a special session was held in 1961, at which time we did meet at 10.30 in the morning, but if memory serves me correctly, at that particular time and prior to that meeting, there was prior consultation by the House Leader, the First Minister of the Province, with the leaders of the opposition parties. I regret to state, Madam Speaker, that insofar as this session is concerned I as the leader of the third largest group in this House was not aware of the calling of the session until I read the fact of the calling of the session through the media of the press, and also that the session would take place at 10.30 in the morning. I recognize and accept the responsibility of government to call sessions as they so desire, but I do respectfully suggest, Madam Speaker, that for the future, that if sessions of this Assembly are called, that at least for the opening session that they be held at the proper time in accordance with the rules of this House.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I am sure my honourable friend would wish me to reply to the question of privilege that he raises, because no one would wish to transgress the privileges that are traditionally, and by rule and constitution, those of the House. I must tell him that the point he raises concerned me as well and I took the trouble to inform myself about the constitutional situation with respect to the summoning of the Legislature, and I think it is clear that the summoning of the House, both the time and the place, is one of the prerogatives of the Crown. Indeed the Legislature can not meet unless it is summoned by the Crown to do so, and if one will consult the authorities in this matter, and I refer to Paragraph 24 of Beauchesne and also to Page 279 of May's 16th Edition, the situation respecting the prerogative of the Crown in summoning the House are set out.

I know my honourable friend has raised this point in a constructive sense, and if I have been guilty of any discourtesy in not referring to him in connection with the time we met, it was certainly not intentional because I would be only too pleased to consult with the leaders of the parties opposite respecting the time of the meeting, but I am afraid I just took it for granted that, in view of our previous experience in this respect, that 10.30 would be recognized as the time we were likely to meet. If I have in any way offended in that respect I would certainly be unhappy, but as regards the constitutional position, I would take the stand that it is the prerogative of the Crown to call the House and to set the time and the place regardless of whatever might be the rules of the House itself, which the House would deal with after it had met. I think there is a distinction there.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, if I may have just one word on this question of privilege. I, too, perused as many documents as I had available to me and I agree with the Honourable First Minister of the prerogative of the Crown in calling a session, but I could not find anything in any reference that I made to their prerogative of calling a session other than the rules of the House agree to. However, I do not wish to belabour the point.

MADAM SPEAKER: In order to prevent mistakes, I have obtained a copy of the Address of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor which was read. I wish to inform the House that Frank E. Skinner has been appointed Sergeant-at-Arms for the Third Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that the Votes and Proceedings of the House be printed, having first been perused by Madam Speaker, and that she do appoint the printing thereof, and that no person but such as she shall appoint do presume to print the same.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that during the present session of the Legislature, the House may sit from 10.30 o'clock in the forenoon until 12.30 o'clock in the afternoon, and from 2.30 o'clock in the afternoon until 5.30 o'clock in the afternoon, and from 8.30 o'clock p.m. until 11.30 o'clock p.m.

Mr. Roblin, cont'd). . . each sitting day, and on Saturday, and that each such sitting be a separate sitting of the House, and that Government Notices of Motion and Government Orders shall have precedence over all other business except Questions and Notices of Motion for Production of Papers.

MADAM SPEAKER: Moved by the First Minister and seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that during the present session of the Legislature, the House may sit from 10.30 o'clock in the forenoon until 12.30 o'clock in the afternoon, and from 2.30 o'clock in the afternoon until 5.30 o'clock in the afternoon, and from 8.00 o'clock p.m. until 11.00 o'clock p.m. each sitting day, and on Saturday, and that each such sitting be a separate sitting of the House, and that Government Notices of Motion and Government Orders shall have precedence over all other business except Questions and Notices of Motion for Production of Papers.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I thank you for correcting me on that last time. It is 11.00 o'clock and not 11.30. I did --(interjection)-- Beg Pardon?

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Is it at 8.30?

MR. ROBLIN: I'm sorry --from 8.00 o'clock until 11.00 will be the evening sittings. I had the opportunity of consulting on this point with the leaders of the two opposition parties opposite, Madam Speaker, and they were good enough to consent, I believe, to the introduction of this motion in order that the government may place before the members the full program for this present session as speedily as possible in order that the debates may take place with all due speed.

I'm conscious, however, that there are some items on the agenda this morning that can not be dealt with in any off-hand manner or within such a strict time schedule as we have laid down here in this speed-up motion as it is called. I therefore would like to make it clear, as I did at the last special session in 1961, that we would wish to accord to speakers in any part of the House a reasonable time to prepare themselves to reply to any debates that are initiated on this side of the Chamber, and for that reason we would be more than pleased to suggest to members, particularly to the leaders of the opposition parties, that they should indicate when they are able to proceed with the particular debate in question and it will not be called until they are prepared to go ahead. In that way I think we can achieve the best of both worlds. We can proceed with reasonable despatch and yet we will not in any way rush the business in an unseemly way or deprive members of reasonable opportunity to consider the legislation that is put before them.

So I move this resolution with the stipulation that we will respect the rights of the members of the House to a reasonable time to deal with these matters if they should not wish to proceed at the time it would normally be called.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, that is completely acceptable to us. We in no way want to hold up the work of the session. On the other hand, the government and the government members obviously have seen the legislation that is coming in; they have had every opportunity to investigate it, check back on any further information that they require, whereas this is not the case for members of the opposition. We accept the motion, the speed-up, on the understanding that we will be given time on legislation to have a proper discussion within our own group and full investigation before we are asked to reply.

MR. PAULLEY: We have no objection, Madam Speaker.

MR. J.M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I would like to inform the House that I will not give consent to this motion, especially so to the forenoon sittings. I will require certain time to go through the bills. Whereas the other parties have numerous members and they can refer them to certain members of the House to study them, I can't do this and therefore I will object and do not consent to the motion as it now stands. I object to the forenoon sitting.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I fear that this matter cannot be disposed of as easily as this because I believe it must have unanimous consent for this resolution to pass at this stage. There has been no notice of the resolution, and while it could be voted on by a majority of the House had there been notice, with no notice given I'm afraid that the House is in a position where the dissent of one member is sufficient to prevent the passage of the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: - - - my honourable friend who dissents, I think that may be the case, and if he dissents to the motion and we can't pass it then we'll all go home right now. We'll have to come back I suppose at 2:30 this afternoon with no business done this morning, whereas the government is prepared to place its proposals before the House right now. I'd just like to point out that if consent is now refused the only thing that we can do is advise the House that this is notice of motion and we'll vote on it two days from now. So we'll just gum up the works to that extent, but as far as I'm concerned it's a matter which I have no control over.

MR. FROESE: Well I certainly do not want to give consent and I am not in a position either to amend the motion otherwise I would amend it. I have no seconder and therefore I cannot amend the motion. I certainly don't feel that I should be prevailed upon to sit morning, noon and night and not giving me any time to go through the legislation that will be placed before us. I think this is unfair and I certainly will not agree to it.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, may I point out to my honourable friend that that's precisely the undertaking that I gave to all members of the House, not just the party leaders but to all members of the House, that if they were not prepared to proceed with discussion of the legislation because it was coming at them too fast, that the government would not insist on them proceeding with the debate at that particular time. So that I think my honourable friend's rights in this connection will be fully respected and he will have a full opportunity to give the consideration that he feels is necessary for the various bills. We will not insist on his proceeding at the first moment that the item appears on the Order Paper. If he tells us he's not ready to proceed, we will wait until he is. Now I think that's a fair offer. We don't want to rush my honourable friend. We're willing to give him the time. That's the undertaking that I have just given to all the members of the House and I think it should meet his particular case. I ask him to consider whether he wouldn't be willing to let us go ahead on this matter knowing that when he wishes to speak on any item if he is not ready, we'll wait until he is ready, because we're not prepared to push this matter down in that particular way. But I think he should give some consideration to the general procedure that we follow here and the measure of agreement we usually reach on these matters because we're not anxious to trample on anybody's toes.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, on reconsidering this motion before us, I would like to say no, that whereas he has consulted the other leaders on every occasion before every session, and on important items, he has never had the courtesy to call me in and discuss matters of this type with him. I feel this is very unfair. After all, I'm not only the Member for Rhineland, I'm also the leader of a political party in Manitoba and as such I should have the right to discuss these matters the same as any other political leader in this province, and therefore I was rather shocked to find these motions on the Order Paper this morning. I don't only object to this motion, I object to the next one as well, because I haven't had time to consider all those rules that are listed in that motion. I don't feel that I can go along with the second motion even if I consent to this one. I don't know in what place or what position that places me. I would agree to the first one but I couldn't agree to the second one.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, Madam Speaker, if I may again speak --quite out of order I must admit-- I take it that my honourable friend is willing to agree to the first motion without notice, for which I thank him, and we'll be glad to proceed with that.

The reason why I did not consult him with respect to our procedure here is parliamentary, because if he will consult the rules he will see how a party is defined for the purposes of this House, and I am pretty well obliged I think to work by those rules in dealing with party leaders. Unfortunately, unless one has a certain strength in this House one is not recognized as a party leader regardless of the fact that one may be a party leader outside this House. I say that by way of explanation to my honourable friend because I would not wish to in any way depart from the rule here, or failed to have consulted him when I was bound to do so. But it seems to me that following the rule of what constitutes a party and a party leader within the Legislature, that that excludes him from the consultations which have taken place, and I think he's entitled to get that explanation from me.

What I will propose then is that we proceed to take the vote on this first motion, and as regards to the second one, which doesn't have to be dealt with today, I don't believe, we can simply regard that as Notice of Motion, but I point out to my friend that I will be asking for

Mr. Roblin, cont'd). . . leave of the House to proceed with my speech in connection with the main subject that brings us here together this morning. I'd like him to think that over because when we come to that stage we'll need his agreement to allow me to make that speech this morning. But as things stand at the present, I thank him for his willingness to vote for this motion and if the other one offends him, we'll regard it as notice on the Order Paper here and we'll deal with it next time it comes up.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Madam Speaker, we've already had a vote on this motion. Are we in order even discussing it now? This should have been done before we took the vote. It seems that it's going to end up two out of three or something like that. We've had a motion, we voted and I can't see that this is in order at all.

MADAM SPEAKER: I agree that we are out of order. I think a certain amount of explanation is necessary here. If the House is agreeable to let it pass, ---I think the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has raised his point.

The second motion here, as I understand it, will not be presented and we have taken a vote on the first motion to which the Honourable Member from Rhineland has stated he will agree.

MR. ROBLIN: I therefore will proceed to the next motion, Madam Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: If I may, I'm not really clear as to where we stand on the first motion. There was a vote taken in the House, and I presume recorded by the gentleman at the Clerk's Table, and one member of the House did not give consent. Now, we're---

MR. ROBLIN: If we call for the Yeas and Nays, we'll have a recorded vote and then we'll know where we stand if the members wish that. I leave it to my honourable friends.

MR. PAULLEY: I think, Madam Speaker, that is the way out of this dilemma which we have created ourselves and would facilitate matters for the records.

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

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

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Desjardins, Evans, Froese, Gray, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson (Gimli), Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Roblin, Schreyer, Seaborn, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Smerchanski, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Nil.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 56; Nays, Nil.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Welfare, that during the present Session of the Legislature James Cowan Esquire, Member for the Electoral Division of Winnipeg Centre, be appointed Deputy Speaker and Chairman of the Committee for the House.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, at our last Session at my personal request the Honourable Member of St. Matthews agreed to continue as Deputy Speaker and Chairman of the House, but I undertook to find a suitable replacement for him the next time we met. I'm sure that the House would wish to mark this occasion when we will find ourselves under a new aegis when we're in committee or when you're not in the Chair of expressing some word of appreciation to the Honourable Member for St. Matthews for the way in which he has handled the job over the last six or seven years. His good nature, his patience and his understanding of, not only the rules but of human nature when carrying out his task I think have been remarkable and have contributed very greatly I think to harmonious proceedings. We aren't always quite as harmonious here as we might like to be but I know that he has helped maintain that level of tolerance and equanimity which are so important in deliberative chambers of this kind, and I would not like this occasion to pass without recording my sincere appreciation for his service to this Chamber and I'm quite sure that in doing so I speak for all members

Mr. Roblin, cont'd). . . of the House. I can only hope for his successor who is now being nominated, the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that he will enjoy the same confidence and esteem from the members as his predecessor has done. He is one of Her Majesty's Counsel, learned at the law, and I'm sure that that training will stand in good stead and I believe that members from all sides of the House will wish him well if he is elected to undertake this task. So in proposing this motion I would like to make reference to the distinguished service of the Honourable Member of St. Matthews and express words of good wishes to his successor, the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, that a special committee of the House, composed of all its members, be appointed to consider bills referred to it and that the Attorney-General be Chairman of this committee.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and Conservation, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the resolution standing in my name. Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to provide, among other things, for taxation to provide funds to institute certain reforms in local government organizations and to provide for certain payments with respect to local government financing.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready to consider the resolution?

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to provide, among other matters, for taxation to provide funds to institute certain reforms in local government organizations and to provide for certain payments with respect to local government financing.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, members of the House will recognize that this is the resolution that precedes the bill which covers the government's policy with respect to the main subject that has brought us together here, the question of local government organization and finance. The details of this matter, the principles upon which the government is acting do not lend themselves to discussion in Committee of the Whole, and I would hope that we would have a very brief discussion here because this is merely the preliminary measure necessary to a money resolution, and that we would then have first reading and I would ask for leave of the House to proceed at once with second reading. In that way we could have the full substance of the government's proposal before us, together with the bill, in an appropriate manner and thus give members at the very first opportunity the full information with respect to what we propose. This matter was discussed with leaders of the other Parties and I believe that this procedure recommends itself to them as being the most expeditious way of getting the facts before the Chamber, so if that would be acceptable I would like to let it be known that I will ask for leave to move second reading right away as soon as the first reading stage is disposed of.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, is the First Minister inclined at all to give us any further details in Committee however before we go into the formal discussion of the bill itself? We will be unable to ask any questions at that time, as the First Minister knows, and if he were to tell the House as to what type of tax he is thinking about -- is he thinking of a sales tax or is he thinking of a gasoline tax or what exactly it is that he intends to do-- I think that the House would be much further advanced in its discussions, and then when he does make his speech we would be in a position to reply probably more expeditiously than if he insists on doing it strictly by formal reply.

MR. ROBLIN: I think I'd rather stick to that course, Mr. Chairman, because the subject is really too involved to give it in bits and pieces. It's better to give the whole substance of our proposals at once and I would like to do that if I may. Of course we'll be in the committee stage on the bill itself after second reading, and I'm certain there'll be lots of questions then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution be adopted? Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

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

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C., (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from St. Vital, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN: introduced Bill No. 2, an Act to provide for the imposition of a tax on purchases of land and certain products for the reimbursement to property owners of part of school taxes paid in respect of real property and to amend certain Acts of the Legislature and that the same be now received and read a first time.

MR. ROBLIN: Presented, by leave, Bill No. 2, an Act to provide for the imposition of a tax on purchases of land and certain products and for the reimbursement to property owners of part of the school taxes paid in respect of real property and to amend certain Acts of the Legislature for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I don't rise to object to leave, but I would like to offer the First Minister a suggestion in this regard. We have just received the bill now and if he were agreeable to speaking this afternoon on second reading this would permit us to go through the bill during the noon recess and be in a position to follow his comments this afternoon in a much more informed way than by proceeding instantly. We still have on the Order Paper a number of other resolutions to keep us busy in any case until our normal adjournment time for the morning, so there would be no delay insofar as the work of the House and I think it would make it much better for the members to be able to follow his speech along with the bill which we would then have had a chance to study.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I hope my honourable friend will let me proceed. I think we had an understanding to that effect and I would really think it better if I proceeded now. Is that agreed? --Agreed.

The pages may continue to distribute the bill, Madam Speaker, if that's in order. I would like to express my appreciation to members of the House for agreeing to the suggestion that this second reading should proceed now because it will, I think, really be advantageous in the long run that we should have placed the full position with respect to the government's proposals in regard to local government organization and finance before the House at the earliest time, and while I know that the contents of this bill are fascinating and that the members will be anxious to dip into it, I would also hope that they would find some of the things that I'm about to say now also of interest because you can't really understand the bill without the explanations that go with it, so with that expression of interest----

A MEMBER: . . . can we understand the explanation?

MR. ROBLIN: Well I'll try, and if there's any points that are not clear I'm sure my honourable friends will elucidate them in the course of the next week or so. And I should like to begin the introduction of this bill at second reading in this way. The British North America Act provides that the responsibility for what we know as local government be entrusted to the provinces of Canada. In the elaboration of this function two main institutions have been developed --the municipality and the school board. It is through the means of these two bodies that the provincial governments delegate that part of their constitutional responsibilities in local affairs that circumstances and the requirements of the times dictate. This short reference is necessary here only to bring into focus the importance of the two institutions of local government-- the municipality and the school board. They are important not only for the functions they perform but because they are rather direct forms of representative democracy. Our society has traditionally placed high values on sound functioning of democratic processes at the local level as an important element in its own preservation.

It can be safely asserted that over the years local governments have fulfilled the purpose for which they were intended; but it is just as correct to state that as in all human undertakings, from time to time, study and reform are indicated if local government is to continue as a vital force in our political system and if provincial constitutional responsibilities are to

Mr. Roblin, cont'd)...be effectively discharged.

This question of study and reform of local government has been before the public in one form or another almost continuously in recent years. The latest and undoubtedly one of the most important of the studies in the field is the report of the Royal Commission on Local Government Organization and Finance, --the Michener Commission. This Commission was established by Order-in-Council on February 13, 1963 with the broad terms of reference which are on the public record. Its first report dated April 28, 1964 is now before us. It is a notable contribution to the question of study and reform of the matters within those terms of reference. The Commission hearings were valuable not only in themselves but also in the fact that they provided a public forum for a wide expression of opinion from many sectors of the Province. The Commissioners have provided us with an objective statement and analysis of the facts and have given us recommendations of an original and provocative character. I wish to pay at this time my sincere respect to its members: the Honourable Roland Michener, P.C., Q.C., His Honour Judge John Thompson, Q.C., James R. McInnes, C.A., Professor Murray S. Donnelly, Ph.D., Donald L. Campbell, Q.C. These gentlemen gave to their task diligence and capacity combined with a sense of urgency for the importance of the questions that they were to answer. In the opinion of the Government the report provides a public document which can be the basis of many improvement and sound advance in the area of local government organization and finance. The budget speech of 1964 gave an undertaking accepted by the House, that the report would receive our prompt attention.

Altogether the Michener contains 72 recommendations over a broad field of local government. It is clearly recognized in the report itself however that all things cannot be done at once and that plans and priorities are essential to a proper staging of its proposals. Recent consultation with municipal and school authorities has reinforced that conclusion and the Government agrees that study and consultation with local government and the development of public opinion must temper the pace of action. But this is not to say that untoward delay is acceptable. It has been made perfectly clear to us by both local representatives and the public generally that in some important areas immediate action is required. One of these would be to reduce the burden of local school taxes; and another would be to implement the re-division of some of the responsibilities between the Province and the municipalities. If we are to provide beneficial action to local taxpayers for their next fiscal year which begins on January 1, 1965, we must do it now and not wait for spring, when local budgets have been determined. This is our own view and was we believe the unanimous opinion of those in local government with whom we consulted.

In analyzing the 72 recommendations of the report several main recommendations can be recognized: 1. There should be a transfer of school tax burden from local taxpayers to provincial taxpayers, in order to give relief from the burden of school taxes on real property. The report makes it quite clear, however, that there is a local responsibility and that the support of schools must continue to be shared jointly between the local and provincial taxpayer, although the provincial share could well be larger than it has been. 2. While the Commission did not consider that there should be any significant transfer of burden from municipalities to the provincial government, they did submit important recommendations regarding functions. They recommended a strengthening of the independence and responsibility of municipal governments by a concentration of their functions and by a more clear cut division of function between them and the Government of the Province. 3. The Commission was of the opinion that the operational efficiency of municipalities and the school system could be improved and brought into line with modern conditions by reforming the organizational structure of both and by introducing a regional concept both local and provincially. 4. A variety of other important procedural changes in local government was recommended, including changes in assessment and planning.

Considered in this light, a logical priority of action can be discerned. Questions of structural changes; boundaries; regions; procedural recommendations, assessment policy, all these obviously depend on considerable public education and familiarity as well as on the detailed consideration of those directly involved. We must be assured that what we do is based solidly on public understanding and support. Much depends on the local government

Mr. Roblin, cont'd). . . representatives and officials in this regard. This rather special and detailed range of subjects clearly do not lend themselves to action at the present.

But with respect to the transfer of the tax burden from the local school taxpayer, action is deemed necessary now. We shall also make a start now on the redefinition of the functions and powers of local government and the division of these responsibilities with the Provincial Government. We can determine where the need is clearly established and where the impact of local finances can be adjusted most equitably --all in a manner consistent with our own financial ability.

We intend that our actions will not only ease the burden of the local school taxpayer but will go some distance toward our objective of making local government more fully responsible for its own financial policies.

We propose a good start on those parts of the Michener Report where immediate action is called for. We leave for further consideration and consultation those other important matters which should not be attempted without further time for their study and consideration.

But, if local taxes are to go down, provincial taxes must go up. There is no magic way to avoid this necessity. While no fiscal relation is static, this question of the relief of local taxpayers is a central theme. What we are trying to do is to achieve a transfer of tax burden --not to increase the capacity of local governments to spend.

It therefore becomes all the more necessary that we make the changes in a way to assure to the largest degree possible that we achieve our aims --that local taxes do go down and that to the extent possible we avoid double taxation.

The main recommendations of the Royal Commission call for the transfer of school financing responsibility of about \$10.2 million from the local to the provincial taxpayer through the reduction of local property taxes and the imposition of a provincial retail sales tax. For the purposes of its calculations the Commission assumed that there would be no change in the total school tax bill as a result of such a transfer.

The statistical information accompanying this recommendation confirms what this Government has long contended --that our situation with respect to the burden of local taxation compares favourably with that of the other provinces - (and I refer you to Table 1, on Page 260 of the Report). With respect to the percentage of personal income devoted to raising local tax funds, Manitoba was taxed close to the highest from 1940 to 1957, but from 1958 it has been taxed relatively more lightly than the majority of provinces.

In case we think our situation is unique and that our school expenditures have taken an unprecedented rise, we should refer to Table 3 on Page 72. Here it is shown that this Province has had the lowest percentage increase in school costs in the period 1941 to 1961, of any province in Canada.

But in spite of our favourable position compared to the other provinces, the Commission recommends, and with this the Government agrees, that substantial relief from school taxation is required at the local level. The central problem is how to secure and make effective an actual reduction in local taxes by this transfer and how to avoid, in the largest degree possible, resultant double taxation.

At this stage let us examine how the report recommends the tax transfer should take place. It recommends the Province accept a larger share of school costs through the medium of a revised foundation grant programme, while at the same time making the assumption that total school costs will remain unchanged. This assumption in our view is most unlikely. The proposed new foundation grant can almost be guaranteed to increase total costs.

This comment is supported by the Manitoba School Trustees' Association, which has suggested that by 1965 the increased cost of the proposed foundation programme to the provincial government will be nearly \$20 million rather than \$10.2 million --and with probably corresponding increases to local taxpayers through special levies or a higher basic levy than that proposed.

From past experience we can assume that changes in the provincial grant structure are unlikely to be reflected to any great extent in local tax savings. We must then regretfully conclude from this that the use of such a foundation programme will not provide the answer that we have been seeking, and will result not only in higher provincial costs but will in the process also lead to higher costs in the school system itself.

Mr. Roblin, cont'd). . . If this method proves faulty, would some system of controls be any better? The Commission gives a number of suggestions as to what methods of tax discipline might be imposed on school boards and municipalities but finds no answer it can recommend except self-discipline on the part of the municipal and school authorities.

Some people would say that a formal system of controls is required. As this question was studied by the government in consultation with municipalities and school authorities it became more and more evident why the report gave no firm recommendation on this aspect of the problem. The more it is examined the more difficult it becomes to make applications both in theory and on effective practical grounds.

Municipalities, led by the City of Winnipeg representatives, have made clear their firm opposition to any further controls. They contend that disciplines exercised by their voters are the traditional and indeed the most effective democratic sanction. School authorities, on their part, pointed that 60% or more of their costs were due to teachers' salaries which are set by well-defined negotiating procedures without central controls. Any effective control of school costs would dictate an abandonment of such negotiating procedures.

The teachers have maintained with some real justification that the salary negotiating machinery has worked reasonably well for all concerned. They would strenuously oppose any change that would deprive them of their present rights. It must be admitted that many local governments, both municipal and school, have on the whole discharged their taxing responsibilities reasonably and well. Reliance on normal democratic processes should not be lightly discarded. All these considerations underline the problems of local tax discipline.

How then can we most nearly assure that the school tax transfer we seek actually takes place? Perhaps the most direct and simple method will prove the best. For these reasons we are proposing a new departure in school tax relief. It is to rebate directly from the Provincial Treasury to the local taxpayer a portion of his school tax payment.

Through the rebate the local taxpayer will be able to gauge the increased contribution being made by the provincial tax structure in relation to the local tax burden. The local school authorities will still have the responsibility to set their budget and account to the local taxpayer for the local part of the costs. In this way local responsibility and autonomy is preserved. We believe that this system will have a better possibility of assuring the transfer of the school tax burden we seek and of minimizing double taxation than any of the other methods open to us. The rebate system preserves the principle of self-discipline on which Michener ultimately relies and which the local authorities strongly recommend.

In considering the transfer of school costs it must be noted that the Michener plan called for a flat general local rate of 13 mills. Many people have jumped to the conclusion that this will equalize all local taxes, concluding, presumably, that the foundation programme will cover all local expenditure. This is not the case. Special levies would still be necessary and to a substantial degree. They would fluctuate quite widely and in the examples we have worked out vary between 5.8 mills and 17.2 mills from different areas. This is, of course, over and above the basic 13 mills proposed.

The introduction of the tax rebate as we propose, will make a significant contribution to the equalization of ability to pay. It will lower the tax liability threshold by providing what is in effect a basic exemption for school taxes. It has the same general effect as a basic assessment exemption, and is relatively of much greater value to the small taxpayer - the pensioner, the small home-owner, the farmer - although it does provide a real tax relief benefit to all who pay school taxes.

The system we propose is a 50% rebate of school taxes paid to a maximum of \$100 of tax - a maximum of \$50 payment on each tax bill in any year. Our estimate of this cost is between \$8.5 and \$10 million as against the \$10.2 million that the Royal Commission has proposed. By this --and, Madam Speaker, this is a most interesting statistic-- by this, something over 60% of all school taxpayers will have their taxes cut in half while others will enjoy substantial benefits.

The report also makes important recommendations in the administrative structure of education with respect to the greater divisional responsibility for school finance. These and other new proposals for the improvement of educational quality will be dealt with at the next regular session in so far as it is deemed desirable and practicable to do so. These and

Mr. Roblin, cont'd). . . future measure that will be brought before you are concrete recognition of the priority that the government attaches to education and to the burden of local school taxes.

Some other recommendations of the Royal Commission regarding local government responsibilities commend themselves for immediate attention if they are to be effective for the 1965 municipal year.

With respect to municipal government, the main recommendations dealt with the concentration of municipal responsibilities and a redefinition of function between the municipalities and the Province. It is a simple thought to express but a difficult one to define and to implement. In particular, we have found large problems of application and equity where individual municipalities are concerned. Frequently the overall averages given in the report conceal significant variations between individual municipalities.

Two important improvements are sufficiently clear-cut and desirable to call for action now so that the results may be effective in the next municipal fiscal year. These are the report's recommendations on roads and on drains. A redefinition of function is therefore proposed as follows: 1. In rural municipalities the province will take over on a 100% capital cost basis about 4000 miles of community connector roads now jointly financed. In addition to accepting the municipal share of capital cost the province will accept 100% of maintenance now fully a municipal responsibility. This will remove a major expenditure from rural municipalities but will restore to them full responsibility for the balance of the local road system still in their hands. Municipalities will then decide for themselves what local taxes to raise for these remaining roads and we expect that they should be able to achieve net tax savings if they so wish.

2. The Government of the Province will now accept 50% of all capital costs of Metro roads and bridges including the cost of land acquisition. A ceiling both for the Province and Metro will be proposed and the Metro road system renegotiated with Metro and the Metropolitan municipalities on a periodic basis. In addition to this we will assume \$1,000 per lane mile obligation for Metro street maintenance --per lane mile obligation for Metro streets maintenance. The effect of these two measures should be an immediate saving to Metro of about \$1 million or more a year and should act to stabilize Metro street costs. In this way, all taxpayers in the Metro area should benefit through a reduced need of local tax levies for Metro support.

3. Cities, towns and villages outside Metropolitan Winnipeg will be assisted in a manner similar in principle to that proposed for Metro. The implementation of these policies is expected to increase the current budget of the Province by about \$7 million --\$3 million for Metro and \$4million for the balance of the Province, in part through a transfer of existing costs from capital account-- thus releasing funds for the provincial trunk highway system-- and in part by increased expenditure and responsibilities.

4. It is also proposed that the Province should take over main trunk drains in a manner similar to that proposed for roads. Estimated provincial costs for drains will rise about half a million a year, or by 25%; thus placing local governments in full control of their own local drainage budgets.

These two measures are clearly designed to separate provincial and municipal responsibilities. They should also enable municipalities by their own decision to control their own expenditures in the immediate future. But the long range benefits to municipal taxpayers should be even more marked. The province is now assuming those areas of responsibility where major cost growth may be expected and has left to local government those areas where cost growth is likely to be less burdensome. The actual roads and drains in questions will be reviewed by the Provincial Government with the local authorities on a regular basis so that the provincial network may be expanded as circumstances indicate necessary and desirable. Under these proposals, the Province now becomes responsible for the principal areas of escalating costs. A regular review of needs will be applied. Local decisions with respect to local needs and their relation to local taxpayers are underlined. The Province also proposes to accept the basis of the Commission's recommendations regarding the payment by the Crown of grants in lieu of local taxes up to 5% of the total tax bill in a municipality. The report notes this cost at an additional \$700,000 but our estimate indicates this added cost will be

Mr. Roblin, cont'd). . . about \$1.25 million for 1965. Many municipalities will benefit but about one-half of the new local tax grants will accrue to the City of Winnipeg. As recommended, the province intends to charge back to municipalities, using the provincial-municipal assessment arrangements, the full cost of assessment instead of the half cost now being paid. This will mean an increased cost to municipalities of about \$200,000. The Commission recommended a much more extensive provincial activity in the field of assessment. Recommendations on assessment improvement will be dealt with after further consideration and consultation on the problem. The incidence of the Commission's proposals with respect to health and welfare services proves on examination to be most uneven as between individual municipalities. The same is true with respect to planning which being a voluntary function has varying impacts from place to place. It is not considered practical to deal with these subjects at the present time.

The Royal Commission has recommended the abolition of the unconditional grants. Under certain circumstances these grants might well be discarded. But to do so now would seriously upset existing inter-municipal financial relationships and tend to increase local taxes rather than reduce them. Pending a further more detailed examination of the situation we propose to continue the payment of these unconditional grants.

The report made a number of other recommendations which have not been specifically dealt with here. Among these are included: (1) decentralization of municipal services; regional inter-municipal councils; provincial-municipal regional co-operation, regional boundary revisions; boundary revisions of rural municipalities; regional joint governmental facilities. (2) consolidation of school districts. (3) instalment and deferred payment of local taxes; removal of tax exemptions and preferences; standardization of business tax assessment and levy; elimination of personal property, poll and statutory labour taxes, except in certain cases; elimination of ratepayers' votes on money by-laws except on the order of The Municipal Board; a uniform municipal fiscal year. (4) improved assessment procedures; assessment of farm buildings; inclusion at full assessed value of other buildings. (5) standardization of municipal terms of office and elections; powers of municipal councils to dissolve boards and commission; revision of The Municipal Act. Many of these involve complex decisions and far reaching effects and require more detailed study before action can be recommended.

In addition to the reduction in local school taxes, which I have proposed, I have one further tax reduction to submit for your approval. Honourable members will recall that at the Special Session of 1961, a surtax of 6% of federal rates on individual incomes (or 1% of total taxable individual incomes) and 1% of corporation profits was enacted. These rates were considered in fair and equitable ratio between the two tax sources. Both have proved effective methods of providing revenue but changing circumstances indicate, as I originally indicated would be necessary from time to time, the equity of reducing the surtax on individual incomes from 6% of the federal rates to 5% as of January 1, 1965. There are 3 factors which bear on this point: (1) Due to the highly progressive nature of the federal tax on individual income the returns tend to increase more rapidly with expanding income than in the case of the corporation tax. Thus since 1962-1963, the first year the tax was applied, the ratio has been distorted and personal incomes have been bearing a greater proportional share of this surcharge revenue than corporation incomes. The proposed 1% reduction will act toward re-establishing the original ratio. (2) Again, the provincial share of the personal income tax has been increased substantially so that while in 1962-1963 it was but 16% of the federal tax, in 1965-1966 it will be 21% and in 1966-1967 24%. It is thus less essential to use the surcharge to collect our proper share of this field. And, thirdly, the increasingly competitive nature of our economy does not allow us to depart too far from the range set by other provinces in proposing imposing such taxes.

We now come to the problem on the other side of the coin --how is it proposed to finance these transfers of responsibilities and costs? The measures outlined will cost between \$18 and \$19.5 million in a full year. In that part of the municipal tax year falling in the current provincial fiscal year, we estimate costs of about \$4 1/2 million will accrue. Appropriate authority will be sought through supplementary supply. To implement all the recommendations proposed in the report would cost many millions more and in our judgment the policies now recommended are the maximum additional provincial burdens that can be

Mr. Roblin, cont'd). . . accepted at the present time. In order to give effect to these changes at the earliest possible date, new provincial revenue sources must be developed now so that the funds may accrue to meet the additional obligations.

The Michener Report made some trenchant and positive recommendations on how the tax transfers and new responsibilities should be financed. A general retail sales tax was indicated as the best major tax source as yet untouched by the Province which could be employed for these purposes. Manitoba and Alberta are now the only provinces not employing a retail sales tax. I need not make comparisons with Alberta oil revenues and the yield and capacity of our own resource revenues. They are self-evident. So far we have managed to avoid a sales tax even though there is much to be said in its favour as a revenue source for provincial governments: (1) Its revenue ability is great and it has a large growth factor; (2) While sometimes termed regressive in that it can bear relatively more heavily on lower incomes, the regressive features can be eliminated by appropriate exemption. Statistical evidence available elsewhere supports this. (3) It is paid by all and therefore it is appropriate to consider it when seeking ways and means of relieving taxes that bear inequitably on a particular part of the community --the owners of real property, mostly small home-owners and farmers. (4) While it has some economic disadvantages, these appear to be more than offset by its benefits. (5) While it is an untidy tax to collect, it has been widely accepted in the Canadian tax structure and its increasing use seems unavoidable.

All these arguments are advanced in the Michener Report and under normal circumstances there would be a good case for accepting them. However, a provincial sales tax should not be considered in isolation from the rest of our national tax structure and from current influences. When I first spoke about a sales tax during the last general election campaign and warned our people of its possibility I referred to two Royal Commissions then studying tax questions. One of them, the Michener Commission on Local Government Organization and Finance, has placed its Report before us. The other, the Carter Commission on federal taxation, is still to come. Secondly, partly at our suggestion, a federal-provincial tax structure conference may be expected in September. Thirdly, Manitoba hopes to establish a system of joint federal-provincial priorities to be related to that tax structure. If our views are accepted, new tax resources may be made available to us for the support of education and other primary provincial needs. Fourthly, the whole question of that part of the national tax base that should be devoted to pensions and to health care is as yet undecided.

Related to all this is the fact that federal and provincial governments must also meet before long to replace the current tax agreements which expire in March 1967. These uncertainties suggest to us that if possible our people would wish us to avoid implementing a general sales tax at this time but would rather have us examine other ways and means of financing our present urgent needs until the determinations I have referred to have been made. This is the policy the government proposes. No general retail sales tax in Manitoba will be recommended at this time. But I must warn you to expect very substantial increases in other revenue sources for we must find the current funds necessary to provide the school tax relief so necessary for local taxpayers and to implement our other proposals. These new revenues provided for by the bill are as follows: (1) We propose to increase drivers' licences from \$4.00 to \$5.00 for the 2 year period with a corresponding (25%) increase in most licence fees and charges under Schedule A of The Highway Traffic Act on motor-vehicles and drivers, effective for the licence year beginning March 1, 1965. (2) In view of the fact that a very substantial part of our costs arise from road responsibilities in municipalities and in Metro Winnipeg we propose to increase the gasoline tax by three cents (3¢) per gallon as well as fuel taxed under The Motive Fuel Tax Act. Purple gas is now free of tax. A general sales tax would undoubtedly embrace such products and representations were made that these should be taxed now. However, in recognition of the particular part that agricultural production plays in the economy of the Province we do not propose to take such action at this time. We are proposing that there should be an increased revenue from liquor sales. Our prices generally are lower than those in other western provinces and in most of those to the east. We believe that the liquor user in Manitoba can fairly be asked to make a somewhat greater contribution to the public need than he does at the present time.

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

The Liquor Commission has therefore been instructed of the government's wish that prices be adjusted upward but to a level still below those prevailing in other western jurisdictions in many categories. These changes will involve a price increase of 25¢ per bottle for lower priced brands and 30¢ for the higher priced. The price of off-premise beer will be increased 15¢ per dozen. Draught beer will remain unchanged at 15¢ per glass and bottled beer will not exceed 32¢ per bottle in beer parlors. Vendor beer prices in Northern Manitoba will remain unchanged. Wine prices will be increased proportionately. There may be a difference of opinion on its value as a necessity of life but we also turn to the tax on tobacco to produce a more substantial provincial revenue than it now does. We are, therefore, proposing an increase of 5¢ per pack of 25 cigarettes with corresponding increases in other forms. It is also proposed that Manitoba's natural resources should make a larger contribution to the public revenue. The main source here is the mining royalty tax. I am proposing an adjustment in the rate, lower for small operations and higher for larger operations, which I believe will result in a contribution more in keeping with our Province's interests.

Two new taxes are necessary to provide the resources to make our programme possible.

(1) Manitoba citizens and firms enjoy exceptionally low rates for their public utilities --the lowest in Canada in most categories of service. There is justification for an increase in rates that would provide a substantial profit to the Crown but this would be a complicated and lengthy procedure and would build the changes in on a more permanent basis. Again, if these utilities were not publicly owned they would undoubtedly be expected to pay their share of taxation in support of public needs. Under the circumstances, to provide for this contribution, a surtax of 5% is proposed on all purchases of electricity and local and intra-provincial telephone service. In the City of Winnipeg this will parallel but not replace the present tax now applied on purchases from City Hydro. In order to maintain the present competitive situation and in recognition of the present balance of consumption patterns the surcharge will also apply to purchases of natural gas and coal. Fuel oil used for heating will be taxed under The Motive Fuel Tax Act at 1¢ per gallon. (2) It is proposed to ask the Legislature to levy a tax of 1 percent on all land transfers. This is a source of investment profit from which little direct public revenue is derived. In the Province of Ontario there is a small percentage tax on land transfer. I am asking that a similar charge be levied in Manitoba at a rate of 1% of the actual value of the transaction. This tax will be reasonably simple and economical to collect. It will not bear heavily on those who cannot afford it but those who profit by frequent transactions in this area will share in some small degree with the Province the profits that accrue to them from this natural heritage.

Based on a full year we at present estimate that the tax changes proposed will yield additional revenues of the following magnitudes: Motor vehicle licences and fees, \$1,900,000; Gasoline tax \$4,750,000; Motive fuel tax \$2,800,000; Land transfer \$2,200,000; Liquor profits \$2,700,000; Mining royalties \$400,000; Surtax on fuels and electricity \$2,100,000; Surtax on telephone service \$700,000; Tobacco tax \$3,200,000 --giving a total of \$20,750,000. It is expected that all these will be put into effect as soon as may prove possible, and except for the licence and fee changes with respect to motor-vehicles and drivers, by January 1, 1965. Thus the funds will be provided to meet our obligations in the municipal financial year 1965. According to our estimates new revenue may exceed new expenditure by something over a million dollars or 5% in a full year. In view of the rather uncertain nature of some of these estimates on both sides of the ledger, we consider that this is a reasonable margin to assure our financial position.

Under the Michener proposals the primary recommendation was the transfer of school tax burden from the local taxpayer. The Commission's basic proposal involved the sum of \$10.2 million a year. We are proposing a transfer of between \$8.5 and \$10 million a year. The system of tax rebate chosen is the most effective means open to us of achieving a reduction in the local school tax burden for the taxpayer. It preserves the strongest incentives for local government responsibility and leaves the rights of discipline to the local taxpayer rather than to a central authority. This is the most democratic way.

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

As for the municipalities, although the Commissioners do not recommend any dramatic reduction in municipal taxes, they do recommend a concentration of their responsibilities and a clear distinction between them and those of the Provincial Government. We are taking an important step in implementing two of the most important recommendations without delay --those relating to roads and drains. This leaves to the municipalities the power to control their own taxes in relation to two important functions. In paying increased grants in lieu of taxes we will be multiplying the provincial contribution five-fold, far off-setting any acceptance in part of the Commission's recommendations regarding assessment responsibility-- and as I have said the unconditional grants will not be cancelled as the Commission recommended but they will be retained. There is good reason to expect that municipalities generally may be able to reduce taxes as a result of the advantages of these changes. No one can guarantee of course what the effect will be in the short run in any single municipality but we can be sure that in the long run municipal budgets will benefit. When this benefit is added to that of the school tax rebate, the advantage to the local taxpayer is clearly shown.

In all candour I must stress that we do not profess to have found the ultimate or perfect solution to provincial-municipal financial relations or to the problems of local government. These, like all government affairs, are subject to new and varied stresses and strains as our society grows and develops. Review and reform will be constantly required as we proceed. We recognize that a large field of additional change and reform still remains to be considered. Present proposals cover only those areas which call for immediate action and leave for future consideration those matters requiring further consultation and study before action can be recommended.

A general sales tax has been put aside, particularly because of the uncertainties facing us in the national fiscal structure at the present time and the knowledge that conferences and decisions contemplated for the near future may profoundly affect our ultimate decisions. It is the firm belief of the Government that the proposals made today with respect to taxation changes are the most equitable under present circumstances for all concerned. None of the new proposals bear heavily on those who cannot afford them. Collectively they will have the greatest impact on those who can afford to pay. Indeed in several cases the payment is at the taxpayers own discretion. Bearing in mind that these proposals are essential to the transfer of responsibilities from local governments to the Province, they should commend themselves to the public. In the school tax rebate alone we are making the greatest single increased contribution to local educational costs in the history of the Province. In all these matters the Government has been seized with the importance of the task before it. We have endeavoured to give full recognition to the place of local government in our system by confirming its responsibility for self-government and by accepting a realistic level of provincial responsibility to the local taxpayer. Government today is becoming increasingly complex and as it develops in complexity the necessity for full and sincere co-operation becomes increasingly important to us all. We have tried to recognize this basic truth and we believe that we have in good measure succeeded.

Madam Speaker, this outline now presents to you and to the members of the Chamber, and to the public at large, the government's proposal with respect to taking over school taxes, with respect to municipal reform, and with respect to taxation at the present time, and I anticipate that we will have a lively and vigorous debate on the various features of the recommendations that are now in the Chamber. I should like to say that copies of my remarks are available and will be distributed to the leaders of the opposition parties, and the Honourable Member for Rhineland, and to members of the press if they wish to have them, so that my remarks may be studied in detail if that should be the wish.

Madam Speaker put the question.

MR. MOLGAT: I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, may I just have the leave of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition just before that motion is put, just glancing over the Bill I noted a figure of \$50 is the maximum rebate. I believe the First Minister --this is the school rebate-- I believe the First Minister mentioned the figure of \$100 at the time he was speaking and I was just wondering

Mr. Paulley, cont'd). . . if we might have confirmation of one figure or the other.

MR. ROBLIN: If my honourable friend will look on page 12 of my speech, I say "the system we propose is a 50% rebate of school taxes paid to a maximum of \$100 of tax, a maximum of \$50 payment on each tax bill in any one year. Our estimate of these costs is between \$8.5 and \$10 million as against \$10.2 that the Royal Commission has proposed. By this, something over 60% of all school taxpayers will have their taxes cut in half while the others will enjoy substantial benefits."

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I would suggest that if the House were agreeable we might meet this afternoon --or perhaps we could do it all now, there isn't too much ahead of us, and finish the Order Paper-- and then perhaps we might adjourn till some time tomorrow. Would the House like to proceed now and try and finish the Order Paper by 12.30?

MR. MOLGAT: I think we should try and proceed and see how far we get.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, I think we might. . . . Very well, Madam Speaker, we'll. . . . I move the Committee of the Whole with respect to the resolutions on the special committees which stand in my name, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Mr. Cowan in the Chair.

MR. ROBLIN: His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions recommends them to the House. Mr. Chairman, you have five, I believe, five resolutions before you all dealing with the same general thing, namely the reappointment of the five committees that were empowered to sit during recess. According to rules it's necessary to re-establish all those committees and give them power to sit again, but I would hope that the committee would not wish you to read all these motions because they're very lengthy and they are purely formal ones. They will appear in the Votes and Proceedings, and I trust we can just consider them in that light.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Agreed. The committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the committee has adopted certain resolutions and asked me to report same and beg leave to sit again.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C., (Winnipeg Centre): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that the resolution respecting reconstituting the Committee on Highway Safety be moved.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that the resolution reconstituting the Shared Services Committee be read.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Health that the resolution to reconstitute the Committee on Dental Technicians and Denturists be agreed to.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education that the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be permitted to sit during the recess of this Legislature.

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

MR. ROBLIN: I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Welfare that the resolution reconstituting the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders be agreed to.

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

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee of the whole to consider the following proposed resolutions. Would you like me to read them all?

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House Resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Mr. Cowan in the Chair.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready to consider the resolutions?

MR. ROBLIN: Perhaps you should read them. It will give an opportunity for members to ask questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting the registration of real estate brokers, real estate salesmen, and providing among other matters, for the cost of the administration of the Act to be paid from and out of the Consolidated Fund.
Passed?

Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act by providing among other matters, (a) a new method of computing annual superannuation allowances payable under the Act which may result in increases in the superannuation allowances payable to certain persons under the Act; (b) for the payment of interest accumulated on contributions where the contributions are refunded upon the death of an employee, and (c) for payment by the government from and out of the consolidated fund of (i) one-half of the amount by which the superannuation allowance payable to employees who retire after the 31st day of March 1964 are increased; (ii) all of the amounts by which the superannuation allowances of employees who have retired before the first day of January 1965 are increased after the first day of January 1965, and (iii) the amount of interest repayable with refunds of contributions in the case of death of an employee.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Committee could indicate what are the intentions in so far as interest on contributions made by an employee who either leaves --or rather let's take what is mentioned here, upon the death of an employee-- what is the rate of interest which the government intends to pay? Secondly, does it intend to pay where an employee leaves the employ of the government and withdraws his contributions from the fund, will he receive interest on that portion? And what will be the delays imposed? In other words, will this be repayable to any employee regardless of length of service, or are there terms of service that must be laid down in this regard? This matter was discussed in the House last year and I pointed out to the Minister at that time that there were some cases of long-time employees who had --in fact, one at that time had passed away sometime before that had been paying into the fund for a long time and received only his own contribution. I think the Committee would like to know exactly what the Minister has in mind.

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, the rate of interest that's contemplated is 3%. The term of service --there is no term of service, if there is death, why it will be paid on death. If an employee leaves why he will receive the amount that he has contributed, plus 3%.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution be adopted? (Aye) Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act by providing, among other matters: (a) a new method of computing pensions and allowances payable under the Act which may result in increases in pensions and allowances payable to certain persons under the Act; (b) for the payment of interest with refunds paid upon the death of certain persons; and (c) for payment from that part of The Teachers' Retirement Allowances Fund to which the government contributes to that part of the fund from which all payments and refunds are made of the amount of interest paid with refunds upon the death of certain persons; all of which will require additional payments from and out of the Consolidated Fund to The Teachers' Retirement allowances Fund. Agreed?

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister could advise me --last session he and I had a discussion regarding a number of teachers who missed out in the new Teachers' Pension Fund by reason of the fact that they retired before '65. Now is this new scheme going to make provision for them?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): The amendments here are simply amendments which will keep The Teachers' Pension Act in concert or in harmony with The Civil Service Superannuation Act. Other amendments concerning the fund --certain inequities have come up as referred to by the Member for Selkirk and I would hope that consideration to these amendments will be forthcoming at the regular session.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, will this mean that there will be added contributions required from the districts as well as from the

MR. JOHNSON: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Carried. Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Department of Agriculture and Conservation Act by providing among other matters for declaring certain water control works, natural water channels, or lakes, to be provincial waterways and providing that the cost of construction, improvement, repair, and maintenance of such provincial waterways be paid from and out of the Consolidated Fund.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Chairman, I only have one question. This will in no way conflict with the federal jurisdiction over natural waterways and other things covered by this particular measure, will it?

HONOURABLE GEORGE HUTTON, (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): No.

MR. PAULLEY: This deals Mr. Chairman, with the taking over of the drainage responsibilities that was mentioned by the First Minister in his oration?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, at the moment there are certain areas of the province that are established under drainage maintenance districts --other areas are not -- in those cases the drains comes under straight municipal responsibility. What is the intention of the government in so far as the drainage maintenance districts? Will they be dissolved or will they continue?

MR. HUTTON: We don't contemplate doing anything immediately with respect to the legislation governing these drainage maintenance districts but I would anticipate that there would be much less need for this approach once this program has been consummated.

MR. MOLGAT: But at the moment because of the existence of drainage maintenance districts the grant structure varies I believe. In other words, in the drainage maintenance districts the department already accepts on a number of the drains a two-third responsibility, on the balance of the drains a one-third. In other parts of the province it's normally either on a 50-50 or 60-40. Now is this measure going to have the same system right across the province in every municipality?

MR. HUTTON: Yes.

MR. MOLGAT: Secondly, how is it proposed to determine which water control works and water channels and lakes are to be provincial waterways and which ones are not? I presume that the Minister will tell me, well that will be a departmental decision. But this can leave some considerable difficulty in various municipalities. Will there be an appeal from the municipalities to another body than the Minister himself in so far as a decision as to which are appropriately provincial responsibilities and which must remain local?

MR. HUTTON: Generally speaking a rule of thumb; the government would be designating by Order-in-Council those waterways --drainageways, which are now considered to be two-third drains or 60% drains. However, there must be adjustment from time to time because, for instance new construction can require a redefinition from time to time. That is why it is being left to designation by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. For instance, if you reconstructed a drain it might throw a --what is now considered to be a major drain-- it might make this drain purely a local nature, and in that case you could have a local drain designated as a provincial waterway, and on the other hand you could have what is now considered to be a major drain become of a local nature and it would be designated as a municipal responsibility. So it must be a flexible approach.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, supposing the municipality is not satisfied with the decision of the Minister they feel that certain drains should be a provincial responsibility and not a local one --and these things can arise because of adjoining municipalities and water moving from one to the other. We have the problem, particularly in areas where there is a local government district adjoining a municipality. Now, what right will that municipality have of appeal beyond the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council? Can it appeal, for example to the Municipal Board or some other body to make sure that they do get a hearing if they are not satisfied?

MR. HUTTON: This is not contemplated.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): I hope the Minister will forgive me, but I sense a contradiction in some of his explanations --three questions ago he replied that no change was contemplated in so far as the drainage maintenance district legislation is concerned. And then in reply to the last question he intimated that very likely some existing drains that are under

Mr. Schreyer, cont'd). . . the control of drainage maintenance might very well be put by Order-in-Council as a completely provincial responsibility. Now there seems to be a contradiction there. Perhaps he could explain it at this time.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, before. . . . the honourable member, I wonder if he would be kind enough to advise me whether he contemplates any changes in The Water Rights Act. The change that I have in mind --and I think the Minister is aware of the fact that there is considerable doubt regarding the legal distinction between a natural water course and a surface water course under The Water Rights Act-- And I know that the officials of his department have been worried about that distinction for some particular time and the difficulties with which they are confronted. Now I was wondering whether the Minister intends to clarify the situation in Manitoba --doing away with that distinction between a surface water course and natural water course, because in my opinion at least I think a surface water course in Manitoba is drainage regardless of whether it is surface water or natural water, it's used for the same purpose; and I was just wondering whether or no the Minister intends to do anything in connection with The Water Rights Act to clarify the distinction between these two designations, because frankly I don't think there should be any distinction in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, before he answers --is it correct to assume then that international waterways will also be considered provincial, those that we have in Manitoba?

MR. HUTTON: The Water Rights Act is under study at the present time.

In respect to the drainage maintenance districts, I said that we are not rescinding the legislation at this time providing for the drainage maintenance districts. However, I foresee that there should be no need in the future for this approach because we will in a large sense remove from local responsibility the responsibility for those waterways which require inter-municipal supervision. There should be no --I think this clarifies the position of the Member for Brokenhead.

In respect to international waterways, I would just put it this way that I would expect where water is rising in another country that this would almost automatically become a provincial waterways.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Chairman, what does the Minister propose to do in unorganized territory with regard to drainage.

MR. ROBLIN: According to the clock Mr. Chairman, it's beyond our time. We really ought to rise. I'm prepared to suggest we spend another few minutes and get rid of these resolutions and the first readings, if that's agreeable. (Interjection)

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Lakeside should recognize when I'm trying to give brief answers. I don't always try. In the unorganized areas we are contemplating that the same policy would apply to these areas as in the rest of the province, that there would be a local responsibility and a provincial responsibility.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Do you propose to collect the money in the unorganized, then?

MR. HUTTON: We aren't going to collect money anywhere. Our responsibility will be carried out with monies from the Consolidated Fund.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution be adopted?

MR. MOLGAT: . . . the member from St. George has a good point, because at the moment all of the drainage in the unorganized is a provincial responsibility. Now if the province is going to designate certain waterways as a provincial responsibility then automatically it means that some others no longer are provincial, they're local. Now the member says then how are the local ones going to be built, who will maintain them, what are the arrangements; because there is no local body, no taxing structure, there's no local organization, therefore will the province abandon these others completely?

MR. HUTTON: I think there is adequate machinery left for the local people to organize if they wish to, and I think one could expect that we will not leave them with a responsibility which they are unable to carry out or meet. But there has to be some responsibility at the local level there as well as in the other parts of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution be adopted? Carried. Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Municipal Act by providing among other matters for the making of grants from and out of the Consolidated Fund to municipalities in respect of

Mr. Chairman, cont'd). . . certain crown lands in the municipalities on the basis of accepted assessed values.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I have two questions I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister. Will this provision cover local government districts, and will the grants, the size of the grants be more or less related to the amount that the province is now paying on land in community pastures?

MR. PAULLEY: I have one Mr. Chairman, that the Minister might answer at the same time. I wonder if he would give me a clarification of what is meant by the "basis of accepted assessed values". Accepted by whom?

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, in local government the basis of the proposal really is that we accept by and large Michener's proposition concerning grants in lieu of taxes, and if the province owns land and building, land or buildings, in a local government district then on the same basis it would be in municipalities grants would be paid. On a community pasture at the present time as I understand it there is a levy of 1¢ per head per day which is going to the local government. Therefore community pastures will not be included in the lands for which we will be paying grants in lieu of taxes. The "accepted assessed value," in those areas where the provincial municipal assessor does the assessing, that will be the accepted assessed value. In those areas where the provincial municipal assessor does not do the assessing then there will be some consultation between the assessor in that area and the provincial municipal assessor to agree on the basis of assessment.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, that was not quite my question that the Minister answered. We have community pastures established in certain municipalities and have received certain grants on the basis of the number of livestock and so forth in them. Now adjacent to these community pastures in another municipality we have Crown lands. Will the municipality in which the Crown lands are situated and are not in a community pasture, receive grants approximately equivalent to what is being paid in the community pastures. The reason I raise this question is because we have areas where there are anticipated community pastures which will adjoin existing community pastures and if the grants under this provision are going to be considerably higher than they are in the community pasture he will run into difficulty with the municipalities to have further community pastures established. That's the point I'm raising.

MR. SMELLIE: Well on those Crown lands which are grazing lands, if they're unpatented lands then they will not be eligible for grants in lieu of taxes. If they are leased under the grazing policy there is an amount collected now from the lessee which is turned over to local governments in lieu of taxes, and that policy will not be changed.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: understand the Minister there are only certain Crown lands that you'll make grants on and not all of the Crown lands.

MR. SMELLIE: Yes, I think it will be clear to my honourable friend when he sees the bill. Generally speaking in the past the province has paid grants in lieu of taxes on lands but not on buildings, and the major change here is that buildings will be included.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution be adopted? The Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the Committee has adopted certain resolutions and asked me to report the same and beg leave to sit again.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. STEINKOPF: Introduced Bill No. 7, an Act requiring the Registration of Real Estate Brokers and Real Estate Salesmen and Bill No. 13, an Act to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act.

MR. JOHNSON: Introduced Bill No. 14, an Act to amend the Teachers' Pension Act.

MR. HUTTON: Introduced Bill No. 9, an Act to amend the Department of Agriculture and Conservation Act.

MR. SMELLIE: Introduced Bill No. 12, an Act to amend The Municipal Act.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I suggest that I move this resolution about the gracious speech which will then be moved and seconded without a speech on this side of the House and

Mr. Roblin, cont'd). . . . then can be adjourned for further discussion. I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture that the Speech of His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor be taken into consideration immediately.

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

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND, (Hamiota): I think that applause must be for not making a speech on this occasion. I beg to move, Madam Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. James; that an humble address be presented to His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor, as follows: To His Honour, Errick F. Willis, Q. C., Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Manitoba, we her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in session assembled, humbly thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has been pleased to address us at the opening of the present session.

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

MR. MOLGAT: I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, that brings us to the end of the Order Paper. Would members be disposed to meet this afternoon to have second reading on the bills that have been introduced this morning?

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, I would like an opportunity to diagnose them a little as far as I am concerned but I would have no objections if the members really wanted to go ahead.

MR. ROBLIN: I think all we'll expect this afternoon will be the second readings of the bills we have given first reading to and then that would get the explanation before the House, if that's satisfactory. In that case I'll move the adjournment, Madam Speaker, till 2:30 this afternoon, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 p. m. Monday.