

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



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Monday, February 27th, 1961

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MR. W.B. SCARTH, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the report of the Special Committee of the Legislature to review and consider statutes containing onus sections.

MR. CLERK: Your Special Committee appointed on the 21st day of March, 1960, to review and consider those statutes containing onus sections with a view to recommending such revisions as may be deemed necessary, beg me to present the following as their final report.

MR. SCARTH: Mr. Speaker, I might report to the House that the Committee who sat were unanimous in their views on each of the questions raised in the report and due to the fact that the report itself has been printed and circulated, perhaps the House might give leave to dispense with the reading section by section.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed that we dispense with the reading?

MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SCARTH: Mr. Speaker, I now beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell that the report of the Committee be received.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. D.L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition) (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I presume that in this case as in the other Special Committee that reported that the intention will be to move for concurrence at a later date so that if any member of the Committee or any other member of the House wishes to make any representation that they'll have the opportunity at that time.

MR. SCARTH: Agreed, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Would you put the question, Sir, on the reception of the report.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees. Do we have another report by Standing and Select Committees?

Notice of Motion.

Introduction of Bills.

MR. J.D. WATT (Arthur) introduced Bill No. 11, An Act to incorporate the Manitoba Automobile Museum Foundation.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

MR. SCARTH introduced 8, An Act to amend an Act to incorporate the University of Manitoba Foundation.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I think the House would expect me to make a brief comment on my attendance at the Dominion-Provincial Fiscal meeting which took place during the last two days of the previous week. I think, Sir, that at this stage the best thing for me to do is to lay before the House the same information that was laid before me at the Conference because I'm anxious that all members should have an opportunity to acquaint themselves with the details of the latest proposals of the Federal Government, but I do not think that it would be appropriate for me at this time to make any statement of policy respecting the matter as that is a matter that requires some further consideration. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you would allow me to read into the records then the statement made by the Federal Prime Minister so that we would have his exact words before us which deal with this matter. When he opened the Conference he spoke to us as follows, and I quote: "I welcome you to this resumed session of the Conference. My colleagues and I appreciate that you have come to a season when it is difficult for you to leave your capitals because of the meetings of your

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)....respective Legislatures or the preparations for them. The fact that all are here is a testimony of the importance of the business before the Conference.

Je vous souhaite la bienvenue à cette reprise de notre conférence. Mes collègues et moi, savons bien qu'il vous a fallu vous arranger pour venir à Ottawa à un moment de l'année où il vous est difficile à tous de quitter vos propres capitales, soit parce que les assemblées législatives sont en session, soit parce que vous êtes en train de vous y préparer. Le fait que vous soyez tous venus, à cette conférence souligne l'importance des questions que nous allons discuter." I hope my accent was a little better than his, Sir.

"All will be agreed that it is desirable that decisions be taken soon with respect to the fiscal arrangements for the period to follow March 31st, 1962, the necessary legislation for which the Federal Government hopes and desires to introduce at the present session of Parliament.

This is the third stage of the Conference which opened last July and resumed in October. The discussion of the fiscal relations between the Federal and Provincial Governments, and of other related matters, has throughout benefited each of us. Each and all Governments have serious financial problems. Each must recognize its heavy responsibilities and at the same time the obligation to take into account the problems of the others who are here. The Dominion Government fully recognizes the burdens and responsibilities resting not only on the Provincial Governments but on municipal authorities as well and takes into account the sources of funds that are available to the provinces and to their creations, the municipalities.

The Federal Government has given proof of its recognition of the financial problems resting on the provinces and the municipalities and of its desire to aid them. It has enlarged tremendously the payments made out of the Federal Treasury to or for the benefit of the province. Indeed, the conditional and unconditional payments and abatements provided by the Federal Government in the present fiscal year amount to \$1,283 million compared to \$664 million four years ago. The Federal payments and abatements to or for the benefit of the provinces have thus practically doubled in this short period. In thus enlarging the aid to the provinces and thereby easing the burden on provinces and municipalities, the Federal Government has incurred substantial budgetary deficits. The provinces must recognize that the Federal Government has burdens too, and must in its policies retain the confidence of the investing public.

The July meeting was largely devoted to having the provinces state their position and their claims. In aggregate the claims advanced by them would have increased the financial burdens on the Federal Treasury by more than \$2 billion per annum, a responsibility which the Federal Government is in no position to assume. At the October meeting, I advanced on behalf of the Federal Government certain suggestions intended for discussion, rather than as firm proposals. All the Premiers commented in detail upon them. At the close of the October meeting, we undertook to take into consideration the views expressed by the Premiers. We have done so. The flexible attitude exhibited by the Federal Government was commented on favourably as the October meeting approached its close. We have endeavoured to apply a like flexible attitude to the further intensive study made since then of our mutual problems in the fiscal area.

The two principal elements in fiscal relations between the Federal and Provincial Governments, which we have fully recognized in previous discussions, have been the sharing of the three direct tax fields which the Dominion and the provinces jointly occupy, and the equalization arrangements by which Parliament provides direct assistance to those provinces that are in a weaker fiscal position than others. Some means must be found for dealing with both of these aspects. In particular, the Federal Government agrees that the principle of equalization must be preserved. Furthermore, the element of stabilization will be retained. The proposal which I would now submit on behalf of the Dominion Government will take these elements into account and the new arrangements will cover a period of five years.

The joint occupation by the Federal and Provincial Governments of the three tax fields - personal income taxes, corporation income taxes and succession duties - inevitably creates problems. The present system of tax rentals has achieved, in the case of the eight renting provinces, a measure of tax uniformity and has simplified collection. The tax rental agreements, however, have severely restricted the Provincial Governments in meeting their

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)....financial problems and have deprived them of the necessary flexibility. Moreover, both before and after entering into the rental agreements with the Federal Government, the provinces have complained that the rental payments to them are quite inadequate.

The agreements which they signed, with effect April 1st, 1957, defined the rent in the following proportions:

- (a) 10 percent of the yield from the personal income tax,
- (b) 9 percentage points of corporation taxable income, and
- (c) 50 percent of the yield from the succession duty or similar tax.

The present Federal Government took account of these complaints even though the agreements were in effect and binding and, without obligation to do so, Parliament raised from 10 to 13 percent the provincial share of the yield from the personal income tax effective April 1st, 1958. In the intervening three fiscal years, this increase has added \$191 million to provincial revenues and has added equivalent cost to the Federal Treasury.

The discussions last year have made it clear that it would be difficult to reach agreement upon another such rental formula, and equally clear that the provinces should have more freedom than the tax rental system offered in their view for them to meet their financial needs.

Accordingly, the Federal Government proposes to discontinue the tax rental system when it expires on March 31st, 1962. It will thus be open to and up to any of the provinces to impose whatever taxes, in the three jointly occupied fields, they consider to be necessary to meet their respective financial responsibilities. They will exercise their constitutional right to impose, vary and adjust their levies from time to time as may be necessary in the light of their responsibilities to their provincial taxpayers and without recourse to the Federal Government. Thus there will be a return to the active responsibilities which the Constitution confers upon both levels of government under the Federal system.

The termination of the tax rental system does not mean, however, that there cannot be a simplified or unified system of tax collection with the advantages it offers. The Federal Government is prepared to undertake the collection of the personal income tax or the corporation tax, or both, for any provinces which so desire, on condition that the province under its law defines the tax base, i.e., taxable income, to be identical at all times with the Federal definition. It will, of course, rest entirely with each province to establish the rates of tax which it will impose. One joint return form will be employed for both federal and provincial taxes thus simplifying the task of the taxpayer. Although this service will cost some millions of dollars, it will be provided by the Federal Government to the province without charge. All of it has replaced the Dominion's succession duty with an estate tax. The provinces do not possess the constitutional power to enact an estate tax which the Federal Government could collect on their behalf. The Federal Government has no desire to undertake the collection of a provincial succession duty along with its estate tax because a succession duty involves many detailed problems, both for the taxpayer and for the administration, which it was intended to avoid by adopting the estate tax. The Federal Government will, in the case of any province which chooses not to impose a succession duty or similar tax, pay to such province half of the yield from the Federal estate tax in that province, calculated in the same way as under the present rental agreements. Should any province levy a succession duty, we shall be prepared to make the same abatement as at present.

Returning to the provinces the responsibility to levy their own direct taxes raises the question as to the extent of withdrawal by the Federal Government from the personal and corporation income tax fields. The Federal Government has given very careful consideration to this question. It must continue to discharge its vast responsibilities, to provide equalization payments and also to pay the federal share of the many programs now jointly borne by both levels of government, which in this year amount to some \$440 million. It is simply not possible for the Federal Government to discharge these responsibilities and at the same time comply with the demands of some provinces for mathematically equal sharing in the personal income tax and corporation tax. The Federal Government, after intensive study and consideration, has decided that it should not withdraw from the corporation tax field beyond the scale of the abatements now allowed in the law. It will, however, withdraw progressively and substantially from the personal income tax field in favour of the provinces. There are good reasons for this choice. The yield from the corporation tax is subject to wider fluctuations than the yield from

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)....the tax on personal income, which has shown a steady rate of growth. The latter is, therefore, a much more reliable form of tax for the provinces to use. Moreover, the standard rate already provided for in the corporation tax is proportionately larger than that in the personal income tax and corporation profits are generally regarded as somewhat more national in scope and origin than personal incomes and therefore more appropriate for taxation by the Dominion.

Under the system of tax collection rather than the rental agreements, there will no longer be abatements. The federal withdrawal will take the form of a straight federal tax reduction. It will then rest with each provincial government to determine its rates of tax in these fields. Accordingly the Federal Government will ask Parliament for legislation to provide, after April 1st, 1962: (a) for payment to any province not imposing a succession duty or similar tax of 50% of the yield from time to time from the federal estate tax in that province; (b) for reducing the federal corporation tax by the present 9% percentage points of taxable income, which would be a diminution in the federal tax of about 22%; (c) for reducing the federal personal income tax progressively as follows: (i) for the first year by 16% of its level at that time, (ii) for the second year by 17%, (iii) for the third year by 18%, (iv) for the fourth year by 19%, and (v) for the final year by 20%. With respect both to corporation and personal income taxes, the proposal is to reduce the rates below levels that would otherwise prevail at the times specified. Parliament cannot bind itself for five years in advance not to vary the rate of income taxes. It may be essential in the national interest to introduce various budgetary changes that are now unpredictable.

In terms of comparison with the tax rental formula of 10 - 9 - 50, which came into effect on April 1st, 1957, and the existing formula of 13 - 9 - 50 introduced by the present Federal Government, the formula now proposed will by 1966 become a 20 - 9 - 50 formula. Moreover, there will be no restriction on the freedom of each province to establish its rates of tax as it may choose.

At present the equalization formula is based upon raising the per capita yields of standard taxes to the average of the two provinces with the highest per capita yield. The Federal Government is convinced that this formula needs to be improved in two respects if it is to serve the purpose over the long run of meeting fiscal need on the part of those provinces in a relatively weak fiscal position, while preserving equity for all. The present formula disregards sources of provincial revenue other than the three standard direct taxes. The present government has had to supplement it by introducing the Atlantic Provinces Adjustment Grants as it has proven to be an inadequate base for determining fiscal need. Furthermore, it entirely ignores the wide variation in the revenue derived from natural resources. In the interests of equity and fairness, we now propose that for the purpose of determining equalization payments, the formula should include not only the yields from the three standard taxes (with the increasing rates for personal income tax outlined above) but as well one-half of the three-year moving average of the gross natural resource revenues as determined by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. The reason only half of these revenues is provided is to make allowance for the variation in the rates of tax or charge imposed by various provinces, and to avoid discouraging the development of these sources of revenue. As well, this will permit account to be taken of those revenues which arise from the disposal of resources in a manner that should not be brought fully to account in respect of any particular year.

The second principal change that we intend to introduce is to equalize over this broader base I have described, up to the national average of the revenues in question rather than up to the yield in the two highest yielding provinces. We believe that the combination of these two factors will produce a more equitable result over a long period.

Accordingly, the equalization formula will be based on the national average per capita return from a combination of the standard taxes at the progressively increased rates as proposed and 50% of the three-year average of natural resource revenue. The equalization payments will thus ensure to each province the national average return from these revenue sources and will grow as revenues expand. In order to ensure that the equalization payments calculated on this broader base up to the national average shall not leave any province worse off than under the present arrangements, we propose to incorporate into the equalization formula two guarantees: (a) No province entitled to equalization under the national average formula shall be worse

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . off than it would be under a continuation of the present equalization formula and tax rental agreements, including the Atlantic Provinces Adjustment Grants. Thus provinces with substantial fiscal need are fully protected. (b) No province will receive less in total than it has received on the average in the final two years of the current agreements. These guarantees will ensure not only that the equalization factor shall increase in general in accordance with the national average of the yield of these major revenue sources, but that it will increase for those provinces with greater fiscal need as rapidly as it would have increased under the existing arrangement.

The Atlantic Provinces Adjustment Grants, introduced by the present Federal Government, effective April 1st, 1958, have carried the principle of meeting fiscal need farther than it had ever been carried before. The sum of \$100 million was appropriated by Parliament to be paid to the four Atlantic provinces over a four-year period at the rate of \$25 million per annum on the basis agreed upon by them, viz., \$7-1/2 million each to Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Newfoundland and \$2-1/2 million to Prince Edward Island. In the intervening three years, a total of \$75 million has been paid to the Atlantic Provinces as follows: \$22-1/2 million each to Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Newfoundland and \$7-1/2 to Prince Edward Island. The existing federal legislation will carry these grants for one further year.

The Federal Government believes that the Atlantic Provinces Adjustment Grants have rendered an enduring service to the Atlantic area in assisting the governments of each of the provinces to improve the standard of services to their respective people. The grants have also performed an inestimable role in meeting the problem of provincial fiscal need in its more acute form. The Federal Government, therefore, proposes to continue the Atlantic Provinces Adjustment Grants, and to increase them, effective April 1st, 1962, from \$25 million to \$35 million per annum for the ensuing five years, with the basis of distribution among the four provinces being left for them to determine by agreement. The payments to Newfoundland for the purpose of assisting Canada's newest province to raise the level of its public services to that prevailing in the other three Atlantic provinces will be continued for the five-year period at the present rate of \$8 million per annum, over and above Newfoundland's share of the Atlantic Provinces Adjustment Grants.

At the meetings in October, emphasis was placed upon the stabilization element in the present arrangements which assures provinces that their revenue from the rental value of the standard tax rates plus equalization will not in any year be permitted to fall below 95% of the average of the two preceding years. We are prepared to incorporate a like stabilization element in the new arrangements.

We have given further thought to the means of achieving reciprocity of treatment in the position of the provincial Crown corporations and agencies under federal sales and excise taxes and the position of federal corporations and agencies under provincial direct taxes on purchases. We are prepared to waive federal immunity from taxation and instruct federal corporations and agencies to pay provincial purchase taxes and other similar taxes, on the understanding that provincial corporations and agencies will be subject to federal sales and excise taxes. We think that this is an equitable arrangement, being in accordance with the general principles followed in regard to the payment of federal taxes on purchases of federal departments. We think it is better than reciprocal exemptions as an administrative and accounting arrangement, preserving as it will a fairer relationship between Crown corporations and agencies with general and private businesses.

During the period covered by the current agreements, companies engaged in the forest industries in British Columbia and in Ontario have borne a considerably higher burden of the tax rates than other industries. This is because of the combined effect of federal income and provincial logging taxes. When the present arrangements were established, it was thought that the logging taxes would provide an alternative method of compensating the provinces in some measure for the alienation of the natural resources in question. As events have turned out, however, the taxes have become excessive. It is, of course, recognized that the Province of Ontario is not subject to the commitments which were included in the current agreements for provinces renting their corporation taxes. There would appear to be no good purpose served by attempting to apportion responsibility for the situation that has been created by the interaction of the taxes of two governments. It is proposed instead that the Federal Government and the

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . provinces in question should seek agreement by which each will make a concession in the interest of resolving this problem.

The Federal Government will continue to pay to the provinces to March 31st, 1962, half of the federal income tax from corporations engaged in the distribution or generation and distribution to the public of electrical energy, gas or steam.

It is again proposed that all joint federal-provincial programs involving conditional grants or the sharing of cost be re-examined by the Continuing Committee of Officials with a view to consolidation, simplification and co-ordination where possible. To such programs, the Federal Government in the present fiscal year is contributing an estimated \$440 million, as compared with \$111 million four years ago. The federal payments will increase vastly over the next year as the result of Quebec's adherence to the hospital insurance plan and other cost-sharing programs; it is estimated that the total of these payments will reach \$550 million.

The Federal Government proposes to ask Parliament to relinquish the remaining Federal legislative control over School Lands and School Lands Funds in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. Authority will be sought to enter into amending agreements with these three provinces to delete Section 7 of the present agreements so as to confer upon these provinces complete authority over their School Lands and their School Lands Funds.

The foregoing proposal is submitted by the Federal Government in the belief that it will form a satisfactory and workable basis for harmonious Dominion-Provincial fiscal relations for the five-year period commencing April 1st, 1962, and that it will contribute materially to the goals of strengthening the provinces and through them the municipalities to meet their several responsibilities and will equalize opportunity among Canadians in all parts of this great country.

The Federal Government believes that these proposals represent a greatly improved plan of Federal-Provincial fiscal arrangements. In summary: First; we have provided at federal expense for a considerable increase in the provincial share of the personal income tax. The additional federal withdrawal from this tax field, by the final year of the agreements, will have raised the provincial share by more than 40% above present levels. The proposed Federal withdrawals in the three shared tax fields are such that without increasing the over-all levels of taxes, the provinces can, by the end of the period, be assured of one-fifth of all the personal income tax collections, more than one-fifth of all corporation income tax, and one-half of the estates tax. Considering the heavy responsibilities of the Federal Government, we consider this to be a generous proposal. In addition, the provinces will be quite free to impose the rates of taxation which they find necessary and thus to increase the provincial share of these tax fields beyond the amount represented by the federal withdrawal.

Secondly; we have combined this greater freedom for the provinces with procedures which offer the hope of simplicity and uniformity. We have done this by offering to collect without charge any of the above taxes at the rates the provinces wish to impose, laying on them only this one single restriction that the tax base on which they impose their taxes must at all times correspond with that defined in federal statutes. This we hope will greatly simplify the task of the provinces and the problem for the taxpayers and will give the advantages of freedom while preserving administrative simplicity and efficiency.

Third; we have combined arrangements to guarantee greater flexibility and freedom in provincial finance with an improved formula for equalization which meets the problem of disparities in the yield of provincial revenues more completely and more realistically. The inclusion of a part of natural resource revenues in this formula recognizes and corrects in a practical way one of the greatest financial disabilities of some of the provinces. There is no other single revenue source which we could have added to the equalization formula which would have done so much to equalize revenue sources or contributed so much to equity in the calculation of fiscal need. Our decision to move the basis of equalization to the national average is based on financial realism. Naturally provinces like individuals would prefer to be equalized to the top, but no one can seriously contend that equalization to the top is a practicable goal.

Fourth; in addition to the recognition of the need for equalization based on a broader concept of equality and fiscal need, we have made additional, separate and special recognition of the particular disabilities of the Atlantic region. We have done so by increasing the level of these grants by forty percent.



(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)....We are convinced that this new framework and these main aspects of our proposals should assure a new era of harmonious Dominion-Provincial fiscal relations. These proposals are new in spirit but rest upon the sound principles of financial responsibility and independence of governments. We believe that they will contribute materially to the financial strength and independence of the provinces and their municipalities and to equality of opportunity for Canadians in all parts of this great country. They will help us all to meet the tasks ahead. I commend them to your earnest consideration."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for listening so attentively to this rather lengthy reading but it seems to me very much worthwhile that the House should have the exact terms of the proposal that was placed before us. I can assure members, Sir, that this last sentence has certainly been taken to heart -- that they commend these proposals to our earnest consideration -- and that is something that we will all have to take notice of before long.

While not necessarily final and in fact many of the aspects of this proposal are still under negotiation, I think we can assume that this statement accurately portrays the position of Canada with respect to fiscal arrangements for the five years commencing April 1st, 1962. One does not need to be an expert to realize that it is dangerous to make hasty judgments in this area. There are so many changing factors which may alter the relative advantages or disadvantages between alternative plans, therefore, anything that I may say today is purely a preliminary nature and subject to subsequent judgment based on the more detailed economic analyses that are presently being undertaken by the staff of the Treasury.

I hesitate, Sir, whether to comment any further on these agreements because I would not like any member of the House to think that I was taking advantage of the liberty given me in making this statement to begin debate on the point, so if I make a few observations I trust they will be considered to be informative only rather than argumentative or stating the position of the government, because that is something that will come later, but perhaps it would not be out of place if I made one or two comments which I trust will be informative in their character. I think that the House will recognize that some of the objections that were raised last October by some of the provinces have been taken into account when this new proposal was placed before us and we must recognize that the abandonment of the tax-rental plan does not involve an abandonment of the principles of equalization or of stabilization. They're included in the new arrangements and the growth factor is also part of the new proposals that are placed before us. That is something which the House should take notice of.

Some of the new proposals may be described as advantageous to Manitoba and some as disadvantageous. I suggest that changing the equalization formula or mix by including natural resource taxation is advantageous to the Province of Manitoba; but I also suggest that lowering the equalization formula from the two highest provinces to the standard of the Canadian provinces even after taking the good effect of the natural resource factor into account, is disadvantageous if it were not for the special factor now added to equalization, namely that no province getting equalization -- that includes us -- would get less under the new formula than they would have got had the old formula been continued.

We have been making some preliminary efforts to weigh up the precise impact of this whole question on our finances and it's very difficult to give any solid information to the House at present. I can say that the new arrangement guarantees us as a floor what we would have got under the old one, and the first indications that I have lead me to suspect that the new formula will overtake the old formula somewhere between the second and third year in the life of the new agreement, and to that extent it is advantageous to us.

We notice the increased share of personal income tax which is something which has been requested. We also notice that the corporation tax sharing remains the same as it was in spite of our requests for a change in that respect and we notice that the estate duty tax remains the same as it was. It appears that as far as the general taxpayer is concerned, apart from the delicate fact that he has to provide the money, he apparently will be able to provide it on one tax form, the way he has been doing in the past, though I dare say that form will take a somewhat different shape than the present one. There may be different calculations on it, but appears he will be spared the difficulty of dealing with two sets of forms and the province has been offered the facility of having these collected by the Federal Government at no cost to us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there will be I know much interest in discussing the various aspects

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)...of this plan. I would like to repeat that the operations of the proposals are too complex to be hastily defined and this is something about which I do not think you would expect the government to make any policy statements at the present time. I think our duty now is to place the facts as well as we can before the House so that members may form their own judgment about them. There are many features of the new arrangements yet to be resolved in detail. These are being examined by the officials of the continuing committee which is going to meet fairly soon to iron these matters out. I am looking forward, Sir, that when the full study of this matter has been completed it will then of course be the responsibility of the government to lay all the fact at its disposal before the House, to announce its policy, and to provide an opportunity for a full debate of all the aspects of this complicated matter. I rather expect at the present time that that debate will take place on the occasion of the budget. If for any reason that should not happen then we will have to make special arrangements to see that a full debate on this matter is arranged for in this House. Those, Sir, are the best summary that I can give the House at the moment of the facts presented to us last week.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the statement that the Honourable the First Minister has made is not debatable and I am not attempting to debate it. I would like to say that I think the Honourable the First Minister has followed the correct procedure in putting on the record the actual statement that has been made because certainly all the members of the House will be anxious to peruse the proposal that has been made. I wonder, however, Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable the First Minister would be kind enough to answer a couple of questions? I think perhaps one that I would like to ask has already been partially answered. I was going to ask if the First Minister thinks that this proposal is final or might it be like the October one considerably modified. My second question would be if he thinks it is final or final except for discussion in detail, is it his expectation that legislation will be introduced at this Session of this House?

MR. ROBLIN: If I may have permission to do so, Mr. Speaker, I'll answer the question as best I can. I think it would be wise to work on the assumption that this is the final proposal made by the Federal Government. Although the sessions were in camera --- and I would not have taken the liberty of reading this statement had it not already been placed before the public by the Federal Government -- although the discussions were in camera I don't think it would betray any secrets if I said they received a good number of suggestions from various people as to ways and means in which this present proposal could be improved and without betraying any confidences I might say that perhaps I was one of those who had some suggestions to offer. Now it's impossible to say what account will be taken of those at the present time. Let us assume, however, for the sake of our debate we might just as well assume that the position is fairly well fixed; there will be variations we know in some application of these things because it sounds very simple to read it but when you get into the detail of how to make it work you run into all kinds of unanswered questions which have quite an effect on the ultimate result, and that's one reason why I'm a little diffident about proceeding with any further statement on it. However, I think that on the whole let's consider this framework as being fixed. If there are changes made and no doubt we'll hear in due course, but I've no knowledge as to whether any of the suggestions will be accepted.

The second question refers to legislation. The answer is I don't know. That again depends on the progress that is made in ironing out the technical and other difficulties that have been mentioned and it's quite impossible to say when that will happen, so I'll just have to say that I don't know.

MR. E. GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. Has the Provincial Government received a firm commitment of financial assistance from the Federal Government regarding the Red River Diversion, and if so, what is the commitment?

MR. ROBLIN: All that I can answer my honourable friend is that the matter is being negotiated. Offers have been made and received on both sides but I think that until conclusions are reached it perhaps would not be advantageous to discuss them in detail.

MR. E. PREFONTAINE (Carillon) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to correct a statement made in the Hansard that was just put on my table. I just started to read my own speech -- I suppose it wouldn't surprise anyone if I did. I was speaking with

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.)....respect to minority rights that had been included in the BNA Act and the Manitoba Act and I said that these minority rights were put in there by purpose and I quoted C. B. Sisson's "In Church and State in Canadian Education," and I quoted that three later sub-sections were desired by Galt. Now in Hansard "Galt" is written capital "G-O-D, God". My pronunciation possibly was not correct. And then after having stopped for a few minutes, for a second I suppose, after "Galt" I left my eyes from the book and I said, "Galt was one of the Fathers of Confederation" -- A. H. Galt. Now the text in the Hansard goes on, "God was the Father of Confederation." And again it continues -- I was reading "Galt" and then it continues in Hansard, "These were desirous by God as affording additional protection to Quebec Protestants" and so on. So I think the word "Galt, a Father of Confederation" should be substituted for the word "God" that is in this Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wonder if I might table the annual report of the Civil Service Commission, and while I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, if I might tell the House that I think I have come upon a solution of the problem that jointly faced myself and the Honourable Member for Rhineland. It seems to me that we have established a principle that parties as such must have certain qualifications before they're provided with individual caucus rooms as parties, but it has been the custom in the past to afford independent members of the legislature accommodation of this kind, and so we are happy to tell my honourable friend that he will be able to occupy room no. 333, and if the page will kindly do so, I'll ask him now to take the key to my honourable friend.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to lay on the table of the House the report of the Board of Governors of the University of Manitoba for the year ended March 31st, 1960.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to lay on the table of the House a copy of all regulations filed on or after the day on which Section 10 of the Regulations Act -- which appears in Chapter 62 of the Statutes of Manitoba 1960 -- all regulations filed subsequent to the 23rd of May. These regulations are being filed pursuant to this new section of the Regulations Act which requires that there be a standing committee of regulations of this House to review the subject matter of this document.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF) (Radisson): I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney-General intends to make available to the two groups in opposition copies of that for our perusal?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, we intend to make available to the members of the committee copies of the document that I've just filed.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the First Minister? In view of the heavy snow the last few days, particularly down in the east, which may come here, is he in touch with the forecasting committee on floods?

MR. ROBLIN: May I have the last part of the question, I didn't hear it?

MR. GRAY: Is he in touch with the forecasting committee on floods?

MR. ROBLIN: The answer is yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and I want to apologize to him that I wasn't able to get in touch with him before the sitting to inform him of the question and he can take it as notice of a question if he so desires. And, Mr. Speaker, I must preface it with a sentence or two but it's all pertinent to the question. I understand that two carloads of tomatoes were shipped into Manitoba from Cuba at a cost of \$36,000. Apparently after being received here something went wrong with the result that the Canadian National Railway were in a position to dispose of them, I understand, for demurrage and transportation costs of \$900; eventually they were sold two carloads for \$300. I wonder if the Minister has investigated this matter or whether he would have any comment to make as this deals with the question of trade in Manitoba?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member will understand if I take notice of this question. It's the first time it's come to my attention.

MR. J.M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to ask a question of the Honourable the Minister of Education as to when we can expect a statement on the Boundaries Commission hearings that were held in the southern part of the province.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware that the honourable member can expect any statement from me. The Boundaries Commission make its own statements.

HON. GEO. HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to lay on the table of the House the annual report of the Department of Agriculture and Conservation for the year ended March 31st, 1960; the annual report of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation for the year ended March 31st, 1960; an nil report for the Manitoba Water Supply Board for the year ending March 31st, 1960; an nil report for the Watershed Conservation Districts Act annual report for the year 1960; the annual report of the Co-op Promotion Board for the year ending March 31st, 1960.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation, if in all these cases there are copies for all members or only for groups?

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, in some cases there will be copies for all members. There are more than enough copies for each one of the groups and other cases.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Questions.

MR. PETER WAGER (Fisher): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister the question appearing in my name on the order paper and request that the answer be printed in the Votes and Proceedings. Is that the ruling?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, in this matter there are a number of questions -- I think the same motion is there. As a matter of fact I don't think that strictly even a motion is required; they do appear on the Orders of the Day and according to Rule 47 there are certain obligations on the Clerk of the House and the Minister to have the answers printed in Votes and Proceedings, and whether a formal motion is required or not, I'm not quite sure. I think this is the first time we've done this in this House.

MR. ROBLIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I don't think a motion is required because the questions are not debatable, therefore there's no motion. We would accept the question but I would just offer this word of warning, that naturally the acceptance of the question does not mean that we guarantee an answer in each specific -- some of the questions, for example, refer to matters which are available in the Public Accounts or other places and we'll make reference to that or otherwise deal with them, but in cases where it is quite clear that we ought to provide the answer, we will certainly do so. If there is any ones that my honourable friend objects to as not having been answered he can always raise the matter in the usual way.

MR. PAULLEY: I'd like also, Mr. Speaker -- I didn't closely check them, there may be some dealing with policy that the government is not in a position to disclose at this time -- if the Minister replying simply states that in Votes and Proceedings we have to accept it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, my remembrance of the discussion that we had on this matter a year, or perhaps more than a year ago, was that even though this procedure would be followed that either the mover of -- not the mover but either the one who is asking the question -- the member asking the question or Mr. Speaker, would read the question so that the question also would be on the Hansard. Now I have always taken the position Mr. Speaker, that it's the honourable member who is asking the question that should be compelled to read it rather than compelling you to read all this list of questions, but I do think that one or the other should, so that the two appear together in Hansard.

MR. PAULLEY: It's okay by us, Mr. Speaker, each member of my caucus will then read the question without a formal motion in order that it appears in Hansard. I might point out to my honourable friend, however, that the answers will not appear in Hansard, they will appear in Votes and Proceedings.

MR. ROBLIN: Again speaking to the point of order, I really don't see the need for my honourable friends to read the questions to get them on to Hansard because the answers will not appear in Hansard, they will appear in Votes and Proceedings, as these do, therefore it's not necessary to read them for that purpose. However, I see that there's a point to be made in having them read period. We also have a rather polite custom around here of sometimes taking matters "as read", and if no one has any serious objections, I suggest that we just take

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.)....these questions as read.

MR. CAMPBELL: With the understanding though, Mr. Speaker, that they appear in Hansard. Is that .....

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, the questions will appear, but the answers will appear in Votes and Proceedings.

MR. CAMPBELL: That's quite okay as far as I'm concerned. Mr. Speaker, my interest in having them in Hansard is simply that we get an index as to what happens in Hansard. We're fairly familiar with checking it as to the different days of work. I don't think that those matters would be as fully covered in the Votes and Proceedings. However, as long as they are put on record someplace, it's okay with me.

The questions referred to in the discussion are reprinted herewith:

MR. WAGNER: 1. How many farmers applied for farm loans in 1960? 2. How many of them received loans? 3. What were the amounts received by each?

MR. ORLIKOW: 1. Is there a waiting list of patients for the Manitoba School for Defective Persons at Portage la Prairie? 2. If so, how many are on that list? 3. Once application has been made, what is the usual waiting period before admittance is made?

MR. PETERS: 1. How many camping sites were completed in the year 1960? 2. How many picnic sites were completed in the year 1960? 3. Where were these camping and picnic sites located? 4. How many units did each contain?

MR. PAULLEY: 1. Were any bursaries granted by the Department of Public Health and Welfare to social workers to help them to obtain professional training in 1960? 2. If the answer to the above is yes - (a) How many received assistance? (b) What was the amount of each bursary?

MR. PAULLEY: 1. Did any employees at the Hospitals for Mental Diseases or the Manitoba School for Defective Persons at Portage la Prairie get in-service training in 1960? 2. If so, how many and what type of training did they get?

MR. PAULLEY: 1. What was the percentage in turn-over for the entire staff in the mental institutions (hospitals for mental diseases and the Manitoba School for Defective Persons) in 1960? 2. What was the percentage of turn-over of psychiatric nurses? 3. Of those who left, what reasons did they give for leaving?

MR. HARRIS: 1. What is the capacity for inmates at the Manitoba Home for Boys? 2. What was the average number of boys in the Home, month by month, in 1960?

MR. HARRIS: 1. How many women prisoners were put on probation in 1960? 2. How many of these did not see a probation officer at all?

MR. ORLIKOW: 1. What is the total staff in each of the following institutions as of December 31st, 1960: (a) Brandon Hospital for Mental Diseases (b) Selkirk Hospital for Mental Diseases (c) Psychopathic Hospital - Winnipeg (d) Manitoba School for Defective Persons - Portage la Prairie. 2. In each of these institutions, what is the total number of each of the following: (a) Certified Psychiatrists (b) Psychiatrists in training (c) Doctors (d) Psychologists (e) Psychiatric Social Workers (f) Psychiatric Nurses? 3. How many vacancies in the establishment exist in each of these categories? 4. How does the number of qualified people in each of these categories compare with the standards for mental institutions set out by either the Canadian Psychiatric Association or the American Psychiatric Association?

MR. ORLIKOW: 1. What was the average length of hospitalization of patients in the Brandon Hospital for Mental Diseases, Selkirk Hospital for Mental Diseases, and the Psychopathic Hospital in Winnipeg for 1959 and 1960? 2. What is the per diem cost of maintaining and treating patients at each of these hospitals (Brandon Hospital for Mental Diseases, Selkirk Hospital for Mental Diseases, and Psychopathic Hospital in Winnipeg) during the last fiscal year?

MR. ORLIKOW: 1. Is it true that drug accounts for prescriptions filled by Winnipeg drug stores for Medicare patients which are now five months old have not yet been paid? 2. If this is so, what is the explanation for the delay in payment, and when will these accounts be paid?

MR. ORLIKOW: 1. When were budgets for 1960 submitted to the Department of Health & Public Welfare for the following hospitals: The Winnipeg General Hospital - Winnipeg, The St. Boniface Hospital - St. Boniface, The Children's Hospital of Winnipeg - Winnipeg, Misericordia General Hospital - Winnipeg, Victoria General Hospital - Winnipeg, Grace Hospital -

(Question, cont'd., Mr. Orlikow).....Winnipeg, Brandon General Hospital - Brandon, Selkirk General Hospital - Selkirk, Dauphin General Hospital - Dauphin, Flin Flon General Hospital - Flin Flon, Le Pas General Hospital - Le Pas? 2. When were these budgets finally approved? 3. When were budgets for these hospitals for 1961 submitted? 4. When is it expected that the budgets for 1961 for these hospitals will be approved?

MR. ORLIKOW: 1. How many juvenile offenders had psychiatric examination in 1960? 2. Of this number, how many had psychiatric treatment?

MR. ORLIKOW: 1. How many probation officers are employed for the adult and juvenile divisions? 2. How many of these are graduates in Arts, Science, Social Work, or correctional training of any kind?

MR. ORLIKOW: 1. How many juvenile offenders - both male and female - are in adult Gaols (Headingley and Portage la Prairie) at the present time? 2. How many were in these Gaols in 1960?

MR. ORLIKOW: 1. Who decides which prisoners at the Headingley Gaol will be seen by the psychiatrist? 2. How many inmates at Headingley Gaol were seen by the psychiatrist in 1960? 3. How many inmates received treatment?

MR. REID: 1. Who decides which people brought before the courts will be seen by a psychiatrist?

MR. REID: 1. What is the number of guards or attendants at Vaughan Street Gaol? 2. What are their qualifications, or training, or experience?

MR. PETERS: 1. What was the number of Winter Work Projects undertaken by the Government Departments, for the winter of 1960 to February 1, 1961? 2. What was the location of each such project? 3. What was the number of persons employed on each project? 4. What was the number of "man-days" of employment provided by each project?

MR. PETERS: 1. How many man-hours or days of work were lost through industrial disputes in 1960?

MR. PETERS: 1. What is the total staff of the Department of Health and Public Welfare as of December 31st, 1960? 2. How many of the staff are qualified nurses, doctors, social workers, or other technically qualified staff?

MR. PETERS: 1. What is the capacity for inmates at the Portage la Prairie Gaol for Women? 2. What was the average number of inmates there, month by month, in 1960?

MR. PETERS: 1. What is the capacity for inmates at Headingley Gaol? 2. What was the average number of inmates at Headingley Gaol, month by month, in 1960?

MR. SCHREYER: 1. What are the functions of the Education Advisory Board? 2. Who are the members of this Board? 3. How often does this Board meet? 4. What salaries and expenses, if any, are paid each member of the Board?

MR. SCHREYER: 1. How many teachers without proper certification (permit teachers or teachers with letters of authority) are teaching in the Province as of December 31, 1960? 2. In what school districts are they located?

MR. SCHREYER: 1. With respect to expenditures made in the Province for education in the year 1960: (a) What was the total sum spent? (b) What proportion of the total sum was expended on ordinary expenses? (c) What proportion of the total sum was expended on capital expenses? (d) What proportion of the total sum was contributed by the Provincial Government? (e) What proportion of the total sum was contributed by Municipal Governments or School Districts?

MR. SCHREYER: 1. On what dates were rate-base hearings held for: (a) Greater Winnipeg Gas Company (b) Inter-City Gas Co. (c) Plains Western Electric Co?

MR. SCHREYER: 1. As of what date has the uniform system of accounting been a requisite for all natural gas companies in the Province? 2. Are all natural gas companies in the Province now subject to the above?

MR. SCHREYER: 1. What has been paid out to the Arthur D. Little Company of Boston, Massachusetts in the following years: 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960? 2. What specific studies has the Arthur D. Little Company of Boston conducted? 3. What has been the cost for each study conducted by the Arthur D. Little Company of Boston? 4. What concrete action has resulted from these studies? 5. On what basis was the decision made to retain the services of the Arthur D. Little Company of Boston, Massachusetts?

(Questions, cont'd.)

MR. SCHREYER: 1. How many bursaries were granted by the Attorney-General's department to probation officers to help them obtain professional training in 1960? 2. If so, what type of training did they take?

MR. SCHREYER: 1. Did any employees in the Correctional Institutions get in-service training in 1960? 2. If so, how many, and what type of training?

MR. WRIGHT: 1. How many individuals are receiving aid under the provision of the Social Allowances Act? 2. What was the case load and total number of recipients on a monthly basis?

MR. WRIGHT: 1. With respect to the Portage la Prairie Gaol for Women, what was the total number of inmates for 1960, month by month? 2. What is the number of staff of this institution as of December 31st, 1960? 3. How many of the staff are trained social workers or teachers or trained in correctional procedures?

MR. WRIGHT: 1. With respect to the Headingly Gaol, what was the total number of inmates for 1960, month by month? 2. What is the number of staff of this institution as of December 31st, 1960? 3. How many of the staff are trained social workers or teachers or trained in correctional procedures?

MR. WRIGHT: 1. How many employees are in our correctional institutions? 2. How many have been trained in correctional procedure? 3. What type of training have they received?

MR. WAGNER: 1. How many farmers are covered by crop insurance? 2. How much did they pay in premiums? 3. What was the cost of administration? 4. What was paid out in claims as of December 31, 1960?

MR. WAGNER: 1. How much money was spent by the Department of Agriculture in the year 1960 on their program for farm home improvements (sewer and running water), and how many homes were provided with sewer and running water as a result of the Government's program?

MR. WAGNER: 1. How many social workers are employed by the Department of Health & Public Welfare? 2. How many are university-trained? 3. How many are employed as administrators or supervisors?

MR. WAGNER: 1. Is any booklet issued to the public by the Department of Health and Public Welfare advising what services are available to those in need?

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't hear the Honourable Member for Fisher. Is he proposing just the one question -- he has several on the order paper.

MR. WAGNER: All of the questions.

MR. SPEAKER: All of the questions. Is it agreeable to the House that we put them through all at once or should we deal with them individually?

MR. ROBLIN: I'm agreeable Sir, to taking the whole list of questions as read, subject to the comments already made.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . and transferred into Hansard without the necessity of going through the microphone. Is that the idea?

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, just a second thought occurs to me here and I just want to be quite clear that my Honourable Friend, the Leader of the CCF Party understands, that if these were read one at a time we might be taking objection to certain of them, but in this present procedure we will not take the objection now, we will simply take it in the course of the answer. For example, one of the questions asks for a statement of the Post-War Emergency Fund as of a certain date. That information is already before the House in the Public Accounts, therefore we would not answer that question, we would simply say, "Look at page so and so of the Public Accounts." Now if it's quite understood that we will be taking objection to some of these which we feel are not properly drawn, then -- I don't want any misunderstanding about it -- but if there's any feeling that we should deal with each instance on its own, we are prepared to do so. I leave it to my honourable friend.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh no, Mr. Speaker, we won't raise any objections to answers of that nature. The suggestion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is that rather than read them out, and we could have by the time we have taken now, but there will be some following, and we might as well establish a precedence now that instead of them being read out

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.)....individually we'll take them as being read, the Clerk or yourself, Mr. Speaker, have them inserted in Hansard as questions being asked and then the answer subsequently in Votes and Proceedings, and what my honourable friends opposite have as the answers, that's their baby and not ours.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the intention of asking in one block all of the questions that have been proposed by members of the CCF Party?

MR. PAULLEY: Right!

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House agreeable? Address for Papers. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. N. SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain that an address be presented to his Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of all correspondence, telegrams and other documents between: (1) The First Minister and Hugh Paton and D. Hubert Cox, and any one acting on behalf of them or either of them, relative to the talks and/or negotiations on Ruperts Land Development Corporation Ltd. (2) Hon. Gurney Evans or any other Minister of the Crown and Hugh Paton and D. Hubert Cox or Hugh Paton or D. Hubert Cox, and any one acting on behalf of them or either of them, relative to the talks and negotiations on Ruperts Land Development Corporation Ltd., (3) Any civil servant, and Hugh Paton and D. Hubert Cox or Hugh Paton and D. Hubert Cox, and any one acting on behalf of them or either of them, relative to the talks and negotiations on Ruperts Land Development Corporation Ltd. (4) Any Minister or any civil servant of the Government of Manitoba and its representative in London, England, or any other person or persons in London, England, relative to talks and negotiations on Ruperts Land Development Corporation Ltd., (5) Any Minister or any civil servant of the Government of Manitoba and the firm of Arthur D. Little Inc., relative to the talks and negotiations on Ruperts Land Development Ltd.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to this Address For Papers. There will be just one privileged document which will be a statement by a bank relative to the credit standing of an individual, which class of paper is always regarded as privileged and reflecting on the private affairs of an individual person. Otherwise all papers of the kind described by my honourable friend will be made available and copies tabled as soon as possible. I might take this occasion to remark, Sir, if I may, that in the ordinary circumstances we would not accept an address for these papers on a deal which has not yet been completed, that is to say, a development project for northern Manitoba, as it might well reveal the bargaining position of the government to any other corporations or individuals who might be interested in making such an investment. I think it would be unwise from a business point of view to do so. However, by unilateral action Mr. Paton saw fit to reveal the contents of these papers and they are now public and we are glad to comply with this Address For Papers.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of Return. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing: (1) Total amount of money spent under agreements with the Government of Canada through PFRA in the Province of Manitoba for years 1959 and 1960 excluding the Seine River Project. (2) The amount contributed by the Province of Manitoba, amount contributed by the Government of Canada. (3) Give location of projects.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

HON. GEO. HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I would say this in respect to this request that some of this information is not available to us. We have participating agreements with the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation and we have non-participating agreements. And of course, in those non-participating it's impossible for me to give the figures -- the cost of works undertaken in the province.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: In that case is the Minister prepared to put in the figures of which he has record?

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



MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing: (1) The number of motor vehicles purchased by the Government of Manitoba from April 1st, 1959 to March 31st, 1960. (2) The make and model of above. (3) The name of dealer or agency from whom the vehicles were purchased.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

HON. JOHN THOMPSON, Q.C. (Minister of Public Works) (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Member would advisewhether he intends to include road building equipment which technically is included in the term "motor vehicle". Do you wish road building equipment to be reported upon or just -- including snow plows, maintenance graders and so on.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could include that as another item perhaps. Motor vehicles and then road machinery. Or include it, it doesn't matter.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing: (1) The Total amount in the Reserve for War and Post-War Emergencies Fund as at March 31st, 1960. (2) A list of the securities or investments making up the fund as it now stands.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think we should decline this question on the ground that if the honourable member will turn to Page 384 of Public Accounts which has already been placed on his desk, he will get the answer.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing: (1) Number of loans made by the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation to farmers of this province to December 31, 1960. (2) Actual amount loaned by the Corporation as of December 31, 1960. (3) Amount loaned and number of loans made at four percent interest and 5 1/2 percent. (4) Actual amount paid out to borrowers up to December 31, 1960. (5) Number of applications for loans received to December 31, 1960. (6) Number of applications not processed on hand as of December 31, 1960. (7) Amount of money, capital and interest that fell due and was payable to the Corporation by the borrowers in 1960. (8) Amount of arrears as of December 31, 1960. (9) Has a loan been made to a director or directors of the Corporation? (10) What was the cost of administering the Corporation for the year 1960? (11) The average Capital investment of all borrowers to date.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, on the 11th question: The average Capital investment of all borrowers to date, would be rather a difficult figure for us to give in respect of all loans. I doubt if that information is available.

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

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

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): In the absence of the Honourable Member for St. John's, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing: A transcript to be tabled of the hearings of the Tritzschler Commission on the Brandon Packers dispute.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Public Utilities & Minister of Labour) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say that the transcript of evidence of the Tritzschler Commission runs into some four volumes. There are somewhat in excess of 2,200 pages and I'm sure the House will realize the cost of reproducing a document of this size. So if the honourable member would withdraw his Order, we would undertake to lay on the -- at least to file with the Provincial Library, a copy of the transcript of evidence.

MR. PAULLEY: The only comment I would make in regard to that, Mr. Speaker, it's rather difficult to go into the Library every time my honourable friend wished to read something in the transcript. I appreciate very, very much the question as raised by the Honourable the Minister of Labour in respect to it being a very large volume. Might I ask him, Mr. Speaker, is there only one available of the transcript? Are there none others that even if he's not able to comply completely with the request to make available for all time a copy of the transcript; if there are more than one, I'm wondering if the Honourable Minister could not allow one, under security, to be made available to my honourable friend who is vitally interested in this question, and it would be returned.

MR. CARROLL: I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, that that would be impossible. I think there are only two copies of the transcript, one of which must remain of course, the part of the official record, but we would make the other one available through the library if that would be satisfactory.

MR. PAULLEY: In the absence of my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, for the time being I'll accept that as being satisfactory, and then if he has any objections to it maybe he could propose the question at some other time.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I again rise to the point of order that we are debating this and therefore we only speak once on this motion, but if my honourable friend would be helped in any way why does he not suggest that we allow this order to stand then when the Honourable Member for St. John's is here he can give us his own opinion. I do hope though that it would be agreeable to him because if we have to reproduce it I don't know when he'll get it -- 2,200 pages are a lot of pages. If he wants to make use of this for the purposes of debate in the near future perhaps the Minister's suggestion is a practical one.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . and again I'm not trying to debate, but just to resolve the -- I see one problem. With it being palced in the Library then it becomes available to anybody and it's my colleague who's so vitally interested in this. It may not . . . . (Interjection) . . . Yes.

MR. ROBLIN: . . .if I can break the rule that I just said shouldn't be broken, Mr. Speaker. Is it not advisable that it should be in the Library because other members may wish to see it and that makes it possible for them to do so.

MR. PAULLEY: Okay we'll accept it going into the Library.

MR. PETERS: . . . suggest this, that if the Honourable Member for St. John's were the first one put on a list to get the . . . (Interjection)

MR. SPEAKER: I believe that there's strict rules in the Library and books cannot be taken out so -- only under certain circumstances.

MR. PETERS: . . . . . order withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER: Order withdrawn? Agreed? The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Logan that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing all items appearing on the Order Paper in my name.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood -- can we have the motion?

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I haven't got the motion in front of me. That an Order of the House do issue for return showing: (1) The number of cases handled under the Social Security Plan for the year of 1960 -- Calendar year. (2) The number of people to whom extra allowances were given in this same period, the year of 1960. (3) The average allowance given to each applicant for 1960. (4) The total amount spent for this particular assistance to all individuals, in 1960. (5) The total number of persons receiving the old age pension: (a) Those over 70, under the Old Age Security Act. (b) Those between 65 and 70 years of age, with a Means Test.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. GEO. JOHNSON (Minister of Health & Public Welfare)(Gimli): . . .with the Honourable Member for Inkster when he refers to the number of cases handled under the Social Security Plan for the year 1960. Does he want the total number of cases handled in all categories of assistance or was he particularly concerned with the aged and infirm group? There 's the total. . . .

MR. GRAY: All of it, Mr. Speaker, because the extra allowance is also given to those

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.)....old age pensioners for whom the government here is not responsible.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing: (1) The value of contracts let since August 15, 1958 by Greater Winnipeg Gas Company to: (a) G. M. Gest Company. (b) Mannix Construction. (c) Gas Utility Construction. (d) Harris Construction Company.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing: 1 (a) Did Greater Winnipeg Gas Co., (formerly Winnipeg & Central Gas Co.) publicly call for tenders for the award of their construction contracts since September 1st, 1958? (b) If so, in what publications and dates did the advertisements calling for tenders appear? (c) If public tenders were not called for, how were construction contracts awarded? (d) What firms submitted tenders on the above contracts? (e) What were the prices contained in these submissions? (f) Which firms were awarded contracts in each case? 2. (a) Copies of all construction contracts made by Greater Winnipeg Gas Co. since September 1, 1958. (b) Were these contracts submitted to the Board for approval? (c) Did the Board retain the services of engineering consultants to evaluate these contracts and the prices contained therein? (d) Copies of the Board's engineering consultants reports to the Board regarding the above contracts. 3. Copies of all orders by the Board approving or disapproving construction contracts made by Greater Winnipeg Gas Co. (formerly Winnipeg & Central Gas Co.) since September 1, 1958.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, we will accept the order if the honourable member would withdraw items 1.(e), 1.(f) and 2.(a). This is information which is not normally available to the Board but which of course might be made available at the time of a rate base hearing. There are a great many contract documents here that are being requested, many of which run in excess of 50 pages; there may be as many as 50 or more contracts so it's a very costly and expensive request that these documents should be reproduced and laid on the table of the House. The Company has agreed that they will show contracts and answer any question that members of the House may have if they want to come down as a group or as individual members. If you would care to contact me I could make that arrangement with the Company and I'm sure that they would be prepared to answer any questions which you may have on these items that are mentioned here—the items that I'm asking to have withdrawn from this order.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm disposed to accepting that condition. I would like, however, to get clear if the Minister means that if we contact him personally that he will take us to the place where these records are available, is that the idea? Would we be able to take them out?

MR. CARROLL: No these documents of course would not be available to take out of the building and of course this is only offered to the Members of the Legislature. They're not opening their books to members of the general public but would open it to groups or individual Members of the Legislature who would like to make this arrangement.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Honourable Minister why 2. (a) is excluded, if I understood him correctly?

MR. CARROLL: Well, my understanding is that the contract documents are rather involved -- documents containing possibly 50 or more pages in each, and of course you're asking for documents that date back over a period of time here; we understand there may be as many as 50 or more contracts. They're not in our possession and incidentally -- but the Company have offered to do this as an indication of their good faith to Members of the Legislature.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Logan that an Order of the House do issue a return showing: 1. How many liquor stores are now in operation in this Province? 2. The number of beer and wine outlets licensed in this Province? 3. The number of cocktail lounges now licensed for operation in this Province?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 15. The Honourable the Minister of Health and Public Welfare.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli) presented Bill No. 15, An Act respecting The Department of Welfare, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, this bill, the principle of this bill is to establish a Department of Welfare. I think the principle behind the bill is sound in that the Departments of Health and Public Welfare are becoming increasingly more complex and we in the public interest -- I think possibly the public can best be served by having a full time Minister in charge of this Department. Concerning the bill itself, it has been the decision to call the department the Department of Welfare. I would draw attention of the members to the fact that the bill is not to be proclaimed on Royal Assent but rather on Proclamation. There will be a certain amount of intense reorganization required following the decision to split the department in that the area of rehabilitation and care will have to be put in one department or the other. There will be too very great needs for continued liaison between the two departments because as health activities increase, welfare becomes more important and vice versa. Therefore, we have made provision in this bill that the Act come into force on proclamation which will give the government time to give fullest consideration to this border area of rehabilitation and care.

.....Continued on next page

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the government and the Minister for bringing this bill up before the House, and remind him, remind the government that our group has asked for it for a very many years, and whenever we make a statement, which quite often is being denied, but for 25 or 30 years we asked for legislation which is coming in now, please do not accuse us for not telling the truth. The question that worries my mind is, why should a bill like this come from the Minister of Health and Public Welfare rather than from the Leader of the House, because after all it's not a policy of the Minister but a policy of the government. However, this explanation which I would like to have I want to compliment the government for bringing up this year and I think that by dividing this portfolio in two more good for the sick and the needy will come out.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 16. The Honourable the Minister of Health and Welfare.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli) presented Bill No. 16, An Act respecting The Department of Health, for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I have no questions to ask as the Honourable Member for Inkster had, as to why this is done in this particular way. I'm simply assuming that the reason that we see quite a number of acts quoted here and in the other bill as well, that it's just a case of distributing the responsibilities and authorities between the two, and I note the Honourable the Minister's remark that there'll have to be continuing co-operation between the two departments and such like. I recognize the reason for a proclamation. I'd just like to ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, are there any unassigned responsibilities when the two acts have been sort of correlated and are there any new responsibilities created for either department?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister is closing the debate.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, in response to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's question, certainly it was the decision of the First Minister and my colleagues that this division occur, and I guess because the acts are now under the Minister of Health I was asked to introduce these, and as I've said earlier, it is with mixed feelings that you see these departments split, and I certainly am aware of the tremendous need for continuing co-operation.

In direct reply to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I anticipate no new acts coming under the department. We have everything now from The Anatomy Act to The Cemeteries Act and the Hospital Services Plan. However, in the Department of Welfare and Health there has sort of been an over-riding responsibility in the area of rehabilitation and care, both departments working together in this area and the Department of Alternative Care, the Rehabilitation Division, and there will have to be great thought given to just which department these functions will fall under, but that will, I think, be resolved to the satisfaction of both before proclamation.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 24. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS presented Bill No. 24, An Act to amend The Business Development Fund Act for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, sometimes in the course of making a loan it is desirable to have an appointee of the Manitoba Development Fund or one of their directors become appointed to the Board of Directors of the borrowing corporation. The legal authorities within the government thought there was some question about this in the wording of the present act. This amendment removes any doubt on the point.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Honourable the Minister if that's not a case of the department attempting to dominate the industry?

MR. EVANS: The answer to my honourable friend, Sir, is no.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 26. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 26, An Act to amend The Real Property Act for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, there are two principles involved in this amendment, both largely of an administrative nature. One involves the permission which is now given by the amendment for the Registrar-General or District Registrar to avoid the writing up of a new Certificate of Title where transfers are being registered in theory and where a transfer is following upon another one. The second one involves a setting up of mechanics for the disposition of liens which have been in existence in the Land Titles for a period of ten years or more. I might just mention in that connection that there are some 15,000 old liens, old and new liens, on file in the Winnipeg Land Titles Office as an example; some 7,000 of these are better than 13 years old; some of them date back prior to 1938, and it is deemed advisable to have this form of sanitation amendment applied to The Real Property Act in order that we might clear out some of the old documents presently on file.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, there's one or two comments I would like to make and a couple of questions I'd like to ask the Honourable Attorney-General. The first question is in connection with the order dispensing with the actual issue of a Certificate of Title where there's a succession of transfers. My question is, is there going to be any rebate in fees, or charge full fee for each transfer notwithstanding the fact you're not going to issue a Certificate of Title? Now the second question is this, and I'd like to preface the question by this general statement, that I can appreciate that it is desirable from the standpoint of the Land Titles Office that the cluttering up of old liens in the General Register be modified to some extent because it is a problem today. No matter what you're registering in there you're always faced with old liens, but there's one point that I'd like to raise and that is this: has this matter been discussed with any of the municipal organizations in Manitoba, because if this act is an act it means this, that this coming December any liens registered by municipalities such as liens for relief, or liens for hospitalization, or liens for any other purpose, the municipality will be served with a notice advising that these liens will be ten years of age on the 31st of December, and it will necessitate the municipality re-registering these liens. Now, that's all right from the government's standpoint because the Department of Health and Public Welfare or any other government agency can register liens without any cost or any charge, but under your tariff as it prevails in the Land Titles Office today, it's going to cost a municipality \$2.00 to register every lien that it has to re-register. Now, it may seem too that a lot of these liens because they're 15 or 20 years of age they're not going to catch anything, but that is not the case. Liens may be registered against an individual by a municipality in the Land Titles Office and at the time of registration that individual may have no assets, but subsequently that individual may acquire assets either through an estate or through purchases, and it's really amazing how much municipalities are able to collect on liens that as far as the debt is concerned, it's been written off the books of the municipality for years, so I don't want to appear that I'm trying to throw a monkey wrench into the machinery or anyway, but I was just wondering whether it wouldn't be advisable to take this up with the Union of Manitoba Municipalities or some of the other municipal organizations to get their views on it before it is an act and is law, and I make that suggestion simply on account of the financial aspect of it.

MR. SPEAKER: .....debate.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the points raised by my honourable friend certainly are not interpreted as throwing a monkey wrench in. I think his points are quite valid. With respect to the first one I have had no indication from the Registrar-General that there would be any lapsing of the fee when this requirement is taken away from him. With respect to the second point, this matter was raised initially, as the honourable member has quite properly surmised, by the Registrar-General and his staff because of the great amount of time that is spent by the staff in Winnipeg and the staff, indeed, in each Land Titles District in Manitoba checking over the huge file, some 15,000 as I mentioned, in the Winnipeg Land Titles Office, of liens in order to ascertain that a person has not something registered against him in the General Register. Now the point that is made by my honourable friend from Selkirk is quite valid. Is this going to have an effect of defeating a claim which a municipality may have against a person and, of course, the act itself explains that it does not have that effect. But it does have this effect - it prohibits -- not prohibits, but it makes a municipality think before it goes ahead indiscriminantly and files liens for petty amounts against an individual. Now, my honourable friend will appreciate Sir, that in a good number of cases there have been, not only municipalities,

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.). . . . but other persons entitled to file liens, have done so for negligible amounts of money. There is no such limitation in the present amendment before us, but that has been recommended from time to time that there be a limitation on the amount that a lien might be registered for. That is not being done. Actually all we're saying here is that when a lien has been registered, when it has been in force and effect and registered for ten years, that there then perhaps should be an onus on the person registering that lien to check it over again and if he still feels that there is some value in it, if he still feels that there is some opportunity that he may exact some of the money back for which the lien stands as a memorial of indebtedness, that he can then refile the lien and carry it on in the Land Titles Office. I would not subscribe to the theory, Mr. Speaker, that this is an onerous burden to place on a municipality or anyone else because I think after ten years that's a considerable amount of time in which to exact payment, if that is in fact what you are hoping to do. If, on the other hand, you're merely filing a lien for the nuisance value that it may have, why then all the more reason why it should be lapsed after a period of ten years so that the nuisance value is decreased in the Land Titles Office.

When we get into committee, I will be prepared to answer any further questions that we may have on this and I'm not prepared at this moment, unfortunately, to answer the question about the reference to the Union of Municipalities. I do know that I had some conversation earlier with the late -- my predecessor, the late Honourable Maurice Ridley, but I don't have any material or notes in front of me at the present time to elucidate upon the point.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. This resolution stands, I understand.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, if memory serves, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition was to consider whether or not he would introduce an amendment to this resolution, and as I see that he has notice on the Order Paper of a motion of his own which bears on the point, I take it that is his decision; so I suppose that the resolution is now open to debate and presumably for the vote, because my honourable friend's objection has been taken care of, I imagine, in that way.

MR. CAMPBELL: . . . . . perhaps, Mr. Speaker, that the way that the House would like to deal with it would be that this one would still stand and that when my resolution was reached in due course, that we would simply make the decision of the House on it which perhaps would pretty well dispose of this same matter.

MR. ROBLIN: I really can't say that I object to that, but I just wonder, Sir, if it wouldn't be better to dispose of this now. It doesn't affect my honourable friend's resolution and we can deal with it on its merits when we get to it. Is there any serious objection to that, that is not obvious to me?

MR. SPEAKER: I wish to say that this is the resolution that we had the ruling on several days ago and it was at that time decided that it was out of order until a committee had been set up. It would appear that it would not be debatable at this time until the other motion had taken effect.

MR. CAMPBELL: . . . . . with the view that you took, Mr. Speaker, and I was simply trying to follow the arrangement that we had tried to make between us.

MR. SPEAKER: It would follow if the House did not accept the motion that is now on the notice of motion, well this motion would still be out of order.

MR. ROBLIN: Do you feel, Sir, then that we should let this item stand? Is that what your view is?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I would think it would be better to let it stand.

MR. ROBLIN: Very good, I accept that.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

MR. ROBLIN: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, just a few brief words on the motion. The estimates were placed before the members last Friday so that they would have an opportunity of looking them

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . . over over the week-end and familiarize themselves with the main outline of them. Perhaps I might just be allowed to say that the total as you are aware, Sir, is some \$103,856,514, exclusive of Capital Supply. This very large sum represents an increase of almost \$8 1/2 millions over the estimates that were submitted to the last session of the Legislature and I think the effects of these expenditures can be seen in almost every field of government activity.

I may point out, Sir, that the estimates for Education constitute an increase of 75% over the amount that was voted in the year 1959 - 1958. Members will be aware of the very great changes that have taken place in the educational structure since then. It is interesting to note that as a result of that, and also of other factors, that there is an increase in the number of students who are attending the universities and other institutions of higher learning in the province, and that compared with the 1958-59 estimates, these estimates show an increase in grants to the university from \$2,157,000 to \$4,565,000 -- more than doubled in the period.

In the Department of Agriculture and Conservation, I draw attention to the items of crop insurance and agricultural credit and agricultural research. These are an indication of the efforts of the government to assist this basic industry in our province to deal with the problems which are before it. The estimates of the Attorney-General are up somewhat which reflects the changes that have been made in the probation system and the processes of law enforcement and penal reform, which I think the House as a whole approves of. In the field of Social Welfare there has been a very significant progress in the last few years. In the estimates of 1959-1958 we provided some \$7,142,000 for assistance to those in need. In 1961-62, this figure has been raised to \$13,165,000 for the same general purpose, an increase of about 85% in the two years -- between the two periods. That represents a very substantial increase as well. Certain changes are being proposed in the Department of Mines and Resources which the Minister will comment on. Re-organization of his department to obtain better use of the personnel and facilities that are available there.

I should also draw attention to the fact that in these estimates we're asking for another \$1 1/2 million to pay interest on the public debt, which indicates the nature and extent of the investments that we continue to make in the roads and public services of the province. I think I should say to the committee too that these estimates do not show the number of employees opposite the various salary appropriations. However, as a result of last year's discussion on the matter we think it right that we should table a document, which we'll do very, very shortly, from the Civil Service Commission indicating that information so that members may follow it, should they desire to do so. We think that the information we have now is considerably more accurate than it was in the past because of changes in definition of just exactly who is a civil servant, which led to some very considerable misunderstandings in the past. The fact is, Sir, that the new Civil Service Act brought in last year did away with the category of temporary civil servants. We had hundreds, indeed well over a thousand, of these people that formerly were not reported as part of the staff when the staff of a department was being scrutinized by the House. Those numbers did not appear. They will appear in the return that the Civil Service will make on this particular point so that we have the full list of the number of people who are classified as civil servants in the province under those headings. If you notice what appears to be a startling jump in the total, it's because of this difference in classification. They were there all the time but they formerly were not counted as such. I believe, Sir, that that's all I need to say at this time because I'm confident, relying on the experience of the past, that members of the House, when they do reach the committee, will give their usual thorough attention to the estimates and the projects as they are presented to the Legislature.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I too, would like to make a very brief comment or two with regard to the estimates just after our first look at them. The Honourable the First Minister has answered some of the queries that I was going to put, because I think it is a mistake to not show the numbers of the people that we're dealing with in these different categories, but if there's some document that's going to be presented to us that will enable us to keep track of that, instead of having to be calling out to the Minister all the time as we did last year, asking him what are the numbers in this case, what are the numbers in that one and so on. Then that at least is some improvement. I think it would be better to show them here particularly now that the Honourable the First Minister reports that the new Civil Service has resulted in what



(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.).... he believes to be more accurate figures in that regard. But I certainly disagree with him when he says that the people were there all the time -- these increases that he's speaking of -- (Interjection) -- Well, yes, there were certainly a lot of temporary ones but the information was always available as to the classifications between permanent and temporary, and certainly I wouldn't want the Honourable the First Minister to convey the impression that there had not been a very great increase in the number of civil servants. I think that another thing that should be improved in the presentation of these estimates is listing at least some more of the salaries. I think the House would like to have the salaries of some of the senior civil servants, at least, broken down for them. Certainly the deputy ministers. I think we would like to be kept informed as to the progress that is being made with regard to the salary schedules of the deputy ministers and how they compare with some of these salaries that have been mentioned as existing in other jurisdictions close by.

The Honourable the First Minister mentions the fact that, as I caught his figures, that there was a 75% increase in education estimates as compared with the '58-'59 estimates. Well, I think that's rather characteristic of the progress of this government in general. Whatever the differences in education, whatever the differences in Health and Welfare, whatever the advantages that are accruing might be questionable in some regards, but there's no question about the difference in costs. They certainly are up! In that regard, I'd like to elaborate a little bit on what the First Minister has mentioned about the interests costs. As we look at the total figure here, I estimate it to be up by \$2 million -- more than two and a quarter million, Mr. Speaker -- \$2,334,000 odd. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. ROBLIN: Not the interest.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, that's the interest in large part because of the fact that even though some sinking funds are taken in there -- that's right -- and even some debt redemption which I admit, but those figures were shown in the comparative figures a year ago too, and not greatly different in total from now, and the recovered interest is deducted from them. But that's not all the story, Mr. Speaker, not this \$2,300,000 this year, but last year, by the same token, it had been up two million practically seven hundred thousand as compared to the year before. And so my honourable friend wants to make comparisons on what is being spent on education, health and welfare, agriculture and these other places, which he has a perfect right to do, of course, I would like to just make the comment as well -- look at the increase in the debt charges for this province. Taking the two years together they're almost exactly \$5,000,000 increase in our debt charges, and that in turn leads to the question of why has the interest gone up in that way, and if you look at the Public Accounts that have been recently laid upon our desks, compared to those of two years ago you will find that the increase in debt in the two years is just over \$100,000,000, Mr. Speaker. Now, I'm not suggesting that all of these could have been paid out of current revenue. I think that the tax rates would certainly have been very high to have done so, but I am suggesting that we're -- and we haven't the figures yet of what debt has been added since March 31st, 1960. I would like to get that sometime during the discussion on estimates -- but when we get that picture as well, Mr. Speaker, we're really going to have the very best evidence of what some of us have been predicting for a long time. It's a fine thing to be going along with all these programs and telling the people about the splendid progress that's being made, but there's progress being made also in adding to the overall debt of this province. There's certainly progress being made in the interest payments, and the fact remains as valid today as it was a few years back, that the extent to which you increase the interest costs and your debt repayments to that extent you cut down the services that can be given, because you can't -- you can't continue to build up the costs of government at this rate for very long. Not unless you get a lot better deal from the Federal Government than we have reason to believe we have yet, or unless taxes are considerably raised. And I will make the prediction now, Mr. Speaker -- it's a prediction only because the Honourable the First Minister doesn't take me into confidence -- into his confidence in advance on these matters -- that we're going to be faced with some pretty heavy tax increases. I maintain we've had them already, but they're going to be even greater in the very near future. And we see Federal Government being in the position -- and I'm not trying to blame the Honourable the First Minister for not being able to give us a more detailed examination of the new proposals that have been made; I know those are complex discussions; I know that the material that's laid before a conference of that kind is very hard

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . . to digest in a short time, and even though I am sure that the First Minister and his staff have been working at it diligently indeed, it still is not too easy to unravel quickly and make considered statements on. I'm not trying to blame him for that. But my own assumption is -- certainly this is a very quick look at it too -- my own assumption is that the Federal Government is simply finding out that it too has got to think about its own financial situation, that it can't do very much more under these circumstances toward assisting the provinces with their financial matters in the way of giving them any large additional assistance. And so we've got to, as it appears to me, look to our own resources, and all that I can see for it is a tax increase in the very near future. Now I'm not asking the Honourable the First Minister to comment on that at the present time. That belongs to the budget. But I simply can't -- I can't arrive at any other conclusion after looking at these estimates and recognizing the continuing growth in some of these high-spending departments.

Mr. Speaker, I was interested to note in the Winnipeg Tribune of February 20th, a week ago today, a forecast of what was going to be shown in the estimates when they reached this House. And I would like to ask the First Minister how does the Winnipeg Tribune, four days before the estimates are tabled here, how do they make so accurate a forecast? -- (Interjection) -- No, it's a very good question. I'm not using strong words on this occasion and suggesting leaks or kite-flying or anything of that sort, but the fact that this article appeared four days before we had the estimates laid on our desks, just to say the least, quite a coincidence! Because the estimates are seen according to the headline of this article at \$103 million. The '61-'62 spending plans expected to set a new record. They certainly set a record. The forecaster is wrong in one regard because he thinks that the estimates will be laid before us on Monday night. If he had been right on that then he'd have had his story out a full week before we, the members of the House, hear what the House is going to be asked to grant in the way of financial assistance to the government. He thought it would come on Monday. Actually our progress was such that the Honourable the Leader of the House was able to lay them on the desks on Friday evening, and I appreciate that because we were glad of the week-end to look them over. He says that it's understood that this year's spending will be up about \$8 million. Well, it is up about eight and a half as I see it.

Then the next interesting pronouncement by this authoritative article -- the estimates are up despite ruthless paring of department budgets by the Treasury Board. The three big spenders usually are Education, Public Works, and Health and Welfare -- they sure are. Education is a big spender, and Health and Public Welfare are big spenders. And at least Public Works talk as though they spend a lot anyway. They take a lot -- they take a lot of pleasure in -- but the article was not exact in this regard -- "Education is not expected to be up from last year's high of 32.1 million." I guess my honourable friend the Minister must have got in some last minute licks with people who are doing the ruthless paring. But the burgeoning -- that's a good word -- Health and Welfare Department is expected to increase spending by several million dollars over the 23.4 of '60-'61. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask quite sincerely, how is it that the Winnipeg Tribune has such a close estimate of the financial plans of this government four days before the members of this House are given any inkling on the matter at all? I think that that's not a good policy, and I think that -- well, it's a policy of the Tribune apparently -- (Interjection) -- No, but I talk to my honourable friends about it because they're the people who should maintain the secrecy of the financial affairs of this province until they are ready to lay them before the members of this House. We're the people who are supposed to have the first look at these. However, it's all information and it is interesting to find out how quickly the news gets out to the public to the extent that it was some advance notice on this. I can't complain about it personally, but I would suggest to the government that they be a little more careful in future of where they leave their working papers lying around, perhaps a little more careful to not let some of the Ministers know about ruthless paring so that they can slip in the back door and get them boosted up again despite of what the Tribune thought, and a little more careful to be sure that the members of this House get the first information rather than the press and the public as to what the financial program is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister has set a good example in the matter of not talking very long in the introduction of the estimates, because we do have lots to say as the time proceeds, and I shall follow that example by saying no more at the present moment, but I do think

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . . that I will have a little bit to say on some of the departments as they come under our scrutiny.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend has raised a question on the privileges of the House which is a most important one. I'm not really allowed to answer in this debate; I'm not allowed to speak again so I won't deal with it, but I do tell him that as soon as we get into committee where we have a little more latitude I'll be glad to resume discussion of that important point.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say a word or two as we're going into the estimates. I don't think that it should come as any surprise to the House that there is some variance of opinion between the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and myself in respect to some of the expenditures that are contemplated within the estimates. In reference to his reference to the story which appeared in the Winnipeg Tribune, I wonder whether the reporter for the Tribune may have been in company with my honourable friend, because one of the greatest exponents and criers of doom because of increasing provincial expenditures, of course, has been my friend the Leader of the Opposition! It might be that the reporter for the Tribune hazarded a guess which coincided with the estimates. Of course, it's not for me to attempt in any way to bring the government out of a hook if it happened to be coincidental insofar as the increase in the estimates spending is concerned.

I join with my honourable friend in looking at the question of the increase on the net debt of the Province of Manitoba for interest charges. I hasten to add, Mr. Speaker, so that there's no misunderstanding, I do not join with him when he suggests that there shouldn't be any increase in debt at this particular time; as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, . . . . voted against their resolution simply because of that and made the bald statement in the House that any forward-looking government in the Province of Manitoba would of necessity have to increase debt at this time, particularly following on the footsteps of such a close-fisted financial government as he led during his term of office. But I do say this, and I say this in all sincerity, that it's too bad that the people of Manitoba and the people of the municipalities within the Province of Manitoba and indeed across the length and breadth of Canada, are having to face up to increasing debt charges due to the action of the Federal Government of my colleagues or friends of the Government of Manitoba. It started -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. ROBLIN: I was just wondering how my honourable friend got me in on that one. I thought . . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Because of the political stripe, Mr. Speaker, of my honourable friends opposite with those at Ottawa. Because I've always been convinced, and I'm still convinced, that it was with the bond conversion of a few years ago when, in my opinion, the Government of Canada doubled the interest rates at the time of conversion on our Victory Loans, laid the ground work for the huge increases which we're finding having to be paid by every public treasury in the Dominion of Canada. And we're finding it here in the Province of Manitoba as well. I think it's a travesty of justice on a young nation -- and we are a young nation -- that in municipal borrowings and school board borrowings we have to pay over the period of the next 20 years such exorbitant interest rates of seven percent. To me it's a noose on the school boards, our municipalities, our provincial government and the people of the Province of Manitoba.

I appreciate very much the fact that the Honourable the First Minister is not in a position, and I don't expect it, to be able to give us any further information in respect of the Dominion-Provincial Conference, but I do note if press reports are correct, and in this I join with my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, that the people of Manitoba may be facing a tax increase of some consequence this year, because if the figures that have been prophesied in the daily newspaper are correct insofar as the payments of the last year in respect of the Dominion-Provincial Agreement are correct, we will be receiving less money than had been anticipated, and whether or not my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer may be able to recoup from some other sources the amount, I don't know. I do say, Mr. Speaker, I do give my honourable friend a lot of credit for his ability to juggle figures so that they look very, very pleasing to the eye, because I was noting here in the estimates of the year ending 1959 I believe it was, that whereas in '58 the actual interest charges on our public debt was one million eight, simply by using the right end of a pen rather than the wrong end it was reduced down to \$7,800.00. Now possibly my honourable friend might be able to do that in respect of making up for the amounts

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . . of monies we had anticipated from the Dominion-Provincial Agreement which appears as though we're not going to get, due to the fact, and I want to emphasize this, Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that the economy of Canada has not kept pace with the forecasts that were made by the Honourable Mr. Fleming at the time of his budget some ten months ago. And I don't think it would be remiss for me, Mr. Speaker, to emphasize the necessity of us in all levels of government because of that factor, because it's been pointed in the lesser amount to our provincial treasury this year, the necessity for us using all of our efforts at every level of government and every economic level, labour, management and otherwise to see if we can get out of the doldrums that we are in in our economic situation here in the Dominion of Canada at the present time. I think we can do it. I think we're approaching it in the wrong way in some quarters. I know that the finger may be pointed at me as the representative of my particular party and a section of my party. There may be differences of opinion as to our approach, but I do again suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we've got to get together, because this country is too big and too great to allow ourselves to remain in this situation any longer than we are at the present time.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say one or two things directly in connection with the estimates themselves. I'm glad to know that we are going to get a list of the employees, the staff. I would suggest, and I join with my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, in respect of our Deputy Ministers — I also would like to know — and possibly this question can come up or if the Minister can supply it in advance — I note that a number of our Deputy Ministers have also other positions on commissions and boards. Just to — Mr. Premier, I would like to know what their combined total salaries would be, and if you'll just take that as notice I'd appreciate that very, very much. Apart from that, Mr. Speaker, I think that that is all that I have to say at the present time. I, like the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and my group indeed may have a question or two that we'll ask the Ministers on their respective estimates. I think that it is our duty in opposition to have as full a debate or examination of the respective estimates, and it is our intention to do that. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I was only asked this morning why was it when it was prophesied that this was going to be sort of a session as though we were in the doldrums in between two elections. My answer to that, Mr. Speaker, we of the CCF never get into the doldrums at any time, and it's our duty as elected representatives in this Legislature to keep the government on their toes, and we're going to certainly try to do that.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that I'm not the financial critic of my party. As a matter of fact I always sit and listen, but one or two items which my leader perhaps has not mentioned, and I do want to call the attention of this House to; number one is the tremendous amount that we are paying out to people who do not labour of the big profits, namely, \$8 million, or about \$8 million, interest on the money we borrow. Well, I know we get some other, but in this — (Interjection) — Well you get back a few dollars, I know.

MR. ROBLIN: Two and a half million interest.

MR. GRAY: Two and a half actually what the government pays. I'm sorry, I've looked — I did not check the interest that you get from the different commissions, but the commissions are part of the government as well. If you borrow money to help out the Hydro, surely to goodness the interest the Hydro pays is also the interest that we are paying. It's just a question of bookkeeping. Actually you're paying out \$8 million. If I'm wrong, please correct me. If I would be a financial wizard perhaps people would listen to me more, because it's the dollar that talks. Now this is one point. So the only remedy is, we should have had the remedy 20 years ago, when we had suggested it 10 years ago, and even a year ago, I think your idea of selling bonds over the counter at four percent interest or three percent interest is still more than the bank carries, and it is just as secure as the bank because you have a million people in this province guaranteeing for that money and guaranteeing for the bonds, and a lot of people would take advantage — you would have saved a lot of interest and perhaps create a better love and attachment and interest in this province by the people. There is no reason in the world why they shouldn't buy Manitoba Bonds or Savings Bonds. There's no reason in the world. We had a member here years ago — probably I wouldn't give him any publicity — who said, "Manitoba is no good." Well, supposing if Manitoba is no good in Wall Street, it doesn't mean to say that Manitoba is no good. For goodness sake, we have so much natural resources to pay a

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.)..... thousand times our debt and when we see that we are paying out \$8 million for interest it hurts me a lot -- it hurts me a lot. I couldn't understand why we should do it.

As far as the increase in the estimates, I am not going to say a word except discussing certain matters which should be done which have not been done, because the more money you spend the more ..... you get to the people, and I'm going to repeat another statement which I'm sure that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition wouldn't like. The people today are not worrying about their taxes; the people today -- I'm going to repeat -- are not worrying about their taxes. They are worrying about the lack of service, that's what they are worrying about. They want a proper education for their children; they want roads; they want health; they want hospitalization. They want all this which is absolutely necessary to bring up their children and make them self-sustaining when they grow up, and these days only a boy or a girl with a proper education can succeed in this world economically because we have all the machines. Labourers are out of style altogether and they have got to get a good education. So I say, and I am with the public as much as any member in this House, I meet many all day. I meet the capitalists; I meet the labourers, and I meet the prohibitionists; I meet the drinkers; I meet them all, and let me tell you something that's ..... taxes, high taxes has nothing to do. True, I don't want to pay any more taxes than I should, but that's not the main important thing. I have paid taxes in this city, \$125 a year and I had four children in school. At that time to educate a child was only \$100.00. So I got \$400 just for the education of my children. Today, \$300, so I would have got \$1,200.00. That's not important. The education of the child is important. So I'm not going to argue whether you pay over a dollar here and a dollar there, and as far as salary is concerned, I'm not going to argue. My argument will be during the estimates: Are they getting the right man for the right job? Are you getting value for the money you spend? And that's all that I'm going to say during the debate on the estimates.

MR. G. MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I certainly was very interested by the comments of the Honourable Member for Inkster with regards to the views of his constituents on taxation. I must confess that mine seem to hold a slightly different view at this stage and are concerned about taxes. It's true that they also want services, but the two must go hand in hand. Far be it from me to offer advice to that honourable gentleman, but I would like to say this to him, when these fellows across there are through with them, they'll be plenty worried about their taxes. And I suspect that that might be once we get into the treasurer's budget later on this year. On that subject of budgets, I think it's unfortunate that my honourable friend, the First Minister, didn't continue the practice that he established back in the spring session of 1959, when he included in the estimates as well, details of estimated revenue. These, I think, were quite helpful, because after all, as we're discussing these items of expenditure, it's very handy if we know at the same time how my honourable friend expects to pay for them, because he and his colleagues on his side are very fond of saying to us - "Well, now you voted for it, you're in favour of these plans because you're backing us up by your votes." Well, we're prepared to vote for them on the basis that he's always told us that he could do all this without increasing taxes, and we're certainly prepared to endorse any such move. So if he could at the same time as he asks us to pass these items of expenditure, tell us how he's going to get the money, as he was quite prepared to do in March of 1959 -- mind you the circumstances were slightly different; there was a destined impending election and he did have some desire to show a so-called balanced position at that stage. In fact, he was claiming quite a surplus and I suppose maybe the incentive isn't quite as great today -- there won't be an election for a couple of years -- but I would suggest that he might reconsider that practice as it was very helpful to us. -- (Interjection) -- Well, he did it once before, so I don't see why we couldn't follow the same technique.

There are a couple of questions of mechanics that I would like to bring up before we go into the actual discussion of the estimates. That's the question of sequence and I don't expect an answer right now, but once we get into the discussion itself, if we could have an answer at the beginning, whether or not we'll be following the sequence as it is in the book. This is helpful, I think, to all the members of the House so that they will know pretty well what routine we'll be following here and we can prepare our material in sequence. The other matter is the question of time. Now, in the past it didn't matter too much how much time we spent on the

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . . estimates, but now under the new rules, the 11 o'clock rule which my honourable friend from Inkster is very fond of will apply only after we go over the 65 hours, as I recall the rule, discussion of estimates. I presume that this will mean only actual time of estimates discussion and not what we are doing right now, and that is discussion prior to going into Committee of Supply. I would like to have that assurance that it actually means only once we have gone into Committee of Supply as such. Now, that again can be answered once we get into the actual discussion of the estimates.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The House do now resolve itself into a Committee of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty. Would the Honourable Member for St. Matthews please take the Chair.

MR. ROBLIN: Now that we are in committee there is considerably more latitude in discussion than we are permitted in the House itself, and it gives me an opportunity to reply to some of the points that have been raised previously by those who spoke in that debate. First on the question of the privileges of the House and how come the Winnipeg Tribune got that story. Well, I wish I knew. I concluded very soon after I got into my present position that there was no such thing as a secret in the public service, and that with the best intentions in the world, information that should be considered of a private nature -- at least until such time as it has been disclosed in the House -- did get out. And I used to become quite annoyed by this and irritated about it until I found that it was just one of those things that one had better get used to because it happens. Now, I want to assure members of the committee that the government made knowingly no disclosures with respect to its estimates. Of course, it is quite improper that anything of the sort should happen because this House is entitled to hear it first. We did our very best to keep that very sound principle in mind, and no releases or information or hints, that I know of, were given out to the gentleman in question on the Tribune. As a matter of fact, it rather titillated my curiosity, because when I saw the story I got hold of the gentlemen that wrote it and without telling him where he was on this particular point, I asked him where he got the information, and of course he did not disclose to me what his source was. However, on Saturday morning when I got back from my visit to Ottawa, if my memory serves me, I did have a further talk with the gentleman in question and he said that he is responsible for himself. In other words, that he made an educated guess, and I had to congratulate him. If that was the case it certainly was a very well-educated guess, because it was right on the mark as far as the total is concerned. But I think that we may believe him when he said that, because as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition pointed out, he was not accurate in detail. He was way off in detail with respect to which departments would be spending extra money, as members now know. And I think probably we'll just have to accept the fact that this was an educated guess, and I think after you've been covering these things for some time you're in a position to come pretty close to what might actually be the facts. Well, now that really doesn't -- I don't really expect that to satisfy anybody. All I want to say is that, to the best of my knowledge, this was an educated guess on the part of the reporter concerned. If so, I think that we should congratulate him on being so accurate. But nothing -- it has nothing really to do with anything we said to him and I want to assure the committee that there was no improper disclosure of public information on that point. The reporter very nobly took the blame himself, or the credit as the case may be, and I think we'd just better leave it at that as being the facts.

Now, one or two other things. We did consider the advisability of bringing down the budget with the estimates; it's done in one or two places, not many. However, on consideration we decided that the procedure that had previously been followed for many years would probably be satisfactory for the future. Respecting the sequence of the business, I do not undertake now to give the committee an assurance that we will follow the sequence in the book. There may very well be changes. There'll be none for the first few items, I shouldn't think. But I do undertake to give as much notice as possible of any changes so that members are not taken unawares by the government simply coming into committee and announcing, "Well today we're going to discuss 'A'", when they were fully expecting to discuss "B". We'll try and give some notice on that point. Regarding the time element that was asked about the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, I think the matter is very clearly set out in the Orders of the House, and I wish I could turn my -- Rule 2, Sub-section (4) at the top of Page 5: "If the time of sitting

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . . in Committee of Supply exceeds 65 hours, sub-rule 3 does not apply to the sittings of either the House or any committee." Well, the time starts, in my judgment, from the time that Mr. Chairman took his seat a few minutes ago and from here on in, and that we just carry through till 11 o'clock at night and then we automatically -- time is called and we go home to get ready for another day, until 65 hours have elapsed in committee in that respect, and then we would probably expect members to sit longer in order to clean up the business. But the rule was introduced because on the average, over the past two years, 65 hours in committee has proved to be adequate for a proper review of the public affairs that these estimates refer to, and it was, I think, pretty well unanimously agreed that 65 hours was a fair bargain. So that's the story on that. So if committee is willing, Sir, we can proceed to discuss Item No. 1 - Legislation.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, before we enter on the detailed discussion of the item, could I ask the First Minister if he would comment on another part of the same press statement and tell us if the Tribune reporter was as accurate or educated in his guess regarding the revenues from liquor, drivers' licenses and gasoline taxes, and also the yield from the Federal-Provincial Taxation Agreement?

MR. ROBLIN: I think my honourable friend would agree that it would be improper for me to comment on a newspaper story in that way.

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

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, this matter of (b) -- I do not intend to take the committee through all the various discussions that we had a year ago. I am of the same opinion as always. There doesn't seem to be any point though of threshing away at old straw. I simply make the announcement that being of the same opinion I do not intend to keep any of the increase myself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (c) passed; (d) passed; (e) passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, under (e) - the figure is going down I noticed, and yet I understand that we have put in more facilities. Now those are considered as capital worthy, these that went up in the gallery and so on?

MR. EVANS: That, Mr. Chairman, that doesn't cover the reinforcement of sound in the gallery. This has to do only with the recording equipment of our friend up here and concerning the things that are necessary to transcribe. There was some intention to have replaced the equipment this year but it was found that it could be repaired instead. I think the additional sums there are accounted for by -- I think my honourable friend is referring to the comparison from \$1,625 last year to \$1,500 this year. It's just that this amount was considered adequate this year.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, could the Honourable the Member of the Board of Internal Economy tell us where the item does appear in either the estimates or the public accounts for the other matters?

MR. EVANS: . . . . . Mr. Chairman, there's an amount provided for alterations of the building at the time of the move, and providing the small facilities they're putting into the Chamber. That would be under Public Works.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder, and I think I asked this question last year, where do we find the expense of Hansard? Is that in this item of Assembly Expenditures or . . . . .

MR. EVANS: I think it's Item 4, Legislation . . . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to renew the suggestion that I have made on other occasions that it seems to me that this item and the Hansard item should be combined, at least kept closely together. I don't care particularly under what department they are shown, but I think that we should have this one and the actual Hansard expenditures together. Has the Minister considered that suggestion, which I certainly made last year.

MR. EVANS: I think if my honourable friend will give me a moment, I think I have the information in here somewhere. Under 1-2(c). No, that can hardly be. . . . . If my honourable friend will allow me, I'll get that information. The explanation I have here is that -- well, let me get a full explanation and return with it.

MR. R. G. SMELLIE (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Chairman, before we leave Item 2 -- under Item 2(b) last year the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition named the recipient of the extra

(Mr. Smellie, cont'd.).... salary for the Opposition Leader. I wonder if it is going to the same place this year, or if he would like to announce to the House that Brandon College will receive the benefit of his generosity.

MR. CAMPBELL: I would like to be able to announce the same place but it seems to me that the finances of the Province of Manitoba would hardly stand the additional strain of tripling the amount that I would give, I being of such a generous nature that I think for the Province of Manitoba to double it would be a little too difficult for them in their present financial straits. No, I am not going to pass along the donation that this House and the taxpayers of the province make to me in this regard to the same place. It seems to me that I have discharged my obligation in that regard and I'm not prepared at the moment to announce the recipients of it. Certainly the church in my own farm community will be one. One of the other churches with which I am associated will be the other, and the balance will have to be checked up pretty carefully, because, being the type of fellow that I am, I'll have to take into account the income tax that I will have to pay on this. Last year there was no problem in that regard because the donation to Brandon College was income tax exempt. I'm afraid that the two churches are not income tax exempt and the other one that I might be considering might not be in that position either, so I shall have to make some calculation very carefully to see that I give away exactly the amount that the taxpayers are giving to me -- no more, no less.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, is it necessary for an honourable member of this House who gets indemnity to declare his philanthropic obligations?

MR. CAMPBELL: ..... the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell was just pulling my leg and I take it in the spirit in which it's given. We both had the advantage of attending Brandon College which may not raise the institution very greatly in the minds of a lot of the people who listen to us in this House. But because we are alumnae of the same institution, we're entitled to tease one another a little bit.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I've now discovered the information that I'd like to give my honourable friend about Hansard. Item No. 2(c) is the correct item. Salaries of the Hansard operators are provided for there, the breakdown being as follows: The Deputy Speaker, \$750; the Clerk of Internal Economy, \$720; The Sergeant-at-Arms, \$600; Sessional Assistants in total, \$13,110; and the operation of Hansard including 13 transcribers and 3 supervisors, \$13,035.00. That does not include the cost of printing itself which is under Supplies, Equipment, etc., and renewals.

MR. PAULLEY: ..... Mr. Chairman, so that we have the total cost of Hansard. I'm sure the members of the committee are interested in that, and if it's convenient for the Honourable the Minister to give us that now, then we'll have the complete cost of Hansard.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a suggestion that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition when he's considering giving, or donating his money, that he make a donation to the New Party.

MR. EVANS: Then to add to that, Mr. Chairman, is the operator of the recording equipment - \$950; assistance for him \$150.00.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, ..... available, I wonder if he would be kind enough to get for us the information of the complete cost of Hansard.

MR. EVANS: I'd be glad to.

MR. H. P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Mr. Chairman, in discussing Hansard, I wonder if the Minister would give consideration to supplying high schools in Manitoba with a copy of Hansard. I've had several requests for a copy of Hansard to be sent out to the high schools of Manitoba. They would appreciate it very much in discussing the subject of Canadian History, and I was just wondering if the Minister had given any consideration of supplying the high schools, Grade XI especially, with a copy of Hansard.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I think we'd give very sympathetic consideration to any request that was sent in by a high school for use within the high school library or within the high school. I should think it would be right to expect a request to be made by an individual high school rather than a mass distribution.

MR. E. I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question with regard to Hansard? Does this House send the Hansard to the regional libraries throughout the province



(Mr. Dow, cont'd.)..... or do they have to request them?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that each recipient must request it and pay for it.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): Mr. Chairman, there's been quite a bit of comment lately in the weekly newspapers about the government sending a a lot of material to the editors that they don't use, including Hansard. I was wondering if the government periodically, once a year, if they wrote to the editors to ask them if they wished to continue to receive this material, or do they just automatically keep sending it?

MR. EVANS: ..... with respect to Hansard they continue to get it if they continue to pay their subscription fee.

MR. GROVES: ..... sent free to the weekly newspapers?

MR. EVANS: Oh, I'm not aware of that but I can find out definitely -- I'm not aware that it's free to the weekly newspapers. I think all subscribe for it. There's a very limited free list which I think consists of the official copies for the House, the Clerk's office, one for our own provincial library here, I think one for the office of each Minister, and that's all. And then further copies such as are required for staff, Deputy Ministers and others are, in fact, charged to the departments concerned. And just repeating again, the newspapers do pay for the copy they get. So renewal is only upon payment of the renewal fee.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister, when he's getting this information, would he get us the figures as to the total list of Hansard -- a free list, a paid list, etc. Not as to the individuals who receive it, of course, but just as to the totals.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, following on the question of the Honourable Member from Morris which I thought was an excellent one, did I gather from the Minister that if high schools requested it that they would be sent to them free in that case?

MR. EVANS: Yes.

MR. MOLGAT: While we're still on the subject of Hansard, we're not normally in the position on this side of the House where we throw bouquets over there, but I think this is one case where I would like to stress congratulations to the staff of Hansard, this year in particular. I notice that they have been coming on our desks daily, right up-to-date; there's been no delay whatever. I think the service in that regard has been excellent, and I think this should be conveyed to the people responsible for it.

MR. EVANS: It will be done, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2(e) passed. Resolution 1 - passed. Item 3(a) passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the First Minister indicated that we would get a list of the numbers employed. Now this is where we start running into the first one where there is any large numbers. When would that list be available?

MR. ROBLIN: It will be ready tomorrow, Mr. Chairman. If plans had carried, it would have been ready today. I'm sorry that it isn't.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, ..... be the one that would include the salary list of one such as the Comptroller-General and the Deputy Ministers?

MR. ROBLIN: The Comptroller-General's salary is indicated in the estimates and if anyone wishes to know a Deputy's salary we'll be glad to provide that as we go along. The list itself merely refers to the number of people whom the amount covers.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like the First Minister if he will to jot down the fact that he, I think, indicated he would tell me the names of the Deputy Ministers and their departments who have other salaried positions as well.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, we'll do that as we come to them.

MR. PAULLEY: You'll do that automatically?

MR. ROBLIN: I'll do my best because there's only two of them.

MR. PAULLEY: Because I don't know, of course, what departments they are connected with.

MR. MOLGAT: ..... this is the total of the Comptroller-General's salary. He has no other salary from other sources within the government.

MR. ROBLIN: The two deputies concerned are the Deputy Treasurer and the Deputy Minister of Industry and Commerce. The rest are not in that category and we can give the details when we come to each one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 2, \$330,710 - passed. Item 4, Resolution No. 3, passed.

MR. MOLGAT: ..... cover exactly?

MR. ROBLIN: It covers Votes and Proceedings, Orders of the Day, printing of the statutes, all that kind of thing. It's really a routine catch-all for the lot of paper work that us chaps here are responsible for.

MR. MOLGAT: Is there any consideration given to bring the statutes -- revising them?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes.

MR. MOLGAT: When will that be done?

MR. EVANS: I have some information I can give the committee in connection with the changes in the method of printing the journals and the Orders of the Day as authorized last year. The cost of printing the journals for the 1958 session was \$2,581.80, but printing for 1960 session by the Queen's Printer was \$1,332.95, or a saving of \$1,248.85. With respect to the Orders of the Day, the lowest tender received was \$8.65 per page, a total of \$4,471.80, but the cost of printing by the Queen's Printer was only \$825.87, making a saving of \$3,645.93, or a total for those two items of \$4,894.78. It's now considered that the statutes can be printed in smaller type thereby putting more wording on a page and saving a considerable number of pages. It's anticipated that a total of 832 pages can be contracted to 556 pages with a saving of \$4,278.76, but I think the members of the committee should note that this cannot be put into effect in time this year. It was necessary for the printing contractor to outfit himself with type and other things for the smaller face. He couldn't do it in time to print the bills to be ready for the session and so on, and so this saving will not be brought into effect for the coming fiscal year, but the year following.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Honourable the Minister if all the tenders are called from shops which pay the fair wages, or are they union shops, or is it ad hoc anybody bids in on them.

MR. EVANS: My impression is that any shop, whether union or otherwise, is eligible to compete, but that they must subscribe to the Fair Wage provisions. Now the Fair Wage provisions -- I'm not -- no, the fair wage doesn't apply. They certainly observe the minimum wage regulations, not the fair wage. All shops are eligible to compete.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this item, in view of the very fine savings that my honourable friend the Minister is speaking about, could he explain to me how come this year we are spending \$45,000 and two years ago we were only spending \$34,000, and yet he's saving money all over the place. Why the increase?

MR. EVANS: Yes, I think we can account for that in two ways. There has been a rise of approximately 5% in the cost of paper, a rise of almost the same percentage in the cost of wages, but more particularly there has been a large increase in the volume of printing required. Now there's much more printing being done -- the savings have then prevented the costs from going up by that much.

MR. MOLGAT: I'll have to take my honourable friend's word for it, but I don't see from a legislative standpoint that there has been a necessity for that much of an increase in printing. If this doesn't include Hansard, if it includes just things as Orders of the Day and the things that we use here in the House, I don't know of any drastic increase in the past two years that would account for such an increase in costs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department II - Executive Council. Item 1 (a), passed. (b), passed. Resolution 4, passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: ..... Mr. Chairman, that there's a reduction in the other salaries under 4. Is that because of fewer people employed?

MR. ROBLIN: One less employed.

MR. CAMPBELL: And some salary increases, I suppose.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, and there's various items in here. One less employed and then there's the whole of the escalation that goes on with this increment system we work here so we save part of it and spend the rest.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4, passed. Item 2, Resolution 5, passed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I notice that's an increase and the conference is over. I presume that the Treasury will be saving some money now because it won't be necessary for the experts -- or will it be necessary for them to go down there and attempt to analyze what the Prime Minister of Canada has laid before the province?

MR. ROBLIN: Well, I must confess that this was placed in the estimates before we had been to the meetings. My honourable friend would understand that we had no means of knowing what would transpire. However, goodness knows, maybe we'll save a dollar, maybe it'll be another conference on something or other. There are other kinds of conferences besides the fiscal one. My honourable friend over here has to go and talk about the constitution. Unless I miss my guess that's going to take a long time and many meetings.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . honourable friend . . . isn't informed of what his pal down at Ottawa proposes, like he used to be?

MR. ROBLIN: I have to tell my honourable friend that I know it when I see it in the paper or somebody reads it to me from a piece of paper.

MR. PAULLEY: Things aren't what they used to be.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, they were never like that. That's just a figment of my honourable friend's imagination.

MR. CAMPBELL: I was going to suggest to the Honourable the First Minister that this might be an item that we'd ask to have stand because I think perhaps in the committee would be the best place to discuss federal-provincial financial arrangements, and obviously the Minister is not in a position to go into any detail on the most recent proposal at the present time. Why not let this item stand so it would be open for a discussion in committee that would be . . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think that my honourable friend will probably agree with me that it's unlikely that I'll make any statement about this in addition to what I've said before the budget, and that if we desire a committee discussion after the budget there's always the Committee of Ways and Means so we can deal with it now but it doesn't bar further detailed discussion if anyone wants it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 5, passed. Item 4. Grants and Miscellaneous, Resolution 6, passed.

MR. WRIGHT: . . . . in the way of grants that have been unallocated at present?

MR. ROBLIN: I suppose, Mr. Chairman, it would meet the convenience of the committee if I gave the full details of this because someone is sure to ask for it. I might just as well give it now. Here we go for those with pad and pencil: Manitoba Drama League - \$250; Manitoba Theatre Centre - \$4,000; Manitoba Museum Association - \$5,000; Historic Sites, Advisory Board - \$1,000; Men's Musical Club of Winnipeg - \$2,000; Royal Winnipeg Ballet - \$9,000; Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra - \$15,000; Winnipeg Art Gallery Association - \$9,000; Brandon Arts Council - \$3,000; Manitoba League of the Blind - \$100; Canadian Mental Health Association - \$2,000; Canadian Welfare Council - \$3,000; Salvation Army - \$900; Last Post Fund - \$250; Welfare Council of Greater Winnipeg - \$2,000; Manitoba Heart Foundation - \$6,000; Indian and Metis Friendship Centre - \$4,000; The Boys Scouts Association - \$2,500; The Girl Guides Association - \$2,000; Commonwealth Parliamentary Association - \$1,000; Canadian Forestry Association - \$4,000; Manitoba Federation of Game and Fish Association - \$3,000; Canadian Highway Safety Conference - \$1,200; Royal Canadian Humane Association - \$100; Manitoba Federation of Fishermen - \$1,000; Unallocated - \$8,700.

MR. S. ROBERTS (La Verendrye): There's a very imposing list; there's one very noticeable by its absence. I think I should mention that the Rainbow Stage has requested a grant from the Provincial Government and has been refused, I understand, and I feel that mention should be made of this because I think that the Rainbow Stage in particular has contributed a great deal to the City of Winnipeg, to the Province of Manitoba, to the province in particular as a tourist attraction, as a cultural attraction, and I think it is every bit as worthy as many of the other societies which are receiving grants under this appropriation. The Rainbow Stage in Winnipeg has gradually grown in stature to the point that it is one of our finest attractions. It rivals the Theatre Under the Stars of Vancouver as a major summer out-door attraction and will eventually I think become just as well-known. I feel that other sporting events are receiving grants that many other types of entertainment are receiving grants that aren't contributing nearly as much to the province, to the tourist possibilities and to the cultural possibilities of the province. The Theatre Under the Stars has one added feature in that it offers summertime work to musicians that might otherwise have difficulty getting year around work, and I think that this must be considered too. The Rainbow Stage has some hope of receiving grants from Metro but otherwise has been cut off from any source of public funds,

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.)....and I think it's a mistake on our part to overlook the Rainbow Stage in this way. I think credit should be given to CJAY Television which has carried on a Telethon program which contributed some \$10,000 or \$12,000 or \$13,000 to the growth of Rainbow Stage and I think that if it hadn't been for this, we may have lost Rainbow Stage to Manitoba. At the present time Rainbow Stage has had to tighten its belt and hopes to continue to operate, but certainly without any long-term or long-range information as to whether they're going to be able to operate another year. I do think that we should be giving quite a bit of consideration to the Rainbow Stage in this appropriation.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm very sympathetic indeed to the cause that my honourable friend advances in respect to the Rainbow Stage and it underlines one of the most difficult problems that you have in trying to allocate in a fair and proper manner, whatever sums are available for cultural activities. I would point out to the House that there's been a very big increase in these grants. I think they've doubled or trebled, -- I think trebled is closer to the mark -- in the last three years. So one can see that while we really have nothing to boast about yet in respect of our contributions to cultural activities, at least there has been a very substantial increase. When I remember -- reflect upon the objections raised by some members in the House towards increasing our expenses, this is one place in which I must confess that I'm guilty that they've been increased two or three times over what they were. Now the question is who's going to get the money? There are dozens of very worthy people who come to us and Rainbow Stage is certainly one of them. The way we looked at it was this; we decided that we had so much money to make available for the encouragement of drama. It wasn't enough that we would make any substantial difference if it was spread around all the dramatic groups. We were advised by those who had some pretensions to know that the Manitoba Theatre Centre was really the nursery, one might say, of the dramatic arts in this community, that a good many of the people who were active in the Rainbow Stage were really based, as it were on the Manitoba Theatre Centre, and that if the Theatre Centre were to keep going it would provide the nucleus of the trained and professional staff that would be used by other people interested in the dramatic arts. Whether that assessment is right or wrong is a matter of opinion but it seemed to us on the basis of the evidence presented that that probably had some merit to it, and that if we made our contribution to the drama to the Manitoba Theatre Centre it would indirectly at least provide a basis of trained and professional and interested people that all people interested in the dramatic arts could draw upon. Also, I think it must be recognized that the Rainbow Stage is in a rather interesting way, and more power to them, a professional organization. Their budget has risen from \$25,000 to something in the nature of \$100,000, I believe, if my memory serves, and I'm working from memory and subject to confirmation, it's been a very large increase and most of it has gone out into salaries. Many of those salaries are paid to people who are stars and come in from outside the province and perform. Now there's nothing wrong with that. That's a very proper thing; the Rainbow Stage people obviously think it's necessary for the success of their undertakings, and they have had a very substantial increase in their costs because of their expanding horizons in this nature. And I've no criticism on that, but when we were faced with the deficit that they were troubled about recently, we had to conclude that there was room for some economies in their operations if one wished to look at it from that standpoint, but we couldn't bring ourselves to pass any judgment of this because it's a matter for them to settle. And if they can raise the funds through the good offices of the TV people or others, or from the other municipal bodies, the municipal bodies here that are interested, well, more power to their elbow. They're a splendid organization and we wish them success. Our stand simply was that we thought our very limited allocation for the drama should be invested in the way in which I described a few minutes ago.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, before we call it 5:30 I believe that the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association was one of the grants mentioned?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, Sir.

MR. CAMPBELL: Does it not show in any other place?

MR. ROBLIN: No, this is the only place it shows.

MR. CAMPBELL: Then I would suggest that we let it stand until after.

MR. ROBLIN: No objections.

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