

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, March 21, 1968

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I wish to transmit to the House the following communication I received from the Chief Electoral Officer. "This is to certify that pursuant to a Writ of Election dated the 30th day of January, 1968, and addressed to Harry Gall of Deloraine in the Province of Manitoba, Returning Officer for the electoral division of Turtle Mountain, for the election of a member for the said electoral division of Turtle Mountain caused by the resignation of Edward Ingo Dow, the said Edward Ingo Dow, agent, of Boissevain, has been returned as duly elected as appears by the return of the said Writ of Election which is now lodged of record in my office." Dated at Winnipeg this 21st day of March, 1968, and signed Charland Prud'homme, Chief Electoral Officer. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain has taken oath and has signed the roll. Accordingly, he claims his right to take his seat, and on behalf of the Chair I welcome him back to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Again, I would like to interrupt the proceedings and introduce our guests for the day. As you can see, the gallery is full to capacity, which pleases me very much as I'm sure it pleases the House.

We have with us today a group of Indian people from the Peguis Indian Reserve led by Chief Thompson, Fisher River Indian Reserve led by Chief Molat, and we have also some folk from the Jackhead Reserve. These people are from the Interlake area, and on behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

On my left we have 34 Grade 8 students from the St. Jean Brebeouf School. These students are under the direction of Sister Marguerite and Miss Labossiere. (I trust the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is listening to my attempts.) This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

We also have 37 students of Grade 10 and 11 standing, from the Notre Dame de Lourdes School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Benoit and Mr. Bibault. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Also, we have 30 students of Grade 8 standing, from the St. Malo School. These students are under the direction of Maurice Ruest. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Carillon.

We also have with us today 25 students of Grade 10 standing, from the Amaranth High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. D. Whiteway. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome each and every one of you here today.

Orders of the Day.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct this question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Yesterday he received a brief from the Manitoba Farmers Union; subsequently he was interviewed by Channel 6 for his opinions so far as the brief was concerned, and he took his position to chastise the Farmers Union for presenting a very comprehensive brief, and in particular the question of Medicare. I wonder whether the Minister feels that the Farmers Union should have not taken a position on Medicare.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I would have to disagree with the Honourable Member from Brokenhead's interpretation of my interview. I did take the occasion to comment that we have sufficient number of farm problems to be seriously concerned with without taking in the broad field of government activity, and that I had suggested to the members of the Farm Union - and I think with some concurrence - that we attempt to zero it in on the specific farm problems facing us and that it would be advisable that their briefs and their representations to government zero in on these specific problems.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. I would just like to ask the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture whether he considers that the

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . provision of health services to people in the Province of Manitoba is not a problem affecting the people engaged in agriculture.

MR. ENNS: Certainly any social problems that face any citizen in Manitoba affect farmers as well as anybody else, but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that when a basically farm organization, organized for the purposes of furthering farm policies meaningful to the farmers of Manitoba, that it's not entirely wrong, this interpretation on my part, to solicit from them suggestions, constructive criticisms, relating to the farm sector.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the First Minister, although perhaps the Minister of Municipal Affairs or the Minister of Education may be better qualified to answer this. In view of the fact that the public schools' Finance Board has announced a 4.1 mill increase in the uniform levy, and being mindful of the added burden on the taxpayers, can the government state its attitude towards a 1967 resolution of the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities calling for an amendment to the Income Tax Act allowing a deduction of mortgage interest and municipal taxes from gross income?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier) (Minnedosa): Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not so sure that before the Orders of the Day is the proper time for us to express an attitude.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside constituency, that the House do now adjourn to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the 45 percent increase in the mill rate on farm and residential property, from 9 mills to 13.1 mills, and the very substantial increase in the mill rate on commercial property from 33 mills to 37.1 mills, established by the government on its Foundation School Program, in the light of the statements of the government that it would shift the load from real property to other taxes in view of the fact that this government has imposed a 5% sales tax on all Manitobans allegedly for this purpose.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside . . .

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, before you read the motion I should like to rise on a point of order to suggest to you, Sir, the now hal- lowed but nonetheless accurate argument, that in order for the House to be adjourned to discuss a matter of urgent public importance under the relevant rule, that it is necessary that the ques- tion of debate - not the subject matter but the question of debate - be of extreme urgency. That is not to say that the matter which my honourable friend raises is not urgent, but is the urgency of debate present? And I would suggest, Sir, with respect, that after careful consideration you could come to only one conclusion, and that that answer would be in the negative because we have on our Order Paper today the question of supply - a motion will be made during this sitting, probably tonight, to go into Committee of Supply, at which time this whole matter can be discussed. And if that were not answer enough in itself, Sir, I could suggest that this mat- ter was raised in the House two days ago and it could have then been debated on the Throne Speech which was then in progress. So where, I ask, is the question of urgency of debate which arises at this time, which must be brought to bear to delay the regular proceedings of the House in order that the matter can be debated at this particular moment? So I would suggest, Sir, that without taking anything away from the importance of the subject matter, that the motion does not fall within the meaning of the rule and the question of urgency of debate at this time.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order raised by the Honourable the Attorney- General, I'd like to point out that insofar as his point that it could have been brought up two days ago, Number (1), my own right to speak on the Throne Speech debate was exhausted and it was therefore impossible for me to do so. I might point out that I stated then that I had considered raising it as a matter of urgent public importance on the day in which it was reported to me, but that I wanted to get the full facts on the situation before proceeding. I now have, in my opinion, sufficient facts and I believe that this is an opportune time to debate the matter. It is of extreme importance to the people of the province; it affects every single individual in Manitoba; and far from delaying the business of the House, I think it is one of those urgent mat- ters that the House should discuss.

I might point out further that insofar as the other point raised by the Attorney-General, that is, my being able to bring the matter up on the motion to go into Supply, that there's no guarantee that we shall reach Supply today. And furthermore, as the Honourable the Attorney- General knows, one is allowed to speak only once on the motion to go into Supply, and this

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . would mean that any honourable members who would engage in a debate at that point on this matter would exhaust their right to speak on other occasions, whereas debating it in this manner now will not prevent anyone from engaging in a further debate on another subject at a later date.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party in asking Your Honour consideration to allow the motion to be proceeded with. I reject the contentions of the Honourable the Attorney-General in this matter. It is a matter for urgent debate. Our municipal councils and our school boards throughout the whole of the Province of Manitoba are in the process of compiling their respective budgets for submission to their taxpayers. The taxpayer of Manitoba is deeply concerned with the increasing tax load that they have, and I suggest that it's only through a motion of this nature that this matter can be properly drawn to the attention of the government in time for them to consider possible changes in their announcement and in their plans in order to facilitate the compiling of the respective budgets of the school boards and the municipalities. And also, as the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party has said, there's no guarantee in the first place that we will get into the order of business of going into Committee of Supply today. There's two or three controversial matters that are going to be considered by the House before we come to that item of business if the government intends to pursue the Order Paper as set up at the present time.

So I suggest, Your Honour, that the motion proposed by the Leader of the Liberal Party is a proper one and I appeal to you, Sir, to allow debate on this very urgent, important matter of concern to each and every Manitoban.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, it always amazes me when we bring in a motion of this type that we always have the objection of the government on motions of this type. And I can't just see why. After all, the rules provide for such occasions and I think they should be only too happy to have the discussion. Then, too, the educational estimates are quite late on the list and it will be some time before we get to those estimates. Therefore, I feel that this is quite timely and proper to discuss this matter at this particular time.

Some of the points that I was going to raise have already been raised, such as the matter that was raised by the Attorney-General that this could have been discussed during the Throne Speech. Well, it has been pointed out that some of the members had already exhausted their opportunity to speak and therefore this certainly is not justified that we could have discussed it at that particular point. Therefore, I will support the motion that is before us.

MR. LYON: . . . to add one further comment on the point of order because I haven't heard really, an argument raised that defeats the argument about urgency of debate. My honourable friend's point, the Leader of the Opposition, that he might have been estopped from speaking because he had exhausted his right, really does not bear upon the point whatsoever. It is the right of the House, not of a particular member, to speak upon a motion and he was the only member, as a matter of fact, who was disbarred from speaking, unless previous members had come back - those who had spoken on that first motion. In any case, that really does not affect the issue. The issue is: is there an occasion -- without adjourning and disrupting the business of the House, is there an occasion in the close foreseeable future when this matter can be discussed? The answer is yes there is, so I suggest with respect, Sir, that the motion is clearly out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable gentlemen that have spoken and I appreciate their sincerity and the opinions given. I, too, have given considerable thought to this and I intend to proceed.

Moved by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the House do now adjourn to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the 45 percent increase in the mill rate on farm and residential property from 9 mills to 13.1 mills and the very substantial increase in the mill rate on commercial property from 33 mills to 37.1 mills established by the government on its Foundation School Program. In the light of the statements of the government that it would shift the load from real property to other taxes, and in view of the fact that this government has imposed a 5% sales tax on all Manitobans, allegedly for this purpose.

Has the honourable member leave to proceed? Are there sufficient members in support of the . . . The Honourable Leader of the Opposition may proceed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much for your ruling on this matter. I

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . recognize that these are difficult rulings for you to consider. I judge, however, that the matter is of major importance and that this is the proper time to discuss it. I deny completely the statements of the Attorney-General that this is a matter of disruption of the House. I don't think that this is the way that these motions should be looked upon. It's not a question of disruption of the House, but a question of the House discussing an urgent matter that the House is responsible for and which is of extreme importance to this House and to the people of Manitoba, and that's what we are here for, Mr. Speaker, to discuss . . .

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I concluded discussing the point of order after you made your ruling. I suggest that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition be asked to do the same. I can answer that argument quite clearly and cut the legs out from under him on it, but I don't intend to waste your time or the time of the House. I suggest that my honourable friend get on with his motion.

MR. SPEAKER: I would expect that the arguments on this discussion will become somewhat provocative but I would appeal to the honourable members to be brief and to the point and be agreeable, in order to dispose of this matter at the earliest possible time to the satisfaction of all concerned.

MR. MOLGAT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that when the letters that were sent out by the government reached the hands of the municipal people in Manitoba, their first reaction was one of disbelief. They could simply not believe that the government was at this time proceeding to increase the local taxation on the Foundation School Program. They assumed that there must be some mistake. When they realized, and went through into the details of it and found out what the government was actually saying, the next reaction was one of shock and anger on the part of the municipal people generally, and certainly on the part of the public of this province.

The government has hidden behind the legalistic argument that this is what the Act says. Mr. Speaker, there is no denying that this is what the Act says, but that is not the basis of the problem, and to simply hide behind the Act and say, "Well, this is what was passed here last year in the Legislature and the people ought to know," does not change the picture one iota and does not change the effect of the government's action one bit insofar as the people of the Province, to begin with, the taxpayers of this province, and secondly, the municipal men of this province.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question about it, that the general reaction of the people in Manitoba last year when the announcement was made of the Foundation Program, the announcement that there was to be a 9 mill on farm and residential and a 33 mill on commercial, their general reaction was that this was to be a fixed mill rate, and they had good reasons to believe that on the basis that in good part the government sales program for the unitary school division was based on this, and furthermore, this had been the request of municipal men across the province for a long time. This had been the basis, in fact, of the recommendations from people like the Michener Commission, recommending that there be a fixed mill rate for school purposes at the local level and this would then permit local administrations to carry on with their responsibilities and do their planning, in the way that was laid out for them.

This is what they thought was meant. The government certainly did not, in the course of the sales campaign, indicate that this was not their plan, Mr. Speaker, because if one looks at the news reports of the day, we have for example, on the 20th of January, a headline in the Free Press "Giant School Change Urged", and the sub-headline, "Province-wide uniform standard levy and shift of tax burden are proposed." This is certainly the impression of the people who sat and listened to the discussions in this House and this is the way it was reported. This is 1967, the 20th of January. And the news story goes on to say that "under the revised system proposed by Dr. Johnson, a person paying real property tax in a single district division would pay a uniform standard levy, calculated on the basis of the equalized assessment of 9 mills on farm lands and homes and of 33 mills on other real property in the municipality in which his property is located."

That, Mr. Speaker, was the reaction at the time at which the White Paper was introduced and the statements were made in this House. What happened subsequently during the course of the campaign - the campaign to sell the unitary division plan? Well, here we have the Free Press on the 27th of February 1967: "MLAs off to hustings with new education plan." Once again the same story repeats: "The White Paper outlined a Foundation Program whereby the

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . province will pay 65 percent of education costs, the local share will be raised through a 9 mill levy on residential property and 33 mills on business, industry and apartment blocks."

What happens during the campaign itself? Well, we have a few days later, a story on the 28th of February, and the headline is: "Roblin probed on school vote" and the sub-headline "Three hundred attend Holland Memorial Hall rally to hear Premier urge single district plan." Now what does the story tell us? "Dealing with the advantages of the new plan, and explaining the formula in detail, he said there would be a uniform levy of 33 mills based on the equalized assessment on all property in the province for the basic school Foundation Program, but the farms and homes would be given a special exemption of 24 mills so that the levy would only be 9 mills in these properties."

Mr. Speaker, the government can say they were wrongly interpreted, that this is not what they meant; but this is still the impression that got across to the people of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, that this was to be the structure, 9 mills and 33 mills, and there are the reports on the discussions in this House and the sales campaign that went on through the province. The news media reported presumably what they heard said by the speakers at those meetings, and there is no question, Mr. Speaker, this is what the municipal men in Manitoba understood as well. One need only call them up today and ask for their reaction to the new mill rate to see whether or not this was their understanding. And, Mr. Speaker, this is the exact contrary to what the government had been saying prior and during the last election campaign. When they campaigned on the basis, we agreed with them; we said the same things. We had been urging the government to do this, to limit the load on the local taxpayer because it was getting simply impossible, and they agreed that they would shift from the local taxpayer on to provincial responsibility.

So what did they do, Mr. Speaker? They brought in a 5% sales tax. In fact, it was labelled in its first stages as a 5% education tax. No question about what the government intended, and no question that the purpose of the sales tax, they told the people of Manitoba, was to be able to shift the burden from the local taxpayer on to this 5% sales tax. Here we have now, a year later, the 5% sales tax imposed on Manitobans, I think quite properly the 5% sales tax - I say quite properly the statements have been made - 5% sales tax bringing in much more in revenue than the government originally told this House a year ago when they brought in the legislation. With this tax bringing in more than had been expected, the government now turns around and adds to the local burden once again; a reversal of their announced policy, a reversal of the basis on which the plan was sold, and an extremely high and additional burden on the local taxpayers. Where does this leave the taxpayers themselves? No alternative. They're caught. Where does it leave the municipalities and the school boards, Mr. Speaker? They have in many cases been expecting from this relief the opportunity to do something else, and there are any number of municipal corporations across this province who had either planned on maintaining a mill rate level in their areas - and we have the example here of the City of Winnipeg - or at least having a very minimal increase, who are now going to be faced with having to put on an additional 4.1 mills.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this were the only aspect, the government could say, "Well, it's in the Act and this was understood and they should have know," but at the same time that this imposition has gone on, there has been another subtle form of increase upon the taxpayers at the local level, and this has been the one that we have already mentioned in this House, the question of the assessment. And throughout the whole of the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, this has been going on, a steady increase in the assessment. Now, I have been getting complaints from every quarter of the province. I have here, for example, some assessment notices for the R.M. of Pipestone showing me a number of increases, and this happens to be on rather low assessed land; this happens to be some mainly pasture and hay land. Here is the type of assessment increase: from \$800.00 in '67 to \$1,700 the following year - or rather \$866.00 to \$1,767; \$800.00 to \$1,700; \$600.00 to \$1,400; \$350.00 to \$700.00. Other municipalities, one that I received today -- in fact, the gentleman who wrote to me in this particular case objected because he heard that I had complained about the increase of 9 to 13 mills and he said, "You should be complaining about a lot more because my increase is far more than 4 mills," and he sends me his assessment notices. Here he shows, for example, on a piece of property, a quarter section, the 1967 assessment \$2,650 and the 1968 assessment \$4,350.00. On another piece of property, the 1967 assessment \$1,950, the new one \$6,150.00. Mr. Speaker, virtually

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . . a doubled assessment, so he finds himself not only having now a 4.1 mill increase on his mill rate, but his assessment is doubled; so he ends up by having really a double increase.

Mr. Speaker, this is certainly not what the people of Manitoba were led to believe. This was certainly not the basis on which this government said they had to impose a 5% sales tax. This is certainly not the basis on which the Unitary School Division plan was presented to the people of this province. There is only one way of describing the whole operation. It's one big hoax. It was improperly sold, Mr. Speaker, and now for the government to say, "It's in the Act," is no answer whatever, because it's contrary to what they said they would do and it's contrary to the needs of the province of Manitoba.

Now, the government is prepared to admit that their sales tax has brought in more money. Speaking here the other day, if I understood the government's statements correctly, they are able, they say, to increase the estimates of this year substantially without new taxation. Without new taxation, Mr. Speaker. That is, without new taxation directly by the government. What have they done? They've forced the municipal people to raise their taxes. They send them a notice, "... increase your farm and residential by 4 mills," a 45% increase. They proceeded to increase the assessments all over the place, so, Mr. Speaker, we are right back where we began. This government, after having said they were going to take the load off the local taxpayer, are busy pushing it back on those people and busy forcing the municipal people to collect those taxes. This is no shift, Mr. Speaker. It's no plan. It's a hoax.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I want to lend my full support to what the Leader of the Opposition has said. I feel that the government is really guilty of either a calculated and knowing bit of bamboozlement, or they themselves were the innocent victims of a fantastically gross miscalculation within the department itself; and I'm not guessing at this. I would like to refer to the White Paper last year dealing with the Foundation Program. At that time, it was clearly made known to this House and to the people of Manitoba that the cost of this new Foundation Program was estimated to be \$95 million; \$95 million if all the 48 unitary divisions were created. Well we know, of course, that they were not created and, as a result, the program didn't run to \$95 million. We heard the other day that instead of \$95 million it was \$74 million in total, of which the province only had to put up \$48 million and the municipality \$25 million.

But let us say that the government thought that it required, or was told it was required to raise \$95 million to pay for a basic Foundation Program. Now this year we are now told by the Minister of Education in reply yesterday to the Leader of the Opposition, that the program is going to cost \$97.4 million, an increase of slightly under \$2.5 million. Now if last year 9 mills and 33 mills was going to raise \$95 million, how can they possibly come this year and say to us that to raise just another \$2-1/2 million they now need a 4.1 mill increase both on the residential and on the business. The simplest arithmetic proves their figures completely false.

I would like to read from the White Paper: "Some indication of the order of magnitude of the change is given by our estimate that the new Foundation Program would total about \$95 million in 1967 if all districts opted in to form single district divisions." Well all districts didn't, and so of course the figure of \$95 million is wrong. This government is very lucky that all 48 divisions didn't come in, because had they come in they couldn't have possibly raised the kind of money they said they were going to raise. They were completely out. And when we on this side of the House questioned the \$95 million, and when I said to the Minister of Education, "Are you pulling that figure out of a hat?" we were told that they knew what they were doing. Well, Mr. Speaker, they didn't have a clue. They were about ten to 15 million out last year, and they are worse out this year. They said that "the Foundation Program will contribute \$61-1/2 million as the provincial share and \$33-1/2 million municipal share, a total of \$95 million," and that \$95 million, according to all their calculations - and they're great calculators; they know all about how to calculate how the Federal Government is wrong in their Medicare costs; they're great calculators, all right - and according to their calculations it would take 9 mills and 33 mills to raise \$95 million. This year they come along to us and say, "So sorry; costs are going up; we have got to increase the mill rate."

But in fact what costs have gone up? Have they enhanced the program? Have they enriched it in any way at all? They have added approximately \$900,000 to the cost to the Foundation Program. That's it. But the equalized assessment in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker has gone up \$94 million between 1967 and 1968, so that the old 9 and 33 would have looked after this

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) . . . . so-called enhancement of the program. The truth is that on the Manitoba equalized assessment, 1,824,000,000, if there had to be an increase it was less than one mill, if that \$95 million figure was at all valid. And so it's obvious that somebody goofed and they goofed at the expense of the people of Manitoba. But worse than that, they misled this House. They misled this House because we accepted the figures as being valid and true, frankly never dreaming that the government could be so far out in their estimates. And we went along with the concept of the 35-65 split on the Foundation Program. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that if the true figures had been known and if all 48 divisions had come in last year as we had hoped they would, and if the actual costs would have been properly laid before this House, the members in this party certainly would have said 65-35 is not a shift of the burden in taxation at all. If you honestly and sincerely mean to shift the tax burden from the local ratepayer insofar as the cost of education is concerned, then it should be more in the neighbourhood of a 75-25 or maybe a 80-20 shift if there has to be any levy at all on the local ratepayer. And I say "if any levy at all" because, Mr. Speaker, this is not the end of the levy; this is only the beginning. On top of this Foundation levy there is the special levy, the special levy that we were told by the Minister would probably have to be levied in Metropolitan Winnipeg because they had richer programs, and -- he didn't use the word "frills" but he suggested that they were sort of offering more than what is a solid Foundation Program. Fine. The Metropolitan area was going to be charged a little more -- would have to charge a little more.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there isn't a unitary division in Manitoba that didn't have to lay a levy over and above the Foundation Program. Every one of them did. Mr. Speaker, they're going to this year and they're going to next year, and within 12 months - I predicted this last year and everybody thought I was sort of, maybe just talking out of turn; I couldn't prove it; I just went by a hunch, if you want to call it that. But I predicted last year that the \$95 million was unrealistic. I predict now, Mr. Speaker, that unless we alter the formula and the government acknowledges that \$95 million was indeed a figure pulled out of a hat and it is not a true cost of the Foundation Program, and if they will now recognize this fact, then they must come forward, before we deal with the Education estimates they must come forward with a change to transfer the burden back to where they said it was going to be, on the shoulders of the Provincial Government, from the 65-35 ratio to something more like 75-25 or 80-20. Then, and only then, will they be living up to the commitments which they made when they went to the people in 1966, and that was that the municipalities should not be burdened with costs which they cannot and aren't geared to handle.

So, Mr. Speaker, in summary I'd like to put it this way. We're dealing with actually two phases of this question: (1) the gross miscalculation, whether by intent or by sheer accident - and I admit that accidents can happen. The other day they were talking about "to err is human" and I'm prepared to forgive and let them be divine. But let's not compound this error. Let's not stand here and say: "The Act says . . ." The Act says a lot of things, and the Minister said a lot of things, and the Premier at that time said a lot of things, but these things were based on a premise which we now know was incorrect. I won't say false; they were incorrect. So let's admit that. Let's get on with the business of giving the people of Manitoba the break that they've been waiting for and they've been promised. Let's not once again hide behind the legalistic arguments of "section so-and-so in such-and-such an Act which says as follows." Sixty-five-thirty-five with this present formula, with the present known costs of the Foundation Program - costs that were not known last year, but the present known costs - the ratio cannot remain and must not remain at 65-35 or we are going to break the back of every municipal government in this province.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'm rather sorry that I didn't know that this thing would be coming up so I could have been much better prepared. However, I want to take part in the discussion of the motion that is before us and I was listening with great interest to what the other speakers had to say. I, for one, was not surprised at the announcement that was made in the House the other day in connection with the increases that were supposed to take place. I think this was something that we could expect to happen. It has also been already shown by the previous speakers that the estimates of the amounts that would be required were grossly underestimated a year ago, and, as already pointed out, there would be large amounts of money short if all the divisions had come in, as has been explained. Because only a few did come in, the amounts of money that were required was therefore much smaller.

The Leader of the Official Opposition read off some notices of assessments in connection

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . with taxes. Well, I could bring many tax notices where the assessment was not only doubled but was tripled, from \$3,500 to well over \$10,000 - \$11,000 - for a single quarter, and that you have taxes of five, six seven - some even go as high as \$800.00. Well this is outrageous when we were supposed to get relief through the legislation that was passed here last year.

Then, if we take a look at the divisions that voted themselves out, what happened there? Because of the large increase in assessments of those municipalities, the government is getting a large amount of money that they normally didn't get through the general levy, which is levied on the equalized assessment, and because you had this large increase in assessment the government got three times as much from these areas as a result, and these amounts are applied against the grants that these districts and division schools are to receive. Therefore, the assistance that they should get, an increased assistance, resulted actually in a lower assistance, and this is what I feel is very wrong, especially so because we levied a five percent sales tax which was originally tabbed an education tax and which was to go toward education originally. Later on they called it a revenue tax but I think the government had already showed its hand, that actually the taxes that were being collected were going to go to pay the cost of education in Manitoba. So what do these areas that voted themselves out get from this five percent sales tax? The only increase that came about was a \$300.00 increase per elementary teacher and a \$400.00 increase in secondary teacher grants. That was all that they got out of the five percent sales tax and this is a very, very small quibbly amount. So here you have a discrimination of the largest degree.

I happen to have the Honourable Minister's speech that he made to the convention to the Manitoba Association of School Trustees as of November 14, 1967, and here he states that "the unitary system has been well received in those 19 new divisions in which it was introduced on April 1st." I just wonder how well this division plan is going to be received now that they find out that they will have constant increases in taxation.

Then too, further on in the same paragraph, it reads this way: "Nonetheless, great progress has been made and the calibre of local education" - and here I want you to listen - "and the local control of education have both been strengthened by the adoption of the unitary division system." I take issue with the latter part of that statement about local control being strengthened. I feel local control has been weakened, and what we have here before us today shows this up so very definitely because we find now that local control is gone. It's the provincial Finance Board who now sets the rate, and we have these increases come about.

What can the local people do about it? Not a thing. They've lost all control in this matter, and this is the point that I argued a year ago in this House. The local people have lost all incentive to economize at the local level. Why should they economize under the unitary system, because it is spread over the whole province. You've pooled all the resources into one general pool and as a result from here you're going to distribute the services. And everyone is entitled to an equal portion of that service, and everyone wants the maximum of this service, so here you have a situation where everyone wants the maximum of service and the costs of education increase as a result.

This will continue, because we have examples of other departments in the government. We have Welfare, for instance. Welfare used to be, to a large extent, under the municipal councils, and what happened when it was transferred to the government, centralized? The costs went up. We have costs rising almost \$4 million annually for the last number of years, and if we look at the estimates that were tabled the other day, we see an increase of over \$4 million again for this year. So this is what centralization does and this is what we see happening here under the present system now that the education has been placed. And we can expect further increases as we go along. There presently is no reward for initiative at the local level to economize. The reward is gone. Before, under the local school board, you could set your budget and if you lowered the budget, your local people would benefit by it. Now this is not the case. They could probably economize but another district spends more than they need and the people that try to economize will pay the burden of the other schools under this system, so that the matter of incentives to economize fall aside completely.

And as I said, this is the result of centralization of administration and the people of this province were forced to accept this situation last December because they felt that they couldn't keep on the way they were with the small assistance that was coming forth by the government if they did not accept the unitary system, and as a result a number of them capitulated, in my

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . opinion. It was not that they wanted the system, it was just that they could not afford to go on with the little assistance they were getting from the Provincial Government.

What do we find in other provinces? British Columbia is legislating this year whereby they'll make the school trustees . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I see no point in the honourable gentleman bringing into this discussion what is happening in other provinces, but rather to stay with the matter that is before the House, if he will.

MR. FROESE: The matter I was going to refer to is because it has a direct bearing on the situation here in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion, it has no bearing at all.

MR. FROESE: I'll abide by your decision but you don't know what I was going to say so how can you say that it doesn't have any bearing? Because we see that out there they're decentralizing instead of centralizing, and this is the point that I was going to make, that they were going to make the trustees responsible for the cost of education and that they would have to be responsible for levying these taxes.

So, Mr. Speaker, while I was not surprised at what was happening, I feel that there was gross miscalculation and that the people were to a large extent misled in what happened last spring.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): . . . Mr. Speaker, take part briefly in this debate. If I was to give a lengthy address I would have to almost repeat word for word what my Leader has said and I, like a lot of people in rural Manitoba, was misled by this government. It is, Sir, I suggest, a matter of public importance that this matter be discussed today. In fact, I suggest, Sir, that it's so important that any hope that the Premier had of regaining public support must surely have vanished. I cannot altogether blame him for being in on this, but when the former Premier left him holding the bag - and he did - you have a tiger by the tail, I suggest, Sir, and if you don't get some businessmen advisers around you instead of a bunch of politicians, you're going to be in trouble.

With this five percent tax that was levied, through the government's own admittance this brought in more money than they expected. Well now, when this increased cost of education came through, surely to goodness they could have used this extra money to hold the line to the 9 and 33, and I suggest, Sir, that if it's gone up 4-1/2 mills this year, where is it going to go next year? And this education is on the minds of every civil servant, every individual, every politician and every taxpayer and every voter in Manitoba, and it has to come to an end. Changes have got to be made in this regard. You cannot put any further taxation on real property; it simply can't stand it. What will happen if we can't find some other form of looking after this education, I can visualize a television in every school room and I'm not so sure that a lot of people couldn't be taught a darn sight better if this is what we did have.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, not for one moment do I take this whole matter other than most seriously. There isn't a member in this House, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't realize the importance of controlling, as much as we can, educational costs. There is not a member of this House who doesn't recognize the importance of education, and all but one member of this House who does not acknowledge that the unitary system has the best administrative mechanism in 1967 with which to deal with education at the local level. This was the whole idea of the unitary divisional plan.

Now the one thing I want to make clear, and abundantly clear right now: I can accept all the criticism and I want constructive criticism from the Opposition. I wish I knew all the answers; so does this government and every other government in the Canadian nation. But there's one thing that we can't be accused of, or this Ministry can't be accused of, is bamboozlement. I attended more meetings than anybody in this House, and every meeting I went to I made it loud and clear, and everyone in this House as a politician knows the danger of quoting figures; 9 - 33; nothing is static. I pointed out, as the White Paper said loud and clear, 9 - 33 is the mill rate in the first year of operation. Nine - thirty-three was the estimate by the best financial people available to my ministry, that in the year 1967, if the 48 divisions were to come in on an estimated Foundation Program of approximately 95 million, that a 9 - 33 mill rate would raise the 35 percent local share. This was not bamboozlement; it was said candidly in this House. And I don't know yet, nor maybe we will ever know, because a lot of the assessments weren't taken off on the 9 - 33 basis for the divisions that didn't come in but we -- so I can say

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) . . . . categorically to my honourable friend, just as candidly and forthrightly, that he can't make any better a guess than I can at this point.

But I want to point out what the White Paper said, and if this isn't clear -- and one went to every school trustee and one went to every member of this House and I read it to this House and it's in the Hansard of this House, and here it is: "It is equally important to note that the uniform standard living cannot be expected to remain constant at the equivalent of 9 and 33 mills. The 65-35 division of cost of the total Foundation Program for the province will be fixed by statute. Provision will be made, however, for annual adjustment of the 9 and 33, an annual adjustment of the yield of 35 percent of the anticipated cost of the program in any year. The costs of education in Manitoba are expected to rise. The total of real property assessment is also expected to increase steadily but at a less rapid rate than the cost of education." And that statement in itself indicates that if the assessments don't go up as fast as the costs in the divisions go up, the mill rate has to give. "Mill rates can therefore, Mr. Chairman, be expected to increase from time to time. At the same time, the cost of the provincial 65 percent will also rise in dollars and rise roughly at twice the amount of the local share."

Now this was a statement made in this House in this White Paper, candidly and clearly, and at most of the meetings - 38 meetings that I attended - I tried to point out to the people of this country and of rural parts of our province that, as Minister of Education, if I was going to do my job in this province from where I'm sitting to the best of my ability I had to recommend the kind of system that I thought was best for the people of this province - at the local level. We needed over-all planning. How would you sit in the Ministry of Education with schools consolidating one at a time? Look at the waste in money we would do in unnecessary small buildings again, for which the Opposition give us the devil from time to time for saying we overbuilt previously.

We're trying to build about total planning. We're working closely with these new unitary divisions. They have superintendents. We're authorizing the superintendents to certify teachers to give that board and that administrative staff local control of their affairs in the advancement of teachers in their own system. We're trying to plan properly; over-all building programs. Not instant schools with a courtyard in the middle which you can't add to five years later. That's what's happened in some of our divisions - the Member from Assiniboia raised the point. The fastest-growing area in the Province of Manitoba. The kids are there; he needs new schools. His Leader says, "Pace yourself, government; pace yourself." The other side says, "build, build, build." By golly, there's some of those building costs in this increase this year, and it's alluded to and made plenty clear in the White Paper on education. -- (Interjection) -- You call that a hoax. We're trying our best, and after all it's our local Manitoba taxpayer. He knows, he knows that the money only comes from one guy and that's him. The local taxpayer pays the shot, whether we collect this through sales tax, whether he pays it at the local level or what have you. But we were trying through that scheme to bring about further equalization of educational costs over this province. Don't forget, gentlemen, we had mill rates up to a thousand mills. We had mill rates from 50 to 1,000 mills - 20 to 1,000 when we started out last year. We knew these had to give. Through our Finance Board we're trying to achieve costs in this first year of operation. That board's becoming more and more knowledgeable. It's been looking critically at budgets and looking for recommendations as to what they think of how costs may be controlled.

But the kids are there. We have to have a competitive education system in Canada. We have to compete for teachers across this nation, and trained people; and I think the quality of education and the increased services that I will outline as we come to my estimates in the Department of Education, justify those increases that have occurred within the Foundation Program under the regulations as printed, set down and published, which gives the ceiling on what we think is a realistic program.

I don't know if the Member from Seven Oaks when he said, now on top of this comes the special levy -- today in our free society we allow elected representatives to add to what we think is an adequate program. If he's suggesting ceilings on it that's not our baby in this House. This comes under trustees. Trustees' salaries, or teachers' salaries are outside the purview. They're in the Act through collective bargaining, as we know.

The Member from Birtle-Russell says we've got to do something about these costs, and by jiminy everyone in this House realizes we've got to do something about controlling costs. And I'd like some constructive suggestions too. We've got to get some ideas. Now I'm as

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) . . . . concerned . . . No one likes taxes. Lord Harry, we don't like them. And this 4.1 mill increase, as determined by the Finance Board for this year's operation of 40 divisions, is a reflection on the fact that the equalized assessment, as I understand it, didn't go up as much as last year - I think it was \$94 million this year, \$160 million last year - which means that that in itself with the built-in increased costs in the Foundation Program - for instance teachers get an increment because they've been another year in the system - and in the first year of operation we're going to feel it more than at some other time.

The government takes the responsibility for maintaining the 24 mill differential; the government takes the responsibility for maintaining the 65-35 ratio; but I would ask honourable members to look at other jurisdictions. How many of them are providing out of the Consolidated Fund a 65 percent balance on what they considered an adequate program? Our trustees are having problems at the local level in controlling their costs. The biggest portion of any educational cost, as in the hospital field for example, is salaries; and these trustees are negotiating these things at that level. And they are going to have some special levies, there's no question about that. Last year, the best estimate we could make was that those special levies would be kept fairly low, and those special levies did vary from about two to a top of one at 12 in Winnipeg, 14 in St. Vital, and other than that they were all around two to seven mills. And there was this relief to the homeowner. There was this further equalization across the entire province of the basic program, where it used to be multi-district divisions with varying rates from 50 to 1,000 and on top of that the divisional levy.

I'm not denying for one minute that this is a matter of public concern; not for a minute. But, by golly, we've got to take the responsibility, too, and the government's on this side, on raising the money to service the system that we think is desirable and good for the boys and girls of our province. We have more children; we have more teachers; we have more transportation; we have more buildings to service these children. And there are members in this House, including the Member from Rhineland, who would dearly love vocational education. He wants a school there tomorrow. Well, if we're going to recommend all these things in this House we've got to stand here and be prepared to pay for them, and I'll say another thing. As a government, unhappy as it is, we've got to levy taxation, and we have a responsibility to keep this system within the ability of the people to pay.

This leads me, of course, to the point where it's very true that the difficulties in a province of 960,000 people with 235,000 boys and girls in the public schools, 15,000 at university - 250,000-plus young people in the educational system in a province of 960,000 people - this is the problem. How big a base for the numbers of young people who are, as every Manitoban knows, the finest investment we have?

Mr. Chairman, I could say very little more, really, on this matter at this time. I don't underplay the importance to the people of Manitoba of the rising taxation in education. I welcome candidly the ideal solution. I welcome it, and I'm looking forward to further debate on this matter as we come to our estimates. But before I sit down, I would remind members to read, as I have to them, that vital section in the White Paper that was published and distributed, and I reject out of hand any suggestion that any bamboozlement or misleading of the public took place. It's certainly -- as I have said, I as the Minister have constantly said that these costs are going to rise, we have to take as many measures as we can to keep these within control, and some internal work is being done very actively for some time in our department to keep our priorities, and I hope to reflect these in some detail to the House when we come to my estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Thank you. I'll be very very brief, and I'll start with this. The government fooled us. They lied to us and are still lying. -- (Interjection) -- Just a minute; I am not through, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I must remind the honourable gentleman that I'm sure he didn't mean what he said in view of what the Minister has just concluded in his remarks. You're not doubting the Minister's word, I'm sure.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly. These are not my words. These - and I was going to continue. This is the general expression . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Please. The honourable gentleman did hear what the Minister said and he's not doubting his word, I'm sure.

MR. TANCHAK: No, I am not.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, why do you use that statement?

MR. TANCHAK: I was just quoting what I received by letters. That's what I'm coming to. I don't say I agree to that.

A MEMBER: You're quoting.

MR. TANCHAK: I'm quoting. This is the general expression that I get from many of my constituents ...

MR. SPEAKER: Will the honourable gentleman tell me what he's quoting from?

MR. TANCHAK: Yes. Letters that have been written to me by my constituents. I have't got the letter before me but this is the general expression that I get from the people and I will ...

MR. LYON: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it's well-known by all members of the House that a slander uttered outside of the House cannot be uttered in the House, and shouldn't be repeated either.

MR. TANCHAK: I think I'm being candid when I say what I hear from my constituents and it doesn't necessarily mean that I endorse that, and that's what I was coming to. I do not say that I endorse that, I'm just quoting what I get, and I sympathize with some of the people although I do not agree probably as the words were put in the letter - in not one but many letters. I do not agree with it, but, by inference, I would say there's a certain amount of agreement - I would add that - by inference.

But I think that the Minister who has just spoken completely missed the point. I do not think that anybody here so far argued about the cost of education. Nobody argued about the cost of education and I'm not arguing about the cost of education. I think the point is here that this government has continually been promising the people of Manitoba to shift the burden of taxation from the property tax to a wider base. That is the principle here that's involved and the government has failed miserably, because now we've got added increased taxation at the property level - on the property owner - and that's the thing, not the argument that the cost of education, as the Minister has said we are arguing against, but we are not, it's the cost of education probably to the property owner. We have the sales tax which was termed education tax. Where did that money all go? We'd like to know.

This government has been promising, and the present Premier has been promising that -- he says, "I'm going to hold the line" - not so long ago, during the leadership convention. It is time to hold the line and I agree with the First Minister; it is time to hold the line. He indicated he's going to do it, and now what do we get? The top priority in the new Premier's program is raising the tax where it hurts most. That's what we are arguing; not the cost of education but the tax. This government has completely failed to keep its promise to shift the burden from the real property owner to a wider base and that's our argument right now. Something has to be done about it.

Let's go to Parkinsons Law. I think that the property owner has had about as much as he can take.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I only want to make a brief comment. The Minister, I think -- I'm not sure whether I agree with his interpretation of the selling program that the government produced across this province because it seems to me that although the Minister has said otherwise, that whenever one read an account of the costs of this program it was simply stated 9 and 33 mills, and I wonder whether the Minister said that or whether he ever qualified his statement. I wonder whether it was carefully explained that this was an approximate figure of 9 and 33 mills, that it would be at least 9 and 33 mills, or whether they made statements like it would cost somewhere around 9 to 12 mills or 33 to 36 mills, because the message got through that it was plain and simple 9 and 33.

Similarly, you have the 35-65 formula, and I think that is also very much misunderstood. Maybe it's up to the government to make their position much clearer, starting now, because I think they failed to do this in the past. I think if you were to ask the average person who follows affairs - not the technical experts - that their understanding was also that whatever the cost of education is in any given division, it would be a 35-65 split. This is the type of impression given and of course it is only on certain percentage of the government's program, so that now we have Winnipeg getting a grant of 1-1/2 to 2 million dollars or having to -- they are either getting less money from the Provincial Government or having to raise more on their own.

(MR. DOERN cont'd.)

I think that this formula too is not very well understood, a one-third, two-thirds split, so as far as I am concerned, the New Democratic Party isn't really questioning the general program. I think some of us though question the method of selling, the actual expressions used and the emphasis put. I wonder whether the Minister really did qualify his comments as carefully as he is suggesting that he has now.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, the very fact that we are debating here before the Orders of the Day, I think, has already established the fact that the matter is important. And not only do the 57 members here on all sides of the House consider it's important, I know the backbenchers in particular across the way feel that it is just as important as we do and we feel that it's important because each and every one of us has received phone calls from most of the municipal men in our constituencies. If you haven't then you are going to get them. In talking to one municipal man today, he just got his letter today. I think the letters were sent out on Monday. They are probably in alphabetic order because in talking to Westbourne Municipality today, at the bottom of the list, they just received theirs today, just shortly before I phoned them, and they are all concerned and that's why we are debating it.

Now I think that the point raised by the Member for Emerson and the Member for Elmwood is one of the points that we are discussing here, regardless of what was said during that great campaign - and I've still got my sales kit as good as new - and I am one of the fellows that went out and tried to sell the plan. In fact, we went in our area a little beyond that I think promised by the Minister, but the people who voted - and we voted twice as you know, Mr. Speaker, I guess they did in your constituency too - they defeated it in March a year ago this month and then we came back eight or nine months later and voted in favour of it, but in all of the two campaigns, because we had two of them, the people were led to believe that so far as their real property was concerned - their real property was concerned - that it would be 9 mills on their homes and farms and 33 mills on their businesses. That's what the people thought and I have heard it said, Mr. Speaker, that the average fellow in the province wouldn't know a mill rate if he saw it walking down the road backwards, but I'll tell you this, the average person in the province knows that mill rates and assessments have got something to do with taxes, and if you take one times the other you come up with the taxes; they know that.

But the government has led the people to believe it would be 9 and 33, whereas they got notice today, some of them, some of them Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, that it was going to be 44 percent higher than what they thought was promised to them. Now 13.1 doesn't seem like a very big jump over 9, but it's 44 percent and that's quite a walloping jump. And then in one of the municipalities, as a matter of fact in two of the municipalities in the Gladstone constituency, because of the fact that the equalized assessment is substantially higher than the actual assessment, the mill rate is in one case 16 - rather than being 13.1 it's 16.8. The way you arrive at what the actual mill rate will be, or the impact is, you take - if my calculating is correct - you take the equalized assessment over the actual assessment times 13.1 - am I right? - then you come up with what it will be when you apply it to the assessment that appears on your tax notice, and in this case it's 16.8 rather than 13.1 and on the business property it's 47 percent on the business.

So in most cases it has been a double blow because the people thought it would be 9; it is 13.1 in some cases, but in many many more it is nearly double what they thought it would be. Now whether or not -- I don't say that government intentionally intended to mislead them on this, but my honourable friend who is paying extra special attention to me right now, the Minister of Public Utilities, back in 1959 on page ...

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Minister of Public Utilities) (Dauphin): March 18.

MR. SHOEMAKER: March 18th, he says. He's absolutely correct.

MR. McLEAN: Page 95.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Page 95 - right. I'm glad to see my honourable friend ...

MR. McLEAN: We can take this one as read.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): No, no, no, read it.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well my honourable friend -- what I'm trying to point up is this, in those days - that's nine years ago - my honourable friend said that -- I guess I'd better quote it, because he's likely forgot.

MR. McLEAN: Don't misquote him. Read it all.

MR. SHOEMAKER: "This plan," he says - I'm quoting, Mr. Speaker, as my honourable

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) . . . . friend has said, from Hansard No. 5 dated March 18, 1959, talking about the new jet age plan that went in then - "Now this plan will provide equal educational opportunities for children throughout the Province of Manitoba, particularly with respect to high school education. It will relieve, in large measure, the real property from the burden of school finance, transferring a larger share to the tax base which we have as a Province of Manitoba." Now when a minister of the Crown makes a statement of that kind the people generally believe it, particularly when they are a new government in office. They say, well if Mr. McLean said this, I guess I can expect that my taxes will go down next year.

MR. McLEAN: They did.

MR. SHOEMAKER: They did go down. I know, and Keith Alexander who is no longer here, he said they will stay down. He did, and I can get that answered for you too. Now I know he wasn't a Minister of the Crown but these were the things.

Now in more recent times, Mr. Roblin speaking down at Holland, Manitoba, immediately prior to the last campaign for the unitary divisions -- and he was speaking at Holland and there were 300 polite people it says there - polite people.

MR. DESJARDINS: What did they do, just throw him out?

MR. SHOEMAKER: But there were lots of questions asked - and polite questions I guess - but he led them to believe, if this report is correct, that it would be 9 mills. No question about it ever increasing. It would be 9 mills and 33. Well this isn't the interpretation that the people placed on the remarks that were said, and you can understand, Mr. Speaker, when they increase 44 percent the first year - let's forget talking about 13.1, it's 44 percent increase - so if they increase 44 percent the first year, what are they going to do the next year? This is what the people are concerned about. They are concerned, true, that they went up this year, but gee, they'll say this is only the beginning.

Now I would like to know, and I'll admit that I haven't studied this matter in depth - that's a phrase that my honourable friends like using and I don't really know the meaning of it - but I would like to know how does the government or the department arrive at the new equalized or balanced assessment as appears in a whole leaf of papers that I have. I don't suppose there are any other members of the House that have this because I went up to the Minister's office - oh, yesterday I guess - to receive the statement of equalized assessments for the year 1968 and I have got them, but in a lot of cases they are up. The assessments are up, and as I said before, Mr. Speaker, while 13.1 over 9 seems pretty small, it is 44 percent - 44 percent - and then if we get a new equalized assessment and it's up, it will be worse than ever.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I like all of the other ratepayers in the province are really concerned about this whole cost of education so far as the real property is concerned, because we really believed the five percent sales tax was going to pay the big end of it and as a result the real property taxes would be down.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . the motion has been satisfied?

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Not in this corner, Mr. Speaker, because I have some advice to give to my honourable friends, and I think that even though the motion has been discussed I realize very fully and practically everything has been said, I won't need to go into great detail, but I do want to make the point that has been running through all of the discussion as I understand it here - certainly my honourable friend from Emerson mentioned it and my honourable friend from Gladstone closed with it - I want to briefly emphasize it and it's this. Now I'll begin by saying that I'm not speaking for the Party in this first statement because some have rushed in to say that they are not criticizing the cost of education. Speaking personally, I think the cost of education is rising too quickly and I think that has to be looked at too. I think that you can't continually shove the wages of the employed up above the wages of the employer consistently and regularly for too long a period without something going drastically wrong, so I do not accept completely the vast increases that there are in the cost of education. But that's an observation, by the way, and unrelated to the other subject except in its implications of course as the overall cost, and I'm not speaking for my Party in that.

But on this other question -- the costs that have been incurred of course have to be paid up to date. Whether we can revise the program and get something a little more efficient and without the built-in escalators that we have at the moment is another matter, but supposing that we have to pay these costs, then the point I think that we are trying to make from this side of the House is this, for goodness sake, give us, give to real property a set maximum beyond which they do not have to go; and if you can't control the costs, if they are going to keep on

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.)..... rising, then let's take care of them out of other revenue than those of real property, because I agree completely that those have got to a height that is very very difficult to maintain.

Now of course the same people pay them. Of course we are all taxpayers and of course it's not pleasant to levy taxes of any kind, and I'll be one that will no doubt be criticizing the Government of Manitoba for the increasing costs, and no matter what tax they put on, I won't like it. But I do maintain this, Mr. Speaker, that if it's a choice, if a certain amount of money has got to be paid, then I do maintain that I'd like to put it on the broader base rather than on real estate. And when what we do, Mr. Speaker, when we transfer it from the real estate to the other tax fields, or in other words when we put a maximum mill rate on what we are going to take off of property and say that everything else beyond that is going to be paid by the government, that's tough on the government, but what we do is that then instead of somebody's homes and farms and places of business being taxed, we are going to get the money from the income tax - and I don't like paying when April 30th comes around, and being the kind of a guy I am I never send it in until the last minute you can bet, and I hate sending it in then, but I'd a lot rather pay it, I'd a lot rather see it levied on the income tax than any more on real property. We are saying that you are going to get it out of the corporations, to an extent; and we are saying that we are going to get it out of succession duties, as long as they are on; and you are saying you are going to get it out of the gasoline tax, and I hate paying the gasoline tax too but I'd rather pay it than the real property; and we're saying we are going to get it out of the whiskey that my honourable friend - the Attorney-General is it that sells it - and he was pleading yesterday with the new establishment up at Gimli to not put too much water in it. They'll continue to water it and they'll be taxing the water yet even higher. I haven't too much complaint about that one, that one doesn't bother the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities and me so much because the few times that we do indulge we get it free, but -- (Interjection) -- That's right - that is right - and some of us like my honourable friend and I we survive because we know how to get our requirements of it with somebody else paying for it. And I know it is going to mean some taxes on cigarettes and I don't care too much about those, but those taxes and even the sales tax - even the sales tax, and I still consider it to be a nefarious tax, I don't like it - but even it is preferable to more tax on real estate at this time. The municipalities are simply at their wits' end to know what they are going to do in order to keep up the other services that they have to deal with in addition to education, and education is becoming a real load for them to carry.

Now then, the proposition is this: let's try and control the cost consistent with doing a good job in education. All of us admit it is important. I think the public thinking on it has run a little bit in advance, quite a little bit in advance of public requirements. Let's do what we can in that field and recognize that we have to pay what it costs, but let's give property a maximum beyond which we're not going to go and then let these other sources of taxes pay the balance, and I think we would get away from this kind of argument year in and year out. This will help the municipalities; it will help the school boards themselves; and I think it will be of advantage all around.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Leader of the Opposition afford the House the opportunity of proceeding with business?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I believe that under the rules I must withdraw the motion at this point if there are no others who wish to speak. All I would say in closing, Mr. Speaker, is that I think the action that is required at this time is for the government to take back these estimates, revamp the bill, change the structure within that bill from 35-65 and put a limit on the taxation at the local level. Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to withdraw the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? -- Agreed.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the day, I'd like to table the Annual Report of the Department of Labour and the report from The Workmen's Compensation Board for 1967.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to file the Annual Report for the year ending March 31, 1967 of the Department of Industry and Commerce, the Manitoba Design Institute, the Manitoba Export Corporation, the Manitoba Research Council, and The Manitoba Transportation Committee.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the two Honourable Ministers if copies of both of these or all of these reports will be available for all of the members.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . . . copies are already with the Clerk.

MR. FROESE: I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Utilities. Could he inform us whether the report of Manitoba Hydro has been tabled?

MR. MCLEAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. In his remarks to the delegation that was here this afternoon, he said that after dealing with the Prime Minister and urging the Federal government to maintain medical services for the Indians, he said that ultimately that we will follow it up further. Similarly, his colleagues said that they will continue to get the kind of services that you had in the past. Is the Manitoba Government going to provide these services for the Indian people if Ottawa does in fact withdraw them?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member misinterprets what I said. I said that if it was necessary, after hearing from the Government of Canada, we would follow it up further. What the people were asking for was support in their approach, which was the same approach that we had been taking. At the present time I have no reason to believe that these suggestions won't meet with the success that we hope they will and the other alternative just mentioned I'm hoping won't be necessary.

MR. DOERN: A supplementary question. If in fact services are cut off at the end of the month and a wrangle develops, will the government provide services in the meantime before there's a final solution?

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to take this opportunity on behalf of the members of the House here to extend congratulations to Miss Irene Miller who was selected as Manitoba's outstanding female athlete for 1967 at the Sportsman's dinner last night. In winning this award she becomes the first recipient of the Errick Willis Memorial Trophy in memory of the former Member of this House, the former Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba.

I think it is also of importance to note that Miss Miller is a paraplegic and was chosen on behalf of all the female athletes in Manitoba, so I think it certainly is a great honour to her to win this award. She is a receptionist and her honour comes from competition in the International Wheelchair Games last year, the International Paraplegic Games (Pam Am). She won one gold medal for swimming; one silver for track and field; and three bronze for track and field, discus and javelin. I think this is the first time — it is the first time that International Wheelchair Games were held in this country and I think that Miss Miller certainly deserves this great honour.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I was hoping to follow up -- were you . . .

MR. PAULLEY: No, go ahead.

MR. CARROLL: I'm sorry. I thought maybe the Leader of the New Democratic Party might have been on another subject. I would like to just express the appreciation from this side of the House for having raised this subject because I had an opportunity earlier this year on behalf of the government and the members of this House to express our appreciation to Miss Irene Miller for the wonderful effort that she put forward at the Pan American Games. I also had the opportunity to pay to the association a cheque as a contribution on behalf of the Government of Manitoba towards the cost of the Paraplegic Pan Am Games that we were all so proud of here.

I think I would also like to pay tribute to the other members of that association, the leadership for which was taken by the association here in Manitoba. We have a wonderful group of very courageous people who participate in athletics at great, I suppose, hazard to themselves, but show a great spirit and a great example to all of us for the wonderful effort they put into the various recreation pursuits that the association are promoting in our province and gave leadership to across Canada during the last year. I would like to thank the Member for Assiniboia for having raised it today and we would like to associate ourselves with his congratulations to Miss Miller.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, if I may just draw attention to the House that Miss Irene Miller's family are long-term residents of the Town of Gimli. I've known Irene for some years, and her family, and I would say to the House that this is a magnificent accomplishment on her

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.).... part. She is a young lady who had an unfortunate accident in that community as a teenager and has, through hard work and the assistance of very excellent rehabilitative services in the province, achieved this wonderful recognition. I would like to let the House know that the people of that part of the Interlake, cognizant as they are of her tremendous personal courage -- it's just absolutely fantastic what that girl has accomplished in developing herself since this unfortunate occurrence. I knew her extremely well as a physician in the community and I'm just absolutely delighted to hear of the recognition she received last evening.

MR. PAULLEY: May I first of all, Mr. Speaker, associate my group with the congratulations to Miss Miller. I'm sure her achievements are worthwhile and she is deservant of being the recipient of the new award named in honour of one who we honoured so well here in the Province of Manitoba and in this Assembly.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to either the Honourable the House Leader or to the Minister of Labour. I note on Votes and Proceedings No. 10, which were on our desk this afternoon, that on Page 4 dealing with Bill No. 31, Employment Standards Act, the bill was accordingly read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Law Amendments. We have an Industrial Relations Committee in the House, Mr. Speaker, and I'm wondering whether or not this should have read to the Committee on Industrial Relations, or whether the bill should properly be going to the Committee on Industrial Relations. If bills of this nature are not referred to that committee, then I suggest there may be reasons for not having an Industrial Relations Committee which was set up under the regime of my friend the Member for Lakeside as a committee to consider labour bills and allied matters.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, I can tell the honourable member, the Leader of the New Democratic Party, that I requested this bill to go to Law Amendments Committee just to expedite the work of the House. It is the only bill that the Industrial Relations Committee would meet to look into. Certainly if it's the wish of the members of the House that the Committee sit to consider the bill, I have no objection.

MR. PAULLEY: May I say on that point, Mr. Speaker, we do have and we are in the process of setting up a Committee on Industrial Relations and there may be other bills forthcoming that the Honourable the Minister of Labour is not aware of dealing with labour matters that would be referred to the Committee on Industrial Relations, and I would respectfully suggest that seeing as we have a committee for that purpose, that this bill be referred to Industrial Relations.

MR. GREEN: I would just like to ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Labour which arises from his last remarks. Is the Minister telling us now that the government does not propose to bring before the House any legislation with regard to injunctions and their effect on labour-management relations?

MR. BAIZLEY: No, the Minister of Labour didn't say that, Mr. Speaker, and I might say in answer to the other questions that the matter is under serious consideration.

MR. GREEN: Then, Mr. Speaker, may I ask, since the Minister of Labour said last year that he was awaiting the recommendations of the Woods Committee, which, Mr. Speaker, I choose to call the petrified forest committee, or the Rand Commission, whether he's received any information from either of these two bodies with regard to this matter.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister whether he intends to answer as to whether he has received any reports from either of these two bodies?

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'll be pleased to answer. I haven't seen the Rand Report. In fact I am not aware that the Rand Report has been tabled. I have had recommendations from the Woods Committee which were brought forth in the Employments Standards amendment which passed second reading in this House.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, again I think that the Minister may have some difficulty understanding me. I don't think that the Rand Commission has reported either. My next question was whether he has received anything from the Woods Committee reporting with regard to injunctions, not with regard to Employment Standards.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I regret that I appear to be bobbing up and down but I would like to know whether the Minister intends to answer the question. If he says he is not going to answer then perhaps we could have that verbally.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, I've answered his questions to the best of my ability.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, May I ask a question of the Minister .....

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of .....

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker .....

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: The Honourable Minister of Labour made a reference to the Woods Committee having reported. Would the Minister tell us whether all the recommendations of the Woods Committee have been put into the amendment for The Employment Standards Act?

MR. BAIZLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. CLEMENT: In rising to take part in this debate, it is more in the form of a request to the Minister of Highways than to actually debate. As the official critic of the Opposition on highways, I specifically request -- (Interjection) -- official opposition maybe, Mr. Paulley? In order to take part in the debate on the estimates I respectfully asked the Minister of Highways if it's at all possible to present this information to the House before the estimates come up.

I notice the estimates on Highways are five million, one hundred and -- I can't even read my own figures -- anyways, \$51, 746,000 some-odd, and this is a very considerable sum of money. It is 11th on the list of estimates and this will give the Honourable Minister some time to get it ready. The taxes on gasoline originally, as I understand, were brought on in order to build roads and take care of public works in those days, and I'm sure if this information can be presented I will be in a much better position to constructively criticize public works or highways. So in closing, I would appreciate your help, Mr. Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: I believe I have the right to close this debate, and I had yesterday deliberately held up the matter so that the Minister would be able to check up if he needed any further information and so I would be able to read specifically what he said in reply. Now today I submitted to the Minister the information that I had obtained for previous years on this subject which I believe does come from a publication of the Department of Industry and Commerce of some years ago, and I think that this indicates the type of information that I'm searching for.

There was some question regarding the matter, 'any other revenue relative to highways', and I want to make it clear I'm not trying to find out how many fines were levied, but if it is a clear-cut revenue such as drivers' licenses or anything else. Now I don't think there are others and I think I've identified them, but if there were, the Minister might identify.

Insofar as what type of highway was covered, certainly I have no objection to having the details as the Minister lists them. If they could be broken down they would be better, but if not, I would accept them in total. I'm not sure what these particular figures on the list I gave the Minister do cover. I would simply like to have them comparable - really it's the comparable aspect I'm more concerned about - and if possible, some identification of exactly what it does include. I would like to get, in short, the exact amount that is spent by the Province of Manitoba, exclusive obviously of what is put in by municipalities and by other sources. In other words, what is the actual contribution of the province towards road construction in Manitoba?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order for Return. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster that An Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: An Interim Financial Statement, A Statement of Operations and Balance Sheet, as of December 31st, 1967, for the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, in my remarks in the House here over the years, I have repeatedly requested that financial statements, quarterly statements, for that matter, be made available to the members of this House. I have pointed out the necessity for this too and I did so even in the Throne Speech debate this year. I feel that we as members require more information on financial matters and I had hoped by now the government would offer us such information without having to resort to an Order for Return.

Certainly these financial statements are available to the government and it would only be a matter of reproduction so that we as members would have these statements as well. I regard that members of this House are entitled as voting shareholders in the business of the Province of Manitoba to have such information so that we can properly analyze situations as they come up. Certainly the matter that we discussed here this afternoon in connection with the tax increases for education, would probably have been a matter that we could have foreseen and wouldn't have had to come into this Chamber like it did as a hot potato and that we get up in arms, then we could have reasoned this out and we would have known that this was a must and would come about. Certainly the business of government of the Province of Manitoba is one of the largest businesses of this province and therefore I, too, feel the importance of this matter. And we are not rushing matters in any way because this is more than two months, it's two and one half months since December 31st, so that these statements should be available by now. In fact, they should have been available long ago, because as a number of members of this House have personal businesses and so on, they know that they have to have up-to-date information and that financial reports must be available to them if they are going to run their business properly.

Then, too, I think it's of importance that we as members are aware of the new legislation, of new measures that are being enacted through legislation; those especially affecting the fiscal matters, how they are working out and whether we should change them, whether any changes should be brought about; so that all these points bring about the importance why we as members should have information of this type. I pointed out in the Throne Speech Debate where the province of B. C. did this very thing for their members, that statements were tabled in the House there, so I would appreciate if the government would see to this request and that financial statements would be made available.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I'll do my very best to provide the honourable member with information in response to this Order for Return. I am not able to say that it will be in the form which is commonly understood by the terms that he has used in his Order, those terms being "Interim Financial Statement, Statement of Operations and Balance Sheet". It is just not a practical possibility for the province at this stage to provide a balance sheet as at December 31st. I am sure my honourable friend understands the steps that have to be gone through for a proper balance sheet, that is all the revenues would have to be accrued and such expenses as have not yet been paid would have to be accrued. Inventories would have to be taken and valued and many operations would have to be gone through as one can see by looking at the first part of the Public Accounts of the province. It's a very massive affair. So I tell my honourable friend it is not possible to produce a balance sheet as at December 31st in answer to this Order for Return.

I am able to provide my honourable friend with the following information: The cash receipts and cash disbursements on revenue account and the cash receipts and cash disbursements on capital account and I will include those in the Order for Return, but I am not able to produce a balance sheet in answer to this Order of the House.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I realize under the circumstances that not all the information could properly be given but naturally I'd be satisfied with whatever financial statement the government or the Governor-in-Council is getting. That would be satisfactory to us.

MR. EVANS: If I might be allowed, Sir, to add one further word that the statements that my honourable friend refers to are not supplied to either me as treasurer or to the

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) . . . . Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council as he has just said. It isn't that I am denying him access to a report that I have; I haven't got the report.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on second reading Bill No. 11. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, various members of my Party who spoke with regard to this Bill indicated that we disapprove of the principle whereby one municipality could try to lure industry away from an equally suitable or perhaps more suitable place by offering some advantage which would not accrue to all of the taxpayers in that area generally, and the reasons given both by the Honourable Member for St. John's and the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks are very articulately put and I don't intend to repeat them. We also are pleased that the Honourable Member for Selkirk feels possibly that the section of the Act that he refers to may have a greater effect at prohibiting this, or at least inhibiting this type of activity than the present situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at that point we are not sure that he's correct but at least we agree with him in principle that this should be inhibited to the extent that it can be. We don't know that the section as now worded will do that. I'm inclined to think that the words that the Member for Seven Oaks put onto the record the other day, that is that why not go all the way, are more applicable, but in any event we feel that this bill in principle is something that we can approve of on second reading with notice that we intend to take issue with the wording as it is presently constituted.

We would also, Mr. Speaker, again like the Minister to deal with specifics. I'm inclined to think that recommendations of these kind don't drop out of the air that generally there is some sound and high pressure lobbying that takes place in order for somebody to get the legislation changed and I ask the Minister specifically just as I asked the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, to tell us what municipalities contemplate doing this kind of thing. What municipalities are seeking to reduce perhaps say water rates, to lure an industry from one locality which chooses to continue equity in charging its citizens for water rates, what municipality is going to lure an industry away by doing inequity? I think that the Minister should indicate what are the circumstances that gave rise to him asking the House to pass this legislation?

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, we intend to support the Bill and will have a lot more to say about the particular clause that I referred to in Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member from Carillon that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Member would object if I just made a short comment on Bill 11. Yesterday I was not in the House and I believe that mention was made of the -- I should possibly first say that I rise not only to support the Bill but possibly to clear up a small technicality. In Hansard, Page 346, the Member for Seven Oaks points out some of the necessities of the Bill that were discussed and I think rightly so, but he goes on to say that "or you do it as the town of Steinbach had to do recently in order to entice a trailer manufacturing into Steinbach". And I'm not being critical of the town of Steinbach because under the rules of the game that's the way they have to play it today. I just wish to rise and say this, that actually it is a game and becomes a very treacherous and dangerous game too often but I am glad to report, and to keep this record straight is why I'm rising, that in this case, to my knowledge the town of Steinbach advanced no further offers than had been done by the two previous places. I don't think it's necessary to name them because it always hurts if you don't get an industry that you are trying to get, so I'm sure that the Member for Seven Oaks meant well with what he had to say. I bring it up only to keep the records straight and I agree that too often this bargaining does take place.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member would permit a question? Is it not a fact though that the town of Steinbach did have to make a concession with regard to their municipal levy -- and this again is not a criticism but is this not a fact?

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, yes it is a fact and the only point I am trying to make it was along the same lines in bargaining as other towns.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bills. Bill no. 10, The Securities Act. The Honourable the Provincial Secretary.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have leave to leave this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 27. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. LYON: Could we have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: ... allow the matter to stand? Committee of the Whole House.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, to consider the report of the Special Committee on Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly referred to this Committee by Resolution of the House on Friday, March 8, 1968.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for Arthur in the chair.

#### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Last night we were on page 1, Committee proceed? Pages 1, 2 and 3, passed, Page 4 ...

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment I would like to propose. I move that rule 10 subsection (4) be amended by deleting the words "three members" and substitute the words "a member."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, this is a matter that concerns me more than any member of this House and it has so over all the years that this particular rule has been in existence the way it is now. Other members can get up and ask for a division, the yeas and nays, and they are automatically supported by their particular parties; however with me it's a completely different matter and I here again have to depend on the good graces of other members and I feel this is direct discrimination, that you single out one member under the rules that will not have the privilege that other members have and I feel that this is absurd. This should be changed and I am proposing that any member of this House should be entitled to call for a division and not necessarily have the support of other members. Just last night we experienced a situation and you know the embarrassment that it can cause. The trouble is that other members don't have to experience it. I'm the only one that has to experience this situation and I would appeal to other members to give support. Yesterday I proposed an amendment and the government didn't even have the decency to answer or to reply to my request. I hope at least on this occasion there will be a reply.

MR. CHAIRMAN presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pages 4 to 10 were read and passed. Page 11 ...

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, on Page 11 I have a matter that I would like to develop, at not too great length but still I would like to develop it somewhat fully at this stage. Page 11 - and of course I'm referring to rule No. 29. To put it on the record of Hansard I'll read it Mr. Chairman, if I may. 29. "A member addressing the House shall not read from a previously prepared speech except in the case of (a) a Minister of the Crown making a statement of policy or (b) the Leader of the Opposition or a Leader of a recognized Opposition Party making a statement of policy".

Mr. Chairman, as you are aware this is a matter that I have paid a good bit of attention to during the years. It's not often that I've mentioned it in the House but I've regularly talked about it in the Committee - less actually on the occasion of this Committee than I did on previous sittings of the special committee on the rules.

I do want to suggest to the members of the House here that I think it would be well for us to agree among ourselves that we're going to come much closer than we have in the recent past to observing this rule. Now, if I attempted to tell you what I think are the reasons for having this rule, you would listen courteously probably and wouldn't be too greatly impressed because a lot of you I believe feel that I have a bit of a fixation on this matter, but if I read to you what authorities say - I don't pretend to be an authority - maybe you would be more impressed by what they say.

I would like to read to the House, and they're brief quotations, of what Beauchesne says, and this happens to be the third edition rather than the second but I think likely he has

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) . . . . carried it forward into the second one, and then what May says, because I do have the feeling, Mr. Chairman, and I notice that we have the honour of the Speaker of the House being present in the House at this time and it's a bit more relaxed when he's not in the Chair. There's no reason why the Speaker should leave a seat in the House because he's privileged to occupy one if he wishes to. I was hoping he would stay. I didn't mean to scare him away. I was going to give him some well meant advice by suggesting that this matter is really in his care and that he is the one according to the rules who should be checking up on any and all of us when he finds us breaking this rule. But after all it's not a case of adhering so strictly to rules; it's a case of us doing what should be done. And I once again would like to remind the House that this is not an oratorical society that we have here, it's not a place where we're expected to make our way by developing flowery speeches; this is essentially a debating society. We're here to deal with matters that come before us, legislation and administration, and we're supposed to deal with them in business-like terms. I really regret, as one who belongs to the era when speeches were not read in the way they are now, I really regret to see the change that has taken place in this assembly, of people time after time after time not only disobeying the rules - that in itself might not be so bad because we are prone to disobey them at times I know - not only disobeying the rules but in my opinion greatly detracting from their own effectiveness in the presentation of their case.

I once heard the right Honourable Arthur Meighen, whom I consider to be as good a public speaker as I ever heard, and I've had the pleasure of hearing some that are considered the world's best - I heard Arthur Meighen say that he considered it an insult to his audience to read a prepared speech and that he said - I'm quoting him, he said that in his opinion if anyone who did not know his subject well enough to stand and deliver it without a written manuscript in front of him, should not be speaking on that subject. And certainly, certainly he gave many exemplifications himself of how well he could deliver a speech on the most intricate matter without even notes. But goodness knows, all of us know that there aren't many Arthur Meighens, they don't come often; and even he, I know, would not suggest that in the Legislative Assembly or in the parliament that we should be prevented from using notes and in some cases notes quite copiously and I'm sure, although I never discussed the matter with him, but I'm sure that he would agree with the exceptions that are made here: "a Minister of the Crown making a statement of policy." I think it's only proper that we should allow latitude and leeway there because matters of policy, particularly now when there are recording facilities and particularly now when government has got so much bigger than it used to be and particularly now, then expenditures are so large and there's interplay between the various spheres of government and questions that need to be very accurately put - no one I think would seriously object to such statements being read - and then the same privilege is extended to the Leaders of Opposition Parties.

I have mentioned to the House on other occasions that one of the objections, in fact a major objection that I always had to the installation of recording equipment in this House, and later on its transcription into a Hansard, was that I prophesied that the introduction of recording equipment itself and particularly the transcribing it into an Hansard which would be available to the members would lead to an increase in the reading of the speeches. My honourable friend for Morris will remember well the debate that used to take place in the House in the early days and I was one who opposed for a long time the introduction of even recording equipment in the House. I always took the position that although I have at times found it necessary to question the strict accuracy of the reports that we get from the Press, I always took the position that they tried their best to give an accurate representation of what we said and that usually in my experience, and in my case personally, usually it was that I have failed to put my point over well enough or with sufficient clarity that was responsible for any deficiencies that I found in their report. But I was overruled, even at the time that our Government was in office, I was overruled by the feeling of the members of the House and we went first to recording equipment and then after this government came into office, and we didn't have only recording equipment in our time because the rule was that when anybody - although we took down the recordings on tapes or records yet when anybody asked for any one of the speeches they were always taken off at the government's which means the taxpayers, expense and then if anyone asked for a speech then it was taken off and delivered to the leaders of the other groups as well. So that anyone's speech that was asked for at all, was thereby made available to the other

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) . . . . members of the House. Well when this government came in - and I'm not criticizing them for this, this is not a complaint - when they came in they decided that we would go the further distance and have a full Hansard. And I admit that I have changed my mind, I admit that in my opinion the Hansard is worthwhile. I admit that I was wrong. It's not very often you get a politician to admit that he was wrong and I don't often do it, the reason being that I've not often been wrong. But on this occasion, Mr. Chairman, I think I was wrong. I think Hansard with all of its imperfections - and it has them - is an advantage, it's worthwhile, but the other worry that I had about it has certainly been substantiated in my opinion. It has increased the reading of the speeches and I think this in unfortunate, it's not only against the rules, I think it's unfortunate, because I think it tends to make the point less effective. I think that honourable members who intend to carry on in public life will find that they don't always have the time to prepare a manuscript. They'll be at some meeting sometime and if they have grown to rely too greatly upon a prepared manuscript they will find themselves in difficulty when they are without it.

Now I read from Page 102 of Beauchesne's third edition because I think that this will make a much greater impression on the House than anything that I might say. Citation 238: "It is a rule in both Houses of Parliament that a member must address the House orally and not read from a written previously prepared speech for the reason that", and then this is in quotation marks, "If the practice of reading speeches should prevail members might read speeches that were written by other people and the time of the House be taken up in considering the argument of persons who were not deserving of their attention." I would think, Mr. Chairman, that in our time that the practice of speeches being written by other people than those delivering them may have grown somewhat too, but certainly the practice of reading speeches whether prepared by the speaker himself or herself or by someone else, certainly that one has grown.

I would like to read from Sir Erskine May's document - there is more, for anybody who wishes to pursue the subject further, there is more, considerably more in Beauchesne, and certainly Bourinot has a treatise on this subject as well, but I suppose the ultimate authority so far as commonwealth parliaments are concerned is Sir Erskine May. And I would like to read briefly what Sir Erskine May says on this subject: "A member is not permitted to read his speech but may refresh his memory by a reference to notes. The reading of written speeches which has been allowed in other deliberative assemblies has never been recognized in either House of Parliament. A member may read extracts from documents but his own language must be delivered bonafide in the form of an unwritten composition. The purpose of this rule is primarily, " -- and I call this to the attention of the honourable members -- "the purpose of this rule is primarily to maintain the cut and thrust of debate which depends upon successive speakers moulding their speeches to some extent upon the arguments of earlier speeches and decays under a regime of set speeches prepared beforehand without reference to each other." And how many times have we seen that happen? May goes on to say, "As the real purpose of the rule is to preserve the spirit of the debate" - it is not unreasonably relaxed in cases such as we mention in our rule - this is what I believe is one of the latest editions of Sir Erskine May's parliamentary practice. This one is the sixteenth edition, I think probably that one also may be up to the seventeenth or even eighteenth now. But I mention those, Mr. Chairman, once again to plead with the members of the House, in their own interest, as well as the interests of conforming with the rules of the House to - if you have the practice of reading your speeches, try and escape from it. If you haven't yet developed the practice, don't adopt it, because I think that from every point of view it's advantageous that we adhere to this rule.

I had hoped that Mr. Speaker would be in the House when I was delivering these few remarks; maybe he will do me the compliment of reading what I have said. I'm sure that he has available to him more authorities on the subject than I have. I hope he will take the time to think about this matter and that he will begin to, not enforce the rule, because I certainly would not want to see an arbitrary decision made here that no one can read a speech. Always we have felt that there should be considerable relaxation in the case of newer members and there may be some further relaxation in other cases as well, but in general, in general, I think that it's better for the argument itself and the person making the argument that we should adhere to the rule in spirit as well as in letter. So I am going to have a little chat with the Speaker and see if he'll take the time to look over my remarks in this connection and then

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) . . . . enforce the rule, not arbitrarily but with a judiciousness with which speakers in many other assemblies have managed to get a good deal of co-operation from the members of the House. Incidentally, I think it would be one of the matters that would assist considerably in cutting down the time of the House, and in case I be accused of wasting the time of the House myself, that's all I intend to say about it at the present moment but I do urge honourable members to think upon these things.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Chairman, I think it was the purpose of the Honourable Member reading article No. 29 to have it correctly recorded in Hansard as it appears here, and unless he is making a change in it then he should have included all the words as they appear, and in order. He left out one word. He can refer back to Hansard tomorrow and find out which one that was. If I'm not correct in making this correction for him, I would like to help him to have it accurately recorded.

The article reads: "A member addressing the House shall not read from a written previously prepared speech except in the case of so and so . . ." He left out the word "written" and I would assist him in having this correctly recorded in Hansard so there need be no misunderstanding as to what he was intending or meaning.

MR. CAMPBELL: I thank the honourable member for his correction. If I missed a word I would want to give it correctly. The rule itself is 29 and it says "A member addressing the House shall not read from a written previously prepared speech" except in the case of - with the exceptions that I mentioned. I thank my honourable friend because I would want to have that accurately recorded.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to enter the debate for a moment to pay a compliment to the Honourable Member from Lakeside. Years ago when we were asking for a Hansard I was one of the members that kept asking year by year, or session by session to have a Hansard. I think that it is well worth the time, the effort and the cost to every member in the House. Before we had Hansards printed and distributed to the Members, I remember one or two elections that I had the opportunity to be in, when I was misquoted by those parties that were opposing me but since we have had Hansard we have done away with these misquotations and I think that it's one of the better things that we have in this House as far as being able to go back to what a member said one year, two years ago or three years ago, and I do want to compliment the Honourable Member from Lakeside for his support in the Hansard that's being issued these days.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I would also like to thank the Honourable Member for Lakeside for bringing to our attention the matter of Rule 29 and his request that members speak off the cuff and not have written speeches and read them out.

I think also the matter that he raised that there was certain relaxations of the rules, specifically to certain rules, and this is the point that I would like to make. We find that so often especially Rule 29, is not adhered to and yet when we have Rule No. 10, subsection 4, the one I referred to, or the one earlier that I tried to amend, we don't find these relaxations. We find every time that I ask for a division, up pops the Leader of the House and reminds the Speaker, has he got support; yet he can see how often this rule is offended and no remarks are made, no reprimands. So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see that, if we're going to adhere to one rule, let's adhere to all of them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 11 passed.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a word here at this particular time. One thing I've always wondered about is how they interpreted the rules in other provinces during their sessions and also at the House of Commons, I often wondered. I never had the privilege of sitting in, only once or twice in the House of Commons, never in any provincial legislature and I always wondered how they interpreted a rule, if they had the same rule. Maybe someone here could answer me. Do they have the same rules as we do regarding written speeches or do the Speakers overlook this particular matter? I kind of agree, and I thank the Member for Lakeside for the words that he has spoken to us just now because I'm inclined to think that we would run into many problems out in the hustings if we were to be called on to give a 15-minute speech if we weren't prepared, if we didn't have some experience. In here it does tend to be a little awkward some of the time to speak on a particular subject when you're not well prepared, but there is some merit. So I'm glad to know that the other Legislatures do follow the same rule and it's up to the Speaker himself to determine when the rule's broken or not.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, to answer the honourable member, I believe that the Ottawa rule is almost identical with our own in this matter but if I had read further from Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms the immediately following passage from where I left off reading begins this way - I read all of citation 238; citation 239 begins in this way, I didn't read it because I thought the point had probably been made but the very next item is: "Mr. Speaker Glen said in the House on February 20, 1942: 'I have a statement I should like to make to the House. Now that the debate on the Address has been completed, I have been concerned with what I am sure has been evident to all members of the House, namely, the breach of the rule which deals with the reading of speeches'". And he goes on to say that he's observed that it's been violated in many cases and he makes an appeal to the members of the House to try and live up to what the rule says. We're not unique in that; it's violated in many Houses.

MR. CLEMENT: Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say as one who has been in and out of this Legislature for quite a few years and believes in fairness and after knowing the Honourable Member for Rhineland for at least almost two years, I am quite prepared to let him use my name at any time if it's going to help him. He's never had any trouble yet. His friends to his right have always accompanied or went along with his seconding but if he wants to use my name, I'm prepared to help him out.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I'll be willing to say that on all occasions where I think it's proper, I'll be prepared to make the third.

MR. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Chairman, I, as one of the new MLA's which the Honourable Member from Lakeside has made mention of, and I congratulate him on his sentiments, find the experience of being a new MLA of great difficulty in presenting your points, the first year of course being one of great unshaken ability - you're not just too sure where you stand in the field of debate and with the quality of debaters who sit in this Assembly it's with great reluctance at times that we do rise to our feet because without a speech it's difficult to stand on solid ground. But I think I can voice the sentiments of a lot of the back-benchers that at the second year I think we feel much more comfortable here and I myself I think would be - I think it a privilege to rise and debate without notes. I enjoy the expression and the way he brought the new MLA's into the remarks and I congratulate him on that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, if my honourable friend won't mind me saying so, I carefully listened to his speech a few days ago on the Speech from the Throne; I gathered he was sticking very very closely to his notes that day; I listened to the one today. I think the one today was much better.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I just want to acknowledge the offers that were made by honourable members and I appreciate what they've said and I do hope that I will get the assistance and I welcome the offers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Pages 11 to 18 were read and passed.) Page 19 ...

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, on this point would it be well for the Honourable the Attorney-General to mention to the House just the substantive change that is being made here. This one is a change, it's an innovation. Personally I think it's worthwhile but it's in my view a rather major one.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, this is a substantive change in the rule that was agreed to by the committee. Under the present practice a money bill which is introduced from the Treasury benches must be preceded by a Message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor and then it goes through the resolution stage before first reading is permitted. We've had, I believe, one such bill already in this session.

Under the new rule as it is proposed, the resolution stage would be abolished. The Minister would stand up and announce at the introduction of the bill or the resolution or the address that the recommendation of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor had been received and then would table that and immediately would proceed with first reading of the bill. This would have the effect of cutting out that previous stage of debate that we have had at the resolution stage before the bill is present in the House and before the members. It is a substantive change but I think in the light of the various opportunities that are offered for debate on bills at second reading, then at committee and then at third reading, that really Parliament or the Legislature is not losing thereby. I think it's an acceptable form of expediting the manner of handling substantive matters that must come before the House by way of a

(MR. LYON cont'd.) . . . . message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor and I for one would certainly recommend it to the House.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't present at the committee meeting when this was discussed, it was brought in and I haven't studied it too closely. Does this mean that we will have no debate at the time that the resolution is brought forward?

MR. LYON: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Page 19 passed; Page 20, passed) Page 21 . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: There's quite a substantive change here too, Mr. Chairman. I don't know whether honourable members have had a look at it but this one - I think it's an advantage, and committee, after a lot of discussion and some disagreement came to a consensus but I think it's one that should be called to the attention of the committee.

MR. PAULLEY: I think possibly, Mr. Chairman, it might be well for the House Leader to make reference to this. In essence it sets up a process of rotation insofar as resolutions on the Order Paper. Instead of a resolution staying in its same place every day, if the resolution is stood, then it goes to the bottom of the Order Paper, in that particular grouping that it may happen to be in. That is the idea of the rotation of the resolution so that members' resolutions cannot stay in one place all throughout the whole session and not be proceeded with. That's a brief explanation. I'm sure the Honourable the Attorney-General can explain it far more fully.

MR. LYON: . . . more fully but I don't think I could explain it any better than the Member for Lakeside or the Leader of the New Democratic Party because they have given really the nut of the change. I think it is a facilitation particularly for the handling of private members business in the House whereby we have found in other years that resolutions placed on the Order Paper, say in the middle of the session or towards the end of the session, really didn't come up until perhaps the final day or the final day or two and I think all members of the committee were hopeful that by adopting this new method of treating such resolutions in particular, that it would afford fuller opportunity for debate on all matters that are brought before the House and in perhaps a more equitable way than was the system under the present rule under which we operate.

The point that the Leader of the New Democratic Party perhaps did not mention was that if the matter stands on three separate occasions at the bottom of the Order Paper and is not dealt with it is then automatically removed from the Order Paper. This does not of course preclude it being reintroduced; it can be reintroduced but it is then taken off automatically from the Order Paper because of either the absence of desire on the part of the Member to move it or to proceed with it or as expressed by his failure to move this particular resolution.

I don't know that there's anything else that is substantive in this but it is an attempt again by the members of the committee to deal more expeditiously with business of the House and I think in this case it can be said, if it works, and these rule changes are all subject to the hard galvanizing test of whether or not they are practical, if this one works as we anticipate that it will work, I think it will lead to a more equitable manner of handling the debate, particularly on private members' resolutions.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, you were a little fast for me. I had those rules that I wanted to speak on, marked up. On Page 20, Rule 54 requires that all motions shall be moved and seconded. I find that when we go into committee that motions are made without a seconder. Where do we find this substantiated in the rules? I for one appreciate not having to have a seconder when we are in the committee and make amendments, but I'd like to know from the Leader of the House where is this covered?

MR. LYON: The honourable member, Mr. Chairman, raises I think a good point because there is the rule in our Rule Book which says that the same rules that apply in the House apply in committees of the House. I believe at one of our recent committee meetings the Clerk of the House brought it to the attention of the Committee that in his opinion he felt that seconders were required in committee. We have been following a usage or a custom in the past of not requiring seconders and I can't quite honestly, Mr. Chairman, put my finger on the authority in the rules which would back up the practice which is raised by the Honourable Member from Rhineland. I just don't know where it is.

MR. CAMPBELL: I can't give the number of the rule at the moment but my recollection is that what the rule says is that all the rules of the House or the rules of the House apply in committees except the Committee of the Whole and on that interpretation --(Interjection)--

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) . . . . yes, yes, as to the number of times of speaking and the seconding of motions and things of this kind. If the Committee of the Whole is the only exception then I think the Clerk would be right in saying that the Standing Committee had to have seconds.

MR. LYON: The rule itself, following the good advice that was given by the Member from Lakeside when in doubt, always go back to the rule, and in this case, the rule is 62 and it reads as follows: "The rule shall be observed in a Committee of the Whole House insofar as they are applicable except the rules as to the seconding of motions and limiting the number of times of speaking". So in committee of the Whole the rule requiring seconding is not followed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We were on page 21. Pages 21 and 22 were read and passed. Page 23 . . .

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, on page 23 we have the rule considering the 80 hours to be spent on Estimates. As you know we've been under this practice now during the past year and we now have received a list as to the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: What section are you referring to on page 23?

MR. FROESE: 62 (a). And the point I would like to raise is we have now received a list as to the order that we are going to follow and the way the departments are going to be handled as far as the Estimates are concerned. Now it has happened in other years that certain departments are left to the last and do not receive the necessary consideration and I for one would like to have a little leeway under this rule so that when we do come to the end of the 80 hours and that there are certain departments left that we apportion some time to the Estimates of those departments as well. We probably did a certain amount of it last year, but I would like to have an understanding that this will be the situation should it arise again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 23 passed.

MR. LYON: I think on that point, Mr. Chairman, I should mention that this rule was considered in the committee. I don't think there was any great debate surrounding it, but there seemed to be general agreement - this may have been one of the days when the Honourable Member from Rhineland was absent as well - there did seem to be general agreement among the parties that we should carry on with this rule of, with the restriction of 80 hours, but the further suggestion that was agreed upon informally in the committee was that there would be as much liaison as possible between the government and the members of the Official Opposition parties in order, not only on the list of the Estimates but as well on keeping track of the time that is used, because I think the feeling is general -- and if I'm exceeding the bounds of agreement I'm sure others on the other side of the House will tell me this -- I think there was general agreement that we could with the proper allotment of our time and without repetitious debate, which occurs on all sides of the House, we could certainly accommodate the discussion and the debate surrounding all of the estimates of this House in the 80-hour period that is allotted. When we look at the amount of time that was utilized last year for debate on several of the departments that came before the House we can see possible areas where this debate could be cut down; we can see other departments possibly where the amount of time could be increased and I know it is possible as well in a hypothetical way to work out a schedule of acceptable times because I've worked out such a schedule. We've looked at it with not too much care, but it is certainly possible to work in all of the debate on all of the departments within an 80-hour period.

I think rather than consider breaching the rule at the end, we should consider rather - and this applies to all of us in the House - we should consider the question of keeping very close track of the amount of time that we spend on the departments having regard to what their responsibilities are, and the amount of public monies that are handled through them and through a process I suppose of self discipline as much as anything, try to insure that we do not go beyond the allotted times on departments that are relatively small departments in terms of administrative responsibility or in monies expended and to make sure that we have the time left for the major departments, and for the major subjects that the members of the opposition will wish to raise regardless of the size of the department, because very often debate is predicated not only on the administrative responsibility of the department but rather on the subject matter that is handled by the department. So here again I think it is one of those cases, as in so many cases, in any parliament or in any legislature where we are dependent upon the continuous consultation between this side of the House and the Opposition

(MR. LYON cont'd.) . . . . side of the house to keep track of progress, to put up warning flags from time to time if we seem to be exceeding what would be a reasonable period of time for debate on a department and to make adjustments then accordingly, if we have done this, to make adjustments in the time that is allotted in order that we can achieve the end which all of us seek which is namely to have all of the departments brought before the committee and a reasonable amount of time allotted for the discussion of the responsibilities of all departments of government.

So from the standpoint of the Government I can say that we will keep in touch with the Leaders of the Official Opposition parties and with my honourable friend from Rhineland as well, to insure that we are making reasonable progress in their opinion and to do everything that is possible within the limits of reason to insure that all of the departments get before this committee within the 80-hour period.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Minister's comments in that we should try and conduct our business within the 80-hour limit. However, this is not in the power of any individual member, it must be a combined effort and if no consideration should be given to extending the time limit, should we have some departments that haven't received any consideration after the time limit has elapsed, then I would have to voice my disapproval and objection to this rule.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Pages 23 to 33 were read and passed.)

MR. PAULLEY: I was wondering, Mr. Chairman -- it will take me more than the two minutes -- I don't know if you are going to be as strict as the Speaker was yesterday, at one portion of yesterday's proceedings, I have a few comments to make in respect to page 33 A. It may take a fair amount of time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . . 5:30.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, if I could just with leave of the House enquire from my honourable friends opposite if in view of the progress that we are making if they would be agreeable to carrying on tonight. Now we do have a choice of going into Committee of Supply tonight, adjourning this committee now and then going into Supply tonight or of carrying on and finishing this and in the light of the progress that we are making it might be advisable if there is agreement. I'm in the hands of my honourable friends; if they wish to move to Supply, we can do that, otherwise we could finish this.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe this is the only other area that we are offering some suggestions to the Committees for possible changes in the draft report, on this portion of the report - I'm not saying anything at all, however, on the other part that I'm sure my honourable friend the Member from Lakeside is interested in, is the question of the permanent Speaker. I just refer of course to the actual rules themselves, that we won't have very much more other than this point here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5:30. I leave the Chair until 8 o'clock.