

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8 o'clock, Monday, May 6th, 1963.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster, as amended, and the proposed amendment of the Honourable Member for Burrows, and the proposed sub-amendment of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

I have given consideration to the sub-amendment of the Honourable Member and I have decided that it is in order and anyone wishing to speak on this motion may proceed.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I just want to make one brief comment insofar as this resolution is concerned. The reason that it was proposed by my colleague from Brokenhead was because first of all the amendments that were previously made to the original resolution of my honourable colleague, the Member for Inkster, it appeared to us that there was an attempt on the part of the Liberal Party to invoke their basic philosophy, if you can call it a philosophy, that they have at this time because of the fact, Madam Speaker, as is well known at least in the last four months there have been four different proposals insofar as social security in the Dominion of Canada forthcoming from the Liberal Party. I think it would only be fair and truthful for me to say that if there is ever a floundering ship on the seas of the political situation in the Dominion of Canada, then it has at its masthead the word 'Liberal'. However -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I did check on the election results, Madam Speaker, and I did find that due to distribution across Canada and circumstances that we now have in the Dominion of Canada a Party with only 41 percent of the total vote of the Dominion of Canada at the helm of government. So on taking into consideration, Madam Speaker, the results of the last election which certainly to me was a complete rejection of the Liberal Party and all of its leaders.

However, the reason for the sub-amendment, Madam Speaker, I think is obvious. We have been attempting here in Canada over a period of years now simply to have a patchwork system of social security. It seems to me that every time that there is an election there is a certain amount of propositions of a piecemeal nature brought to the fore and it is the purpose of this sub-amendment to attempt to have a resolution adopted that at least would lead to a comprehensive social security system in the Dominion of Canada.

Now we had two or three commissions that investigated this matter and most of them are gathering dust at Ottawa. However, I do recommend this resolution to the Legislature as at least a start as far as we're concerned here of a directive to the Federal authorities to attempt to set up a reasonable social security system pension in the Dominion of Canada.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed amendment of . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, Madam Speaker, the Yeas and Nays please.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

The question before the House is the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, that the resolution be amended by: (1) Deleting the word "pension" in the first line thereof and inserting after the word "national" the words "social security"; (2) Deleting in the second line the words "individual contributes" and inserting after the word "the" in the second line the following: "employee, employer, self-employed person, government, contribute" (3) Adding after the word "fund" in the last line the following: "and pay to those who are sick or unemployed a basic rate of \$75.00 per month plus an additional amount based on their contribution to the fund."

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

NAYS: Messrs. Cherniack, Gray, Harris, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer and Wright.

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 7; Nays, 45.

Madam Speaker declared the motion lost.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed amendment of the Honourable Member for Burrows.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster as amended.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Madam Speaker, in the country where I was born and brought up the rank outsider that got in with the team in the final day's activities was termed as one "running with the hounds" and as a backbencher I feel I can claim that I'm running with the hounds today with everything that has gone before.

The subject that I have to speak on has been on ice for some little time; the ice has now turned to water and I must speak and am very glad to do so.

Madam Speaker, in taking part in this debate I'm mindful of the fact that in recent months millions of words have been written and said on the subject of nuclear arms, which to my mind have left the people of the country confused, bewildered and the defense issue not resolved. I am confident that the Leader of the ND Party in putting forward his resolution, he, along with possibly millions of others, believes that nothing but misery, ruination, stagnation and death overhang nations and people throughout the world. I would have hoped that his motion would have advocated the abolition and destruction of nuclear arms everywhere.

The Honourable Member for Roblin was in my opinion, under present circumstances, absolutely right when he said that it was essential to realize that the decision as to the use of nuclear arms should be the decision of civil government responsible to the people, rather than a decision of military authorities. Our leaders must, I feel, Madam Speaker, continue with caution when dealing with those nations whose leaders by force wear uniforms. Madam Speaker, we have had centuries of sabre rattling followed by misery and suffering. Surely in this day and age common sense will prevail all over the world and the terror that nuclear power now holds will be turned to serving mankind rather than destroying him.

Madam Speaker, listening to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition the other day I thought he was sincere and wholeheartedly interested in the well being of our people but I suggest he surely had some reservations when he told us that Canada was not meeting its commitments. He must be amazed and bewildered by some of the news stories emanating from Ottawa these days. I have one here. He referred to clippings today, and I'm sure he won't mind me doing so. "US Agreement not binding. Defence Minister Hellyer stated the nuclear agreement with the United States would be a permissive agreement which would not commit Canada to anything." He said on a CBC Television programme enquiry "That with the permissive agreement we do not bind ourselves to any specific action." The rest speaks for itself as I'm sure the Leader of the Opposition in his quiet moments has read with some anguish.

Madam Speaker, I should like to read into the record an opinion taken from the Winnipeg Tribune of April 19th: "The Government never fell down on any of its military agreements with our allies and the fact was then as it still is today that the NATO Alliance still has not achieved an overall policy setting out the various roles to be assumed by its members. In the case of NATO all members have been engaged in the most acute re-examination of problems, both nuclear and conventional, proposed by an understanding reached by President Kennedy and Prime Minister MacMillan at Nassau." The same article goes on to say "There is no possibility of Canada acquiring nuclear warheads under the present American law. In NATO the nuclear warheads would be released by the President in a final emergency and not before. The agreements between the United States and the various NATO nations, including Canada, clearing the way for training in certain aspects of nuclear war were signed in 1959. The agreements specifically forbid the acquisition of nuclear weapons by any of America's allies."

Madam Speaker, we in Canada have never shirked our responsibilities in the past, nor will we ever in the future. We covet no country or peoples. We are a cosmopolitan population, made up of people of every race, creed and kind, some who have suffered at the hands of tyrants. People who live and want to let live in the land the third largest in the world; the richest country in the world, for in its vaults of nature are hidden treasures yet uncovered. We must persevere no matter what the odds and seek out these treasures for the good of mankind. Madam Speaker, we have the ability to feed the people. We have the ability to abolish poverty and we have the ability to furnish a living for all. I suggest, Madam Speaker, that no time should be

(Mr. Bilton, cont'd)... lost through our government leaders; our church leaders and our places of learning in channeling the minds and hearts of our people toward the goals I have mentioned. I am, Madam Speaker, one who believes that a family "that prays together is a family that stays together." Could this not be something that we might hope for? That nations all over the world would strive for world peace in this manner. That is to say, Madam Speaker everyone should bend every effort for the understanding and stability so necessary these days everywhere. Madam Speaker, I believe in civil government as divinely ordained to protect men in the enjoyment of their natural right and to rule in civil things and that in this country it is entitled to the respectful and willing obedience of all. Recent years have seen many new nations come into being. Who will say that they are not watching this comparatively young nation in the hope that we can, with our knowledgeable diplomacy and stature on the world stage do much in the furtherance of peace.

Madam Speaker, with all these thoughts in mind, I feel it an honour and a privilege to move the following motion, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet: That the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the NDP be amended by deleting all words after the word "Assembly" in the first line thereof and substituting the following - "Support the proposition that Canada can, under present circumstances as we know them best, serve the cause of peace and the defence of the western world by not adopting nuclear arms for her forces in Canada, and by continuing to work for the total world disarmament in both nuclear and conventional weapons."

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I think that it is necessary for me to say a few words on this amendment. I want first of all to say, Madam Speaker, how much I appreciate the remarks of the Honourable Member for Swan River. I know that he has given this matter great consideration, one could gather that completely from the remarks that he made in presenting this resolution. I agree with him most heartily and most sincerely, Madam Speaker, when he says that we should continue to work for total world disarmament in both nuclear and conventional weapons. I don't think that anyone in this House will argue with this proposition. I'm sure that my honourable friend has many companions standing in this House and outside of this House, saying that it is only through the united effort of free loving people throughout the whole globe working toward the objective contained in the latter part of his resolution that indeed the world will ever achieve the stability that it needs and deserves today. But when we look over the whole globe today, when we find in all parts of the globe that there's strife and trial and tribulation and overhanging all of these differences in the different countries in the world, a threat, of force, be it nuclear or conventional force, it behooves each and everyone of us, particularly in Canada and the United States, to lend every effort that we can to see that we do achieve total disarmament in the world.

I doubt very much, Madam Speaker, whether I can find myself to agree with the first part of the amendment as proposed by my honourable friend, the Member for Swan River, because he deletes from the resolution as originally proposed by myself, any reference at all to nuclear weapons in the hands of the Canadian forces beyond the boundaries of our Dominion itself. I want to say, Madam Speaker, that I appreciated too, the remarks of the Honourable Member for Roblin when he was speaking on the main motion and also the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party. I listened with a great deal of interest to their proposition and the logic of their argument and I want to say to the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party, particularly in reference to that part of his speech where he was dealing with the question of arming our Canadian forces overseas and the fact that they should have equality with others. I agree with him most sincerely that we should do everything within our power to see that our Canadian forces are not in a second class position to anyone; and I think, Madam Speaker, that the first way in order to achieve this is to see that they do not have nuclear weapons, because if nuclear weapons are placed in the hands of our Canadian forces overseas, then surely to goodness those countries belonging to the Warsaw Pact will also supply nuclear weapons for their allies on the other side of the screen in Germany. I think that at the present time we have the equality and I think that that equality should be maintained. I think, Madam Speaker, that it's up to us in Canada to be leaders in the quest of world peace and I think it goes without saying. I gather from the remarks of the Honourable Member for Swan River, he agrees at

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)... least to some degree with this insofar as the question of Canada is concerned; that Canada without nuclear weapons on its home shore can still retain its position as a leader in world peace; that we can join in the other nations of the world in peace councils far better if we haven't in our possession here in Canada, nuclear weapons. I suggest, Madam Speaker, that this is equally true or even more so true -- that if we can go into the peace councils of the world being able to say to the other countries that we have neither nuclear weapons at home or abroad, and I think that that will establish our position far more concretely and lend us more support if we can do it untainted by the weapons, either at home or abroad, and I think that this should be the objective of Canada.

Now, Madam Speaker, we've just gone through a general election here in the Dominion of Canada. One of the foremost issues that was before the people of Canada during that election was the question of nuclear arms for Canada. As a net result, as a net result of that election, if one uses the statistics that we have at the present time, we find that 41 percent of the people of Canada supported a political party that had as its objective the domiciling of nuclear weapons here in the Dominion of Canada. On the other side of the picture, Madam Speaker, 59 percent of the people of Canada -- I believe, rightly or wrongly -- rejected for Canada nuclear weapons, and by rejecting them for Canada certainly rejected them for their forces elsewhere as well. And I want to say, Madam Speaker, that I'm prepared to accept that. I know that it's quite often said "figures can lie and liars can figure" but it does appear to me on the basis of the results of the last election that what I am saying now is substantially correct.

We heard a lot of debate during the last Federal election as to whether or not Canada had commitments with United States for the acceptance of nuclear weapons in Canada. One of the parties, namely, the Liberal Party, maintained throughout the whole of the election that we had commitments and that we must honour our commitments. But, Madam Speaker, if we take note of the press releases of this last two or three weeks, we find that the present Minister of Defence is saying, "Well, I don't think we did have any firm commitment insofar as nuclear weapons are concerned in Canada." So even in this there has been a re-look -- if we can call it that -- at the question of Canada in respect of nuclear weapons. We even find that the new Minister of National Defence has taken another look at the situation and he is not clear now as to whether or not Canada has any commitment. And yet at the time of the election, even though they only garnered 41 percent of the popular vote in Canada, they said, "We definitely had commitments insofar as nuclear weapons in United States are concerned." But Madam Speaker, this being what it is, I still think that we even have a greater force working for the abolition of nuclear weapons, or the prohibition of them insofar as Canada is concerned; forces that are far more moral, in my opinion, than either the Liberal, Conservative or New Democratic Parties of Canada.

I want, Madam Speaker, at this time to read a copy of a resolution that was adopted by the Council of Social Service for the Anglican Church of Canada at its General Synod, September 28th, 1962. The resolution reads as follows: "Believing that the moral influence of those nations who refuse to have nuclear weapons can become a determining factor in the course of world affairs and while conscious of the grave dilemma confronting the governments which endeavour to reach such a decision, yet this General Synod records its conviction that the only sane course open to humanity is never to use nuclear weapons and urges its members to press continually as a matter of most urgency for the abolition by international agreement of nuclear bombs and of other weapons of similar destructive forces the use of which is repugnant to the Christian conscience." I'm happy to be able to say in this House tonight, Madam Speaker, in all deference to people of other denominations that I am an Anglican and I am glad to know that the General Synod of the church I am a member of has taken this particular attitude insofar as nuclear weapons for Canada is concerned and I only wish that others would do likewise.

But even apart from the Anglican Church here in Canada, Madam Speaker, I was more than happy just recently on April 10th, just following our general election, to hear that His Holiness Pope John had issued an encyclical dealing with this very important matter of nuclear weapons, and as recorded in the Winnipeg Free Press of April 10th, His Holiness had this to say and I think this is very very pertinent, he added, the article refers: "Even though the monstrous power of modern weapons acts as a deterrent, it is to be feared that the mere continuance of nuclear tests undertaken with war in mind will have fatal consequences for life on

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)...the earth." And then His Holiness, Madam Speaker, goes on with this sentence, or the report goes on to say that His Holiness said this: "The Pope called for the deterrent of arms equality to be replaced by universal acceptance of the fundamental principle that the true and solid peace of nations consists not in equality of arms but in mutual trust alone." And I suggest, Madam Speaker, that if we adopted the policy as enunciated by my Honourable Friend the Leader of the Liberal Party speaking on this resolution the other day in order to have equality, it's just the reverse to the suggestion of His Holiness Pope John, where it isn't a question of equality at all but a determination of all of us to see that these weapons are not to be used and in the deterrent of possession of these weapons it is not enough for the Christian concept of humanity.

Now, Madam Speaker, with these few remarks I do want to make an appeal, a last minute appeal to the Members of this House, to join me in a realization that it isn't a question of having equality, to join me in a full realization that the greatest deterrent to nuclear war, apart from the deterrent of having numerous weapons at the present time, but the greatest deterrent of all is to make sure that there's no expansion of a nuclear club because once the club is expanded other members are in possession of nuclear weapons then the controls that are evident and possible at the present time are by the board. So I suggest, Madam Speaker, that we cannot accept the resolution. We do accept the sincerity of the Honourable Member for Swan River.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

The question before the House is the amendment of the Honourable Member for Swan River that the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the -- (Interjection) --

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

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 33; Nays, 18.

Madam Speaker declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party, as amended.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. George, and the proposed amendment of the Honourable the Member for Lac du Bonnet. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, when on the discussion of the Minister's estimates the Minister announced his new policy for the long-term use of land, there was at least one good feature about it and that was that after four years of delay and total inability to reach a decision, the government had finally decided that they would do something about this problem. Because there's no question that the problem had been caused by the government itself in the first place when four years ago it proceeded to freeze the sale of land and refused to renew long-term leases and put the ranchers of this province in a position where they didn't know from one year to the next whether or not they would be obtaining land, at what price, what security of tenure they had, or any of these matters that are so important to someone who is planning the development of a livestock industry. And I know that in those areas with which I am particularly familiar--my own constituency for example -- there were a number of ranchers there who attempted to purchase land from the government and were turned down. People who knew the land that they were dealing with, Madam Speaker. I appreciate some of the objections raised by some of the government speakers on this subject when they refer to abandoned land. It's true that after the First World War in particular the Soldier Settlement Plan of that time was not successful and in too many cases these unfortunate veterans were settled on lands that were not

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd)... suitable for agriculture, grain raising. They attempted to do so; they worked very hard and eventually had to abandon those farms. But this was largely a case of strangers coming into an area not knowing the land they were dealing with.

Madam Speaker, there's a very different problem from that in many parts of Manitoba. I am sure the Member for Rupertsland has seen exactly the same thing because he represents an area somewhat similar to my own. We have cases there of established ranchers -- people who have been living in an area for 25 and 30 years -- who have been trying for four years now to purchase adjoining land to theirs and the government's reply was 'No we won't sell it to you. We know better than you do,' the government said to these people, "what this land is good for. We won't sell it to you because we don't think it's decent land." Madam Speaker, there's no one knows better what the land in a lot of this unorganized territory is worth than the people who are living right there. They are familiar with it; they know what it can do and if they are prepared to buy it I say that it should be sold. Similarly on the long term leases. The old ten year leases were not renewed when they came up the end of their term and as I understand it the ranchers simply had them on a year to year basis. Now at last the government has made a decision. Well what decision have they made Madam Speaker? Well as I listened to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that evening when he made his statement here in the House, the main decision it seemed to me. was that now that the election was over they were able to make a decision because the main import of his decision was to raise the fees, because this is exactly what is going to happen on the majority of these leases and rentals, as I understood from his statement that night. There will be a substantial increase in the cost of these lands to the ranchers who've been having them and I suspect that once the new policy is put into effect we will find that that is exactly what is the result. I remind you that back in 1958 or 1959; in any case just before the election at that time the government at that moment had proposed an increase in hay and grazing fees, but the political situation was such that they very quickly backed down on it. Now however, the election is over and it's fair game to proceed to increase it. I don't remember if the First Minister was speaking exactly in those terms when during the course of the election he adopted our policy of establishing long term leases. He didn't say it was going to be connected with a fee increase.

I do not agree therefore, Madam Speaker, with a number of the points in the Minister's policy. I do not agree with a number of the points in the amendment to this resolution. For example this statement that "whereas the newly announced policy of sale of Crown land constitutes the sale of only those Crown lands which are considered arable agricultural land." I can see this policy where you're dealing with strangers. It doesn't apply, Madam Speaker, in those areas where there are established ranchers, where land is available close to them and they are prepared to use it within their present ranching operations. Why refuse to sell it to them because it doesn't happen to be arable land? Why refuse because it happens to be hay or grazing land? This doesn't make sense. These people know what they can do with it. They're in a position to make proper use of this land and there's no reason it shouldn't be sold to them. I cannot therefore, Madam Speaker, support the amendment that's proposed. I'm happy to see as I said, that at long last there is a policy; I think the Minister should take his policy back, work over it a bit more, establish definitely the long-term basis and proceed to give the ranchers a better break than what his statement seemed to indicate when he made it here on his estimates.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. George, as amended.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I would just like to concur in the remarks made by the Leader of the Liberal Party. This policy as it is now is very discouraging to a lot of the farming people in my constituency where there is a lot of grazing land and hay land. I know it won't assist those people who wish to purchase this land and I am very disappointed that the government hasn't seen fit to make this land available to the farmers.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Lakeside. The Honourable the Member for Roblin.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER: Madam Speaker, I took the adjournment on this on behalf of the

(Mr. Alexander, cont'd)...Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, in rising to speak to this resolution of the Honourable Member for Lakeside, I hasten to assure the House that I do not have a long 60 or 90 minute speech prepared on this occasion. In fact I rise in a very conciliatory mood and after the statement of a few of the precedents of the House surrounding this rule I think probably room for some sort of agreement between the Honourable Member for Lakeside and myself will become readily apparent. I should start first of all Madam Speaker, with the rule from my own rule book -- rules that were adopted on the 26th of March, 1960 -- and under that general heading of "Standing and Special Committees -- Witnesses -- starting at Rule 67, Chapter 8, we find Rule 73 which states: "A report from a committee shall not be amended by the House but it may be referred back to the committee." I propose that if the original drafters of that rule had seen fit to insert the words "a select committee" or a "standing committee" we probably wouldn't be involved in this debate at the present time. If we go back to the rules that obtained in this House for some years prior to March 26 of 1960, that is the rules which were adopted on the 18th of April, 1951, we find that precisely the same wording was used in those rules -- it was then Rule 76 and the rule stated: "A report from a committee cannot be amended by the House, but it may be referred back to the committee." I think there is a change in the verb. Our present rule says "shall not be" and the former rule said "cannot be", but it may be referred back to the committee. That's about the only substance of difference in the two rules -- the verb.

Based upon that rule we had certain precedents arise in our chamber, the most recent of which was that I believe referred to by the Honourable Member for Lakeside in the course of his remarks on this resolution. He states in his resolution that the ruling of Mr. Speaker of 21st of February, 1961 on the question of an amendment referring a report of a special committee back to the committee for further consideration be reversed by this House and that this House declare that its practice shall not present a report, even if it is a final report, of either a Special or a Standing Committee being referred back to be amended. Referring to the second paragraph of the resolution, I submit Madam Speaker, that the practice of our House, based on the rulings of three speakers regarding the refusal of referring the matter of a report to a committee, applies only in the cases of referring a report to a special committee of the House and not to a standing committee. I think a division can be made if we look back over the precedents and we see that reports from Standing Committees have been referred back whereas reports from Special Committees were not referred back pursuant to this rule.

The ruling to which the Honourable Member for Lakeside makes reference reported in the Journals of the Assembly for 1961 of page 30, and the ruling of Mr. Speaker on this matter read as follows: -- I'm not going to quote the whole thing -- Mr. Speaker ruled on the adjourned debate of the proposed motion of Mr. Smellie "that this House doth concur in the report of a Special Committee appointed on the 23rd of March, 1960 to consider the Election Act and received by the Assembly on Tuesday the 16th of February. The proposed motion was put by the Honourable Member for Lakeside that the report of the committee be not concurred in, but that it be referred back with the instruction that Clause (c) of subsection (1) of 8 of the Election Act be considered. Then Mr. Speaker of that time made the ruling in which he referred to Beauchesne's parliamentary rules, 4th edition, 1958, page 236 and citation 286. He ruled the amendment out of order on the basis of that citation without going through all of his ruling which is apparent to anyone who wishes to read the journals.

Now Madam Speaker, there are rulings taken from May, from Bourinot as well as from Beauchesne which have been dealt with I think at some length in the remarks of the Honourable Member from Lakeside. One question that perhaps was not dealt with at any length at all was the precedents that had been established in this House -- in this very Chamber -- the precedents with respect to the interpretation of Rule No. 74. There were two rulings -- March 26th, 1960 and April 2nd, 1957; both of these were precedents by speakers, neither of which were challenged or appealed to the House and these rulings in turn were based on Beauchesne, the third edition, citation 555 and Beauchesne, 4th edition, Citation 286 which reads in part as follows: "A select Special Committee ceases to exist on the moment its final report is presented to the House. The report cannot afterwards be sent back to the committee with instruction to amend it in any particular. If further proceedings are desired it is necessary

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd)... to revive the committee."

Now the honourable members, Madam Speaker, I think would wish to refer to a ruling of Mr. Speaker reported in the journals of 1960 at pages 281 and 282 on March 26th, 1960. And in this case, and this is a quotation: "The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of myself. Resolved that this House does concur in the report of the Special Select Committee appointed by this House on the 20th of January, 1960 to consider Rules 9, 27 and 34 and such other rules as the committee may decide to review and which report was tabled in the Legislative Assembly on the 1st of March, 1960." And then there was a proposed amendment which was moved by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains: "That the motion be amended by adding the word "not" after the word "doth" in the first line thereof and that the following words be added after the word "figures, 1960" in the fifth line thereof: "but that the report of the committee be referred back to the Special Select Committee for further consideration and that the Special Select Committee be reconstituted for that purpose." Mr. Speaker reserved his ruling as to the admissibility of this amendment in 1960 by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains. He gave his ruling as follows: "Beauchesne, 4th edition, page 236, citation 286 reads in part as follows: 'A select Special Committee ceases to exist at the moment its final report is presented to the House' and so on, as we have already observed from that citation. At the same time Mr. Speaker on that occasion said that he wished to refer the honourable members to citation 325, subsection 4 on page 252 of Beauchesne's 4th edition. This citation reads as follows: "When a motion is made for concurrence in a Select Committee Report, it is competent to the House to adopt it, reject it, refer it back to the committee or decide that consideration of the report will take place 'this day six months'." Mr. Speaker continued; "May I also refer the honourable members to rule 52 of our own Rules, Orders and Forms of proceedings," and then he carries on, "In my opinion two separate motions would be required, one which would come within the scope of citation 325 (4) of Beauchesne and another separate resolution to revive the committee." "Accordingly", said Mr. Speaker, "I must rule the amendment out of order."

Now those were two precedents of recent time, 1960 and 1961, in which it was definitely laid down by the Speaker of the House that reports from select committees could not be referred back, based upon the citation from Beauchesne. But there is one further that goes back to 1957 -- remember that the rule that we are dealing with in 1957, with the exception of the verb is precisely the same rule that we have on our rule book today. Now this ruling was made by Mr. Speaker on April 2nd, 1957 and was reported in the journals of that year, page 282 and 283 and this was a case where the present First Minister was overruled on this same point. The journals of '57 reported this matter as follows: "Mr. Turner, from the Select Standing Committee appointed to consider and report on Rule 41 of the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, presented its first report which was read as follows" : "Your Committee met for organization and appointed Mr. Turner as Chairman. Your Committee recommends that for the remainder of the Session, the quorum of this committee shall consist of five members. Your committee was appointed by a resolution agreed to in the House on Tuesday, March 19th, '57, on motion of Mr. Stinson as amended by the Honourable Mr. Roberts. Your Committee held three meetings on March 28th, April 1st and April 2nd, 1957, respectively. Your Committee recommends that Rule 41 of the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Assembly be amended by adding after the word "pending" in the second line thereof, the words "In a Court of Law" the amended Rule 41 would then read as follows" -- and they go on to quote the amendment to the rule which I won't burden the House with. Mr. Turner then moved that the report of that committee be received. Whereupon the present First Minister suggested that the report be not received, but be referred back to committee in order to alter the terms of reference and a debate arose and the present First Minister, the then leader of the New Democratic Party or the CCF Party, Mr. Turner, having spoken, Mr. Speaker ruled and here is the ruling of 1957, again based on this same rule "That a Select Special Committee ceases to exist at the moment its final report is presented to the House. The report cannot afterwards be sent back to committee with instructions to amend it in any particular. If further proceedings are desired it is necessary to revive the committee." The citation given by the Speaker was "see Beauchesne citation 555." The Journals continue and conclude, "the report was accordingly received."



(Mr. Lyon, cont'd)....

Now in the first line of the report of the journal the committee is referred to as a Select Standing Committee. This was not the case; this was an error and it should have been a Special Select Committee which that committee apparently was. This special select committee was appointed on March 19th, 1957 -- Journals of 1957, pages 196 and 197.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, we see this situation which has arisen in Manitoba by virtue of three precise rulings by previous speakers. The one in 1957; the one in 1960; the one in 1961. The Honourable Member for Lakeside, in the course of his remarks and in drafting of his resolution says that the ruling of Mr. Speaker of February 21st, 1961 should be set aside and that the House should declare its practice to be that a special or a standing committee should be able to refer its report back. I think without all of the mechanics of amending the rule we might get at the nub of what he is seeking to do by a better means.

I am persuaded, Madam Speaker -- by the evidence that the Honourable Member for Lakeside has read from the Clerk of the House of Commons and from his correspondence and the correspondence of Mr. Speaker Harrison with former Speaker Michener -- I am persuaded that it was probably the intent in the Ottawa rule that the reports of both select and standing committees should be referable back to those committees for amendment. I think that's probably the intent. In Manitoba, by the basis of these three precedents that I have enunciated tonight, that rule has been inhibited to refer only to standing committees, because of the citation from Beauchesne, the citation which we find is perhaps a misinterpreted citation as a result of the notes of Mr. Raymond from Ottawa. Therefore, what I'm suggesting to the House tonight, Madam Speaker, is that there is merit, there is certainly merit in the case that is put forward by the Honourable Member for Lakeside and I think we owe him a debt of gratitude for the time and the trouble that he has taken to get information on this point and to present it to the House as he has. But I suggest that the way, perhaps, to clear the situation -- and in my remarks let me make it clear that anything I say tonight cannot be construed in any way as a criticism of any of the three speakers, or any of the two speakers who made the three rulings that we speak of, because the first speaker in 1957 apparently was setting his own precedent, that precedent was followed in 1960 and again in 1961 -- all of them based on precisely the same citation from Beauchesne. But it would seem reasonable and practical that the reports of select and standing committees should be capable of being referred back.

I would therefore suggest Madam Speaker, that the action to take in the light of the information that we have is not a resolution of the House, but rather a direct amendment to our rules; a direct amendment to our rules which would take roughly this form, subject to consideration by the draftsmen -- a "report from a" -- and I'm reading now in Rule 73, but I would suggest it might take this form. "A report from a" -- and then I would insert the word "Standing or Select Committee" -- shall not be amended by the House, but it may be referred back to the committee." Now if that were done, Madam Speaker, I suggest that there would be no further room for doubt; it would effectively eradicate the three precedents that have been established, I think correctly and properly on the information that the speakers had before them at the time, and certainly the government is prepared to give consideration to that amendment and to give an undertaking that consideration would be given to making that amendment at the next session of the House. In the light of the wording of the resolution I would therefore suggest to the Honourable Member for Lakeside that if he sees fit to act on the basis of this undertaking that he withdraw his resolution in return for the undertaking that the amendment will be brought forward next year to clarify our rules and to put his thinking and that of myself and the other members on this side, indeed all of the members of the House, on the same common ground; get to the point where select and standing committee reports can be referred back; and can be referred back because the rule will definitely state that they can. This I suggest is the best way to get around this rather legalistic conundrum in which we find ourselves at the present time and I therefore bespeak the co-operation of the Honourable Member in withdrawing the resolution on the understanding that the government will make the amendment in words approximately along the lines of those that I suggested tonight.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, the Honourable the Attorney-General has quoted to us some precedents arising from our own journals. I would like to point out, however, that ever since the adoption of our new rules we have gone for our precedents to Ottawa, not to our

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd).... own House. The Honourable Attorney-General, I am sure, will remember that one of the reasons that we made this so plain in our general rules was that where there was any doubt about our own we would go to Ottawa, not to our own--not usages or customs or precedents. I suggest that the way that our rules now read, and all anybody needs to do is read the old general rule that we had -- I don't have the old rule book in front of me -- but if you'll look at the general rule in the older rule book and then in the present one, you will see the difference. This was done for the special purpose that because usages and customs and even precedents are hard to remember and opinions on them are bound to differ and interpretations of them will vary, that we decided in that Rules Committee that we would get rid of that statement in the old general rule and go to Ottawa as the final authority where it was not covered by our own rules.

But, Madam Chairman, in this case, we never should have been talking about Beausiesne or Bourinot or May, or any of the other authorities because our own rule is crystal clear. The heading of the chapter -- and I know that my legal friends will say that the heading of the chapter does not control the various sections that appear -- but the heading of Chapter 8 on Page 28 is "Standing and Special Committees" -- Standing and Special Committees -- and you carry all the way along through there talking about reports of committees and when you come to 73, the one that the Honourable Attorney-General mentioned a little while ago, here's how clear it is. "A report from a committee shall not be amended by the House but it may be referred back to the committee." Nothing could be clearer.

As I mentioned in my few remarks on this matter the time before, the mistake that a great many of we parliamentarians make is that we go dashing off to Beausiesne when we ought to read our own rules, and as long as we've got a rule that covers the subject, we do not go to Beausiesne or any place else. We are masters in our own House if we have set up a rule, and I maintain this one is crystal clear. But the Speaker of that day felt that it wasn't, and undoubtedly he was paying some attention to the precedents that have been referred to. He felt that it wasn't clear enough for him to make a final decision on it and so he quite properly, under those circumstances, went to Beausiesne and unfortunately hit upon this citation that Mr. Raymond, the Clerk of the House in Ottawa, has now told us is quite frankly in error.

When the Honourable Attorney-General mentioned in his opening remarks that I -- he said, "The Honourable Member for Lakeside dealt with Beausiesne and Bourinot and May." I was not dealing with Beausiesne, Bourinot or May, all I was doing was I was telling you what the Clerk of the House of Commons at Ottawa said. I read into the record what he said and I certainly will not take the time to read it under these circumstances tonight, but he makes it very plain, very plain that this citation that was given is wrongly quoted in Beausiesne's 4th Edition.

Mr. Raymond told us to look up the House of Commons debates of that time, or at least gave us the pages in the House of Commons debates so that we could follow them through. I did that and anybody that will take this correspondence with Mr. Speaker Michener and the notes that Mr. Raymond furnished, and anybody that will take that correspondence and follow it through with the debates will see exactly the history that Mr. Raymond has given. He ends up on Page 4 -- and all the leaders of the House groups got a copy of this correspondence so they can look at it at their leisure -- he ends up with this statement, and this was quoting Mr. Speaker Lemieux: "So that the practice in the Canadian Parliament does not present a report, even if it is a final report of either of Special, or better still, a Standing Committee being referred back to be amended. Then, says Mr. Raymond, "the above ruling by Mr. Speaker Lemieux to my knowledge has never been challenged and I suggest it still reflects our practice." Then Mr. Raymond goes on, on the same page, and gives a citation from May. He gives that as well, and then he says: "Therefore, either following the Canadian practice laid down by Mr. Speaker Lemieux or the practice in the United Kingdom, as stated above, it is my opinion that the amendment submitted by Mr. Campbell was in order."

Now I don't intend to weary the House with any more lengthy debate on this. The fact is, Madam Speaker, that this has been a problem for some years, as the Honourable the Attorney-General mentioned, and I have attempted to follow it through on this occasion. When it was held that our own rule was not clear enough and when this was being debated by the House, I urged Mr. Speaker to look at our own rules; I urged him to consider Rule 73 of our own book and said

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd).... then what I say now, that we don't need to go to Beaufort because our own rule is clear, but having gone to Beaufort, we have the final authority of the then Speaker, Mr. Michener, who incorporates Mr. Raymond's notes into his answer on the subject that this is correct.

So in my motion I have absolutely incorporated -- this second paragraph is exactly the way Mr. Raymond has given it in his letter, in his notes back to us. I left out the words "or better still". I left out but, with that exception, this is exactly the way Mr. Raymond presented the case to us. There is no question in the world, in my opinion, and I think there will be none in the opinion of anyone who reads the correspondence that I furnished to each one of the Leaders in the House, that this is the correct procedure. Now my honourable friend the Attorney-General says that there's some question about it because of the precedents that have occurred before. Those precedents mean nothing. They mean nothing in the light of Mr. ....

MR. LYON: They mean everything in the light of this practice here.

MR. CAMPBELL: They mean nothing here. Our own rule is clear. It was clear before and the mistake that the Speaker made in 1957, and the mistake that the Speaker made on two occasions since that was traipsing off to Beaufort instead of paying attention to our own rules.

MR. LYON:.....to say that Speakers don't make mistakes, they make precedents.

MR. CAMPBELL: Their precedents are frequently mistakes.....

MR. LYON: No, no, they aren't.

MR. CAMPBELL:.....and this is one of them. This is one of them, and we should not let the mistakes remain when we have the statement in clear and unequivocal language by Mr. Raymond the authority that our own rules point to, if we think our own rules are not clear. I submit that this rule is crystal clear.

But now we have the statement by Mr. Raymond that the Ottawa practice and the practice in the House of Commons at London is the same. I suggest the resolution should be passed.

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

MR. CAMPBELL: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker, please.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Lakeside that the ruling of Mr. Speaker of February 21, 1961, etcetera.

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

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

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 20; Nays, 32.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Emerson. The Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, even if I was one of the members that won the award that the press made here about two weeks ago, I'm not going to be long this evening; I'm not going to try and support those awards that were made at that time. But I do want to say this, Madam Speaker, that I know that all members of this House agree with the preamble of the resolution that is before us. I do expect that they will disagree with the active part of the resolution that is before us.

Now the resolution, what it is saying is simply this, that they do not think that children have an equal opportunity where one teacher must teach, in some cases, 34 pupils. There are literally hundreds of schools in the province still left--rural one-room schools--where the pupil count is possibly eight, nine, ten and eleven. There are lots of those left around. I will admit that there are not too many two-roomed schools left in the province--there are some--and I know that the Honourable Minister of Education will agree with me that when a teacher has more than say 20 pupils to teach, it does become a problem. The teacher cannot handle that number of pupils and do justice to their individual needs. To prove that, I believe that he

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd)

told us some two or three weeks ago that it was the intention of the government to set up certain classes for training the unemployed in Brandon, Dauphin, The Pas and places like that, and whether he told us or whether it appeared in literature on this subject matter, it stated that the classes would be limited to 20 pupils so that each student or pupil would receive a fair instruction.

Now in my own constituency there is one two-room school that I can think of at the moment where the pupil count is less than 35. It is true they have two teachers, but the School Board is paying for one, that is they only get a one teacher grant. But the School Board realized that it is next to impossible to teach 33—I think it's 33 pupils that they have in this school—so they have by themselves hired another teacher and paid for her salary.

Now what I would suggest and would like the government to consider is this, that where the pupil count is in excess of 20 in a two-room school, that they establish a sliding scale grant, and what I mean by that is where the pupil count say is 21, give another \$100.00; where it's 22, \$200.00; 23, \$300.00 and so on. Now this would enable the School Board to pay a little more money for the teacher, and when they advertise for a teacher they can say we have so many pupils and we are able to pay so much money. That is, pay them a little bit more when they have a large pupil count. I maintain, Madam Speaker, too, that in schools of the kind that I refer to, more often than not they end up with a teacher that has been unable to obtain a school somewhere else. It is only natural that the school teachers would like to live in a town like Neepawa or Gladstone or Dauphin or some of these places where their accommodation and the atmosphere and surroundings are much more attractive than they are away out in the sticks somewhere, and I suggest that if we had some basis for paying these teachers on a sliding scale, you could pay them a little more money. There are still teachers left in the province that are capable of teaching 22 or 23 or 24 pupils, but I say let's pay them what they're worth. Let's have in this particular case, merit rating.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, you didn't catch my eye. If nobody else wishes to speak, I'll be closing the debate and I'll not hold the audience very long. My remarks will be very brief and I really mean it this time.

I have had several complaints from rural areas regarding the difficulty in obtaining and retaining good teachers in schools by fact of the departmental regulations where the grant applies—only one grant or two grants. To qualify for two grants to schools, the attendance must be over 34 pupils and, as has been mentioned by my colleague, this does not give an equal educational opportunity to pupils attending such schools.

Now the argument is that if some of the ratepayers and the trustees can realize that opportunity is not there and they're willing to contribute their own money to see that these pupils get an equal opportunity, I think it is high time that the department—the government—look into this problem and alleviate the situation. I promised I would bring this up in the House so it could be aired out and I think it has been thoroughly aired out, and at least now I would hope—I would like to hope that the Minister will look into this problem and maybe come up with some solution to help these people.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Inkster.

MR. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, I would --(interjection)--oh, I'm sorry.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Brokenhead, the following resolution: Whereas--(interjection)--Oh, I'm sorry--Seven Oaks. He was here a minute ago. "Whereas sugar is being produced in Manitoba by a single privately owned corporation, and whereas the people of Manitoba are being obliged to pay prices for sugar which are higher than those being paid by sugar consumers in the neighbouring United States and do not derive the benefit of competition by local industry, and whereas the price paid to producers of sugar beets appears to be controlled by this single corporation without benefit to the consumer; therefore be it resolved that the Government give consideration to the advisability of instructing the Co-operative Department of the Department of

(Mr. Gray, cont'd)

Agriculture, to make a study of ways and means of transforming the production of sugar in Manitoba from a privately owned to a co-operatively owned and co-operatively operated enterprise, and to make a report thereon to the Minister of Agriculture.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, believe me that it is not my fault that this resolution came at the end of the agenda, and realizing that the members have had enough work, struggle, and perhaps suffering to listen to some of us, including myself, but it is not my fault as the Leader of the House, of necessity I admit, had to shuffle around the Order Paper. I do not complain and I do not regret; I just want to explain why I'm late in having this resolution discussed.

Madam Speaker, the resolution was not submitted for the purpose of having an academic discussion as between public ownership and private enterprise at this time, but to bring to the attention of this House the high price of an important commodity affecting the consumers. The resolution does not involve any expenditures. This is a request to our Minister of Agriculture who has a department dealing with co-operatives. This resolution is prompted by an article that appeared in the Winnipeg Press--the daily press--a couple of weeks ago, and this is in connection with the two or three increases of sugar to the consumer in the last few weeks.

This article, which has not been challenged, stated that people living only a few miles south of the border in Fargo, North Dakota, could buy sugar at a cheaper rate than the people in Manitoba where the sugar plant is in operation. There is supposed to be a world shortage of sugar, yet in Fargo a bag of sugar weighing 100 lbs.--that was a couple of weeks ago--can be purchased for \$10.89 while 100 lb. bag in Manitoba is \$13.59, and I understand there was another increase just recently. The same news report states that the Manitoba Sugar Company had refused to disclose its price other than making a broad statement to the effect that it is following world prices. The world price for sugar is usually arrived at by adding the freight rate from New York to Winnipeg and to the New York price. Now the article continues to state that the sugar beet growers in Manitoba have not been asked to plant extra acres on account of the world shortage, nor have they been offered any higher price for the sugar beets they now grow. The foregoing statement indicates that the sugar company is profiting by the alleged world shortage and that it is not particularly anxious to overcome the shortage.

Sugar is one of the products that could well be produced on a co-operative basis just as vegetable oil is produced by the co-operatives in Altona. If sugar was produced on a co-operative basis the sugar beet growers and all those who contribute to the production of sugar would benefit from it, and the consumer of sugar and other products would also benefit, for he would get his supplies at prices nearer to the cost of production. He would not have to pay world's price for sugar produced here in Manitoba. The Manitoba Sugar Company, as no doubt know all the members, was formed in 1940 and at that time the Government of Manitoba guaranteed debentures of the company at the time of \$600,000.00.

Grant Dexter of the Free Press wrote several articles in February, 1957, which I do not intend to read. Grant Dexter is one of the great journalists--he knows--and there is the articles in front of me in connection with the situation of this so-called sugar monopoly in 1957, in which he gives full history of the further development, on which at the moment I shall not dwell. The material is now here and can be recited or for anyone to examine. These reports are dated February, 1957.

I also hold in my hand a report issued by the Department of Justice, the Restricted Trades Practice Commission, concerning the sugar industry in Western Canada and the proposed merger of the sugar companies in western Canada. It's a quite lengthy article, which I'm not going to read. I just want to satisfy the House that what I say is not my own thinking, although I realize the interference with industries that use sugar and with the public by adding the price from day to day. God knows the cost of living is high as it is. Nowadays you go to the store, you can't find any more a five cent chocolate. Whether it's necessary or not the children still want it and you've got to pay ten cents, because of the actual cost of sugar. The same with the soft drink industries and the same with other industries where sugar is required. All this information is on record here and I shall not take the time to go over the history and the legalities of the merger and the dealings with the B.C. sugar company and the Manitoba sugar company.

Sugar is one of the products that could well be produced by co-operative basis, just as I said the vegetable oil produced in Altona. The farmers who produce the beets and the

(Mr. Gray, cont'd) . . . . consumers who use the sugar and the by-products from the plant would form a co-operative. If the Government of Manitoba could underwrite the bonds of the company in 1940 and extend the \$600,000, surely this present government could underwrite the co-operative. If, after they found on a thorough investigation by all departments that which would benefit all the people, and if they find that this is feasible, possible or economic, they could help out the producers and the consumers. This is something which is possible. The price of sugar to the consumer would be definitely reduced. It would not be directly opposing private industry and it would benefit everybody. No expense to the province of any kind; no expense to the treasury; the Minister of Agriculture has the department in their office now. They're not going to ask for more money if they look into it during the year, and if they are prepared to recommend it earlier, let them make the announcement. If it requires legislation, it seems worthwhile calling a special session, because it is in my opinion very important.

So I therefore very respectfully want to ask--before I finish I want to tell you that I had intended and prepared a much longer speech, but being one who believes in humanity and the welfare of the people, I don't want to worry them very much. But I do want to appeal, in view of the fact that this is not directly socialism, it's a question of improving the lot of our beet growers and the consumers--no expense of any kind to the government to do this gradually--I respectfully ask, as your last good deed in this House, support the resolution.

MR. EMIL MOELLER (Fisher): Madam Speaker, as a sugar beet grower in Manitoba, I'd like to make a little comment on the Honourable Member from Inkster's speech.

In 1925 was the first beginning of the first sugar company of Manitoba but nothing happened; this company fell by the wayside. Another company was formed in 1939 with New York and Belgian capital and part Manitoba, backed up by the government. I was one of the first farmers that signed a sugar beet contract to the extent of a hundred acres. My present contract is 150. The first year we didn't have the knowledge of growing beets in Manitoba and we had lots of hardships, but during and by the time we got over those hardships, we had to learn and we learned quickly by our mistakes.

The first contract the growers had for the company was based on the sugar content and for purity and by the world price. When the Manitoba farmers came to the company for a new contract in the spring and wanted a few cents more, the company said, "Well we have a counter proposal; we'd like to knock you down a little bit." So the farmers were disgusted every spring until the time of 1956 when the company was taken over by Canadian capital and a new management came to Winnipeg.

At that time the Manitoba beet growers got a participation contract, and this contract goes like this: By 100 pounds of sugar, when the price is \$6.50, the percentage to the grower is 59 percent; and then it goes up to 63 percent when the sugar price is \$8.50. At the present sugar price, the farmers of Manitoba are getting the full benefit of the price increase, so after all this is not just the company that takes all the profit. The Manitoba beet growers share in it and besides sharing in the sugar, they share to the tune of eight percent of the net of the by-products, that's molasses and pulp. So there you see in growing beets it's a risky thing. It's risky for the farmer; it's risky for sugar company; and that's why we have participation contracts. The farmer grows the beets; the company processes them; and when the sugar is made, refined, that grower shares that.

In 1961 the share of the grower was 60.88 percent due to the low sugar price, and it was still low in 1962 in May when the world sugar price reached the lowest point. At that time sugar, raw cane, in New York was just over \$2.00 a hundred, while during the Korean War the price was just about \$9.00. During the Suez crisis it was high too, but on the average, the sugar price has been very low. And why was the sugar price low? During the last ten years in the West Indies, in Cuba, over Europe and all over, there was so much sugar produced that there was a big surplus; and in the last three years, Cuba, what had produced eight million pounds of sugar a year--or 800 million pounds of sugar a year, was cut down to half in the last two years, and so all over the world. So it's no wonder today that the sugar price is high.

As the Honourable Member for Inkster says, prices are lower below the border. He mentioned Fargo. Well when we say Fargo, we think about Moorhead too, and there we have a big sugar refinery. Another point, the American farmer, or beet grower I should say, is highly subsidized, far more than the Canadian beet grower. When the prices drop too low in

(Mr. Moeller, cont'd).....Canada we are subsidized by the Federal Government, but the farmers aren't satisfied. That wasn't quite enough, what we were getting. The growers have asked for a national sugar policy for a good many years but never got one. As time goes on we hope that we will get a national sugar policy in Canada and the only one that benefits by this national sugar policy--or only two parties I should say--is the grower and the consumer. The sugar company doesn't get any benefit from subsidies paid by the government.

Therefore, I say we have a good company here, and during the last two years they have made a lot of improvements. Last year they had built or put in operation the big sugar silos which will net the beet grower to their former price 40 cents a ton. This year they are putting in what they call a continuing diffuser. It's a machine where the sliced sugar beets go in and where the sugar juice is extracted, and that machine cost the company \$550,000. So if the company keeps on like this and the farmer shares the 63 percent, we are not too bad off.

But who else is benefitting by the growing of sugar beets? It's our labour. The Manitoba Sugar Company pays out \$800,000 a year on wages, and when the Manitoba beet grower grows 30,000 acres of sugar beets and pays about \$20.00 on the average for thinning and hoeing, let's figure that out, it's \$600,000 what goes to the workers of Manitoba. In the last couple of years we lost what we call the immigrant labour and the beet growers had to go and look for Indian labour, and it's steady rising. In 1960 we had 1,200 people from the Indian Reserve of Manitoba. Their take-home pay was \$110,000 that year; 1961 and '62, where the acreage was smaller, the labour was done more by local labour and we didn't have so many Indians. But if we keep on going that's the best thing we have, a sugar company, privately owned, in Manitoba.

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

MR. PAULLEY: For the last time, Madam Speaker, Yeas and Nays, please.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Cherniack, Gray, Harris, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer and Wright.

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 7; Nays, 46.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having entered the House and being seated on the Throne, MADAM SPEAKER addressed His Honour in the following words:

May it please Your Honour: The Legislative Assembly at its present session has passed several Bills which, in the name of the Assembly, I present to Your Honour and to which Bills I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

MR. CLERK:

No. 2 - An Act to amend The Provincial Parks Act.

No. 3 - An Act to amend The Land Drainage Arrangement Act.

No. 4 - An Act to amend The Civil Service Act.

No. 5 - An Act to amend The Court of Appeal Act.

No. 6 - An Act to amend The Municipal Board Act.

No. 7 - An Act to validate Order-in-Council 1566/62.

No. 8 - An Act to amend The Local Government Districts Act.

No. 9 - An Act to amend The Municipal Boundaries Act.

No. 10 - An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture and Conservation Act.

No. 11 - An Act to amend The Noxious Weeds Act.

No. 12 - An Act to amend The St. James Charter.

No. 13 - An Act to amend An Act to Erect The Village of Beausejour into a Town Corporation.

No. 14 - An Act for the Relief of Leslie Lidstone and Lucienne Marie Lidstone.

No. 15 - An Act to validate By-law No. 32-1962 of the Town of Killarney and By-law

No. 12-1962 of The Rural Municipality of Turtle Mountain, and to add Certain Lands to the Town of Killarney.

Mr. Clerk (Cont'd.)

- No. 16 - An Act to incorporate the Nelson Financial Corporation.
- No. 17 - An Act to incorporate Bel Acres Golf & Country Club.
- No. 18 - An Act to amend The Women's Institutes Act.
- No. 19 - An Act to confirm a Certain Agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba.
- No. 20 - An Act to amend The School Attendance Act.
- No. 21 - An Act to amend The Game and Fisheries Act.
- No. 22 - An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act.
- No. 23 - An Act to amend The Municipal Act.
- No. 24 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act (1).
- No. 25 - An Act to amend The Tuberculosis Control Act.
- No. 26 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Greater Winnipeg Society for Christian Education.
- No. 27 - An Act for the Relief of Clifford Junghans, Henry Junghans, Albert Chezick and Harvey Chezick.
- No. 28 - An Act respecting Trustees of the Apostolic Temple Congregation in The City of Winnipeg, in the Province of Manitoba.
- No. 29 - An Act respecting Associates Mortgage Credit Limited.
- No. 30 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Community Chest of Greater Winnipeg.
- No. 31 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Trafalgar Savings and Loan Association.
- No. 32 - An Act to incorporate Holy Family Nursing Home.
- No. 33 - An Act to amend The Mortgage Act.
- No. 34 - An Act to provide for the Observance of Official Time in the Province.
- No. 35 - An Act to amend The Coroners Act.
- No. 36 - An Act to amend The Apprenticeship Act.
- No. 37 - An Act respecting Industrial-Talcott Financial Limited.
- No. 38 - An Act to incorporate Pine Falls General Hospital.
- No. 39 - An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act.
- No. 40 - An Act to amend The Soldier's Taxation Relief Act.
- No. 41 - An Act to amend The Education Department Act.
- No. 42 - An Act to incorporate The Elizabeth M. Crowe Memorial Hospital.
- No. 43 - An Act to amend The Wheat Board Money Trust Act.
- No. 44 - An Act to amend The Animal Husbandry Act (1).
- No. 45 - An Act to amend The Manitoba Teachers' Society Act.
- No. 46 - An Act to amend The Winter Employment Act.
- No. 47 - An Act to amend The Watershed Conservation Districts Act.
- No. 48 - An Act to amend The Fair Wage Act.
- No. 49 - An Act to amend an Act to incorporate The Garment Manufacturers and Employees Fund.
- No. 50 - An Act to amend The Mining Royalty and Tax Act.
- No. 51 - An Act to control and regulate the Distribution and Use of Pesticides.
- No. 52 - An Act for the Relief of Mytro Mandybura.
- No. 53 - An Act to incorporate Providence Ste. Therese.
- No. 54 - An Act to amend The Hospitals Act.
- No. 55 - An Act to amend The Jury Act.
- No. 56 - An Act to amend The Devolution of Estates Act.
- No. 57 - An Act to amend The Interpretation Act.
- No. 58 - An Act to amend The Time Sale Agreement Act.
- No. 61 - An Act to amend The Dairy Act.
- No. 62 - An Act respecting The Rural Municipality of Ste. Anne.
- No. 63 - An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act (1).
- No. 64 - An Act to amend The Public Buildings Act.
- No. 65 - An Act respecting C.A.C. Realty Limited.



(Mr. Clerk, cont'd)

- No. 66 - An Act respecting Niagara Mortgage & Loan Company Limited.
- No. 67 - An Act respecting grants to colleges affiliated with The University of Manitoba.
- No. 68 - An Act to repeal the Acts of Incorporation of Certain Corporations.
- No. 70 - An Act to amend The Greater Winnipeg Gas Distribution Act.
- No. 71 - An Act to amend the Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act.
- No. 72 - An Act to amend An Act for the Relief of the Estate of Charlie Young, Deceased.
- No. 73 - An Act to amend The Land Surveyors Act.
- No. 74 - An Act to amend The Judgments Act.
- No. 75 - An Act respecting The Central Trust Company of Canada.
- No. 76 - An Act to incorporate The Winnipeg Art Gallery.
- No. 77 - An Act respecting The Rural Municipality of Coldwell.
- No. 78 - An Act to validate By-law No. 44/62/B of The City of West Kildonan, By-law No. 689 of The Rural Municipality of Old Kildonan and By-law No. 427 of The Rural Municipality of West St. Paul.
- No. 79 - An Act to amend "An Act to amend and consolidate the Acts incorporating 'The Fidelity Trust Company' ".
- No. 80 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Sinking Fund Trustees of The Winnipeg School Division No. 1.
- No. 81 - An Act respecting the Administration and Conservation of Wild Life in the Province.
- No. 83 - An Act respecting Elevators.
- No. 84 - An Act to amend The Portage la Prairie Charter.
- No. 85 - An Act to provide for the Imposition of a Tax on Purchasers and Users of Motive Fuel.
- No. 86 - An Act to provide for the Imposition of a Tax on Purchasers and Users of Gasoline.
- No. 87 - An Act to establish a Manitoba Research Council.
- No. 88 - An Act to establish The Manitoba Export Corporation.
- No. 89 - An Act for the establishment of a Design Institute for Manitoba.
- No. 90 - An Act respecting the establishment of The Manitoba Development Authority.
- No. 91 - An Act to amend The Crown Lands Act.
- No. 92 - An Act to amend The Manitoba Hydro Act.
- No. 93 - An Act to amend The Public Libraries Act.
- No. 94 - An Act to amend The Income Tax (Manitoba), 1962.
- No. 95 - An Act to amend The Operating Engineers and Firemen Act.
- No. 96 - An Act to amend The Steam Pressure Plants Act.
- No. 97 - An Act to amend The Virden and District Elderly Persons Housing Corporation Act.
- No. 98 - An Act to incorporate Victoria Park Lodge and to authorize The Town of Souris and The Rural Municipality of Glenwood to make certain grants thereto.
- No. 99 - An Act to incorporate The Manitoba Centennial Corporation.
- No. 102 - An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956, and to validate By-laws Nos. 18696, 18760 and 18764.
- No. 103 - An Act to amend The Flin Flon Charter.
- No. 104 - An Act to incorporate The Civic Development Corporation.
- No. 105 - An Act respecting The Town of Steinbach.
- No. 106 - An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act (1).
- No. 107 - An Act to amend The Religious Societies Lands Act.
- No. 108 - An Act to amend The St. Boniface Charter, 1953.
- No. 109 - An Act respecting The Village of Glenboro.
- No. 110 - An Act to amend The Municipal Boundaries Act (2).
- No. 111 - An Act to amend The Animal Husbandry Act (2).
- No. 112 - An Act to amend The Securities Act.
- No. 113 - An Act to amend The Registered Nurses' Act.

(Mr. Clerk, cont'd)

- No. 114 - An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act (2).
- No. 115 - An Act to amend The Physiotherapists Act.
- No. 116 - An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act.
- No. 117 - An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act.
- No. 118 - An Act respecting the Control of Plant Pests and Plant Diseases.
- No. 119 - An Act to amend The Agricultural Credit Act.
- No. 120 - An Act to amend The Veterinary Services Act.
- No. 121 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act (2).
- No. 122 - An Act to provide for the Imposition of a Tax on Purchasers and Users of Tobacco.
- No. 123 - An Act to amend The Crop Insurance Test Areas Act.
- No. 124 - An Act to amend The Housing and Rehabilitation Act.
- No. 125 - An Act to amend The Rivers and Streams Act.
- No. 126 - An Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act.
- No. 127 - An Act to amend The Testator's Family Maintenance Act.
- No. 128 - An Act to amend The Surrogate Courts Act.
- No. 129 - An Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.
- No. 130 - An Act to amend Certain Provisions of the Statute Law and to correct Certain Typographical Errors in the Statutes.
- No. 131 - An Act to provide for the Repeal of The Debt Adjustments Act.
- No. 132 - An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.
- No. 133 - An Act to provide for Pensions and Disability Allowances for Teachers.
- No. 134 - An Act to vest the Title to Certain Lands in Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada.
- No. 135 - An Act to amend The Health Services Act.
- No. 136 - An Act to amend The Psychiatric Nurses Association Act.
- No. 137 - An Act to validate By-law No. 4-63 of The Village of Crystal City.
- No. 138 - An Act to amend The Psychiatric Nurses Training Act.
- No. 139 - An Act to amend The Prearranged Funeral Services Act.

MADAM SPEAKER: We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and Government, and beg for Your Honour the acceptance of these Bills:

- No. 60 - An Act for granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year ending the 31st day of March, 1964.
- No. 100 - An Act to authorize The Expenditure of Moneys for various Capital Purposes and to authorize the Borrowing of the same (1).
- No. 101 - An Act to authorize the Expenditure of Moneys for various Capital Purposes and to authorize the Borrowing of the same (2).

MR. CLERK: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence and assents to these bills in Her Majesty's name. Your Honour, may I add to the list previously read:

Bill No. 140 - An Act for the Relief of the Community commonly known as Bissett.

In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to this Bill.

HIS HONOUR ERRICK F. WILLIS (Lieutenant-Governor): Madam Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly: The work of the First Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature has now been completed. I wish to commend the Members for their faithful attention to their duties, including many hours devoted to consideration of Bills and Estimates, both in the House and in the Committees. I convey to you my appreciation of your concern for the public interest and for the general welfare of our Province.

I thank you for providing the necessary sums of money for carrying on the public business. It will be the intention of my Ministers to ensure that these sums will be expended with both efficiency and economy by all departments of the government.

(Mr. Willis, cont'd)

In relieving you now of your present duties and declaring the First Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature prorogued, I give you my best wishes and pray that under the guidance of Divine Providence, our Province may continue to provide the things which are necessary for the health, the happiness, the well-being of all our people.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly. It is the will and pleasure of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor that this Legislative Assembly be prorogued until it shall please His Honour to summon the same for the dispatch of business, and the Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.