

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. D. Watt	Reston, Manitoba
ASSINIBOIA	Steve Patrick	189 Harris Blvd., Winnipeg 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Hon. Robert G. Smellie, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	E. R. Schreyer	2 - 1177 Henderson Hwy., Winnipeg 16
BURROWS	Mark G. Smerchanski	102 Handsart Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARILLON	Leonard A. Barkman	Steinbach, Man.
CHURCHILL	Gordon W. Beard	Thompson, Man.
CYPRESS	Hon. Thelma Forbes	Rathwell, Man.
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	William Homer Hamilton	Sperling, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Kimberly St., Winnipeg 15
EMERSON	John P. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT-PLAINS	M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q. C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	Emil Moeller	Teulon, Man.
FLIN FLON	Hon. Charles H. Witney	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	Nelson Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	Morris A. Gray	406 - 365 Hargrave St., Winnipeg 2
KILDONAN	James T. Mills	142 Larchdale Crescent, Winnipeg 15
LAC DU BONNET	Oscar F. Bjornson	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
LA VERENDRYE	Albert Vielfaure	La Broquerie, Man.
LOGAN	Lemuel Harris	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEDOSA	Hon. Walter Weir	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MORRIS	Harry P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Hon. Obie Baizley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
PEMBINA	Mrs. Carolyne Morrison	Manitou, Man.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	Gordon E. Johnston	7 Massey Drive, Portage la Prairie
RADISSON	Russell Paulley	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
RHINELAND	J. M. Froese	Winkler, Man.
RIVER HEIGHTS	Hon. Maitland B. Steinkopf, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROBLIN	Keith Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	Hon. Abram W. Harrison	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	Hon. George Hutton	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	J. E. Jeannotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent Desjardins	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
ST. GEORGE	Elman Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guildford St., St. James, Winnipeg 12
ST. JOHN'S	Saul Cherniack, Q. C.	333 St. John's Ave., Winnipeg 4
ST. MATTHEWS	W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Fred Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	Room 250, Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q. C.	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	Arthur E. Wright	168 Burrin Ave., Winnipeg 17
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	Fred T. Klym	Beausejour, Man.
SWAN RIVER	James H. Bilton	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	P. J. McDonald	Killarney, Man.
VIRDEN	Donald Morris McGregor	Kenton, Man.
WELLINGTON	Richard Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	James Cowan, Q. C.	412 Paris Bldg., Winnipeg 2
WOLSELEY	Hon. Duff Roblin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, March 6, 1964

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions

MR. CLERK: The petition of Joseph Halprin and others, praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba. The petition of Allan Abraham Hoffman and others, praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate The Winnipeg Hebrew Free School. The petition of Trafalgar Savings Association praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Trafalgar Savings Corporation.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin) introduced Bill No. 82, an Act to incorporate The Wasagaming Foundation.

MR. JAMES COWAN (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 83, an Act to incorporate Fort Garry Trust Company.

MR. COWAN introduced Bill No. 87, an Act respecting Wellington Credit Corporation Limited.

MR. COWAN introduced Bill No. 79, an Act respecting York Trust and Savings Corporation.

MR. COWAN introduced Bill No. 59, an Act to incorporate Investors Syndicate Limited.

MR. COWAN introduced Bill No. 60, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Investors Syndicate of Canada Limited.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James) introduced Bill No. 80, an Act for the relief of Helen Radclyffe and Edward Frank Radclyffe.

MR. COWAN introduced Bill No. 77, an Act respecting the City Savings and Trust Company.

MR. COWAN introduced Bill No. 81, an Act respecting Montreal Trust Mortgage Corporation.

MRS. C. MORRISON (Pembina) introduced Bill No. 47, an Act to incorporate Mutual Trust Company.

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota) introduced Bill No. 84, an Act to incorporate the Hamiota Golf Club.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland) introduced Bill No. 88, an Act to incorporate Eden Mental Health Centre.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are 30 Grade 11 to 12 students from Emerson School under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Blewett and Miss Williamson. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Emerson. There are some 24 Grades 7 and 8 students from MacDonald School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Watson. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Lakeside. There are 50 Grade 8 students from Deer Lodge High School under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Mayer and Mr. Pemberton. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. James. We welcome you here this afternoon. We hope that all that you see and hear in this Legislative Assembly will be of help to you in your studies. May this visit be an inspiration to you and stimulate your interest in provincial affairs. Come back and visit us again. Orders of the Day.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier & Provincial Treasurer)(Wolseley): Madam Speaker, before the Orders are called I would like to lay on the table a Return to an Address by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose voted on February 11th with respect to correspondence between the government and the Rural Municipality of Fort Garry.

While I'm on my feet, Madam, perhaps it would be in order to inform the House that I have been in telephone conversation this morning with the Prime Minister's office in Ottawa with respect to the situation at Cranberry Portage and the intimation we have had that the

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . facilities will be closed to the detriment of that community, and particularly to the detriment of the school system in that area. I have requested of the Prime Minister's office that someone in authority be sent to visit with us here in Winnipeg in order that we may come to some mutually satisfactory agreement in respect of this matter and may take the necessary arrangements to deal with the problems which we foresee with respect to the people who are living at Cranberry at the present time. I was sure that in due course I would have word on this but I wanted the House to know that the contact with the Prime Minister's office had been made.

Now there's another statement I would like to make if I would have permission to do so. It has to do with the matter raised in the Committee of Supply last night by the Honourable Member for Radisson. I think both he and I may be absent this evening and as a courtesy to him I would like to give the information now so that it would be before the House, if that is agreeable. It has to do with the apparent discrepancy in the amount set out as a receipt from Ottawa as their share of the payment of the work on the Red River Floodway in the coming fiscal year. The agreement with Ottawa provides for a sharing of costs, as members know, between Canada and this province, on an approximate 58-42 sharing basis across the board. Canada in fact pays 75 percent of excavation costs and 37-1/2 percent of structural costs. There is no specific provision in the agreement for the size of the annual payment, but this province has, from the beginning, taken the position that Canada would pay as the work proceeded and in order to proceed with the work according to the schedule for completion that was accepted in the agreement, their share for 1964-5 would be \$11,907,000 as shown in the estimate book. This was the figure and the calculation that was put in at the time the estimates were drawn up. Subsequent to the closing of the estimates in December, a letter was received from the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources stating that he would be prepared to contribute 7.4 million as the federal share in 1964-5, and was prepared to seek approval for annual contributions of this amount which would enable the project to be completed according to plan. So from this letter it is obvious that the federal government intend to pay their share on an equal annual basis for the four or five years remaining before the project is completed, while in fact the expenditures will differ from this because there will be greater expenditures in some years -- in the early years than in the latter. On the basis of equal contributions, therefore, there will obviously be years -- and 1964-5 is one of them -- when the province will have to finance the federal share and recover in subsequent years of lesser expenditure. Regardless of the timing of the federal contribution to the project, regardless of the timing, the federal contribution to the project is in no way changed and is fixed by the original agreement. Authority for financing the federal share is contained in section 41, subsection 1, subsection (d) of The Treasury Act, which provides for powers to make payments by the Provincial Treasurer under agreements of this nature with the federal government. From the conversations we have had with them this morning I expect that the sum of \$7.4 million will be shown ultimately in the federal estimates as being their contribution for this year. We are showing what we believe will actually be spent. The federal contribution will be somewhat less than we have indicated is their share for this year, but they make it up in subsequent payments. In the meantime the province has authority under The Treasury Act to take care of the necessary financing of that federal share. I trust that sheds a little light on a rather complicated subject.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I thank the First Minister for his statement. Certainly the answers that we got last night left the matter very much in the air. I would like to have a copy of the statement if possible, Madam Speaker, before this evening's resumption of Committee of Supply, because I think that we may have to have some further questions at that time from the Minister of Agriculture on this subject, and we will of course not have had Hansard by then.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I regret to tell my honourable friend that, while I had this statement in front of me, I said a good deal more than was in the statement because there are just one or two notes here. I expanded on it considerably so I haven't got anything written for him.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Madam Speaker, I know we cannot debate the statement that is before us. I thank the Honourable the

(Mr. Paulley, Cont'd.) . . . First Minister for at least a partial explanation of the questions that were raised by myself in the debate yesterday evening. There's still, however, Madam Speaker, may I warn my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer there still is a discrepancy of 2-1/4 or \$2,400,000 between the announced amount that the newspapers carried as being the federal contribution of \$5 million and the \$7.4 million that my honourable friend has just informed us that he hopes to get. However, he's perfectly correct, Madam Speaker, that he and I will not be around this evening to debate this at least between the two of us. I'm sure that my colleagues in my group, notwithstanding the statement of my friend the Leader of the Opposition, my colleagues in my group will take up the position -- the cudgels, thank you -- the cudgels that I raised yesterday, and it does seem to me that the Province of Manitoba, by the statement of my honourable friend the First Minister, is putting itself in the same position as the province puts the school boards of Manitoba in respect of having to cough up for grants that are forthcoming sometime.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, could I have permission to explain the point raised by my honourable friend about the difference between 5 million and 7.4. We enquired of this as well this morning, and the best answer that could be given us in the hour or so they were on the telephone with Ottawa was that they did expect that the correct figure would be 7 million 4 in line with the undertaking received from the Minister of Northern Affairs, and that final estimate figures, regardless of what appeared in the newspaper, had not yet been prepared in this respect, so I think that we can account for that difference and my understanding is that the Ottawa people will be putting in the 7.4. The difference between us and the school boards, I guess, is that we are willing to finance this with the view of getting on with the job. We don't like it but we do it.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce)(Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, I'd like to inform the House that today I have received a volume under the title Overhaul and Stores Base Facilities for Trans-Canada Airlines, Air Canada, as prepared for the Minister of Transport, Ministre de Transport, Canada, R. Dixon-Speas Associates, February 1964. We received one copy only, have asked for further copies. When they arrive they will be tabled, I hope, in sufficient copies at least to have each group with one copy. It is a substantial volume, some 200 pages. We are proceeding to study it at once and see where it leads us from there.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to table a Return to an Order of the House, No. 18, on a motion from the Honourable Member for St. George dated February 25th, with questions and answers.

HON. R. G. SMELLIE, Q.C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order No. 22 in the name of the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . I want to thank the Minister of Industry and Commerce for his statement that we will be receiving copies of the Dixon-Speas -- well, that we hope. Will the Province of Manitoba prepare a summary and will the Minister be prepared to make a statement on this in the reasonably near future?

MR. EVANS: I have not been able to formulate any plans in this connection in the short time that I've had the volume.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, if I may, in connection with the receipt of the report of the Dixon-Speas Committee, may I suggest to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce or to the First Minister that after a summary is prepared -- and I presume that there will be a summary compiled by the Government of Manitoba -- may I respectfully suggest that inasmuch as there was considerable interest by many different segments of the economy of the Province of Manitoba, in travelling two or three times to Ottawa in respect of the transfer of the employees of TCA to Montreal, may I respectfully suggest that after the report is considered, Madam Speaker, that the government, the Minister, take under consideration and advisement as to whether or not a meeting should be called of those who went to Ottawa on these various occasions in the interest of TCA, to see whether or not they might be able to add to any future plans that the government may have in the battle to retain TCA here in Manitoba.

MR. ROBLIN: I will undertake to comment on the suggestion, Madam Speaker, It took

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . the federal authorities four months to expurgate this edition, so it's going to take us a little time to decide what the right policy should be to follow on respect of it.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I might suggest to the two honourable gentlemen, all they have to do is vote for the sub-amendment we have introduced on the resolution in regard to TCA and it will accomplish exactly what they're talking about.

MR. PAULLEY: May I respectfully suggest, Madam Speaker, my suggestion is to take once again into confidence the representatives of all segments of the community that were interested in this and notwithstanding the suggestion of my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition, his sub-amendment might be construed by many as being purely a political sub-amendment whereas we did journey, Madam Speaker, to Ottawa on a non-political basis.

MR. MOLGAT: My friend better learn to read.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I noticed the other day where someone said that nothing enrages a politician so much as to find out that the other side is playing politics.

MR. M. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, may I direct a question to the First Minister? I, as one of the Canadians, am very much concerned about the change of name. I think, I suspect -- I haven't got direct evidence -- that this is a move against the success of the TCA, and because the name, change of the name, will absolutely interfere with the volume of business where the TCA after years of hard work and starvation and being a first in the field because they needed it with

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please! What is the point of the question?

MR. GRAY: All right, the question is whether anything can be done by this province to revert the name of the TCA to its original name.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, this is a matter which falls exclusively within the jurisdiction of the federal government.

MR. N. SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wonder if I could direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities, and just simply ask him if he is prepared at this time to give me the answers to the questions I put on Tuesday relative to the power toboggans. He says that "I will supply you tomorrow" which would be Wednesday, and I know there is no tomorrow, but I expected that "tomorrow" was last Wednesday.

HON. MAITLAND STEINKOPF, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Public Utilities) ((River Heights): The answer to the question is that it -- I have a partial answer for it now. There are some 20-odd toboggans owned by one department and some of them have been licenced but I'm trying to get the information for all of the departments. I think you'd want the answer complete when you get it.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Health. I asked him yesterday what were the proposals of the Manitoba government with regard to the use of Deer Lodge Hospital, which I understand the Federal government is waiting to hear from the Province of Manitoba, and he advised me then that he would consider this and let me know later. Is he prepared to make a statement yet?

HON. C. R. WITNEY (Minister of Health)(Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, the chairman of the Hospital Commission was out of town yesterday. An answer will be given Monday.

MR. J. P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works. This was drawn to my attention by a certain party, and I wonder whether the Department of Public Works, or who is responsible, gave permission to Metro to set up signs with these -- great big signs with letters "40" like I noticed down St. Vital Road -- the letter 40 on it, or the numerals 40 on it. Is it within the jurisdiction of Public Works?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works)(Minnedosa): Madam Speaker, with regard to the signs that were set up with Metro, the Department of Public Works did agree with Metro that it might be a good idea to establish Metro routes which would lead throughout the Metropolitan area. I don't know whether they were aware of the type of sign, the wording on the sign or anything of that nature, but they certainly were aware, and I was aware, of Metro's desire to attempt to find some easier means of providing route markers throughout the city, and it does fall within our jurisdiction of co-operation with Metro, and we have agreed that it is worth some study along these lines.

MR. TANCHAK: A supplementary question. I'm not opposing that, but would the Minister think that motorists who are apprehended because they mistook the numeral 40 for a speed limit -- 40 -- and were apprehended by the officials, would he agree with me that they should be prosecuted? Because I had a complaint -- that's my only reason.

MR. WEIR: Well, Madam Speaker, the honourable member has had more than I've had. I've never heard of a complaint. I don't know what the circumstances are. You'd have to know the circumstances of the case before you would know. What the similarity is between color and other things I'm really not too well aware. I really can't answer his question.

MR. TANCHAK: . . . ask the Minister. I wonder if the Minister would agree with me that an ordinary motorist, as he's driving he's concentrating on the road and he looks up and he sees the 40, he mistakes it for speed?

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Wouldn't the Honourable Minister agree that the control of the sign designs in Manitoba should be under the Department of Public Works so that there will not be such confusion?

MR. WEIR: Madam Speaker, it depends on these areas. It's an experimental basis. We do have to learn from these experiments on occasion, and quite frankly I've had no report on it; just what I've seen in the newspaper is all I know about it, and I'm not prepared to comment on that basis.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. How many lapel buttons bearing the Coat-of-Arms of Manitoba have been purchased since their origin? 2. How many have been distributed? 3. To whom are they issued? 4. Who is entitled to receive a supply of the same for distribution? 5. The cost of the same?

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. How many awards were given by the Government in the calendar years 1962 and 1963 in connection with the Order of the Buffalo Hunt? 2. How many Bronze Buffaloes were awarded? 3. To whom were they awarded? 4. Why were they awarded? 5. How many Certificates were awarded; to whom, and for what reason?

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. The number of license plates purchased by the Government and Crown agencies for which the additional \$5.00 fee was charged in order that the previous plate number would be retained. 2. The number of license plates purchased by the Government for privately-owned cars.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) How many prisoners were released from Headingly Gaol for the last twelve month period available? (2) How many of those released in that twelve month period have returned?

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. How many receptions have been held at Government expense for visitors, including business prospects, governmental and diplomatic visitors, and others? 2. A list showing the breakdown of such receptions given

(Mr. Paulley, Cont'd.) . . . by each individual department of Government, and the cost broken down by departments for the last twelve months' period for which records are available.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. The number of trips made by Ministers of the Crown outside of the Province of Manitoba for the last twelve-month period for which records are available. 2. The purpose of such trips. 3. The cost of such trips. 4. A breakdown by departments of such trips and costs.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I presume my honourable friend will be happy if we limit this Return to trips made on government business. I don't suppose he wishes to inquire into our personal activities. On that understanding, I accept the Order.

MR. PAULLEY: I assure my honourable friend he can travel to Bermuda or Havana as many times as he likes. I'm not at all interested -- providing it's on private business, and not at governmental expense.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I've never been to any of those places. It sounds interesting.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. The number of flights made by Government-owned planes carrying Ministers of the Crown within the Province of Manitoba while on Departmental business. 2. The number of flights used by Ministers of the Crown on other than Departmental business, showing destination and purpose of flight. The above for the last twelve-months period for which records are available.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: The failure rate in each of the Grade 11 and 12 subjects for which departmental examinations were written in the year 1961 and 1963: (a) Actual or raw rate of failure. (b) The final failure rate after adjustment.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education)(Gimli): Madam Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would let this stand. I am looking for certain matters with respect to this type of information. If he'll let it stand today . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, this Order for Return -- it's been mutually agreed to let it stand, and I ask permission to do so.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. The amount of Climax Timothy Seed that is available for distribution this year in Manitoba through the Manitoba Department of Agriculture. 2. The amount allotted to each applicant. 3. The basis for determining eligibility of growers. 4. The names of growers who will receive allotments this year.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for

(Mr. Guttormson, Cont'd.) . . . Emerson, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. The names of the firms tendering on the Manitoba 1964 auto license plates. 2. The amount of the tenders submitted by each firm. 3. The name of the firm that received the award and the price quoted.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following information with regard to the proposed Manitoba Arts Centre: 1. The legal description of all parcels of land purchased to date. 2. From whom they were purchased and the amounts paid. 3. Whether in all cases the person, and/or firm from whom they were purchased were the registered owners, and if not, the name of the registered owner. 4. By whom they were purchased. 5. Commission and/or fees paid with respect to each parcel and to whom they were paid. 6. Whether any of these parcels of land had previously changed hands within the past six years and the details of each transaction, giving the name of the buyer, the name of the seller, the amount paid and any other considerations involved.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: I just wanted to say that in so far as this information is available to us or can be obtained by us we will provide it.

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 Member for St. James, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Wellington, and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I adjourn the debate for the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, in view of the announcement today by the government that the Dixon-Speas report is now public, I would appreciate the permission of the House to allow this to stand so that I can at least see the news report which I presume will be carried by news media today and tomorrow. I would be prepared to speak on Tuesday. I however have no objection if anyone else wishes to speak.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The Adjourned Debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks. The Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, the Member for St. Boniface has been ill for the past few days. He adjourned this debate for the Honourable Member for Selkirk, and he will proceed.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Thank you, Madam. Madam, this resolution has been fairly thoroughly debated and I will endeavour in the course of my remarks to confine myself to arguments that so far have not been advanced. In the first place, this resolution only asks for the lowering of the voting age to 18 years. I'd like to point out that the lowering of the voting age per se will not change the qualifications of the person seeking election to this Assembly or to a municipal council or to a school board. And although this may seem to be incongruous, inconsistent and illogical, it can be justified on the grounds that we are dealing with a legal status which can best be described as the most inconsistent of the inconsistent, and the most illogical of the illogical. I refer to the legal status of an infant, that is, a person under the age of 21 years.

To give you an example of the inconsistencies to which I refer, under our law two young people of the age of 18 years can get married without their parents' consent; they can buy a home; but under our law they cannot sell that home unless they do so under an order of a court of competent jurisdiction. Now, if for any reason they were induced by false pretences or otherwise to purchase that home, they have no right to bring an action in their own names; they have to bring that action in the name of an "x" friend; and going further, if any marital difficulties arise between these two young people, one could not divorce the other without suing in the name of an "x" friend, and the other party to the contract could not defend unless that other

(Mr. Hillhouse, Cont'd.) . . . party defended through a guardian litem.

Now I'm merely pointing these things out to show to you that by reducing the voting age to 18 years we still will have certain inconsistencies relating to the legal status of infants, and I want to make that clear to the House so that no one is going to accuse me of creating a situation which brings about an inconsistency. What I'd like to point out is that we're dealing with inconsistencies and we're dealing with matters which cannot be construed as being logical.

I therefore do not support this resolution, Madam, on the grounds of logic or consistency -- unless consistency can be construed as continuing to be inconsistent -- but simply because I believe that the time has come for us to take some action to overcome the general apathy which appears to characterize most of our elections in the Province of Manitoba. I feel that if democracy is to survive it is incumbent upon us to do everything within our power to create a greater interest in public affairs, and I am of the opinion that if we do lower the voting age there is a possibility that such action on our part would overcome the lack of interest shown by adults in this province today.

It is true, Madam, that I have not always felt this way. It is also true that a number of years ago I opposed a similar resolution when it was brought into this Chamber, but I now feel that I was wrong in my attitude on that occasion and I am speaking on behalf of this resolution to try and put matters right. If our youth of today are as bad as they have been painted by the Honourable Member for Hamiota, I feel that we as legislators, adults and/or parents have, by our negative attitude, contributed to this situation, and I think that it is incumbent upon us to take a more positive attitude towards changing that situation. I cannot accept the general indictment of youth made by the Member for Hamiota, nor can I agree that the affair at Fort Lauderdale to which he referred is symptomatic of the general lawlessness of youth. I do not condone what happened there but I do not accept this occurrence as anything more than a spontaneous demonstration worked up by what youth calls a "jazz session."

Now on the other side of the coin, Madam, I would like to refer to the City of Jacksonville in Florida some two or three hundred miles away from Fort Lauderdale. There we have a municipal judge by the name of Judge Santora, and Judge Santora has initiated in his court a jury of youth consisting of six individuals, and he employs that youth jury in all cases in which juveniles are involved. Now in the words of Judge Santora, he says, "Almost always I accept my youth jury's recommendation of sentence, although I may modify it. They can see through youngsters' lies or recognize the truth of their statements as I cannot. They know family backgrounds and they understand youthful reactions which often seem strange to an older person. They have no patience with legal flim flam. They are observant, thoughtful and, as I have found in many trials, impressively just." This statement, Madam, by an experienced judge, and I might say a very highly respected judge, of a municipal court, is worthy of consideration, and I think that it goes to show that the incident quoted by the Honourable Member for Hamiota is simply an isolated incident.

I believe, Madam, that the best way to create responsibility is to place responsibility, and I think there's no better example of that than in the Jewish faith where a boy at 13 takes his bar mitzvah and becomes a full-fledged member of the synagogue. I think that that is one factor which has contributed more than anything else to the very very low incidence of delinquency among the Jewish people. I believe that the Jewish people have the lowest rate of crime participation or juvenile delinquency of any other group of people in the North American continent.

I feel too, Madam, that if our youth today are not sufficiently interested in public affairs the fault lies with us and lies with our educational system, and since we control our educational system the remedy lies with us to correct that lack of interest in public affairs. I appreciate, Madam, that this is not an easy resolution upon which to vote, that there are divergent viewpoints sincerely and conscientiously held and expressed, but I do urge this House to pass this resolution and thus make the period of 18 to 21 a period of apprenticeship towards full citizenship.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I too want to say a few words on this resolution but I probably can say that my colleague who has just spoken took some of the thunder out, so I promise to make my presentation very, very short. We have heard, mostly from the opposite side, from the government side, opposition to this resolution, and there were different

(Mr. Tanchak, Cont'd.) . . . objections to it. Some were of the opinion that our children should stay as children a little while longer, at least up to the age of 21; and some -- I think it was one of the ministers, the Minister of Agriculture, told us the students do not want this privilege; why ram it down their throats? I disagree there because I think quite a number of the students do want this privilege, and I know that if they do get it they'll respect it.

Now, just to answer some of those objections or fears of the members opposite, I'm going to try to put them at ease. For those who worry about extending the vote to many who are uninterested or uninformed about politics, I would like to say this. The same built-in protection applies to those over 21 who are not too concerned about politics. Why? Because they don't even come to vote.

For those who say that our democracy is not ready for it I would say it would be undemocratic to deny these young people who are interested the right to vote, unless there are very very strong arguments against it, and these have not yet been presented. By age 18 many people have completed their education and are about as ready, in this respect, to vote as they ever will be, but if they are still continuing their education, either in the school or at the university level, between the ages of 18 and 21, they may actually be better qualified by this education to cast a vote than some of the general public who already has a vote and who is qualified over the age of 21.

Now the one I heard, that it may disrupt our country, here is the answer I have for that. For those who fear that people 18 to 21 will vote with regard to some of the special interests of this age group, I would like to remind them of the special voting fears that delayed the vote for women, not so long ago. Objections were that the women will neglect their household duties, the husbands will never know where they are at a given time, but when they finally did get this vote the country did not fall apart like they predicted; in fact, some -- and mostly women -- say that our democracy is so much the better because of this privilege given to the women. Ruin, and ruin again. We'll be ruined if the young people get the right to vote. That's what we hear. And I would say that the younger people are more idealistic than we are, the older ones. Their hopes and beliefs are just a little bit higher. They're younger. They're less tolerant of corruption and inefficiency. The older people probably have seen corruption and inefficiency and lived with it, so we, or the people who have lived through it, are less hopeful, are more and more inclined to accept it as it is, status quo. The younger people are more inclined to accept progressive ideas, more inclined than the older people. Their viewpoint may act as a counterbalance to some of the people who have reached an age of senility.

Now, some say we know better. We older people tend to live in the past. The younger people tend to be closer to the present and to the future. They still have the better part of their lives ahead of them, while some of we older ones are guided by short-term expectations and simple and few desires; and the most important thing that I would say is, let us not forget that to vote against this resolution and deny -- not only deny the young people the right to vote, but I am going to say that it also insults their intelligence. I hope that this resolution receives unanimous acceptance.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, not seeing anyone else wishing to speak I will close the debate. First of all, Madam Speaker, I would like to thank those who took part in the discussion on this resolution and, while I might not agree with them all, I think it was a good discussion. I am disappointed, though, in the attitude of the Conservative group in regard to the lowering of the age for voting, because this committee at Ottawa that has accepted the idea of lowering the voting age also was composed of Conservatives and I happened to find a pamphlet used in the last election by our Conservative friends when the emphasis was on youth. This jet-aged government, who spoke about what they had done in education, where the high school enrollment was up 45 percent and where Grade 12 is up now 91 percent, and on the front page of their pamphlet, Building a New Manitoba, the Premier is shown surrounded by some fine-looking young people.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . that picture was taken in my honourable friend's constituency and a mighty good picture it was, too.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you very much, because, Madam Speaker, I had some of my constituents call me -- I have the names of the pupils here -- fine looking young people -- it was

(Mr. Wright, Cont'd.) . . . taken at a delayed commencement exercise in the West Kildonan Collegiate, February of 1962 -- and I know these young people personally, and I have the very highest of faith in them, so I say again that I am disappointed that this government who sees fit to place such emphasis on youth suddenly there was quite a scramble the other day to oppose the resolution considering the lowering of the voting age, when in Ottawa a committee consisting of the members of their party also agreed to the lowering of the voting age.

Now if the pamphlet shows faith in the future of the country and the emphasis is on youth, then it's a far cry from what the Honourable Member from Hamiota had to say about our young people, and I would like to quote from Hansard, Madam Speaker; and I'm quoting. He said, "Madam Speaker, it seems to me that young people are rebelling against government and law and order. They have lost respect for authority." This is his impression. Later on he says, "To my mind, Madam Speaker, while this particular age group is in the developing stages we shouldn't allow them to identify themselves with any political party." Madam Speaker, I want to use my honourable colleague on my left as an example, who first became interested in politics at the age of 16, and I know that we all here agree that he's a credit to this House.

The honourable member goes on again, Madam Speaker, to say, "I believe it's a pretty insecure world that our young people are growing up in. It is even complicated for adults." He says that "surely young people are searching for security and safety and isn't this one of the main reasons why we have organized gangs in our cities today?" I don't follow him in his reasoning there. And he goes on to say, "Don't they follow fashions at the expense of integrity?" I fail to see where wearing black jackets has anything to do with integrity. "Don't they dread to be alone? They don't want to stand up and be different. They only want to conform." Well, the boys and girls I refer you to on this certainly conform but I don't see what that has to do with their integrity. He says, "Surely we shouldn't be asking this group of people to be electing governments, and surely we shouldn't accept conformity just to have uniformity in the voting ages." Now I submit, Madam Speaker, that the honourable member has expressed absolutely no faith in our young people by these statements. While his government is placing a lot of emphasis on "we must have faith in the future", I fail to see where he is consistent in his reasoning here. But he goes on to say a little later, though, that many in the 18 to 21 age group would be capable of voting, and again later on he said he didn't want to be over-critical of our young people, and he said he didn't think it would make much difference anyway, because he went on to quote that the president of our University has said and I quote: "Dr. Saunderson, the president of the University believes that there would be no change in the results of voting if we allowed 18 year olds to cast their ballots." In other words, with all the fear he has about young people and their tendency towards gangsterism he goes on to say that well, it wouldn't make much difference anyway. And whether they join one political party or the other, they would, as Dr. Saunderson said, follow pretty much the pattern of the voting of their parents.

I was at a loss to understand why all the opposition on that side of the House. The Minister of Agriculture, when he spoke, he said that he trusted young people. He said that he wasn't the least bit worried about their judgment -- I'm trying to find this here, Madam Speaker. He said, and I quote: "Now, I have the greatest admiration for youth" but he still doesn't want to, with all his admiration he's not -- and later on he said, "so I'm not afraid of their judgment." Not afraid of their judgment, but at the same time he doesn't want to give them the vote, and he says, "I think we expect too much from youth today, and we give too little." Madam Speaker, I have found, in trying to guide young people, and I've had some considerable experience in having been a supervisor in industry where we have apprentices to deal with, I have found that in trying to guide them that you don't keep on reminding them of their immaturity. You don't keep telling them that they're not ready. When you have a little child and you want it to walk you take it by the hand and encourage it. You don't keep telling it, "Now you're not ready to walk yet. It's a little too soon. You can't do it," and all this sort of thing, because that, I think you will agree, is not the right way to go about it. You have to instill confidence, just as you would trying to teach a child to swim.

My father used to say that self-pity was the worst of all afflictions, and here again, in looking through Hansard, I happened to see that it was the honourable members from that side of the House who were simply feeling very, very sorry for our young people, because I noted here, we're talking about the added burdens. The Honourable Member for Springfield when he

(Mr. Wright, Cont'd.) . . . spoke referred to the added burdens here. He said that "we're seeing our young people becoming old men and women in a hurry," and he quoted them as saying, "How much do we care about this country's affairs?" The Honourable Minister of Agriculture when he spoke said that we didn't want to hobble our young people, and he said "Then why do we want to hobble or why do we want to hobble the spirit of youth with this further responsibility?" Here again the emphasis is being placed on "we mustn't give our young people responsibility." And I submit, Madam Speaker, it's only when you treat them like adults and give them responsibilities that they are able to accept them. "We expect them to do too much," the Honourable Minister of Agriculture said. "We expect too much from youth today and we give too little. We must give more of ourselves," he said. Well, if you give them encouragement, if you give them recognition, then give them responsibilities, I think that you will find this would be the right idea.

Now there was no compulsion in this matter. We are not compelling young people to vote. We're simply extending them a right. We're giving them a little recognition, and those who don't want to vote -- and if 50 percent, as was said, do not want to vote, that's fine, but at least we are not stopping the many young people who are interested, we're not depriving them of the right to vote, 'cause I know of many, many young people who are capable and ready to vote. And whether they are asking for it or not doesn't put up much of an argument to me, because I think that just as we take the little child by the hand and encourage it to walk or teach the child to swim, we have to instill in them the confidence we have in them to do this, and I would like to show my confidence in them. My honourable colleague for St. John's said that youth has the greatest stake in the future of this country.

In the paper the other day there was an article from Regina on March 3rd, and I quote of the Winnipeg Tribune: "David Jenkins of Edmonton, national president of the Canadian University Students, said Monday night that Canada would profit if persons at 18 had the responsibility of casting ballots and learning the political issues. At this age level they are impressionable and developing interests which will guide their actions for the rest of their lives." And I submit -- I don't know what sort of company the honourable members keep but the youth that I know, many of them are certainly ready to accept this responsibility, and I take it that their national president of the Canadian University Students is a responsible person. I think he should know about what he speaks. It was stated the other day that President Kennedy himself said that he thought that at age 21 young people were already getting too far away from their schooling. He thought that they should have the vote a little earlier.

Now, Madam Speaker, I don't want to speak at length. There's been a lot said on this subject. As I said before, I presented this resolution with the idea of bringing out some interesting arguments. I thank the honourable members again, because I respect their opinions. This isn't an easy matter to decide, but from my experience with young people I think that if we do give them the responsibilities they will accept the challenge.

MR. F. GROVES (St. Vital): Would the honourable member permit a question? Would you agree that it would be all right also to change the law to allow 18 year olds into beer parlours and cocktail lounges?

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Speaker, that's rather an irrelevant question. I haven't considered this matter. I'm not going to.

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the adjourned debate and the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks.

A standing vote was taken with the following result:

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

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannottee, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McLean, Martin, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 18; Nays, 31.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Carillon and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Fisher, and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Emerson. The Honourable the Member for Emerson.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, again I'll be very brief. This resolution calling for all secondary highways to be accepted by the government as 100 percent government roads -- there has been quite a bit of opposition to this resolution and as general it comes from the government backbenchers, and also the Minister of Public Works showed his opposition to this. I am sure, and I know, that it is well accepted by the people of Manitoba. I have had letters coming in from various people throughout the Province of Manitoba and I have also had numerous letters from municipal men who approve of this, and I am convinced now more than ever that what the resolution asks for is in the best interests of the whole of the Province of Manitoba.

I cannot accept any reasons given in opposition to it because there were no valid reasons. The Minister does not think it to be a bad one but he would prefer to wait for the recommendation of the Michener Report. I wonder who the government is. Is it Michener, or is it the Cabinet? Sometimes we wonder, when all those commissions and committees come up. If the report recommends it, it is fine and dandy -- you have already had it. We will have made some progress even before the report is before us. If Michener does not recommend it I'm sure that no one will condemn it, and Michener would not condemn it, because I believe that I have most of the people with me.

The Honourable Member from Turtle Mountain -- I think he spoke on that -- and his main objection to this resolution was that he has no secondary highways in his constituency. I would like to remind the honourable member that not all of us members have had that distinguished -- what shall I say -- (Interjection) -- experience, is right -- of having a Cabinet Minister who was at the same time Minister of Public Works representing the constituency for a considerable number of years, so I presume that most of the roads there are 100 percent roads, but most of the other constituencies were not just as lucky as the Honourable Member from Turtle Mountain. -- (Interjection) -- Not Emerson. And I would say to him -- not a dime for Rhineland -- I would say to him, take a little and give a little. Let us live together. He represents the have-nots, he must know, in this House, as well as the haves. He also says, I may be anticipating the Michener Report. I can assure him that I am not anticipating and I also know that this government, even though it gets a Royal Commission report, or a committee suggestion, it needs an awful lot of prodding to go along with some of the reports. We have in the past noticed that some of these reports were not very strictly adhered to although it's the prerogative of the government not to, but just to rely on the Michener Report to give us all the goodies, I don't think it is right. The time to do it is right now.

Another objection raised by the honourable member, the same member, was that the resolution does not go far enough. Well I was of the opinion that half a loaf -- like the Honourable Member from Inkster likes to say -- is better than no loaf at all. So that's all I ask for. But to tell you the truth, originally I had intended to include in this resolution also a request to accept all community connecting roads as secondary highways, and thereby accept them as 100 percent government roads. I'm sure that the member has these in his constituency -- some community connecting roads -- and just to show him that I'm not trying to be selfish I'm willing to accommodate him, and I'm now sorry that I didn't include this in my resolution. What are community connecting roads? The community connecting roads are those roads which are very very important to the people living in these areas, connecting different towns. They communicate from one to the other. Most of them -- a lot of them, I should say, and most of them too, have no railway connection and they depend wholly on these roads to transport their goods and produce from one town to another, and these roads are very very important to them and although it's not in the resolution, I would like the government to consider this too -- consider accepting community connecting roads as 100 percent government responsibility.

(Mr. Tanchak, Cont'd.)

Now I hope that some of these people who have objections to this, and especially the Honourable Minister of Public Works, agrees with me and votes for this resolution.

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, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Emerson.

A standing vote was taken with the following results:

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

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McLean, Martin, Roblin, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 17; Nays, 31.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster. The Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I adjourned this debate about a week ago for the Honourable Member for Burrows, and he is absent in the House today, and I would beg the indulgence of the House to have it stand, but I am certain that if anyone else wishes to speak at this time it will be quite all right with our group.

MADAM SPEAKER: Anyone wishing to speak? Agreed to let it stand? Agreed.

. Continued on next page

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Brandon. The Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, there isn't much that I would like to say about this resolution in view of the fact that the member for St. John's spoke after I had adjourned it; there isn't much I would like to add to what he said and to what was said by the Member for Selkirk, because both of them have put the matter into such clear perspective that I think members here can vote on the basis of what was said by these two honourable members and by the sponsor and also the member for Brandon.

It just puzzles me, Madam Speaker, to know why it is that it is so difficult to get the law changed as regards divorce, because one comes to the opinion that more and more people in this province and in this country are dissatisfied with the illogical and outdated state of our divorce law. Everyone seems to be of this opinion and yet it seems so difficult to get enough concensus, or enough resolution on the part of lawmakers to do anything about it. I know that for years -- year after year, the various women's organizations have submitted briefs to the federal government asking that the divorce law be brought up to date; and it is just a little ridiculous that our divorce law should be the divorce law of England or of Britain as of 1837; and whereas they have seen fit to change theirs, we haven't. Well, what are the reasons for not wanting or not having the resolution to change the law. It would seem that one or two of the larger religious denominations have in the past tended to oppose rather completely and intransigently any move to modernize or bring up to date our divorce legislation. I suggest that if one is an Anglican or a Roman Catholic, or whatever his religious faith, it is not for him to say because I wouldn't want to take advantage of the divorce law, just because I don't, no one else can, and so therefore I oppose any change or liberalization in the divorce law. I suggest that this is not the right kind of view to take in the middle of the twentieth century. This is not the reason for opposing change in the divorce law. Certainly one can have other sincere convictions for opposing change, and I think that point of view was put forward by the Member for Brandon. Correction, Madam Speaker, I shouldn't say that he spoke in opposition to a change in the law, he simply spoke as one who would prefer to err on the side of caution. I'll put it that way. And because this was his point of view, he moved an amendment, which although it doesn't really have as much effect as the sponsor would have liked it to, nevertheless it does call for a substantial change.

I would just like to suggest that whereas providing for a legal separation sanctioned by the courts as being a ground for divorce after four years, this still does not take into account the two problems of imprisonment for four years or more, or insanity for four years or more, that is to say, lasting for four years or more, because those latter two, Madam Speaker, are not grounds for obtaining a court-sanctioned separation. And so what I would like to do Madam Speaker, is to see these last two provisions added to the amendment proposed by the Member for Brandon. The Member for Selkirk makes the point that really he agreed on the one hand that something should be done in this country about liberalizing the divorce laws, because as they stand now they are putting many people into conditions of misery -- they cannot live together; they cannot remarry lawfully and start a new life and so on, and this is of course the nub of the whole sorry problem. But on the other hand, he makes the point that our debate is really academic, because he doesn't feel that there will be any change made in our divorce laws until such time as we have a constitutional amendment which will allow for the delegating of this legislative power to the provinces. Perhaps he is right, but I suggest that if possible that if enough important organizations and if enough legislatures in this country were to with almost united voice ask for changes in the divorce laws along a certain line, that the federal government would take notice and eventually quite soon implement or legislate the necessary changes. I notice that when the National Council of Women met with the Honourable Lester Pearson about a month ago, they submitted a brief and much of the brief was given over to a demand and a discussion for changing the divorce law of this country; and among other things the Prime Minister said at that time that he appreciated getting this kind of indication of opinion and he was really looking forward to being able to get a more clear concensus of opinion among the Canadian public. So I suggest that one thing that we in this legislature can do to help in this regard is to give the Prime Minister and his cabinet a very clear indication of public opinion in this province

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd)... through this legislature -- and we can do that by voting 56 in favour of the motion as amended by the member for Brandon and as further amended by the following, Madam Speaker. And so I move, seconded by the member for Seven Oaks, that the amendment be further amended by adding at the end the following: "Insanity or imprisonment for four years or more."

Madam Speaker put the question ...

MADAM SPEAKER: -- interjection -- The Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm not speaking ...

MADAM SPEAKER: I didn't get the yeas and nays. I'm going to ask for them again, please.

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

MR. GRAY: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the Honourable Member members to support his... Call in the members. The question before the House is the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead in amendment to the amendment.

A standing vote was taken with the following results:

YEAS: Campbell, Cherniack, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Wright.

NAYS: Alexander, Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Froese, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McLean, Martin, Moeller, Molgat, Paulley, Roblin, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Vielfaure, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 12; Nays, 37.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The proposed motion in amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Brandon. Are you ready for the question?

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I'd like to close the debate on the main motion -- interjection --

MR. EVANS: I think I'd like to say a word with respect to my own vote. I propose to vote against the amendment and also against the main motion, and I'd like to say a very brief word as to why. I agree that things are not right in the matter of divorce. I agree that something must be done; but I don't believe that adequate study has been given to the matter in its broadest sense. I have considered both the motion and the amendment and think there is a good deal of virtue in both of them, but cannot believe that this is the right solution, although I am not in a position to suggest a better one. So I have made my decision to vote against these on the ground that until the right and complete solution can be found I don't think we should tamper.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion, the main motion as amended. Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I too, would like to state my position on this. It's obvious that I've lost my job -- speaking very facetiously -- as leader of my group, because my group were of different opinions that I were and I respect them very much for it. By virtue of myself not rising to join with my colleagues it's obvious this is not a Party resolution. However, I would oppose it in principle. However, we have before us on the Order Paper a resolution dealing with the question of marriage which is to a considerable degree connected with the resolution that we have before us -- that is the question that prior to marriage there should be more serious consideration given in the joining of hands. This resolution is obvious of the separating of hands that are joined together.

I agree with what the Honourable Minister of Industry just has said. I do feel that there are grounds upon which thorough investigations and changes must be made in respect of the divorce laws of Canada. In some areas they are archaic. I appreciate very much that the United Church of Canada, a year or so ago saw fit to have an investigation into the whole matter of divorce. I also appreciate the fact that the social service agencies of the Anglican Church, of which I am proud to be a member, have likewise undertaken investigations into the adequacy or inadequacy of the divorce laws of Canada. So I respectfully suggest, Madam Speaker, that these investigations are going on at the present time, and as the resolution states, we are asking the federal government to give consideration to amending the law. I'm sure, Madam Speaker, that in the considerations that are going to, of necessity, be made by the federal

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)... authorities, they will take note of the representations and the studies that have been made by these various organizations.

Reference was made also during this debate to the fact that hardships do exist because of our present regulations respecting divorce. I agree with these most heartily. However, as this is in the jurisdiction of the federal authorities; as there are these studies being made; I don't think it necessary for us here in the Province of Manitoba to give any further instructions to the government of Canada respecting the changing of divorce. I'm sure that they will deal with the matter in view of all of the representations that are being made to them now.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want to ask you what motion is before us now and how did you declare the result of the last voice vote.

MADAM SPEAKER: As carried. The question before the House is the main motion as amended.

MR. SCHREYER: Thank you.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I would just like to say a word because I propose to vote against the motion. I want to make it clear, however, that I appreciate that our present divorce laws need investigation but I don't think that there is adequate evidence before us that we as a body should be making recommendations to the federal government in this respect. My main concern in this matter is for the children of marriage, and although I could agree with many of the examples of tragedy and heartbreak and misery that were outlined to us by various speakers such as the Member for St. Johns, I would want to be sure that in trying to correct this situation we did not in any way undermine or make less certain the future of millions of still unborn infants. In my opinion -- and of course it's only my opinion -- that I view marriage as an institution of society for the preservation of the young. I don't think it's a matter of convenience between adults. I would like to see any recommendations that were being made, made on the basis of the most thorough investigation and study. I am in favour of that approach, but I cannot vote for the main motion.

MR. GROVES: Madam Speaker, before the member closes the debate, I'd like to say that I'm also going to oppose the resolution as amended on the grounds that in my opinion a marriage is a contract that is made in the presence of God for life; and we have another resolution on our Order Paper which deals with the matter of preparing young people to take on their responsibilities of this contract. I believe that divorce should not be encouraged and it should not be made easy. I also believe that this is a federal matter and I think that we are not prepared on the basis of the study which has gone into it since we received this resolution to be qualified to make these representations to the federal government.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): I intend to vote for the resolution as amended. I would like to say a word or two with respect to it. I don't think this resolution in itself offers the final stage of perfection in the field of divorce and matrimonial relations, or in what we could recommend to the federal government in that field. There are a number of other items that could be considered, a number of items as a matter of fact that were contained in the original motion moved by the Honourable Member from Inkster. The question of desertion should be taken into account. I think questions of insanity should be taken into account, not in the terms in which he mentioned them however in his resolution, having regard to the fact that in this day and age the number of people that we can call chronically insane have been very greatly reduced, if not entirely diminished by new treatment, new drugs, etcetera, that are available to us.

I disagree entirely with imprisonment being a ground for divorce, because in this day and age with changing concepts in the whole corrections field and with the existence of boards such as the National Parole Board and so on, a term of imprisonment of 15 years can be cut back after a year and a half, to release on probation, and under the terms that are provided here if a man was sentenced to prison for 15 years and his wife was fast enough, she could go out and procure her divorce and be free of the man by the time perhaps he was paroled a year and a half or two years later. So there are a number of things in connection with the imprisonment angle that I do not think should be voted upon too quickly by the House and that is one reason I could not support the original motion as proposed by the Member from Inkster.

Legal separation, as well, should be looked at. So I come back to my original point that the motion as amended, while it certainly does not represent perfection, would represent a

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd)... slightly higher stage of perfection than we have at the present time. This is one of these involved legal matters, legal and social matters, that have apparently perplexed the politicians at Ottawa since the time of Confederation. It is one of those items that could well be cured if we were to have some form of delegation within our constitution whereby the federal government could delegate its jurisdiction over divorce to the provinces, so that each province might deal with it according to whatever mode or treatment it thought would best suit its people; and in this way you would overcome the block which has existed since the time of Confederation in the Province of Quebec -- the completely understandable block that has existed there to any suggestion of amendment or any change in the divorce procedures of Canada.

There are many other things in this whole field of divorce that should be considered along with the grounds of divorce, one of them being the question of domicile. And I don't suppose that too many honourable members in the House have ever had to concern themselves about domicile in divorce, but I know that if you're a practising lawyer you have to concern yourself quite closely with domicile and it's affixion, because the law says at present that unless you can show established residence on behalf of the petitioner or the respondent in one province for a certain length of time why then your action must fail because of some fictional requirement for domicile. There should be one domicile and that domicile should be the Dominion of Canada and you could obviate a number of the procedural and legal problems which now set up so many bars and so many hindrances, fictional hindrances, to this type of petition when it appears in a court. The main concern of the court I suggest, with the greatest of deference, should be the consideration as to whether or not these two people, having regard to their family, if they have a family, whether or not these two people are able to exist together with benefit to the children or without benefit to the children. These should be the subjects upon which a court's attention should be focused, not extraneous or almost irrelevant subjects such as domicile, when you consider that both of the petitioners are Canadian citizens.

And so I say that the whole field is in need of housecleaning. I think that it is incumbent upon the federal authority to undertake this study within a short period of time and I don't think that those old historic and traditional blocks that have existed to some erring of the situation should be allowed to prohibit this erring any longer. I think that in this day and age, in the latter half of the twentieth century we owe it to our people to provide machinery through which a proper look at, and proper treatment of domestic relations can be handled in the courts of our various provinces.

So while I vote for this resolution as amended, I do so realizing that much more has to be done if we are to really place the question of divorce and matrimonial relations in better shape than it is today.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Madam Speaker, I would like just to say a word on this question. It's a perplexing question. As it appeared before us originally it had many clauses there with which most of us were in disagreement as the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has just intimated. I think the sacred contract of marriage has in these modern times been, in many parts of the world, treated with tragic indifference and I think that nothing should be done that would help to increase that indifference or make it more possible for people to break the marriage vow. On the other hand, I recognize this fact, it is perhaps unfortunate that if there is incompatibility of temperament, if there are other causes -- cruelty and so forth, which has resulted in a legal separation, evidently the people unable to get along together -- I'm recognizing the fact that there may be children in the family; but if that's the situation it's unfortunate that they cannot be relieved of the bond which has held them together in the marriage tie.

On the other hand, I am of the opinion that there may be situations where it might be something of the eternal triangle -- collusion -- a third party coming into the picture, and they know that perhaps if they can get this legal separation, and it holds for four years, perhaps when that time comes they can proceed to go forward with the divorce arrangements and secure the breaking of the marriage tie. On the other hand there may be people who are not getting along together and have through the process of the courts become separated, separated for a number of years, but the day may come when they see that that was quite a mistake and they should come together again and be re-united. And so as I think over these things, Madam Speaker, I feel that I cannot support the motion as amended when it provides not only the

(Mr. Martin, cont;d)... question of adultery but when it provides for the dissolution of marriage and divorce on the part of a legal separation for four years.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: At the outset I'd like to put up a bet to every honourable member, who no doubt will likely be here two years from now, this resolution, though somewhat changed, will be carried in this House but not moved by the Honourable Member from Inkster. It will have to be on the other side. And my bet is: three years from now, around Good Friday, at Passover, I am going to give each and every one a box of matzos for Passover, if my prediction does not come true. So I'm quite now -- not satisfied -- but the question was raised. Some of the arguments are very very strange to me -- speak for it, vote against it. I think the only hero here and the only party that was progressive is the NDP because we have given everybody freedom to do what they like. In my humble opinion -- I may be mistaken -- that if a free vote would have been taken in this House our support would be very much greater, particularly to the amendment which takes off all the other suggestions.

So I'm not going to labour this question any more. I intend to read the main two or three lines from each of the letters I have received, and quite many -- they're not all from Winnipeg, they were from the west and they were from the east, in Toronto -- but I don't think I'll even do this because I see that I will not change the mind of anyone. But why not go out quite simple open-minded and oppose it then I'll know. This way it gives me a temptation to bring it up again next year, because, I wouldn't say you have not spoken the truth but I say something is lacking. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce say, let 's give it a little more study. We've been studying this for a hundred years. We've been studying it every day. There are books and books and books written about it, by judges, by welfare people, by doctors, by psychologists, by everybody, and here, read these letters -- I don't want to read all the letters here because I have no authority -- I mean I didn't ask for authority to table them -- but they'll tell its story, its tragedy.

Let me read you at least one. "Divorce laws should be amended. A grave situation when the present law makes people pay for their mistakes for the rest of their lives." A quotation from a man that knows what he's talking about. There is a case, deserted by her husband two and a half years ago when her son was only six months old. No support from him and was compelled to leave her baby and go to work. She lost her house, expensive appliances, which she has worked previously so hard to buy. The husband drinks and if the wife garnishees his wages he quits his job and goes on unemployment relief. He don't listen to her plea for a divorce. She feels these are sufficient grounds for a divorce and if she could obtain one she could readjust her life satisfactorily. She feels this type of situation only encourages common-law relationship, although this does not apply in her case. She gives her permission to use her name and let everybody know. There's another thing: "A terrible shame that because of ancient laws, and opposing religions, men and women cannot break away completely from marriage that has not worked out."

Yes, the Honourable Member from St. Vital is right. This is a contract. But bigger contracts than this are being broken and the percentage of the contracts which is being broken are not so many, but those who have it suffer -- not too many compared with the happy marriages -- but still they are suffering; and there is no end to their suffering. And adultery, you could either have to perjure yourself or belittle yourself, and who wants it? These respectable men and women wanted to go through this. You've got to have a little bit of consideration for those who suffer. And let them investigate, and I'm sure they know about it, because all the young organizations, almost all, in Canada have already appealed many times, and I have no doubt some of the honourable members here have got letters or petitions for it. But whatever I'm going to say any more today, it'll be just like a voice in the wilderness. I might as well quit. I am going to support the amendment because it opens the door a little and it gives at least one reason, one more reason for a divorce, although it's a very very hard one. So, if we're going to lose entirely, I'd rather get a half loaf than nothing, and I'm going to support the original amendment of the Honourable Member from Brandon.

Madam Speaker put the question.

MADAM SPEAKER: Who requested the ayes and nays?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, you'd better not call the result of the vote before we

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd)... ask for yeas and nays.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. ROBLIN: Would you care to put the question again?

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I...

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. I'm sorry, I made a mistake.

MR. GRAY: Even judging on the voice -- expression -- I think that the amendment was carried.

MR. ROBLIN: I think I can tell my honourable friend.

MR. GRAY: Okay, but I want the yeas and nays. I want them on record.

MR. ROBLIN: Oh.

MADAM SPEAKER: Will those supporting the honourable member please rise. Call in the members.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if you would put the question, Madam Speaker. What is the question we are voting for?

MADAM SPEAKER: As amended. The question before the House is the main motion of the Honourable Member from Inkster as amended.

A standing vote was taken with the following results: Yeas: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Gray, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnson (Gimli), Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McLean, Moeller, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Tanchak, Watt, Weir, Witney and Wright.

Nays: Messrs. Barkman, Evans, Froese, Groves, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, McGregor, Martin, Molgat, Paulley, Roblin, Seaborn, Vielfaure and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 33; Nays, 15.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Inkster. The Honourable the Member for Dufferin.

MR. WILLIAM H. HAMILTON (Dufferin): Madam Speaker, the Honourable Member for Inkster I know is quite interested in the formation of co-ops, in my opinion in competition to free enterprise. Something with which I do not agree. Free enterprise has built this country of ours and I consider the small businessman and the small industry the mainstay of our economy, and I hope it will remain so. I'm not against co-operatives. I belong to many myself. I believe they fulfill a certain function. The idea was born in England many years ago to help the workers obtain services and employment denied them and this system has spread all over the world. The greatest grain co-ops of Canada have improved the standards of grain handling, grading, but I would not like to see a monopoly in this field, which could easily happen. Co-op oil companies, I believe greatly assisted the farmer by holding the line on prices during the early years. Co-op grocery stores have performed a certain service to the farmers and to the people and also the farmer machinery co-ops have helped keep prices in line, but I would not like to see everything all co-op in Canada as it might, and I believe would, develop into the greatest monopoly every heard of in history. Therefore, in my opinion, Madam Speaker, I believe that we should leave the Manitoba Sugar Company co-operate and operate as it is. It is performing a good service to the farmers of Manitoba. In my opinion, the farmers would not receive another nickel or a penny more for their products by co-op methods than they are receiving at the present time. As I said before, free enterprise cannot be strangled in Canada or we will rue the day.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. John's): I couldn't help but rise after having heard this last address from the Honourable the Member from Dufferin. I understood him to say that he himself is a member of co-operatives and supports them in certain cases. I understood him to say that he was opposed to the monopoly of co-operatives. And if I understood him correctly, I don't quite understand the function that he visualizes for co-operatives when faced, as he is in this resolution, with the fact that as of today as far as I know, there is only one company which produces sugar, and that happens to be a private enterprise company; and as far as I can see within this province, it is a monopoly, and to the extent that credit unions have a function which the Honourable Member from Dufferin feels is worthwhile, then surely that function is the one he described and that is keeping prices down. So that to me what he has said, is a

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd)... complete contradiction of what he espouses as a member of co-operatives, unless he rather feels that the system of free enterprise as it applies to sugar is one which covers the international boundaries and then becomes a question of competition as between Cuba, Manitoba and all the other producers of sugar. To me, this is something which is completely contrary to what he himself has said, and I urge him that he re-read what he has said and see whether he cannot find in there sufficient contradictions to justify his supporting a resolution which makes the whole idea of fair competition and the whole idea of free enterprise one which lends itself to this whole problem of the cost of sugar to the consumer. Certainly, if there is ever any hope that the free enterprise system could do something for the honourable member, and presumably for those people in his constituency who buy sugar, this proposal will be the one that will help him out in that regard. Rather than that, I would hope that he, as I say, will reconsider what he said. I haven't the slightest hope that it will change his vote, but I hope that in the future he will see that if a co-op has any place at all, it must certainly have it in that industry where there is control to the extent that there is either monopoly or combine control, and that is one such as is dealt with in this resolution.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, on this -- I note that the resolution that he is favouring says: "Transforming the production of sugar in Manitoba." Now, an integral part of the production of sugar is the growing of the beets. Is my honourable friend recommending that the growing of the beets also be set up on a co-operative basis?

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, I think not, but I think that when you deal with a co-operative, it is the members of the co-op if they are in the producer field of it, are growing the beets in an effort to feed the co-operative, to produce for them and for the consumer the product at the lowest possible price. Certainly I cannot conceive a co-operative in the growing of the beets themselves.

MR. HUTTON: Would the member for St. Johns permit another question? Would he tell us if he expects the producers of sugar beets in Manitoba to produce them for less money if they grow them co-operatively than they receive at the present time?

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I thought that the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture could understand that the problem of processing is one which could be tackled on a basis which would have a better influence on the price to the consumer, still maintaining for the producer a proper return of his money so that I feel in that supporting this resolution no one could be accused of suggesting that the producer himself receives a lower return. I am not aware that a selling of grain the way it is done today is one which forces the producer to receive a lower return on his product.

MR. ALBERT VIELEFAURE (LaVerendrye): I would just like to say a word or two on this. I fear the resolution as far as I see it, asks for the transforming -- the government considering the advisability of transforming the production from a privately owned to a co-operatively owned. I too, am a member of a co-operative and a strong believer in it but I don't think it's right for the government to dissolve private enterprise and establish a co-operative. I think a co-operative is established from the grass roots and I sure don't agree with this.

MR. EMIL MOELLER (Fisher): Madam Speaker as a sugar beet grower, I can't sit still and listen to everything. We have a privately owned sugar factory in Manitoba, well established, and I can't see the point that anybody would like to put a plant like that under a co-op system. If this plant would come into financial difficulty that would be a different story, that the Manitoba government and the producers would get together and make a co-op out of this but not in a sense the way it is now, and I think the steam will blow off soon. This last week the sugar price in the east has dropped \$3.10 a hundred. The wholesale price in Manitoba was on Wednesday morning \$14.25, and it can go down some more, and I am sure no farmer will like to tackle sugar beet growing when the price is low.

MR. OSCAR F. BJORNSON (Lac du Bonnet): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Swan River that debate be adjourned.

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 Portage la Prairie, the Honourable the Member for Morris.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, I suppose the members would be quite agreeable if anyone else would like to speak, if they would speak now, but I wonder if the

(Mr. Lissaman, cont'd) . . matter might stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Anyone wishing to speak? Agreed that the matter should stand? Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Lakeside. The Honourable the Minister without Portfolio.

HON. ABRAM W. HARRISON (Rock Lake): Madam Speaker, I adjourned this debate for the purpose of speaking on it because at least two of the decisions that are involved in this particular motion were made by myself when I was Speaker of this Legislature. There are, however, three occasions named in the motion by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, and it is my purpose only to deal with the motion of April 2, 1957, when the Honourable Mr. Bachynsky was Speaker of the Legislature and the government of the day was Liberal. The Premier was the Honourable D. L. Campbell, the member for Lakeside.

Now in order to bring this properly before the House I think I should go back to the Journals of April 2, 1957, and read to the House the motion that was under consideration at that time. It was the consideration of the report of a select standing committee, and Mr. Turner I believe was the mover of the motion and the report read as follows: "Mr. Turner, from the Select Standing Committee appointed to consider and report on Rule No.41 of the Rules and Orders, and Forms of Proceeding of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, presented its First Report, which was read as follows: 'Your committee met for organization purposes to appoint Mr. Turner as Chairman. Your committee recommends that for the remainder of the session a quorum of this Committee shall consist of five members. Your Committee was appointed by a Resolution agreed in the House on Tuesday, March 19th, 1957, on the motion of Mr. Stinson and amended by the Honourable Mr. Robertson. 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 Legislative Assembly of Manitoba be amended by adding after the word "pending" in the second line thereof, "in a court of law". The amended rule 41 would then read as follows: No member shall refer to a matter in which a judicial decision is pending in a court of law or make reference to judges and courts of justice, and to personages of high official station of a nature of personal attack and censure'. Mr. Turner moved that the report be received, whereupon Mr. Roblin suggested that the report be not received but be referred back to the Committee in order to alter the terms of reference. And a debate arising Messrs. Roblin, Stinson and Turner having spoken, Mr. Speaker ruled 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 the committee with instructions to amend it in any particular. If further proceedings are desired, it is necessary to revive the committee. The report was accordingly received'." I might point out that at that time we had a Liberal government in Manitoba. The Leader of that government was the Honourable D. L. Campbell. If he was opposed to this motion, as he is today, why did he not stand up and vote against it or call a recorded vote in the House. He did not see fit to do this and it is construed of course that he gave approval at that time to that motion. Being the Leader of the House he did not oppose it, and we in the Conservative party, and I believe the other party that was in the House at that time, did not see fit to oppose the ruling of the Speaker at that time. And it's reasonable to suppose that this ruling by the Honourable Mr. Bachynsky was unanimously accepted by the House at that time.

Now we have the Honourable Mr. Campbell opposing this motion on two other occasions. It seemed to me when I was Speaker of this House and ruled in two occasions on similar motions, I perused the Journals of the House, Beausiesne, and this is the ruling that I used to base my opinions in ruling on the two motions in question. It seemed to me that the House of that day were unanimous that that was the proper ruling. No one got up and said that it was an improper ruling and should be not considered at that time. I suggest to the Honourable Member for Lakeside that, instead of seeking to rid the House of a precedent that now exists, and I believe that he admits that this is a precedent in the House at the present time and will be used by Speakers in the future as I used the ruling of the Honourable Mr. Bachynsky. I have no personal feelings in this matter at all. I think that one should divest themselves of personalities and look at these questions in an objective manner. It is true that the majority of the rules of this House and all Legislatures are usually formed in a negative manner; that is; the rules lay out what you may not do in Legislatures and conversely it is expected that the rules

(Mr. Harrison, cont.d)... that are not laid out in a negative form it's possible for the House to use them. I believe that the original rules that are laid down to guide our conduct, when Moses brought down the Tablets of Stone, what did he have on them? He had: you shall not steal; you shall not commit adultery. In other words he delineated those things that you could not do. Conversely, it is true that the rules that are not laid out in the Ten Commandments are not regarded as sins. And that is a very, very good principle for legislatures to follow and I'm sure for the past 500 years at least, those rules have been adhered to. There is a rule, to give an illustration, and a rule that I overlooked when I was Speaker of the House. I thought it was the proper thing to do, and it has been mentioned in this House from time to time, particularly by the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

He relates of the time that he visited St. Boniface and they presented him with a red toque and he came into the House and he put it on his head and he rose up to make a speech in this House. Well, of course, he broke the rule, but who was going to say that he shouldn't make a speech. If you adhere strictly to the rules of the House, when you want to make a speech you rise in your place, uncovered -- you take your hat off. Apparently it's permissible to wear a hat in the Legislature, but you may not wear it when you make a speech -- interjection -- Beg pardon.

MR. PAULLEY: I hope I don't have to bring it out this year, but I've still got it.

MR. HARRISON: We will deal with the matter before the House and that is, may a final report of a committee be referred back to a committee. It was pointed out, of course, that a committee dies the minute that it makes its final report. Possibly the Honourable Member for Lakeside will remember when we had another honourable gentleman in this House by the name of the Honourable Judge Stubbs. Now, Mr. Stubbs considered himself to be a guardian of the rules of the House, and he paid particular attention to those things that happened from time to time in this Chamber. Possibly the Honourable Member for Lakeside will remember when the report of a committee was presented to this House -- I believe it was close to the end of the session -- and the chairman of the committee neglected to ask for leave of the House for the committee to sit again -- I believe it may have been a Standing Committee of the House -- the motion was put and was carried. The next time that legislation was presented to the House for third reading and the usual clause was in for second reading, that it be referred to the committee, a particular committee, the Honourable Mr. Stubbs rose in his place and he informed the House that that committee had died because the chairman or the committee had failed to ask for leave of the House to sit again. And I well remember that we were here for a day or two while the period of notice, which was 48 hours took place and the committee was re-constituted.

It is true that in the dying days of the session that they do pass an escalator clause in this House whereby we sit three times a day, morning, afternoon and evening, and it is deemed that each sitting of the House represents 24 hours, and you have the possibility of a motion being given first reading in the morning, second reading in the afternoon, and third reading after supper. Now each sitting is deemed for notice to represent 24 hours and you have the spectacle of today actually being the day before yesterday when it should have been the day after tomorrow. Now, if you would try and explain that to your 7 year old son, I am sure you're better at it than I am.

Now, I don't have too much more to say, other than the fact that I would like the Honourable Member for Lakeside to table the letter that he wrote to the Speaker of the House of Commons, and table the reply that he received from the Clerk of the House at Ottawa. I believe that I have those myself in my files at home -- I kept everything I ever received in the Legislature, and it would take me two days to find it. I would like the Honourable Mr. Campbell to table it. And I have a particularly good reason for that. In the motion that has been presented to the House, I'd just like to read the first paragraph: "Whereas on April 2, 1957, March 26, 1960, and March 21, 1961, Mr. Speaker ruled that a report of a special committee could not be referred back to that committee." Now, Madam Speaker, that is not what we are talking about. I suggest that the Honourable Member for Lakeside should have placed the word "final" before the word "report", and that clause would have read: "Whereas on April 2, 1957, March 26, 1960 and February 21, 1961, Mr. Speaker ruled that a final report from a special committee could not be referred back to that committee." It is my purpose at

(Mr. Harrison, cont'd)... the end of the speech to move an amendment to insert the word "final" at that particular place. I believe that that would clarify the resolution, and I'm sure that the Honourable Member for Lakeside would agree that without the word "final" in there it has no special significance, because we are dealing in motions with the final report. It's true that a special committee, if they make an interim report, they can ask for leave to sit again and that is usually granted. And it's true in some committees that the terms of reference give them the right to report from time to time. But we have responsible government in this country, and we have the right of the legislature to debate the report of committees; and they also have the right to set another committee up on notice with different terms of reference and changes of personnel if they so desire. When a committee dies on the presentation of its final report, it permits the government of the day to give notice -- 24 hours -- reconstitute the committee and possibly give different terms of reference and get on with the business of investigating or doing the job that the committee is set to do.

I do not change my opinion that the committee dies when it reports to the House its final report. I think it's desirable that it should die. I think it facilitates the mechanics of government; and if the government of the day concur in that report, then the report from the committee also becomes the considered and majority of opinion of the government of the day. Those are things that certainly take place, and they are at times valuable. The government of the day may even give terms of reference for the committee to sit between sessions. They also have that right to do.

Committees perform valuable functions in the mechanics of democracy, and certainly the rules of the House should provide for the committees to be appointed and for the committees to function properly. And in a democratic country it should also provide for termination of that committee's work. It's certainly one of the principles of democracy that the government of the day have the right to set policy, and sometimes investigation by special committees is certainly of value.

Madam Speaker, I intend to vote against the motion of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. It may have served a good purpose this motion, because it had a tendency to clarify the issue, and it certainly is not wasted effort. I believe in democracy myself and I think that this particular question should be ventilated and we should know where we stand in the future. I welcome from the Honourable Member for Lakeside his remarks when he closes this debate. I don't feel bitter that my rulings were challenged and are now the subject matter of a resolution in this House. I believe that that is the way democracy works. If you're wrong, well you should be proven wrong; and if you're right, you should be proven right. Whatever the verdict of this motion is, I think it will serve a useful purpose.

Now, Madam Speaker, ...

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, may I ask the honourable member a question before he moves his amendment? If the honourable member would prefer to have the word "final" placed in there I would be quite willing to see the resolution amended at this time to place the word "final" in there.

MR. HARRISON: My opinion on placing the word "final" in there is that the resolution isn't clear. It doesn't make firm or clarify what the resolution means and it clears up a situation where the members of this Legislature will know what they're voting for and they will know that the rulings that were given certainly apply to this particular subject matter -- final report of the committee.

I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, that the word "final" be inserted between the word "a" and the word "report" in the second line of the preamble of the resolution. The first paragraph of the preamble to the resolution will then read: "Whereas on May 2nd, 1957, March 26th, 1960 and on February 21st, 1961, Mr. Speaker ruled that a final report of a select committee could not be referred back to that committee." And I would like the Honourable Member for Lakeside to table the correspondence that he has.

MADAM SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable the Minister without Portfolio, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Roblin, that the word final, be inserted between the word "a" and the word "report" in the second line of the preamble of the resolution. The first paragraph of the preamble to the resolution would then read: "Whereas on April 2nd, 1957, March 26th, 1960 and February 21st, 1961, Mr. Speaker ruled that a final report from a select

(Madam Speaker, cont'd)... committee could not be referred back to that committee and "... Are you ready for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, if I could make a statement in response to my honourable friend's request without being taken as speaking on the amendment, I would just like to mention that I did give to the leader of each group in the House a copy of that correspondence with the Honourable Mr. Michener. I also made it plain that I was quite willing to have it tabled at the same time. My recollection is not firm as to whether it was placed on the table, but certainly I gave a copy to the Leader of the Government, of our party, of the NDP and, I think, of the Social Credit Party; but I will be more than glad to furnish another copy to the honourable member who has just spoken.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the debate be adjourned.

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 Brokenhead. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand.

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

MR. LISSAMAN: Madam Speaker, I wonder, due to the hour now, if I could have this matter stand. I think I'll be longer than 10 minutes and private members' day ends at 5:30 -- if the House will agree.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, unless the members feel that they can't tear themselves away, I would suggest that we do call it 5:30 because private members' day ends at 5:30 and we will hardly finish the Agricultural estimates in the 10 minutes we have at our disposal-- interjection -- Maybe that's a good idea, but I don't really think we'll do that because the government would like, Madam Speaker, to call Bill 37, Bill 38 and the Committee of Ways and Means and then the Committee of Supply, so I'm prepared to call it 5:30 if you are, Madam Speaker.

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