

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 5, 1966

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of the Archbishop of Rupert's Land and the Synod of the Diocese of Rupert's Land praying for the passing of an Act respecting the Diocese of Rupert's Land.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of the Manitoba Conference of the Seventh Day Adventists praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate Manitoba Conference Corporation of the Seventh Day Adventists Church.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Mathews): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Tjitske Medgyes and others praying for the passing of an Act for the relief of Tjitske Medgyes, Feikie Bosma and Tina Stuve.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of the St. James Scholarship Foundation praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the St. James Scholarship Foundation.

MADAM SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Attorney-General)(Dauphin): Madam Speaker, I present the Third Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments begs leave to present the following as their third report. Your Committee has considered Bills: No. 7 - An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act; No. 40 - An Act respecting the Registration of Psychologists; No. 72 - An Act respecting Embalmers and Funeral Directors; and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments. All of which is respectfully submitted.

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

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills

Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the Speaker's Gallery where there are some 45 Grade 11 students from the Carberry Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Tuningley and Mrs. McLennan. This school is situated in the constituency which I have the honour to represent. On behalf of all Members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 37 on the motion by the Honourable Member for Gladstone; a Return to an Order of the House No. 43 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Gladstone; and a Return to an Order of the House No. 48 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

At this time if I might, Madam Speaker, I would like to explain to the Honourable Member for Rhineland in particular, and to the members of the House, exactly what happened on Sunday evening, or Sunday night on the Aux Marais Drain at the boundary between North Dakota and Manitoba. As I reported yesterday, I received a call, an emergency call stating that the waters were rising very rapidly on the North Dakota side. I contacted the engineer and a field crew was despatched to the scene to take whatever action they deemed necessary to effect a flow through the culverts and the road on the Aux Marais Drain. It must be understood that there is an agreement between North Dakota and Manitoba under which the construction and maintenance of the Aux Marais Drain is undertaken. In other words, the State of North Dakota contributes to the cost of building the Aux Marais Drain in Manitoba in order that it is large enough to accommodate flows that have to come that way from North Dakota.

When the field crew reached the scene it was dark, but they discovered that the waters had over-topped the road at that point and the grade was breached badly in two or three places and there was nothing more that they could do and they returned from the field. They attempted to contact the municipal officials but were unable to do so on Sunday evening. Subsequently, the American or North Dakota crew that had been despatched to the area visited the same location. Our crew had withdrawn and so there was no contact in the field in respect to this matter.

(MR. HUTTON cont'd).....They of course found the same situation as the Manitoba crew. Indeed, not only were the culverts overflowing but there was a complete over-topping of the dike in the area with erosion taking place.

I understand that at that time there were one or two sticks of dynamite exploded but these had no real effect upon the volume of water that was crossing the road or dike at that time. Mr. Mudry, who is the head of the Planning Section in Water Control and Conservation, took a reconnaissance flight over the Red River and the Pembina River. The water that was coming over the boundary was an overflow of the Pembina River east of Neche, and yesterday morning the flow across the dike or road between North Dakota and Manitoba was between a half mile and a mile wide, and so really nature increased the flow far more effectively than anything that could have been done by man to effect the flow across the boundary.

At the same time, before I am seated, I would like to acknowledge the visit to our Cabinet flood-fighting meeting this morning of Commander Perrin of the United States Coast Guard. He has been authorized by the United States Government to offer the services of his men and his equipment to Manitoba should we need them. His unit is based at Pembina and there are some, I understand, 75 men in this unit, 25 to 30 boats and two aircraft, and it is very reassuring to us, facing the situation and circumstances that we do, that we should have this additional assistance available to us. I think it is particularly comforting to know that we have such a good neighbour to the south of us and that they are so concerned with the well-being of the people in Manitoba that they offer this kind of service to us.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I do have a few questions. However, I should preface them with a few remarks. No wonder the Honourable Minister can call them good neighbours because if we open up the dikes so that we'll take the water instead of they having the trouble, I think

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member will have to state his questions.

MR. FROESE: I sure will. Why wasn't the Rhineland Municipal Council contacted before this was effected. I was told today that one of the councillors had been with this party till 11:30 and nothing had been done. As soon as he left, around 12:00 o'clock, they blasted the dam open - the dike. As a result there is such a large flow now that it can't be stopped and people are now having to move out with their families, their cattle and everything.

MADAM SPEAKER: What is your question please?

MR. FROESE: I already put one and I'll have some more. In the general area where the flooding was, on the U. S. side there were no farmers in the area living out there. It was bare land - didn't harm anyone - and here they open the dikes and flooded these people out. I think this is wrong and especially more so because no notice was given

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member is not allowed to give a speech right at this time. If he would like to ask a question, please state his question.

MR. FROESE: Well, first of all, why wasn't council notified? One of the councillors was with them. Why weren't they notified before this happened?

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): On an important thing such as this where we won't find any occasion to speak, I wonder if it would be a good idea to suspend the rules of the House and let this member find out. He has a constituency that are very interested and I don't think any member should take objection to that. --(Interjection)-- What's

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DESJARDINS: Why don't you sit down

MR. FROESE: Is it not true then that council was not notified and that one of the councillors was present with the people that he just spoke about, the people that were sent out to view the situation and that were in charge. Why weren't these people notified? Why wasn't council notified so they could warn their people in the general area out there? There was no notice given.

MR. HUTTON: Well, Madam Speaker, the facts that I have can't be reconciled with the statement that the Honourable Member for Rhineland has made. It is reported to me that our field crew attempted to contact the municipal people but was unable to do so. He visited the scene and discovered that the dike was over-topped and washed out before any action of any kind was taken by anybody. It had happened before.

Now I also happen to know that a member of the council of Montcalm visited this area during the afternoon on Sunday. The waters on the North Dakota side were within a foot of the top of the dike. His son visited it a short time later and the waters were virtually ready to come over the top. Sometime between that and the time at which our field crew visited the area,

(MR. HUTTON cont'd) and remember it was dark - at night - the dike was over-topped and breached. No one took any action. This was just the forces of nature coming to bear on this dike and there was no one there at the time the dike was breached to warn the council. If indeed a councillor from Rhineland was with the crew, he would have known that the water had breached the roadway and that there was no way of stopping it. I would have followed that he would have notified the people that would be affected, but I have no information at my hands that would indicate that a municipal official accompanied our field staff to the scene in question.

It is my understanding that they followed the orders that they received from the chief engineer. They drove out there as fast as they could get there, and when they got there, there was nothing they could do. The water indeed had over-topped the grade and, as I say, by the next morning was flowing a half to one mile wide. I can say the Manitoba crew did nothing. I am told that the North Dakota crew set off one or two sticks of dynamite but it would be like scratching a match if you wanted to make a comparison of what those explosives would do compared to what had happened under natural conditions.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, in order to discuss this matter properly, I would ask leave of the House, and I would so move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that leave be given to discuss this matter of public importance.

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member knows that to move a motion of this kind, I must have notice one hour before the opening of the House.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Before the Orders of the Day, a few weeks ago I raised the question with the Honourable Minister of Agriculture about the snowpiles between the Disraeli Freeway and the Louise Bridge. Last night I was watching TV and I saw what a little ice jam did. The Minister assured me at that time that snow would be long gone before the flood waters would reach here. Well that snow is still there. It's a big hunk of ice. I'm wondering what they are going to do with it now. Are they going to let it stay and hope it stays there or are they going to start dynamiting there and getting it out of the river?

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, we have mobile dynamite crews who are available. There is some dynamiting going to be done through the Metropolitan area on this sheet of ice that exists in the channel, and I have no reason to believe that if the engineers feel that there is any danger in this snowpile, that they won't go ahead and do anything that's required to remove it, but I think to date it hasn't represented in any way a hazard in respect to accommodating the flood flows through the Winnipeg area. I'm sure if they feel it is not wearing down and disappearing rapidly enough, well this from a technical point of view, that they will move in and do whatever needs to be done.

MR. PETERS: Might I suggest to the Honourable Minister that he send his engineers out there to take a look at that.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Could I have leave of the House to introduce the motion that I tried to make earlier?

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): We would be pleased to grant him leave.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave of the House to introduce a motion of which he must give me in writing one hour before the House convenes?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce)(Fort Rouge): It seems to me, Madam Speaker, that we have established rules of procedure governing introduction of this motion. There has been no case made for the urgency of debate, such urgency indeed that all of the rules of the House need to be suspended, and I do not think that on this side of the House we could agree to the conduct of this debate at this time.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I think that this side of the House has been very generous in giving government leave whenever they wish to make a statement. There has never been any attempt on this side of the House to prevent the government from making a statement. We have always gone along and given them leave. Here is a situation in which the honourable member has a very definite and serious interest. Quite obviously his constituency is very directly affected, and it is an urgent matter because this is going on now. I submit that the honourable member should be given the leave of the House to make his statement.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Minister of Mines & Natural Resources)(Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, on the point of order, I think the point that is being overlooked by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, and those who are participating in the debate, is that this is a very special procedure of the House where the urgency of debate is at issue as you, Madam Speaker,

(MR. LYON cont'd).....well know. I can think of at least three different ways in which the honourable member can have this matter discussed. One is a grievance on going into Supply; he can speak of it on the Budget Debate on which he holds the adjournment at the present time because that's an all-inclusive debate; or he can introduce a substantive motion. So to suggest this is the only way that the honourable member can debate the issue is really not in accordance with the facts.

MR. M. N. HR YHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): Madam Speaker, if I may on a point of order, I do not think that the Honourable Minister is aware of what the Honourable Member for Rhineland wants. He's not asking that this matter be debated as a matter of urgent public importance, he's asking for leave of the House to be able to state what is happening in his constituency, and with leave of the House, any of the rules can be circumvented and it can be done. We have done this on several occasions when the government were bringing in legislation. We gave them leave to do away with first, second and third readings and everything else in order to facilitate the work of the government. I think that the honourable gentleman, the member from Rhineland, is entitled to the same leave.

MR. LYON: I must have misheard him then because I thought the honourable gentleman was attempting to adjourn the House to debate this as a matter of urgent public importance.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland asked permission to adjourn the House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance. On his second request, he asked for leave of the House to present his motion. This was denied. Therefore, we will proceed with the Order Paper as it is here.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, the Honourable Member for Gladstone asked for certain information and I promised to give it to him. When I came into the House this afternoon the information was not available, and since that time I have received some information from members of the staff but it is not the information the honourable member asked for. I will send a note back and try and get the information he did ask for.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, the statement by my honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs is quite in order but I wonder if he would, when he is getting the information that I asked for last year, would he get it for the two years. That is, what increase, if any, was made in 1965 and proposed in 1966?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the third reading of Bill No.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Before the Orders of the Day, there are two questions I would like to ask. The Minister of Agriculture is out - I don't think I can ask the questions if the Minister is absent. Maybe the Leader of the House - this is directed to the Minister of Agriculture and he's out. I'll put the questions anyway. Is the Minister or the government not willing to take full responsibility for any action taken in regard to the breaching of the Aux Marais Dam? --(Interjection)-- Oh, I'm sorry. I was just going to ask the Minister but he happened to be out. I'll repeat them. Is the Minister not willing to take full responsibility for any action taken in regard to the breaching of the Aux Marais Dam - that's the first question. No. 2. Does the Minister acknowledge that the Americans demolished any Manitoba public works without the permission of the Manitoba authorities?

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, when the crew was despatched from Winnipeg to the crossing of the boundary road on the Aux Marais Drain, they were under instructions to take whatever action was required to effect a flow because at that time we believed that there was a stricture in the culverts, and they were under instructions to either try and open up the culverts or to get some flow across the border. When they arrived, they did nothing. They didn't have to do anything because nature had already done it. I know I'm responsible for a lot of things but I'm not responsible for what the Man Upstairs does. I wish I was so influential.

I will not answer the second question because under the circumstances, and the announcement that I made earlier on the Orders of the Day in respect to the goodwill and the desire to help us, I think it would be rather unbecoming for a Minister of the Crown of Manitoba to suggest that the charge that is being implied by the Honourable Member for Emerson is, in fact, true.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, it's not a charge. I was informed that they were given permission. I didn't get an answer, a direct answer to my first question. I asked the Minister whether he is not willing to accept full responsibility for anything that his department has done and I didn't get an answer. I got another story - a repetition of the first.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, if I may, I am responsible for authorizing the crew that went out there to take whatever steps were necessary. None of the steps that they might have

(MR. HUTTON cont'd).....taken were necessary. I'm still responsible for giving them the order. I would do the same thing tonight if the same thing happened.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, may I address a question to the Honourable Minister who has just taken his seat. Is the Minister aware of the very serious ice jam that exists at Selkirk at the present moment?

MR. HUTTON: Yes, Madam Speaker, and we have tried to relieve it by letting the water out of the channel in an area where I understand it will only flood low-lying land and will not endanger property.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture, however, possibly it would be the Provincial Secretary who would reply. It's with regard to the sandbag supply situation. With the long weekend coming up there will be hopefully an increase in the number of volunteers, in a number of areas, who will be coming forward to do some volunteer work in a number of municipalities. I think that the arrangement is now that the province supplies to the municipality the sandbags and the municipality has to look after the distribution. Can the Minister assure us that there will be a sufficient supply for all the municipalities, that there is a stockpile so that there will be no shortage of sandbags at any of the municipalities over the coming weekend. I understand that last weekend there was a shortage.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary)(River Heights): Madam Speaker, I don't know of any shortage that existed last weekend. There might have been isolated cases where the bags weren't in exactly the position where the municipality sent the people to do the work, but in general the municipalities received sufficient sandbags for all of the filling that they could do and all of the placing that they could do. As far as the future is concerned, according to our present forecast and indication of the rate of sandbagging that will continue for the next few days, there will be sufficient sandbags.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, is it not correct that there was a definite shortage of sandbags in the Municipality of St. Vital on Saturday and Sunday of last week, that for certain parts of the day they did not have sandbags and volunteer crews were not able to work in certain areas?

MR. STEINKOPF: The volunteer crews may not have been able to work in certain areas, but the municipality received the sandbags that they requested previously to the weekend, and in some of the municipalities, particularly St. Vital and one or two others, a lot of the sandbags were delivered to houses for filling and they weren't filled, and as a result, they found that there was a shortage in isolated and local situations. But the amount that was delivered from the central stockpile should have been sufficient and I think was for all of the filling that could have been done on any day since we've had the flood scare.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the third reading of Bill No. 44. The Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, when I spoke on this bill on second reading, it was pointed out that this was just another form of pension for government members, despite the denial of the Provincial Secretary. However, when he was asked point-blank to give us assurance that this bill would not permit the appointment of a present member of the Legislature or a former member of the Legislature, he refused to do so, making it quite obvious that our suspicions were accurate in this respect. If the government wishes to make a form of Senate out of Bill 44, why don't they have the courage to stand up and say so rather than hide behind a bill of this nature and come in the back door with a pension plan for their members. This is just a subterfuge and he knows it, because if it wasn't, he would have given us the assurance that they would not appoint former members or present members of the Legislature.

After all, I think the way taxes are in this province, creating more positions on boards which are going to pay members perhaps between \$200 and \$300 a day to sit on, I think it's high time that we took a close look at this, and rather than increasing this situation, I think we should diminish the situation. For example, the Telephone Board last year met 15 times. For those who attended every meeting - and this was at the rate -- they meet for roughly a portion of a day and they are getting paid \$200 a day for doing this. Now the government brings in a bill to enlarge upon this board so they can put more members on the gravy train. They are not concerned with appointing people who were knowledgeable in the particular field, they are just interested in putting on people that have been paid for party services.

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd).....

Now it's been argued in some quarters about what happens in the Senate. I'm not concerned with the Senate. The Senate is a body that is standing at the present time, and if the members feel that the Senate should be abolished, then say so. But if you're setting up a form of Senate, then say so here, but don't create an impression that more members are needed when you are going to just give some plum to some members that either can't make it or don't want to sit in this House any more. I would suggest, for example, that the member for St. Vital who was going to be one of those who was going to be appointed to this board, that he should abstain from voting because of the conflict of interest; and the other appointee, I suggest that he do the same thing, that he abstain from voting when this bill comes up. I think it's high time the government saw the error of its ways and started having a little respect for the taxpayers' dollars.

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

MR. GUTTORMSON: Yeas and nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the adjourned debate on the third reading of Bill No. 44, An Act to amend The Manitoba Telephone Act.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Cherniack, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Paulley, Peters, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Tanchak and Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 36; Nays, 13.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

The Committee of the Whole House. The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, this is Private Members' Day and these are government bills, and I suggest that they should be at the bottom of the Order Paper and should not be dealt with until such time as the private members' resolutions and private bills have been gone through. It is quite conceivable that if we deal with these third readings of these bills, we'll never get to Private Members today and it's most unfair. We lost last Friday; we're going to lose this Friday; and we can conceivably lose today if we don't proceed into private members business right at this moment.

MADAM SPEAKER: I think I would like to refer the honourable members to the ruling that I gave as recorded in Votes and Proceedings No. 38, when I said: "I am of the opinion that Rule 22 applies here. The day to day precedence on the Order Paper, except as otherwise provided, shall be as follows: (a) Third reading of bills; (b) Reports received from Committee of the Whole House." I also gave the ruling of Mr. Speaker, 1962, where he ruled that it was clear in his mind that Rule 19, one of our Rules, applies in this case. I think that in this House we have been following the rules and the practices which have been established for several years and that the Order Paper is in order.

Committee of the Whole House. The Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following bills: No. 5 - An Act respecting Travel on Highways and Operation of Vehicles thereon; No. 2 - An Act to amend The Municipal Board Act; No. 3 - An Act to amend The Municipal Boundaries Act; No. 4 - An Act; No. 14, No. 17, No. 28, No. 32, No. 57, No. 59, No. 15, No. 21, No. 51, No. 52, No. 60, No. 61, No. 65, No. 68, and No. 73.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I certainly am not in favour of this motion. I think that it is showing the arrogance of the government again in --(Interjection)--I'm in order. I'm in order. I'm certainly in order. Madam Speaker, I appeal to your ruling on this. Am I in order on speaking on this motion, or is the Minister again

MADAM SPEAKER: This is a Committee of the Whole House.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's right.

A MEMBER: It's a debatable motion.

MR. MOLGAT: In spite of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.....

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I'll make my decisions here please. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, and I apologize to the Minister, he won't have his way. I think that we're certainly in order to protest against this method - what this government is doing to prevent us from discussing private members business. We missed, as was said, on last Friday.

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member can speak on going into this, but he must not refer back to the ruling which I gave.

MR. DESJARDINS: I am not, Madam Speaker. I'm talking about the intention, the arrogance of the government. I respect your decision. I accept it, but I do not respect the arrogance of this government and this is what I want to talk about, because I don't think that -- I'm not in favour of going

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. I have given my ruling and you have heard it, that we will follow the practice which has been followed in this House for several years, and that third readings of bills and reports received from Committee of the Whole House are in order. As long as the honourable member does not defer to my ruling

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I haven't and I don't intend to refer to your ruling, Madam Speaker. I'm referring to the government who certainly knows that there's some importance in some of these private members business. We missed last Friday. The government has asked us to co-operate with them and I think that the members on this side of the House have certainly shown this during this Session. We were willing, when they wanted first, second and third reading on the same day, we agreed. We agreed on pretty well everything that was mentioned by this government. We try to go a little faster in the estimates; we try not to delay the committee; and we're asking now that we have a chance to discuss some of this private members business. We missed last Friday, Madam Speaker, and after going through - this one Act there, it'll take pretty well all afternoon and maybe some - we'll miss this and we won't go at all in private members business today, this afternoon, because this evening we are going back on the government business.

Now I imagine that we won't sit on Good Friday. That will be another day that we'll miss. I think that the government is certainly within its rights as you stated, Madam Speaker, but the government is certainly showing some arrogance in following this pattern and not giving the members on this side of the House - the private members - a chance to discuss their resolution and their committees. We know that we have little time to do this. Last year was a good example where we were left in the last day - well every year is a good example - we're left on the last day and we're deciding - everything is rushed in the last day. All the private members business is rushed in the last day and I think this is not good for the conduct of this House and the affairs of the people of Manitoba.

I think that when we decided there were going to be two afternoons, two sittings for the private members, I think we should go with the spirit of this resolution or of this principle, and we certainly are not doing this this afternoon. We haven't done too much of that this Session, Madam Speaker, and I think that certainly the government is showing again that it's being arrogant and doesn't care or doesn't respect the rights of the members of this House, especially the members of the Opposition, who certainly feel that they should have a chance to bring in certain things they are vitally interested in.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I think I should offer some comments on the remarks of the member for St. Boniface. It is based surely on a misunderstanding of the facts because the government has no control over these matters appearing on the Order Paper - well either I'm right or I'm wrong - and I shall state my view of this and see whether in fact I'm correct or not.

I pick up the Rule Book, which says on Page 10, "On Tuesday and Friday between 2:30 and 5:30 the routine business shall be the following list: Questions (written), Motions other than Government Motions, Private Bills, Public Bills, and Orders other than Government Orders, followed by Government Motions, Government Bills and Orders." That's in the Rule Book, not under the control of the government. The Order Paper is not arranged by the government. The Order Paper is arranged under the direction of Madam Speaker in accordance with the Rule Book, and there cannot be a charge of arrogance to lie against the government for an action which is not within their control. It is simply not within reason.

Now if my honourable friends, speaking about the order of business on private members day, wish to make a request that by unanimous consent to change the order of the business to enable their business to be considered in a certain order, I'm perfectly willing to entertain

(MR. EVANS cont'd)..... such a request. Any movement in that direction is not aided, I may say, by the tone of voice in which the matter is approached by the Opposition, but nevertheless if you wish to make the request now that these particular bills, which are not all government motions by any means - as my honourable friend will notice, the last item on the first page, Bill No. 17 stands in a private member's name. He happens to be on this side of the House. Bill No. 59 stands in the name of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. We have some others on this side of the House. Bill No. 21 standing in the name of my belligerent friend from St. George, who sits there looking rather less belligerent than usual, but nevertheless is one of the motions that stands in his name.

I don't think it's particularly arrogant of the government to wish to bring forward an order which stands in the name of the Honourable Member for St. George. There are some others, private members who happen to be on this side of the House; some others - the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. How can it be considered arrogance on the part of a government to bring forward private members motions? True, some of them stand here in the names of some of the Ministers.

Now in spite of the tone of voice in which my honourable friends have approached this matter, if they wish now to make a request that we leave off this matter and do not at this time go into committee but begin the Order Paper at some particular point, in deference to your wishes to conduct the private members business in the way that the House sees fit, make your request and we'll undertake it.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, the statement made by the Leader of the House is exactly the position that we have taken and he has read the rule exactly as we interpret it. If he will look at the rule now he will see that the request that we have made and the complaint that we have made is because the rule is not being followed. The Minister said the rule says that "On Tuesday and Friday between 2:30 and 5:30 the order will be Questions (written)." Well, that's not what we have on today's Order Paper, Madam Speaker, because Questions Written do not come first. "The next order of business shall be motions other than government motions," and if the Minister will look at the Order Paper of the day he will see that that is not the sequence of the Orders of the Day, because in fact the sequence of the Orders of the Day is first of all a government bill; secondly, Committee of the Whole House, which is a government motion to deal largely with government bills.

It is true there happened to be in there some private bills and that quite properly on Private Members Day those private bills should be considered, but the very statement that he made is exactly the point that we are making, that the Order Paper does not follow the sequence that the Rule Book says. --(Interjection)-- Well, my honourable friend says he didn't do it, but there's one thing for sure, the members on this side of the House don't make up the Order Paper, Madam Speaker. We've objected to this before. Surely if anyone is going to change it, it's up to the government to make the change. The Minister himself has just made the case today that we've been trying to make, and there's the point.

MR. DESJARDINS: I would suggest that the Leader of the House read the wrong thing.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I would suggest that the one question that could be addressed to the Honourable the Leader of the House would be from the quotation that he read from the Rule Book: Questions, and then motions other than government motions. If we asked him the question: Was the motion that was just moved by the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities a government motion? I think that's the whole question.

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to refer the honourable members to our Rule Book, Rule 22: "The day to day precedence on the Order Paper, except as otherwise provided, shall be as follows: (a) Third Reading of Bills; (b) Reports received from Committees of the Whole House." This is the order of precedence on which the Clerk of the House made up the Order Paper and unless otherwise changed.....

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I presume that this is the way I have to do it in view of the fact that you've spoken and you are quite correct. Rule 22 says "except as otherwise provided." In other words, when there is no other provision in the Rule Book, Rule 22 applies, but when it is otherwise provided, which is the case under Rule 19, then Rule 22 does not apply because it only applies except as otherwise provided, and in this case Tuesday and Friday is clearly otherwise provided by the rule as read by the Minister.

MR. EVANS: May I suggest, Madam Speaker, what we might do is this - renew my offer to the honourable members opposite to suggest at what point they would like to proceed with business which they regard as being non-government business. This may give, Madam Speaker,

(MR. EVANS cont'd).....yourself, and the Clerk an opportunity to consider the matter that has been raised. Nevertheless, before I take my seat, I repeat and I want it most clearly understood, that the conduct - the arrangement of the Order Paper is not under the control of the government. It is in the hands of the House and will be conducted according to the rules of the House and under the Chairmanship of Madam Speaker.

Now, therefore, do my honourable friends wish to request that a certain order now be called? We are at the moment in a debate upon going into committee and I presume that that item could be disposed of readily by voting against it without prejudice, as far as we're concerned, to enable my honourable friends to be accommodated on Private Members Day. I'm trying to be accommodating and I'm trying to see to the rights of the opposition, and why there should be such a belligerent tone of voice from the opposite side, I have no idea.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, then if this is the wish, I would request then that we follow the Order Paper stated on Page 10 of our Rule Book for Private Members Day, Tuesday and Friday between 2:30 and 5:30, and I would be very pleased with that.

MADAM SPEAKER: I have a Speaker's ruling before me which I cannot overlook, the Speaker's ruling of 1962 where he ruled it was clear in his mind that Rule 19, one of our rules, applies in this case. I would have to have this rule suspended before I could give leave to the House unless the House takes action to suspend it.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Madam Speaker, if I may speak to the motion, and as I understand the motion, the motion has been regularly moved and seconded that the House go into Committee of the Whole. I believe that that is the motion before us at the present time. Actually it has nothing to do, may I suggest, Madam Speaker, with a past ruling or a present ruling. The motion is whether or not the House will go into Committee of the Whole, and I think that is the only matter that we should deal with. So far as the rules themselves are concerned, a committee of the House has, at least on two occasions that I'm aware of, considered all of the rules of the House and the rule still stands in my opinion, Madam Speaker, the way you interpret it.

Now I make this suggestion. The House Leader has suggested that he is ready and prepared to allow private members' resolutions to be proceeded with ahead of third reading of the bills in the Committee of the Whole House. If this is my understanding, then I would suggest that the proper thing, Madam Speaker, would be for the mover of the motion to go into the Committee to ask for unanimous consent to withdraw his motion; the motion then be withdrawn and the Leader of the House ask permission, unanimous consent to alter the Order Paper of the day in order to go into private members' resolutions.

In both cases in my opinion, Madam Speaker, it must be by leave, because according to our Rule Book there shall not be any juggling of the Order Paper on Private Members Day. So I would suggest this would be the proper procedure, for the motion to be withdrawn, and if this is agreeable, then the House Leader ask also for leave to go into private members' resolutions on the Order Paper and I think everybody should be happy.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, with leave of the House I would like to withdraw the motion that we go -- do we have to go into Committee first? -- that the House give me leave, Madam Speaker, to withdraw the motion that we go into Committee.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, by unanimous consent I take it, and by leave, we suspend the order of business and now enter upon the resolutions standing on the Order Paper beginning at Page 3. Is that the correct point, or do you wish to begin with the adjourned debate at the bottom of Page 2.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is it the wish of the House to start with the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface? -- Agreed.

The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, when this Order came up the other day, the question was asked if the government made enquiries as to the financial statements of the different firms or different groups that received money. It seems to me that the government should have some access to the methods of money being spent in view of the fact that the government is making donations to these various organizations, and I was surprised to hear when the Minister, in reply to the Member for St. Boniface's question, said that we don't request any information such as this when we make a donation. I would suggest that this should be done in order that the government knows the money is being spent and spent wisely.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, because the Leader of the House has exhausted his right to speak, I have to make a few comments on his behalf. I would refer you, Madam Speaker, to Rule 171 (x), Page 148 of Beauchesne's 4th Edition, wherein it says that questions may not deal with an action of a Minister for which he is not responsible to Parliament or with matters not within his official knowledge, and that is the basis upon which my honourable friend the Leader of the House said that any information within the official knowledge of the government would be given on this Order, matters not within the official knowledge of the government couldn't and wouldn't be given. It's never been the practice to give it because we can't be assured that the information that was given to us was correct. We can only give the information within our own files that we know to be correct and that is within our official knowledge.

If my honourable friend wishes to know the number of paid up members of an outside organization, the number of conventions secured by the Association, the names of the conventions, the annual budgets giving the salaries of this outside organization, then I suggest he'd have to ask the Association not the government, but the government will undertake to give all matters on this Order that are within its official knowledge but that is as far as we can go.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, the question I think that was brought up after the Minister indicated that this was not a government body, as such, was that the budget must be available however to the government, and if the government is receiving a copy of the budget, which I presume it would receive if it is giving a grant to an organization, that it would like to know what the organization is doing. Surely if we are making grants of taxpayers' money to various bodies, then the government must know what these bodies are doing in order to decide whether or not they are entitled to a grant and what the amount of the grant should be. I don't know how you could establish that without having a budget from the organization.

I can't imagine on what basis the decision to give the grant - the size of the grant could be except on the basis of the budget, so the government must have available to it budgets from these organizations. If it does not have budgets from these organizations, then I wonder how the government determines its grant. How can it possibly decide what it should give to this particular association if it doesn't know what the association spends. We could end up by giving the association the total amount of its budget from strictly a government grant if that were so. So I agree that insofar as the information not being available to the government, if it's not a government body they cannot supply it to us, but where it is available, as in the case of the budget, then I suggest that the government should supply it to the House.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: May I have this item stand, Madam Speaker, please.

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

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba give consideration to the advisability of repealing the tax on electricity and telephone service, imposed under the provisions of The Revenue Act, 1964.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, I said once before that when the Manitoba Telephone System took over the Bell Telephone System to operate it as a public utility, it did so in the interest and for the benefit of the people of this province. That was also true of the government of Manitoba acquiring a Hydro Electric System. That was operated for the benefit of the people of Manitoba. Both of these utilities are owned by the people of Manitoba and, to me, it seems to be an absurdity for the people of Manitoba to be taxed in respect of a utility owned by them. No one can owe money to himself, and I take it, Madam, that where we are the owners of a certain utility, it's not only absurd but it's completely illogical to tax ourselves.

Now this tax on electricity and telephone service has to a certain extent been modified by the recent amendment brought into The Revenue Act, but my contention is, Madam, that electricity and telephone service are two utilities in general use by almost everyone of Manitoba and this government, or any other government for that matter in Manitoba, should be operating in the best interests of the people of Manitoba, and I submit, Madam, with all due seriousness and earnestness, that this government is not acting in the best interests of the people of Manitoba when it imposes a tax on these people for using their own utilities.

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd).....

Now, Madam, I'd also like to raise the point too that this government this year has shown in its budget an estimated surplus of \$25 million on its last year's operations. To me that only means one of two things, Madam, that the people of Manitoba are over-taxed, and I submit they are; or that the government has definitely or purposely under-estimated its revenues for the last year, thus bringing about that surplus. It is true that the government says that by virtue of the school tax rebate they will be paying back to the people of Manitoba some \$10 million. That would still leave them with \$15 million in excess and I submit, Madam, that this tax on electricity and telephone service should be repealed immediately, as in my opinion it's not justified from the standpoint of either policy nor is it justified on the benefits of reacting - or acting in the best interests of the people of this province.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks, 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 motion of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie as amended, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

I have had this amendment of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie under consideration. On Tuesday, the 29th of March, the honourable member moved an amendment to his own resolution which had been amended and to which the House had agreed that certain words shall stand part of the question. It is irregular to propose any amendment to those words as the decision of the House has already been pronounced in their favour, but this rule would not exclude an addition to these words if proposed at the proper time and by another mover other than the original mover of the main resolution as amended.

Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, 4th Edition, Citation 203 (17) reads in part as follows: "After a decision has been given on an amendment to any part of a question, an earlier part cannot be amended." As to the member amending his own motion, Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Citation 204 (1) of the 4th Edition, reads in part as follows: "No member may amend his own motion, but with leave of the House, he may withdraw or substitute it for another."

May's Parliamentary Practice, the 17th Edition at Page 418 states: "Amendment to words ordered to stand part of the question are out of order when the House has agreed that certain words shall stand part of the question. It is irregular to propose any amendment to those words as a decision of the House has already been pronounced in their favour, but this rule does not exclude an addition to the words if proposed at the proper time."

Therefore in my opinion, based on the above authorities, I must rule the proposed amendment of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie out of order.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I shall move the amendment at this time. I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye - the amendment that the Honourable Member for Portage wanted to move. The amendment is: (a) by striking out of the third paragraph the words, "urgent need for a policy," in the first line thereof, and substituting therefor the words, "in existence a program"; (b) by deleting everything in the last paragraph after the word "Government" in the first line thereof and adding the following: "be requested by the Province of Manitoba to give consideration to the expanding of the designated area program in Manitoba so as to remove existing inequalities of opportunity between similar communities."

MADAM SPEAKER: The ruling I gave for the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie applies to the Honourable Member for Assiniboia as well. You did not understand the ruling. Your motion is out of order.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, did I misunderstand the ruling that the Honourable Member for Portage could not move it because the original motion was his, and although it had been amended, it still meant that he could not move it but that some other member could move it. Was that not the ruling?

MADAM SPEAKER: Shall I read my ruling to you again or do you prefer to wait and read it in Hansard?

MR. MOLGAT: Well, if the matter could be left open, I have no objection and we can read it in Hansard. I have no objection to that at all.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is it the wish of the House to leave the matter open until the -- Agreed.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne, and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Member for Gladstone. The Honourable the Member for La Verendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, the amendment to the amendment reads: "This House urge Dr. J.C. Gilson to complete his study as quickly as is consistent with the importance of the subject, so that the Government will have no reason to further delay the implementation of this necessary assistance to the farmers of Manitoba."

I do not suppose that the members on the government side are too surprised at this kind of an amendment, because after all this resolution has been coming up here for the last three years. The first year, if I remember well, it was voted down, and last year we had the all very important amendment which was the cure-all to the problem; we would have the reduction of farm truck licences. As a matter of fact, we all remember that this was so practical that we would have a path beaten to the Government of Manitoba by other provinces to copy the action we had taken here. Well I haven't seen the path and I haven't seen the action either, because nothing has been done yet.

However, I see that this year the members have taken this a little more seriously and have decided to appoint a commission - or a one-man commission - to investigate and report on this subject. However, because of the experience that we had on this side of the House on the actions taken on this resolution in the past, we have decided to bring in an amendment to suggest to the government that this report be brought in as soon as possible so that action can be taken, because we all know that we have the highest gasoline tax in Western Canada in the Province of Manitoba. Practically every farm organization has been asking for some kind of relief in this matter; practically every organization that presents a brief annually has one resolution pertaining to purple gas.

I therefore suggest that the members of this House consider seriously, if they have any intention of doing something about supplying farm trucks with purple gas, to endorse this amendment which says that the report should come as soon as is possible so that action can be taken at the next Session of this Legislature.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, 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 motion of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood. The Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, I think that this resolution is a reasonable request because it points out the complexity of the modern everyday market. I would just like to read, Madam Speaker: "Whereas in the area of consumer purchasing there are numerous complexities and continually altering conditions and devices which have the effect of nullifying or blunting legislation designed to protect the consumer;" and so on. We're not saying, Madam Speaker, that nothing is being done; we are saying that because of the complexity, there's an ever-growing need to keep up with things, and anyone who has read "The Hidden Persuaders" will realize the extent that big business goes to today in order to motivate people to want to buy things.

I think the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre when he speaks about the cost - and I quote from Page 1374 of Hansard, Madam Speaker - he said, "This motion proposes that the government consider the advisability of establishing a Department of Consumer Affairs, and with a new government department it usually means a new Minister, a Deputy Minister and all the staff that goes with the department. This is a cost that I think is unnecessary and would result in an unnecessary burden upon the consumers of Manitoba, who this resolution seeks to help."

I think, Madam Speaker, that the honourable member forgot what the committee that was set up was supposed to do. I would like to read the preface to the report of the Special Committee on Consumer Credit, 1966, and I quote: "The widespread use of credit has produced concomitantly manifold difficulties and problems. Thus, the worthy injunctions of 'caveat emptor' and 'the buyer needs a hundred eyes' are of small avail against the complexities

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd).....which now confront the average individual in the world of commerce and consumer credit." This was recognized when the committee started on their chore of seeing what could be done to assist the consumer in Manitoba.

Now the Premier had already set up a Special Committee to look into consumer credit and they too saw the immensity of this task, and I quote, Madam Speaker, from Page 3 of the Consumer Report. "The Premier's Committee on Consumer Credit, which preceded the appointment of this committee, met regularly over an extended period of time. Its membership was drawn from persons and representatives with the widest variety of experience from all viewpoints related to credit granting and credit purchasing. That committee divided itself into a number of sub-committees, each of which concentrated on a particular area of the credit granting industry, and made specialized studies in the specific fields examined. These studies, in turn, were scrutinized by representatives of consumer organizations. The Final Report and recommendations that resulted in the Spring of 1965 is the product of that Committee having had available to it the most enlightened and detailed information on the subject - both generally and specifically."

Madam Speaker, the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre went to great length to tell us of all the agencies that are available to the buying public today, and he is quite right. We have the Better Business Bureau and many other agencies that a person can apply to, but if these were the complete answer, then I submit there would not be this great concern today on the part of consumers in asking for assistance on purchasing.

We note, Madam Speaker, that there has been a great improvement since the establishment of the Special Committee. That too is noted on the report of the committee, and I read from the bottom of Page 4 where it says: "The credit situation in Manitoba appears to have improved markedly since the enactment of this legislation." I say that that in itself shows the need for having specialized attention being given to this.

Now one has said today that in order to be able to be a prudent purchaser that you need to have a knowledge of the slide rule and a degree in Science to be able to compare the various size packages, because it is not always that the giant super-colossal package is the cheaper. And more and more, because of the motivational research that is done by these large companies, this is not far-fetched.

I don't think it was the idea of my honourable colleague the mover, Madam Speaker, to insist on the establishment of a department under a new Minister. And following from the report of the committee, they too envisaged the establishment of a department under either the Attorney-General or the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and it was felt that this could tie in very well. For instance, we hear much about the pamphlets that are issued by the government. I am very interested in the pamphlets that are issued by the Extension Service Department of Agriculture from time to time. There is a wealth of information in these pamphlets. I can see where a Department of Consumer Affairs could issue pamphlets such as these giving some guidance to the purchaser, and I also believe, Madam Speaker, that small business would welcome this, because I believe that the small businessman today is in the position where he is at a disadvantage in that he hasn't the means to compete with the type of motivational research done by the larger companies. I think that the more ethical we insist on sales, I think it would be to the advantage of the small businessman.

I think there is a need for constant vigilance because of the complexity of the market today to have a department say - let's start as a small department under the aegis of either the Department of Industry and Commerce - this wouldn't be costly. I would prefer it under that department rather than the Attorney-General because I think more of prosecution rather than education, and I believe in education rather than prosecution. I think that in this age of enlightenment that people are looking for the government to take the initiative here. I think because of the rise and the interest and the number of organizations who have organized toward the goal of trying to enlighten the public, that I believe it's getting more and more confusing all the time.

I would support this resolution, Madam Speaker, and say once again that we do not propose that an elaborate department with a ministry should be established, but we do believe it is the responsibility of the government in the age of complex buying to give people the type of information and the type of leadership that they expect.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move,

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, 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 Carillon. The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, there may be very little that I can add to this debate because most of the members who spoke on this side of the House have certainly expressed their views and brought out some real good points why the present system should be changed. I think that most of them have pointed out that it's very slow, cumbersome, and after listening to the Honourable Member for Neepawa when he mentioned the other day when he spoke on this resolution that it cost the government approximately half a million dollars, I think there is good reason for the government to change the present system. I would be inclined to believe that the government will change, because if it does cost this amount of money, I believe the government would have received much more credit if they would have used the rebating system directly through the municipal offices instead of a direct cheque to the homeowner.

So our objection, Madam Speaker, to the present rebate system is not with the substance but with the form. We have long recognized the need to provide relief for the homeowner, but I believe that this relief must be in the most economical manner possible and I feel that the present system is not on the economical basis that it should be done. In fact from appearance, Madam Speaker, it would seem that the government's reason for implementing this scheme is based on its form - the direct cheque method is designed primarily to influence the voting patterns rather than to relieve the burden of the real property owner. The form of rebate has completely disguised the supposed reason for it. Based on its present form, one must be inclined to believe the reason for it is to give an autograph of the Premier to every homeowner, or people that receive the cheque, is to receive an autograph from the Premier.

As we all know - and it has been mentioned by the other speakers and it's right in the preamble of the resolution - that the present form is very slow, and if I'm correct, I understand that all the cheques have not been mailed as of this date. I feel that governments must carry out their schemes in the most economical and least cumbersome method possible. In a year of government growth, the least we can hope for is that bureaucratic increase will be kept to a minimum. Therefore, we find that the purpose of the rebate is secondary to the machinery for its disposal. One wonders whether the homeowner is more relieved in this case or the government.

Our contention, Madam Speaker, is that the form of the rebate was ill-conceived. Its effect, its purpose is most cumbersome and the least direct method possible is used. In a practical and logical sense, there is nothing good to be said about the form of the rebate. We suppose that the government believes it has some political merit. The idea of relieving the homeowner does of course have merit, Madam Speaker, but the Provincial Government must recognize its obligation to carry a portion of the burden now borne by the municipalities. The most direct method would give the rebate to the municipalities. The only problem here, Madam Speaker, some benefit might accrue to the municipal politicians instead of government politicians here.

Madam Speaker, the resolution presented by the Honourable Member for Carillon, I think is a good resolution. It asks the government to bring the form of homeowner relief into accord with its substance. The present method lowers the esteem of this Legislature. I feel that the government would be well advised to change the present scheme because I believe those taxpayers would be in the majority and I'm sure that the government would get much more credit if they would change the scheme. To effect progress with the least cost and least delay is the hallmark of responsible government. To do otherwise, Madam Speaker, brings the whole system into disrepute.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. VIELFAURE: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from St. George, 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 Seven Oaks, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Minister of Health. The Honourable the Member for Logan.

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member we'd like to have this matter stand, but if any other member wishes to speak we would have no objection.

MADAM SPEAKER: Any other member wishing to speak? Agreed to stand? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Arthur, and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Member for Emerson.

In considering the amendment of the Honourable the Member for Emerson, I would refer you to May's Parliamentary Practice, 17th Edition at Page 637, with respect to the appointment of members of a Special or Select Committee: "Members of a Select Committee are named to the House upon the motion of some member, only if previous notice has been given. In the Commons, the member intending to move for the appointment to a Select Committee must endeavour to ascertain previously whether each member proposed to be named by him to serve on such a committee will give his attendance thereupon."

Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, 4th Edition, Citation 291, reads in part: "When the House is considering a motion of which notice has been given for the appointment of a Select Committee" -- also implies that this notice is required. Therefore I must rule that the proposed amendment of the honourable member is out of order.

Are you ready for the question.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wonder then if I may speak on the motion. I guess we're back to the main motion as amended.

MADAM SPEAKER: . . . in amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Arthur.

MR. MOLGAT: That's right. I'm sorry. The amendment has simply been moved.

This matter, Madam Speaker, is one of the very important ones in the agricultural parts of Manitoba and I suppose of all of western Canada. It doesn't matter what group we listen to these days, whether it's the Economic Consultative Board of Manitoba or whether it's the Farm Business Bureau or any group who are concerned with farm matters, we get pretty well the same answer each time; that is, that we have to improve the productivity of our farms; that the rate of mechanization will undoubtedly continue; that in all probability the sizes of many of our farms will have to increase. A number of the reports tell us that in some areas some of the farmers will have to get out of the business so as to set up economic units. Whatever the recommendations that we get, the result is the same. In most cases it means the farmers are faced with the need to buy more implements.

Now this isn't something that is peculiar to agriculture in itself; the same thing applies in business today, to our having all the way through to expand mechanization to go into different methods of computers and all of these things with which other resolutions that are before us are concerned. The concern there is for the effect on the individual of automation. In the farm implement field the problem is that the cost of this machinery is constantly going up. I know that some of the farm implement people say well, but the machinery is improving; it's better machinery than what was being purchased before; or the machinery is more powerful, more horsepower than what the farmers were buying previously. And there is some truth to that, but the facts are that the reports of the government itself indicate that the income of the farmer is not improving. The machinery may be improving but the income isn't improving, so we're faced with the situation, the farmer has no choice but to continue to buy new machinery, to buy better machinery, more powerful machinery, in order to try to keep his costs as low as he can, and yet unable to do so because the costs are going up and the returns are not. So we have that continuous problem on the farm, and some of our resolutions, the other one that was discussed earlier today on the coloured gas and this one, are an attempt to do something to bring the costs down.

It seems to me that in other areas of North America certain steps have been taken that do assist the farmers insofar as farm machinery prices. I am not sure whether these are the complete answer or not but I believe that a committee of this House could do some useful work in getting these questions into the open. Is it, for example, a good arrangement to have what we have in this country now, the question of tied dealerships, where a dealer for a certain farm implement manufacturer is tied to that manufacturer and must sell the line of the manufacturer. If he tries to sell a competing line, particularly what is known as the short lines, that is, those specialty companies who do not produce a full line of farm implements but who may specialize,

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd) . . . for example, strictly in harvesting equipment, as one manufacturer here in Manitoba does, or specializes in hay land equipment and so on. A number of these tied dealerships, under the contract with the major implement company the dealer is to handle only the line company goods. Now, is this the best method of distribution insofar as Western Canada is concerned?

I understand that some of the American States have made some changes in this regard and do not permit tied dealerships, giving the dealers the opportunity to sell a number of different lines of equipment. I'm not sure whether this is the answer or not. It has been tried elsewhere but I'm sure of this: that the problem is serious enough in Western Canada that we should have a look at it. This is one of the things that we could look at.

I think that the development in the Province of Manitoba of companies who produce farm implements, is a most important one to our province, most important from the standpoint of industrial development, but most important too to agriculture, because you find that if the company who is producing is right here on the spot, right here in Manitoba, in immediate contact with the farmers of the province, with the university, with the Department of Agriculture here of the government - and these bodies are very interested in farm implements; the university does a good deal of testing - that the existence here of the farm implement industry and manufacturing industry is vital to having good farm implements, and certainly from what I've seen of the costs, pretty important in getting the prices in line too.

Now isn't there here some good work for a committee in the Province of Manitoba to do, to see what steps can be taken as a province to encourage further the development right here in Manitoba of farm implement companies that are on the spot producing equipment specifically suited to our requirements here in the west? I know that in the past the very big companies have experimented greatly with equipment. I know by personal experience that in many cases the equipment that they produced - which was after all done for a very large market, as you can expect from the distribution that they have - that this equipment was not always suited to western needs or to Manitoba needs. The equipment might get on the market and only after a year or two of trial practice by the farmer himself was it found that there had to be modifications, in some cases complete change-overs, and this has meant additional costs to the farmer himself. Surely a committee of this House, looking at the problems directly from a Manitoba standpoint, would see that there are avenues here that would help in this item of the cost-price squeeze on farmers.

So it's for this reason, Madam Speaker, that we proposed the resolution that we introduced in this House. We were quite aware when we proposed it that work has been done elsewhere in this regard; that the Province of Saskatchewan studied this; that the Federal Government some years ago had a partial industry at least - it was not completed, I understand, but they had made some start; that there's some conversation going on in Ottawa now about the possibility of a federal inquiry; but I submit that there is room for an inquiry by the Province of Manitoba itself, because a federal inquiry of necessity will be looking at the question from a national standpoint. They'll be looking at it from the standpoint of equipment to be used in the Maritimes and in Quebec, in Ontario and through the west. Our concern, quite obviously, must be specifically insofar as the Province of Manitoba itself, and these matters that I brought up, this question of local industry, is something that is of vital concern to us specifically as a province, which a federal investigation might not look at in exactly the same way as we would provincially, so it seems to me that regardless of what Ottawa does, whether they set up a commission of their own, that there would be definite value in the Province of Manitoba itself taking this step. What we're proposing after all is a committee of the House. It is not going to cost any money to the Province of Manitoba. It is strictly the members of the House itself; we could call before us the various companies who are in the farm implement business; we could hear from the farm groups; we could hopefully get some information from what is being done in the United States in this regard, and I think the committee could, to begin with, have some sound recommendations to make to the federal committee, if such a committee is set up. We would then be in a position to speak as a province to the federal committee and say, "Here are the recommendations of the Manitoba Legislature insofar as this investigation of yours." That would be one aspect of it.

The second one would be to investigate what specific steps we as a province could take, what changes we could make in our laws that would provide better service to the farmers, lower costs to the farmers and better equipment to the farmers, and at the same time assist materially

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd) . . . in the industrial development of our province.

So I submit, Madam Speaker, that our recommendation does not live on the basis of whether there's going to be a federal one or not; it can stand on its own feet, because there is need for this in the Province of Manitoba and there is ample scope for a provincial group to do some work, there are I'm sure suggestions that could be made that would benefit the farmers of the Province of Manitoba plus the industry of this province, and so, Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the amendment be amended by adding at the end thereof the following words: "AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this committee be empowered to sit during the present Session of the Assembly and during recess after prorogation, and BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the House urge this committee to so arrange to complete its meetings, hearings, deliberations, decisions and recommendations, that it shall report thereon at the next Session of the Assembly so that action so far as it lies within the power of this Province shall not be further delayed."

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MADAM SPEAKER: Here again I am worried about the question of money involved and I will take it under advisement.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Springfield, and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I did not really intend to speak on this resolution that is before the House. However, I felt that I should make a contribution or two, even though I actually did adjourn it for some other member.

Now what I am really concerned about here, Madam Speaker, is this - that my honourable friend the Member for Logan has brought into the House nearly the same resolution that he had a year ago expressing concern over what will happen to the labour force when automation is in full force and effect, and last year when he brought forward almost identically the same resolution, the members of the government pooh-poohed it and actually voted against their own recommendations, if you recall. I'm referring to the recommendations that were made in the second annual report of the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board, and I found this resolution last year and the amendments thereto one of the most interesting that I have ever listened to in this House, because you will recall that the Honourable Member for Lakeside used a paragraph directly from Page 6 of last year's report from the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board and the government turned it down. The government voted solidly against their own recommendations, and I think perhaps this is one of the very few occasions that they have ever done this in the history of this province or in any other province. Now it's true that it may establish a precedent but, however, I do recall that there were a lot of the members opposite digging into their desks to find the amendment contained right in the annual report.

Now there is no doubt about it, there are many, many people in this province who are vitally concerned as to what will happen to the labour force as a result of automation. Why, my honourable friend the Minister of Education twice, I think, during his estimates made the statement that about 50 percent of the students that were now attending elementary school would be expected to fill positions that were not yet created. Now surely that does point up what we might expect from automation in the future, a clear indication that there will be new fields open - perhaps not as many, but new horizons to face and new fields of opportunity.

Now when my honourable friend the Member for Logan moved the resolution again this year, it was amended by the Honourable Member for Springfield Mr. Klym --(Interjection)-- that's right. As my honourable friend has said, he agreed to the content of the resolution but then amended it, but actually what he said was that inasmuch as the Throne Speech indicated that a new youth and manpower agency will be established, the duties of which will include co-ordination and development of governmental studies and programs relating to technological change, that this would take care of all of the problems that were envisaged and outlined in the body of the resolution. I, Madam Speaker, have not that much faith in the government. I have not faith that, -- on two scores. I question entirely whether or not they intend to set up the Youth and Manpower Agency at this Session, and I question whether or not that it is capable or will be capable of dealing with all of the problems that are outlined in the body of the main resolution.

Now surely I should not have to stand here and inform the government that there is, in fact, a problem, because in 1961 or '62 when the government tabled this famous COMEF report,

(MR. SHOEMAKER, cont'd) . . . it points up the fact that there is going to be major changes in the labor force as a result of automation, and it tells the government in bold terms what they should do now if they are to meet the challenge and take care of unemployment that will result from automation. That was followed up in 1965 by the very strong words of the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board, and it is certainly followed up again this year in stronger terms in the third annual report that was laid on our desks on Thursday last. And on Page 7 of the third annual report, I would like to just refer you to the one paragraph on the bottom of the page where it says, "Automation will, in fact, have a major impact on Manitoba's labour force. This makes mandatory a thorough examination of the adequacy of the educational and training services available to the province's population," and goes on to say, "If Manitoba is to gain maximum benefit from this forward step at the federal level, Manitoba will need to come to grips with some of these problems that are pointed up so clearly in all of the government reports."

And so, Madam Speaker, I would urge all the members of this House to give consideration, favorable consideration, to the resolution that is before us, and vote in the affirmative.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, that the debate be adjourned.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER, the proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, may I have this matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. John's and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk. The Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. M. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): Madam Speaker, in the absence of the honourable member could we have this matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, may we have this matter stand please?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Logan and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare. The Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. PETERS: May we have the matter stand, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable The Attorney-General.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, in taking part in this debate, I think perhaps I might comment that some of the general principle involved with respect to crime syndicates and organized crime was touched upon during the time when we were considering the estimates of the Department of the Attorney-General, and perhaps some of the observations that were made at that time do not need to be repeated on this occasion. I think that we would all join with the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface in his concern about the possibility of crime syndicates operating in Manitoba, and I join him in that matter and indeed assure him and members of the House that a good deal of time and attention is paid to this matter of the control of criminal activities by those who, for one reason or another, wish -- do in fact, engage in such activity. Our concern in this regard must be of course the concern not only with respect to the Province of Manitoba alone, but with respect to all of the provinces and Canada as a country, because what affects other parts of our country, other provinces, can and does affect the Province of Manitoba; and conversely, of course, what affects the Province of Manitoba affects the other provinces of the country.

It is for this reason that we have been pleased and indeed happy to meet under the chairmanship of the Minister of Justice at Ottawa in July of 1965, and later under the joint chairmanship of the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor-General for Canada, on January 6 and 7 of this year, again at Ottawa, when together with the senior officials of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and other persons who have responsibilities in this field, we considered carefully the ramifications of criminal activity in Canada, the extent to which these activities may be related to activities of similar groups in other countries. We were given a good deal of

(MR. McLEAN, cont'd) information which, members I am certain will understand, cannot be disclosed publicly because of the confidential nature of the information that was provided. But all of it left me with the assurance that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the people in the Department of Justice were aware of the dimensions of the problem, that they were doing what was humanly possible to ensure that careful surveillance was kept with respect to these matters, and that every possible avenue was being followed for the protection of the public of our country.

Certain matters were proposed or were outlined to us on the occasion of the second meeting, which are being designed to increase the staff and activity and the effectiveness of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in dealing with this matter, measures which I welcomed because of the fact that they would strengthen the capacity of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in this regard. I may say to the members that we have received a further information, just a very few days ago, from the Solicitor-General indicating his desire and interest in convening a further meeting of the Attorneys-General of the various provinces, during which we may consider the developments that have taken place since our last meeting and any other matters that either the federal people or the various provinces might wish to bring forward for consideration, and to continue the consideration of measures that should be taken jointly and in co-operation with one another for this purpose.

While the matter does not come within the operation of syndicated crime, the recent gold brick case in Manitoba perhaps may be mentioned here. That of course was a locally conceived scheme, as the case will undoubtedly make quite clear, but it is of some importance in this respect, in the context of this resolution, in that when certain basic information had been established here as to the likely identity of those who had engaged in that rather dramatic episode, the section of the RCMP whose function it is to be concerned about activities of a criminal nature as they affect the country and various parts of the country, were called in to operation, and I believe that it was a matter of an hour and thirty minutes within which the RCMP in Vancouver had apprehended one of the key people, if not the key person, in this matter and I cite that as an illustration of the effectiveness of the co-operation that exists between the police forces, and of the effectiveness, the almost startling effectiveness of the work of the RCMP in the work in which they are trained and which they do from day to day all over Canada.

Dealing with the resolution itself, there are one or two comments. I had, may I say, hoped -- I have reason to believe that the report of the Winnipeg Police this year will be a report which will give us good cause for optimism, but that report, I must say -- and I had hoped perhaps it might be available -- is not available and I do not have it to refer to at this time.

I would like to make a comment concerning the proposal that is made in the resolution itself. The resolution calls for, or asks for the appointment of a non-partisan committee of the members of the House. I just interject a comment -- I am not too certain how one would get a non-partisan committee out of a Legislature composed of members of political parties. However that's a play on words. I just make that comment, that I really don't think that there are any of us that are non-partisan yet, to investigate crime and crime syndicates. I would like to make this observation, that it probably would not be wise to have a committee which would be considering this matter, naturally, and of course properly, as a committee of the House, before the public. After all, you don't investigate crime by disclosing all your information. And so the committee would either not have effective information, not have the kind of information that would be worthwhile, or alternatively, if it did, I am sure that all of the people who might be inclined to engage in criminal activity would be very happy to know of the work of that committee, because they would be able to read in advance and prepare themselves accordingly for any plans that there might be to apprehend them. So what I want to say, Madam Speaker, is that I doubt that it would be advisable or that we would really effectively accomplish any worthwhile object by bringing into public debate the means and methods by which the various police forces endeavour to combat crime. I just don't think that that's a very practical approach under our modern day circumstances.

I did, during the time of the Estimates of the Attorney-General's Department, make reference to the fact that counsel had been engaged to keep myself and the Department -- to especially work with the police forces and others in the way of keeping us fully informed of matters that ought to be brought to our attention in this important field, and I mention it again for the information of the House.

Madam Speaker, not being able to agree to the terms of the resolution, although

(MR. McLEAN, cont'd) . . . understanding the concern of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface and, I am sure, other members, I thought it might be advisable if I were to propose an amendment to the resolution, and I would therefore move at this time, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that the resolution be amended by deleting all of the words and paragraphs appearing after the words "United States" in the second paragraph of the preamble of the resolution, and substituting therefor the following:

"AND WHEREAS it is imperative that every effort be put forward to ensure that crime syndicates be not allowed to become established or operative in Manitoba or elsewhere in Canada; and

WHEREAS the problem of combatting the establishment or operation of crime syndicates is one affecting the Government of Canada and the several provinces; and

WHEREAS the Minister of Justice (Canada) convened a meeting of the several Attorneys-General at Ottawa in July 1965 at which time this problem was considered; and

WHEREAS the Minister of Justice (Canada) and the Solicitor-General (Canada) convened a further meeting of the Attorneys-General of the several provinces of Canada on January 6 and 7, 1966, at which time this matter was further considered and plans developed for dealing with the problem; and

WHEREAS the Attorney-General (Manitoba) together with senior advisors attended and participated in the aforesaid meetings; and

WHEREAS the Solicitor-General (Canada) has by letter indicated his willingness to convene a further conference of the Attorneys-General to further consider this problem; and

WHEREAS the Attorney-General (Manitoba) had advised the Solicitor-General (Canada) of the willingness of Manitoba to participate fully in such a conference; and

WHEREAS special steps have been taken by the Attorney-General to ensure that syndicated crime does not become established in Manitoba; and

WHEREAS full co-operation is being maintained by Manitoba with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and all municipal police forces;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Attorney-General continue in co-operation with the Government of Canada and all law enforcement agencies, to take all necessary steps to prevent the establishment or operation of crime syndicates in Manitoba."

MADAM SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable the Attorney-General, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that the resolution be amended . . . --(Interjection)-- Agreed to dispense?

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface, as amended.

MR. EVANS: On a point of order, may I suggest that the main motion as amended should now be put?

MADAM SPEAKER: I am putting it right now.

MR. EVANS: I beg your pardon.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, as amended. Are you ready for the question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, 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 Assiniboia. The Honourable the Member for Pembina.

MRS. CAROLYNE MORRISON (Pembina): I ask the indulgence of the House, Madam Speaker, to let this matter stand.

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

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, in his absence, may we have this matter stand, unless someone else wishes to speak, may do so.

MADAM SPEAKER: Any other member wishing to speak? Agreed to stand. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, may we have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: May we have this matter stand, Madam Speaker?

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

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Madam Speaker, the Honourable Member for Emerson the other day told us quite a lot about the elements of weather and weather forecasting, and I think quite capably so. It is a common fact and quite a known fact that weather conditions in Manitoba, and possibly for that matter right across Canada, or at least most parts of Canada, are quite adverse to some of the more pleasant weather conditions of some of our other countries, and this to me is one of the bigger reasons why we should have a better and a more elaborate weather forecasting and I do not wish only, in the few remarks that I have, to blame the news media. I think though that most companies that are in the advertising business - and I'm referring now to either television stations or radio, for that matter possibly even some of the papers - I think they usually know that their advertisers, the ones they do business with, prefer to do some of their advertising either before or after a weather forecast. Therefore, I think that the weather forecasts are a lot more important to a lot of people and, for that matter, to most people, and especially, as the Honourable Member for Emerson said, to our farmers; and I think I would like to add for that matter to anybody working or playing outside. In fact, I doubt if anything at all takes place - I was just pondering over this question - I don't really think that anything at all in our lives possibly takes place for that matter, in this province or anywhere, without weather conditions affecting us. I think this is quite simple and I don't really think that we have to be reminded too much of this fact; we are automatically quite aware of this I am sure. But a basic point in this resolution is not only how are we affected by good or adverse weather conditions, but how good weather forecasting will allow us to plan ahead our work or play, as I said a few moments ago, and all the things that affect our daily lives.

I thought the other day that we were possibly taking this resolution much too lightly. I do not think that this resolution is wasting the time of this House, although maybe the words that I am saying may, but the resolution itself I think is quite concrete. I think we have discussed a lot of things in this House possibly a lot less important than to encourage these better daily, and as also the member mentioned, either a five-day or weekly local and regional weather forecast.

I am reminded of so many television stations across the line, talking now of United States. A lot of them are spending a whole hour on the news and the weather forecast, and they do this not only daily but two and three times a day, and this seems to take place in practically every state that I have ever visited, and it by now seems to be a common thing. It seems to be just another regular common daily procedure in most of these states and I believe this is essential that these types of weather forecasts are given at least two or three times a day, and it seems to be very much appreciated by all.

I know that when we say "all" we can include a lot of people. I'm thinking of the tours, for example, by the average business people, many of those and many of us who are affected, our livelihood is affected by weather conditions. We can take the sportsmen for that matter, or take many others, and we know how many different types of sports we could be thinking of where the weather is affected in this respect, by the Commercial Traveller, even by mothers wanting to know what their children are going to wear to school the next day, and they could be various as we all know. I'm thinking of not only -- possibly I'm getting away from the resolution a bit when it says it's referring to Agriculture. I know we could go on and talk of the bus and the commercial drivers, the truck drivers and so on, who spend 24 hours of their life on the truck; also the grain elevators, and we all know how many more we could think of.

Well Madam Speaker, I do not have very much to say but I will give two weather forecasts in conclusion of my remarks. I think the temperature in many a farmer's home - and I'm referring now to the temperature of the people themselves - would be much closer to normal if they could get a better and a more detailed weather forecast.

Secondly, as you all know, the weather forecast for tomorrow I think is 25 and 40 above, but this to me is not enough. If this were the final weather forecast for example, to a farmer for that day, say in the month of October or in the later months of the year, and he hasn't been able to do his combining for the last two or three months the way he ought to have done. I don't

(MR. BARKMAN, cont'd) . . . think that this type of weather forecasting is enough. We need a more detailed, not only local but regional weather forecast and I'm sure that you agree with this, so I ask all of you that even if the weather forecast may not seem so important to us today, or personally for that matter, they mean very much to the farmer. I know this is true because I've talked to many a person, many a farmer over the last couple of years, and I'm sure you have too, those of you who are from the rural area, and it's actually a bit of a disgrace to see that some of our news media are curtailing our weather forecasts to less than a minute's time, and tonight when you get home just time the weather forecasting. On most stations they take less than a minute's time. It may be all right at this time of the year but it's not all right to the farmer at certain times of the year, and I think also we know it is important because heaven knows how much we all talk about the weather. In fact, I think it's the most talked about subject possibly other than women. I don't know.

Therefore, if all the people of this province and elsewhere are going to gain by a more elaborate weather forecast, and if the news media actually can make a financial gain - and I think they can - doing this and also satisfying and supplying these types of forecast that were mentioned by the Honourable Member for Emerson, and as I have tried to, then I do not see why this House should not support this resolution because it just plainly reads thus:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of co-operating with the Government of Canada and the news media in providing detailed local and regional, daily and long range weather information primarily for the benefit of Agriculture.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon) Madam Speaker, this is one of those times when I must say, like so many say, I didn't intend to get involved in this debate, but I think that members are not realizing that the forecasting of weather is the forecasting of probabilities, not certainties. Maybe 10, 20, 100 years from now we might be able to arrive at the certainty of a prediction that the honourable member would like to see, and certainly many of us would like to see that degree of certainty. If this resolution were passed I'm afraid it might come to a place where I often get kidded about the weather and they'll say to me, "Well, can't that Conservative Government do something about it?" And I'd say, "Oh yes, but then it would appear on your taxes," and I'm afraid if we got involved in accepting a resolution like this in this House, it would certainly reflect in our taxes, because I think the matter of weather forecasting is being pretty well done by various organizations, certainly those engaged and interested in flying our airlines, and we have various departments of governments federally, involved in weather forecasting.

It's amazing and it's certainly true that it does affect people in every walk of life. I was amused one time when I was at a Rotary meeting. It was rather uncertain weather and I happened to say to the chap across the table we were involved in pouring a good-size slab outside and I would like to know with certainty what the weather was going to be like and someone took up the conversation and I said, "Oh yes, but I don't think you are in the same position. I'm in the position of having several thousand dollars worth of concrete ruined by an unexpected rain," and this chap said, "Oh no. Is that so?" He said he was a general manager of a supermarket type of grocery, and he said, "I'm just as vulnerable to the weather only in a different fashion. If I bring in a carload of fruit and the weather turns bad and the farmers don't get in that week, we have to haul it out to the garbage disposal," so there is certainly truth that we are all concerned with the weather and I think certainly with the system of devices that we are throwing into orbit around the world, which will give pictures of cloud patterns and necessary information that's needed to the weather forecasters and weather bureaus, that forecasting will become certainly more accurate, but I feel in this case like I do toward the attitude I think the government should take in relation to private enterprise. Where a task is being well done and reasonably well done by other organizations, I really think that it's ridiculous for any particular government to get more deeply involved and put the burden on the general taxpayer, and I think we are being provided with very good weather forecasting and I see no necessity for the government getting involved in it. We must remember when we see a whole week's weather go awry from the forecaster that sometimes we might be just as well off with a Ouija board, but that's the state of affairs now and I don't think the government getting involved in it is necessarily going to make it more accurate or a better service than it is right at present.

MR. FRED T. KLYM (Springfield): Madam Speaker, I too was not going to get up and speak on this particular and very important subject, but after hearing two farmers who are quite eloquent and well-versed on the subject, and the Honourable Member from Brandon, I think that probably I should make a few comments on this too.

(MR. KLYM, cont'd) . . .

Well Madam Speaker, I do not know how one would feel when we generally get wet weather for a month or two or three months at a time. Take for example 1959 when our farmlands were soaked with water, when we had lands all flooded throughout Manitoba, and to end it all up in the fall the western part of Manitoba was covered with about three feet of snow, with all the swaths and the hay and everything else left in the fields. Now I don't think that any farmer at that time was very happy listening to the weather forecast. I think he felt like probably throwing his radio out of the window and also out of the car.

Now take again 1961 when we had a very dry summer. Now I heard all kinds of forecasts then but our grass would not grow; our crops would not grow; everything was just wilting and drying; and we will all remember in this House how much we had to put up with getting feed for cattle from different areas and how much our government was concerned with taking a great part in trying to help out the people of Manitoba with both giving them the supplies of water and also the feed for their stock.

Now take for example not long ago; what about the summer of 1965? It was nice and wet too. The farmers had a great deal of trouble putting their crops in, and to top it all off it seemed to have been growing in the water and in the fall of the year they were not able to gather it. I know my own field. I had cut some of the grain that I was able to and it lay in swath for 10 weeks. Just before the snow came we picked up some of it.

I don't think that we would enjoy listening to radio forecasts. Probably it's nice for a radio commentator to be there feeling kind of happy just like a glorified auctioneer announcing the weather conditions every 15 minutes or every half hour or every hour. If he spends a half a minute or spends two minutes, he's just putting in his time and he's happy with it, but I don't think very many of us are happy with it. I do not think that the government should be involved in trying to solve the weather conditions for anybody. I think they're only happy - and we're all pretty good and clever when the weather conditions are favourable.

Madam Speaker, I know in one occasion I believe it was mentioned about that area by the Honourable Member for Emerson where I believe they have such a service in Illinois. Now one morning a radio commentator received the following squawk: "I wish to inform you, sir, that I have spent the last two hours shovelling six inches of cloudy and mild out of my driveway."

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member who just spoke would permit a question? Do the farmers in your group agree with your valuation of long-range weather reports?

MR. KLYM: Pardon?

MR. JOHNSTON: Do the farmers in your group agree with your valuation of long-range weather reports?

MR. KLYM: Madam Speaker, I don't know whether they agree with anything like that, but many of them have often stated exactly what I have stated here. When the weather was bad and lasted a long time, they were not happy. They agreed with me exactly.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I have no prepared speech to make at this time but I think I'd like to voice a few comments on the resolution before us. We all know that weather forecasts today are not to be taken too lightly because most people, when they see them in the newspapers, take a good look at them, and especially so with The Country Guide which puts out a full page weather forecast each month when the publication comes out. I'm sure that a lot of farmers take note of this, and if they forecast wet weather say for the last half of the month, they will do certain work in the first half that they normally might have left for the latter part of the month, so that a certain amount of attention is being to these forecasts.

By the way, this forecast in The Country Guide is prepared by people in the United States. It's an American forecast actually and it costs the paper \$500 a month just to publish that and to get it prepared, so it cannot be taken too lightly, and farmers in Manitoba are appreciative of this. I'm sure the other farmers in Western Canada who get the paper are likewise, because this forecast gives particulars of the various provinces in Canada and their forecasts, so that these forecasts certainly have some merit, and if they can be improved upon it would be certainly worthwhile to look into this matter.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris Lansdowne): Many people discussed the weather this afternoon, and as an insurance agent, that's one of the only things that insurance agents can't insure is weather, although there are some companies - Lloyds of London will take that risk. I think it's if you have a real good sports day going on you can insure it won't rain. The

(MR. McKELLAR, cont'd) . . . premium is very high but I think it's well worth it, and I imagine if the member for Morris was here he would say that this coming summer, due to the wet weather, that I think it would be a good bet for the Morris people to take rain insurance when the stampede is on.

Well I think most of us know, and I think it's the Federal Government that do forecast the weather right now, and if I'm not mistaken, I think it's the Department of Transport, isn't it? I'm just not aware. Well I don't know -- changing it to the province, I don't think that's going to help matters very much. At least if the weather is bad we can blame it on the Federal Government, and if we got mixed up in the weather I know what the people would blame it on, they would blame it on us. Heaven knows, there's enough things to blame on the Provincial Government this day and age without getting involved in the weather.

But I think for the opposition, I think it would be wise to look at the long-range weather forecast, because if I remember in 1958 and 1959 during the experience of electioneering -- especially in 1958 -- it never rained once during election period. It sure was rough campaigning because everybody was just worried whether they were going to have a crop or not and it's pretty hard to convince somebody to vote for you. So I would advise -- maybe all of us -- here we could watch the forecast very closely, and if there's a period of a few showers about twice a week for the period of June, I would suggest to get your shoes on, your clean shirt on, and go out campaigning.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, may I ask the honourable member who has just spoken a question? Was he declaring government policy?

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready

MR. VIELFAURE: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Carillon, that the debate be adjourned.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

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

MR. LISSAMAN: In the absence of the Honourable Member for Morris, I wonder if we might have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 43. The Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam, at the outset I would like to congratulate the Honourable Member for St. James in the manner in which he introduced this bill for second reading. I think he was quite objective; I think he was quite sincere; and I think that he believes in what he termed was the principle of this bill. I hope that after I have finished that the honourable member will attribute to me the same sincerity as I attribute to me the same sincerity as I attribute to him, because the principle to which I adhere in respect to this bill is diametrically opposite to the principle which my honourable friend has asserted.

Now I think it's only right in this particular instance, Madam, that we review something of the background of this bill. The original action against Drs. Rennie and McBeath on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Radclyffe related to an operation performed in 1959, in which it was alleged that both doctors were guilty of malpractice in leaving in the wound a gauze or surgical sponge. Now this action was tried before the late Mr. Justice Maybank and was dismissed against Dr. Rennie on the grounds that he took no part in the operation. He was not present at the operation, and that in spite of the fact that the records of the Misericordia Hospital showed that he was present. The action on the other hand was dismissed against Dr. McBeath on the grounds that the plaintiff had failed to prove, by a preponderance of evidence, that the sponge or surgical gauze had been left in the wound by him.

Following the dismissal of that action, an appeal was taken to the Manitoba Court of Appeal and the Manitoba Court of Appeal upheld Mr. Justice Maybank's decision. Following the dismissal of the appeal by the Manitoba Court of Appeal, an application was made to this Legislature in March of 1964 for a private bill permitting an allowing Mr. and Mrs. Radclyffe to sue Drs. Mackey and Rennie in respect of an operation alleged to have been performed by them in the Winnipeg General Hospital in 1944. In that private bill, no remedy was sought against the Winnipeg General Hospital. That bill was thoroughly debated in this House and was defeated. Following the defeat of that bill, an appeal was then lodged to the Supreme Court of Canada. The Supreme Court of Canada upheld the decision of Mr. Justice Maybank.

Now by reason of the fact that there seems to be a great deal of misconception as to the

(MR. HILLHOUSE, cont'd) . . . effect of the Supreme Court of Canada's judgment, I would like to refer to the part of that judgment which is giving that misconception, and that part of the judgment is the judgment of Mr. Justice Spence who delivered the majority judgment of the Court. By the way, it was a split decision. There was only five judges in the Supreme Court of Canada as against the full nine who sat in on the appeal. Three of them held for the dismissal of the appeal and two of them held for upsetting Maybank's decision and giving judgment against Dr. McBeath.

Now I think it's important to read that part of the judgment which has been giving the misconception. Mr. Justice Spence, who delivered the majority judgment of that court, outlined his reasons for judgment, then he finished on Page 719 of The Supreme Court of Canada Report, 1965, by saying this and I quote: "For these reasons I am of the opinion that I am able to conclude, as did the learned trial judge, that not only has the Plaintiff failed" - that is the Radclyffes - "failed to prove that this gauze was inserted during the 1959 operation and not removed by the defendant Dr. McBeath, but," - and this is the part now which has given rise to such misconception - and I quote, "considering all the factors, I think the probabilities are that the gauze had been left there those 15 or 16 years and had remained dormant until the 1959 disturbance." Then the learned judge says, "I have used the learned trial judge's exact words."

It is that quotation that I have just mentioned which has given rise to a great deal of misconception. A great deal of people take that statement, considering all the factors, etc., as meaning that that was the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada against Dr. Rennie, but it was not. Dr. Rennie was not before that court in respect of a 1944 operation. The Winnipeg General Hospital was not before that court in respect of any operation, and all that that statement amounts to is a gratuitous remark on the part of the judge which is known at law as obiter dictum. Now it does not form any part of his judgment.

Now I wanted to clear that up because I have read articles in the press and elsewhere which in my opinion have at least implied that the Supreme Court of Canada held that that gauze was left there in the 1944 operation. The Supreme Court of Canada did not. All it said was, on the basis of probabilities, it might have been left there. But I would ask you to remember this, that the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada was a three to two decision. Two of the judges were just as adamant and strong in holding that the gauze was left there by Dr. McBeath than Mr. Justice Spence was in holding that there was no evidence, that is at least there was no evidence but that the Plaintiffs had failed to prove that the gauze had been left there.

Now I think it's only right, Madam, to look at this matter in retrospect, because what this bill is now asking this Legislature to do is to give permission to Mr. and Mrs. Radclyffe to now apply to the Court of Queen's Bench - and I am using the words of the member who introduced the bill, not my own words - for leave to bring an action.

Now I would ask all honourable members to take a look at their bill and read that bill, for the purpose of ascertaining what this bill would mean if it were passed, because the first paragraph of the preamble, in my opinion, is a finding by this Legislature that Mrs. Radclyffe suffered injuries as a result of a 1944 operation and that Doctors Rennie and McBeath and the Winnipeg General Hospital are liable for these injuries. Allow me to read this, and I will omit the portions of the preamble which I consider to be irrelevant. Here is what it says, and I am omitting certain parts of it: "Whereas Helen Radclyffe suffered and sustained injury and impairment of health as a result of an operation performed on the said Helen Radclyffe by James W. Rennie, Esq., M.D. and by Lawrence R. Mackey, Esq., M.D." In other words, it is a finding as to fact. Then the bill goes on to say that "An application shall be made to a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench by way of originating notice of motion for leave to bring an action." Now what are you going to bring the action on? We've already held, as a matter of fact, that the injuries and damages were sustained as a result of that operation. All that we're asking the court to do, if we take this bill in its literal form, is to assess the amount of damages. That's all we're asking the court to do.

Now I think it would be worthwhile for the members to read this bill and find out what it says, because it certainly doesn't say what the Honourable Member for St. James says it has said when he introduced it. This bill makes an actual finding of fact.

Now I would like just to review in retrospect what has happened. As I said, the first action was against Drs. Rennie and McBeath in respect of a 1959 operation in which Dr. Rennie took no part. Second, there was an appeal to the Manitoba Court of Appeal against the dismissal of that action by Mr. Justice Maybank. Third, there was a bill introduced into this House in 1964 following the dismissal of that appeal, asking this Legislature to give the Radclyffes the right to bring

(MR. HILLHOUSE, cont'd) . . . action against Drs. Rennie and Mackey in respect of the 1944 operation, and there was no mention at that time made of the hospital. Then there was an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada against the dismissal by the Manitoba Court of Appeal of the action which they brought in respect of the 1959 operation.

Now at all times, excepting the time when the application was made to this Legislature in March of 1964 for a private bill asking for leave to bring an action in respect of the 1944 operation, at all times it was strenuously contended by Mr. and Mrs. Radclyffe that that sponge was left there in the 1959 operation; and it is only now - it is only now, when the Supreme Court of Canada has ruled that it was not left there - or at least there wasn't sufficient proof that it was left there, which is the same thing, because the onus of proof is upon the plaintiff to prove his or her case. It is only now that that position is being changed and we're being asked now to give the Radclyffes the right to bring an action against Dr. Rennie, Dr. Mackey and the Winnipeg General Hospital in respect of a 1944 operation.

Now I think it's wrong; it's very wrong for us to amend the general law in respect of one case. I have the greatest sympathy in the world for Mr. & Mrs. Radclyffe, and particularly for Mrs. Radclyffe for all her pain and all her suffering, and I do sincerely feel that way towards her, but at the same time, I, as a member of this Legislature, feel that I have to take an objective view of this bill and what it entails and the principle embodied in it. I feel that I must do so on the basis of what my conscience dictates as being in the interests of justice.

It may be that Mrs. Radclyffe has suffered an injustice by reason of having no remedy against anyone in respect of the injury which she received, but on the other hand, I am constrained to believe - or at least I am induced to believe that I cannot be a party to giving justice to one individual and at the same time inflicting an injustice on another. That is exactly what we would be doing in this House if we did pass this bill, because as far as Dr. Rennie is concerned, the evidence in the Supreme Court of Canada, the evidence in the Manitoba Court of Appeal, and the evidence before Mr. Justice Maybank, clearly shows that he has no recollection whatsoever of the 1944 operation. It's completely obliterated from his mind. The only evidence in respect of that operation is the record of the Winnipeg General Hospital which was micro-filmed, and in the process of microfilming it they did not microfilm the back side of it on which the doctor's report was contained respecting the operation.

Now the part that was microfilmed showed that there was a correct sponge count in respect to the 1944 operation. Now all that Dr. Rennie can say now is this, "I believe that I followed the same practice and procedure as is customary in such matters." That's all he can say, but he has no specific recollection of it. Now if the court should find, on the basis of probability, that that sponge was left there in the 1944 operation, by reason of the fact that the doctor's record has been destroyed - his evidence has been destroyed with the destruction of that record, and the only evidence that he could give to the court would be, "All I can say is that I believe that I followed that procedure which was the standard procedure at that time." That's what we're up against.

Now the honourable member says that we have precedence for this. I say we haven't. I say that the cases that the honourable member cited, that is bills that were brought before this Legislature, are entirely different to this particular bill, because this bill seeks, even if you do not accept my interpretation of the bill, but this bill seeks to give the right of action in respect of a cause of action, if any, which arose over 22 years ago - or 22 years this year.

Now the other bills that came into this House were in respect of causes of action in respect of which the facts and the evidence were still available and in existence. Oh yes, they were. The bills were brought in simply because, if I remember correctly, actions had not been started under The Highway Traffic Act within the period of one year and these people were allowed to bring those actions after one year, but while the evidence was still fresh and while the witnesses were still available. Now there is that difference between the bills that you have mentioned and this particular bill.

Then my honourable friend refers to The Workmen's Compensation Act and the power of the Compensation Board to abridge time in respect of matters which have not been reported to that board in the time prescribed in the Act. But I would ask the honourable member, and I'd ask the other members of this House, to take a look at The Workmen's Compensation Board Act and they will find that most accidents are supposed to be reported immediately as they happen. Certain types of accidents must be reported within seven days, and so on and so forth, but the abridgement of time - that is the power to abridge time which the Workmen's Compensation Board has - does not result in an injustice to anyone because the facts and the evidence are still there.

(MR. HILLHOUSE, cont'd)

Take for instance the case of a man working, say loading something, and he finds a strain develops. He thinks nothing of it and he decides, well, I'll just carry on, and he -- sure, but they have the right to abridge time. If the man tries to carry on, thinking, well, I've only pulled a muscle or something like that, then he finds out after a few days that he has had a rupture, now the board has the right to abridge the time there and allow the man to file his claim for compensation. It's an entirely different thing.

Now another thing the Honourable Member for St. James says is that - and I'm assuming that your interpretation of this bill is different to mine - that it simply means that the Radclyffes, if we pass it, would have the right to apply to the court by way of originating motion for leave to bring the action. Now you say that all we are giving them is the right to apply to the court. I would like to point out to the members of this House that in four of these bills that we passed, the judge before whom that particular action came felt that the passage of the bill in question by this Legislature was a directive towards him to hear the case. There was no hearing within a hearing. There was no ear. But they considered it was a directive from this House to try the case, and I believe that their reasoning is based upon the fact that we have the power by law to say that the Radclyffes have a right to bring an action. An if that's the way this House feels about it, well let's have guts enough to say so. Don't ask us to pass off our duty to a judge. If we feel that the Radclyffes should have the right to bring the action, let's say so in the bill itself so that there be no flim-flamming about it. Because if we don't, I say that we're shirking our duty, particularly too when the judges in the past have considered those bills extending the time for bringing action as directives from this body here.

Now I know that I sound hard; I sound legalistic; but I wish to assure every member of this House that I am in deep sympathy with Mrs. Radclyffe, but I still can't feel that this is a matter where we should change the public law - and that is a public law. That law was not enacted for the benefit of any individual, it was enacted for the benefit of all of the public. And any time you change a public law for the benefit of one individual, you are running into trouble. And as proof of that is the fact this bill is before this House now. We have in the past, by abridging time in other matters, and notwithstanding the fact that those matters that came before the House in respect of The Highway Traffic Act, nobody was going to be prejudiced by reason of granting that extension, but by merely creating the right - or at least treating these matters sympathetically, we are laying ourselves wide open to our laws being changed by private bills. I say to every member in this House, if you don't believe in the Statute of Limitations, repeal it; because all you are doing by creating special Acts or giving special privileges, is creating chaos. And if you want to create chaos, let's do it the right way. Let's repeal all of our Statutes of Limitation.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member will note that it is now 5:30. I leave the Chair until

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I wonder if because of the interest in this, and if the honourable member isn't too long, whether the House might allow him to complete, because we are going into government business this evening and many of us are quite interested in the thought that the honourable member is exhibiting in this very important matter. I, for one, would suggest possibly that leave be granted, with your permission, to allow him to complete his

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the honourable member leave to proceed after 5:30?

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, we'd like to know how long the honourable member to proceed.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I won't be long, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam, I would just like to conclude by reading an excerpt from an article which I saw some time ago dealing with the Statute of Limitations and the reason why it was enacted. I don't know the name of the author of this article but I agree with what he says, and with the permission of the House I would like to read it.

He says, "I feel it my duty to state that the Statute of Limitations was enacted in the public interest, and it must either be allowed to remain inviolate or it should be altered completely so that the public at large knows exactly where it stands at any time. If there is to be any orderly method of dealing with those who allege negligence on the part of others and seek recovery in damages from them, there must be definite periods during which any rights must be exercised. If this is not to be, or if this principle is to be waived from time to time by the enactment of private bills, then no one will know where they stand and no one will know when they may be

(MR. HILLHOUSE, cont'd) . . . held liable for something they have long since forgotten. There are very serious and far-reaching implications in the waiving of any public law, and I would urge that this should never be done except in the most exceptional circumstances where the interests of the whole public are at stake and not when it merely affects an apparent injustice or hardship to an individual or a small group. "

Now in concluding, Madam, I would only like to refer to a section of the Municipal Act which gives to the Court the right to grant an order for an individual to bring an action against a municipality where that individual has failed to give notice as required under the provisions of the Municipal Act, and that right of the court safeguards the municipality by stating that if the Court feels that the order should go and it will not prejudice the municipality in its defense, that order shall go. Now I submit, with all the seriousness at my command, that if we pass this Act, we cannot say that we are not prejudicing Drs. Rennie and Mackey and the Winnipeg General Hospital. I don't know anything about the Winnipeg General Hospital. I don't know, whether the nurses who were present in that operating room in 1944 are still available. The only thing I know is that there was a record kept and it was only part of that record that was kept. I don't even know Dr. Mackey. I don't know whether he's still in Winnipeg or where he is. But I do say this, and I say it with all seriousness, in spite of the fact that I have the greatest sympathy for Mr. and Mrs. Radclyffe and I sincerely wish that something could be done for them, I feel though that in the interests of justice I could not do them justice by inflicting an injustice on someone else.

MR. D. M. STANES: Would the honourable member permit a question? Madam Speaker, would it not be true that the Judge, in deciding whether or no it should go to Court, would be greatly influenced by evidence available or not available?

MR. HILLHOUSE: I have already told my honourable friend that in four cases that we passed private bills here, they never even made any investigation and went ahead and heard the case.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Hamiota, that the debate be adjourned.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: I leave the chair until 8:00 o'clock.