

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

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, March 20, 1964.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
Notices of Motions
Introduction of Bills

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 57, an Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956, and to validate By-laws Nos. 18854, 18872 and 18884 (1).

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Mines & Natural Resources)(Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the resolution standing in my name on the Order Paper.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution recommends it to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting the administration and conservation of forests in the province and providing, among other matters, for the payment from and out of the Consolidated Fund of moneys required to be expended for the purposes and objects of the Act. Resolution be adopted?

MR. LYON: This is a new forestry Act which will take the place of the present legislation on our statute books, the first major revision in something like 35 years. The purpose of the committee stage here of course is only to indicate that moneys will be required for its administration and operation. I'll be happy to discuss the Bill and principle on second reading and in detail at the committee stage thereafter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Call in the Speaker. Committee rise and report.

Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has adopted a certain resolution, directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. LYON introduced Bill No. 100, an Act respecting the administration and conservation of forests in the Province.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct your attention to the gallery where there are some 28 Grade 5 students from the Robert H. Smith School under the direction of their teachers, Mrs. Doe and Miss Scott. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities. We welcome you here this afternoon. We hope that all that you see and hear in this Legislative Assembly will be of help to you in your studies. May this visit be an inspiration to you and stimulate your interest in provincial affairs. Come back and visit us again.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): Madam Speaker, if the House will permit me, I should like now to give the answers that have been submitted by telegram to me in respect of the TCA questions that were raised yesterday. I think perhaps it would help the understanding of the statement if I were to read again the question asked and the answer received. They are as follows, and as members know, this is the dialogue between myself and the Honourable Prime Minister of Canada.

The first question was: In terms of your statements in Parliament, what undertakings do you consider you have given about the maintenance of employment at the Winnipeg TCA overhaul base? Answer to question 1: I said in Parliament on December 17th last year; "It is the policy of the Government to do everything possible to maintain employment at the TCA base in the Winnipeg area and, if possible, to increase it." So far as TCA is concerned, this means that the base will continue to be used for the overhaul of Viscount aircraft so long as these

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd)... aircraft are in service. So far as the Government is concerned, it means further that we will do everything we can to ensure that other aircraft work is available in Winnipeg so that the eventual withdrawal of the Viscounts is at least balanced by new activities. This policy should not be interpreted as a guarantee that each particular job now filled in Winnipeg will continue indefinitely. Normal changes in technology and work methods, and the provisions of seniority rules between employer and employee, may lead to the disappearance or transfer of particular jobs. A dynamic industry cannot be frozen into a particular employment pattern. My undertaking means that there will be no transfer of work from Winnipeg by deliberate policy. On the contrary, the policy is to do our utmost to secure enough aircraft work to maintain or improve the present employment level.

Question 2: Have these undertakings of the Federal Government been reflected in TCA policy re employment and transfers at the Winnipeg overhaul base? Answer to question 2: I know of no basis for the allegation that TCA actions since November have been contrary to the policy which I then announced. The part of that policy which concerns TCA relates to the continued overhaul of Viscounts in Winnipeg. TCA has confirmed that, as far as its planning now extends, most of its Viscount fleet will remain in the service for at least 10 years, and the commitment to keep this overhaul work in Winnipeg has been clearly re-stated. According to detailed information supplied to me by TCA, there has been little change in employment at the base for more than two years. As you are aware, employment has been up to a peak of over 1,300 but was substantially reduced in 1960 and 1961. At the end of 1961 it was 984. It has changed little since. Our latest figure, for January 31st last, is 962 -- A difference of 22, I interpolate. -- TCA has supplied me with a detailed analysis of the changes between December 1962 and January 31st, 1964. During this period 12 people in all were transferred from the Winnipeg base to Montreal. Of these, 11 were management and clerical staff and the other was a weight control technician. The facts as TCA presents them to me are therefore completely contradictory to any allegation that, in defiance of the stated policy of the Government and the airline, numbers of skilled employees are continuing to be transferred from the base.

Question No. 3: In view of the Federal Government policy to encourage development of regional air centres, will the Federal Government, in co-operation with the Province of Manitoba, direct a study into the decisions to transfer TCA facilities from Winnipeg, including a consideration and an evaluation of the Dixon-Speas Report, and the proposals for the future development of the Winnipeg base? Answer to question 3: I entirely agree that it is desirable to have a clear review of the problem. It should be a constructive review directed especially to future development. The Federal Government will be happy to have the co-operation of the Government of Manitoba in carrying out this study, and the Minister of Transport will shortly be discussing with you specific proposals as to how it should be made.

The telegram from which I am reading is signed by the Prime Minister. Just a very short comment on this wire, Madam Speaker. I think the answers to questions 1 and 2 have very much cleared the air because there has been, and I think quite justifiably, a fog of misunderstanding and perhaps even of suspicion surrounding this whole matter, and it was for that reason that my questions were addressed to the Prime Minister in the tone that they were, so that he would have an opportunity to put the facts as he sees them and as TCA reports them to him before this Assembly and before the province. So I think that it is very valuable indeed that we have had that clarification from him as to the nature of his undertaking and the way in which those undertakings are being carried out by the Crown Corporation concerned, and I trust that this will sufficiently provide us with information on that point.

I think the really important matter, in view of the fact that the past is behind us and the future lies ahead, I think the really important matter is the willingness of the Government of Canada to have a clear review of this whole problem in co-operation with the government of the province in such a manner as to promote the future development of that base, and I am glad to know that the Minister of Transport will be making some suggestions to us as to how this can be done. I believe this does represent a constructive mood in our efforts to establish the aircraft industry in this metropolitan centre.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, if I may be permitted to make a comment, I want to thank the First Minister for reading this to the House and to thank the Prime Minister of Canada for making the position of his government

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd)... very clear. I think this is a most encouraging report to Manitoba. We may not be aware here of the pressures exerted at the moment on the federal government to move this base to Montreal by eastern interests, and for him to come out with a clear-cut statement of this nature once again vindicates his position and is most encouraging to Manitoba.

I'm particularly pleased to see as well that an enquiry will be conducted. I think we have to look towards the future, and that there will be this co-operation between the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba in the interests of the air industry here in this base is most encouraging.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Madam Speaker, I, too, wish to thank the Honourable the First Minister for the statement that he has read to us today. We will not be receiving Hansard of today until Monday at least, and I wonder if my honourable friend would be kind enough to have copies made of the replies to his questions available for us, if possible today, in order that we may give study to the answers that the Honourable the First Minister has received from the Right Honourable the Prime Minister. I have read some telegrams that have been sent backwards and forwards in the past in which there could be different interpretations placed on them, and I would like to have the documents in front of me to see whether or not the same may hold true in respect of the telegram that the Honourable the First Minister has just read to us.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I'll be happy to table the questions and the answers, and ask the Clerk if his staff could produce some copies so that members may be informed.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to take the opportunity to invite the members of the Legislature to view the film "Are Rivers Masters or Servants?" We are going to run the film for the benefit in Room 200 on Monday evening next at 7:30. It's a 20 minute film and there should be ample time to view it and get back into the House for the business of the evening -- interjection -- This is restricted to MLAs.

At this time also, Madam Speaker, I would like to announce an extension of the crop insurance test area. I'm happy to make this announcement on the expansion of the area covered by crop insurance for the coming year. This government has concurred with the recommendation of the board of directors of the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation to extend the present areas as follows: The Rural Municipality of Louise with the exception of those sections and parts of sections situated west of the Long River, and the Rural Municipality of Lorne and the Rural Municipality of Pembina have been added to the south central test area. That part of the Rural Municipality of Ritchot which is situated west of the Red River has been added to the west Red River test area. The Rural Municipality of Fort Garry, the Rural Municipality of St. Andrews, the Rural Municipality of West St. Paul and the Rural Municipality of Old Kildonan have been added to the north central test area. Crop insurance will be available to the farmers in these municipalities for the 1964 crop.

The corporation will begin its sales campaign in these areas within the very near future. The additions to the west Red River and the north central test areas provide for protection to the whole of the farming area adjacent to and along the length of the west side of the Red River. This represents an extension of crop insurance to another five percent of our farmers. Crop insurance is now available to approximately 35 percent of Manitoba farmers. This expansion is rather modest when related to the 65 percent of our farmers who have yet no opportunity to protect themselves, but until the Government of Canada provides an acceptable re-insurance program, we have no alternative but to expand our program in a cautious manner.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wish to ask a question of the Minister. He indicates that this increases the number of farmers who can be covered by five percent. Could he indicate the increase in percentage of acreage covered in the province?

MR. HUTTON: It is an approximate figure and runs about the same.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture is going to make available a showing of the pictures dealing with the floodway. I wonder if he or the Minister of Public Utilities are also going to make available to members of the Legislature the showing of the controversial picture "Tom Jones?"

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister a question. How many municipalities are now covered under this program?

MR. HUTTON: I'll have to get that information for my honourable friend.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, I thank the Minister for the invitation to the showing of the film, but I was wondering if he could reconsider another evening. Members of our group have committed themselves to an engagement that evening and it would make it impossible for us to attend under the circumstances.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I'd be happy to accommodate the members of the Liberal Opposition. I think we'll hold the filming on Monday evening as we have arranged, and will provide a special premiere performance for the members of your group. Most happy to oblige.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Thank you very much.

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to draw the attention of the members to a 100th birthday. Mr. Ed McConnell of Hamiota will be 100 tomorrow, March 21. He has been an outstanding citizen. He was always active in many community projects and his church being the foremost. I believe his mainstays in life were agriculture and politics, and although he was never a member of this Legislature, he was very vociferous when it came to his political feelings. He was a farmer in his active days and one of the promoters of the Hamiota Agricultural Society, and I think it's true to say that this society is one of the more outstanding, even today. In politics, I think Mr. McConnell slipped a little bit because he was, and is, at 100 years of age, a Liberal.

He has a very keen mind at 100 years of age and I'd like to relate just a little incident that occurred just before this Session opened. I had called on him to assist him in making out his income tax, and as I was leaving he called me back and he asked me two questions. He said: "When does the Session open?" I told him, and his next question was: "Is he going to put a tax on sales?" When I said I doubted that this would happen, his reply was "That's good," and I couldn't help but be amazed at how keen and active he was mentally at 100 years of age. While Mr. McConnell has been living alone in his later life, I'm sorry to relate that today he is in hospital and he's not very well. I'm happy to mention this hundredth birthday because I'm sure all members would like to join in expressing good wishes to Mr. McConnell.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I certainly appreciate the fact that the Honourable Member for Hamiota was so thoughtful as to raise this matter in the House today. We don't make many exceptions in our business here to recognize distinguished citizens in this way, but certainly when someone reaches the age of 100, I think we should be glad to pause in our work to pay a tribute to the great service that they have given. And now that the Honourable Member for Hamiota has mentioned a couple of other great qualifications possessed by Mr. McConnell, that makes it all the more emphatic that we should pay our respects to him and send our congratulations to him on his 100th birthday.

I have known Ed McConnell for more than 40 years. As the honourable members will have noticed, he and I are in roughly the same age group and we have been friends throughout the period. As the Honourable Member for Hamiota has also mentioned, though Ed McConnell didn't himself take the time to spend some of his years in this Legislative Assembly, one of his brothers did and his work certainly is recorded here as that of an excellent member for that fine constituency.

I'm sure, Madam Speaker, that all of us would want to join with the Honourable Member for Hamiota in expressing our congratulations to Mr. McConnell and our sympathy with the fact that he is indisposed just at the moment, to wish him a speedy return to the active community life that he has served for so long and so well.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I should like to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 15 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, and a Return to an Order of the House No. 21 on the motion of the same honourable member.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to direct a question to my friend the Honourable Minister of Public Works. He reached the headlines of the paper on March 13 and it is said that the Minister would reveal the route of the Carberry road next week. We have now reached next week, in fact this is the last day of the week, and I wonder if he could tell us now -- if he could reveal the route of the Carberry Road as suggested here.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): The answer is "no,"

(Mr. Weir, cont'd)... Madam Speaker. I might say I don't know where the report came from.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to extend an invitation to all members of the Legislative Assembly from Mr. Bowra, the Vice-President of Canadian National Railways to visit the Transcona Shops Wednesday next. A bus will leave from the front of the Legislative Building at 10:00 a. m. After the tour you are invited to be guests of Mr. Bowra at a luncheon at the Fort Garry Hotel.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would hope that the House would join with me in congratulating Mrs. William Gray on her 102nd birthday, which is today. Mrs. Gray is a resident of the constituency of Winnipeg Centre and lives on Mayfair Avenue and is in the best of health. She is a real old-timer, having come out to Winnipeg before the railways got here. She came in 1880 by boat from Sarnia to Port Arthur, and then by the Grand Trunk railway from Duluth and eventually got to St. Boniface. This lady is in the best of health and certainly is a wonderful lady for her age.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Address for Papers standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that an humble address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of all the correspondence between the Government of Manitoba and the City of Winnipeg with respect to: 1. The first slum clearance program in the history of Manitoba in which the provincial government participated and for which the provincial government is responsible as stated in the House on Monday, March 9, by the Premier. 2. The first housing program in the history of the Province of Manitoba with respect to the re-housing of people apart from those who are in special categories, for which the province is responsible as stated by the Premier in the House on Monday, March 9.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, I have spoken to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition about this Order for Return and he advises me that he would be happy to receive the correspondence without all of the enclosures, because there were very numerous and voluminous enclosures with most of the correspondence, and on that understanding I would be happy to accept the Order.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I am prepared to accept this. The Minister was kind enough to discuss it with me. I really want the letters that we're concerned. If there should be certain reports that after perusal of letters are required, then I would see the Minister to see if those are available, but I'm certainly quite happy to accept his amendment.

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

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

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. The number of contracts for road building and drainage let by the Department of Public Works or any other Department, for which tenders were not called for or received for the last twelve month period available; 2. Details of all such contracts; 3. To whom such contracts, if any, were awarded.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the 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: Bill No. 37, an Act to amend The Telephone Act; and Bill No. 38, an Act to amend The Manitoba Hydro Act.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole, with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

Bills Nos. 37 and 38 were read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bills No. 37 and No. 38 without amendment, directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fisher, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. STEINKOPF presented Bill No.37, an Act to amend the Manitoba Telephone Act, for third reading.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the third reading of Bill No.37.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Beard, Bilton, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Evans, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Paulley, Roblin, Schreyer, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 37; Nays, 13.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. STEINKOPF presented Bill No.38, an Act to amend The Manitoba Hydro Act for third reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I do not rise to repeat the arguments that have been covered in debates on this Bill on second reading and in Committee, but only to say that we will vote against this Bill as we voted against the companion bill which was just passed by the House. These two bills are useless legislation, joining the roster of a number of actions from my honourable friends on the far side; needless cluttering up of the statute books; actions that the government has proven they can take without these bills at all.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, may I rise to support the bills as I have done throughout their progress in the House for the opposite reason of that expressed by the Leader of the Opposition. I am sure sure that the people of Manitoba will be better served in the conduct of its public utilities by the members of a committee of the Legislature having a full opportunity to investigate into the operation of the public utilities which are the responsibility of this House.

I also want to make a comment, I think a proper comment, Madam Speaker, that during the committee hearings of the Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources, the Party which has been loudest in its condemnation of the conduct of the Manitoba Hydro and the Manitoba Telephone System, namely the Liberal Party of Manitoba in general were conspicuous by their absence

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege, no member of this Party has condemned, ever, people who were running the Hydro.

MR. PAULLEY: So I continue, Madam Speaker. I see no point of privilege. I merely want to point out here in this House and for the purposes of the records that the Party who has raised so much malarkey or buffoonery in respect of the operation of the Hydro and the Telephone System, when they had an opportunity, as they had in the Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources, were conspicuous by the smallness of the number of their members of the committee that attended the hearings. I think, Madam Speaker, it is particularly to be observed that the Honourable Member for Gimli -- excuse me-- the Honourable Member for St. George, who raised certain allegations last year, who sought certain information this year, did not attend one of the committee meetings thus far that have been held.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege, this is not true.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, to my observation the Honourable Member for St. George did not attend any of the meetings, and if I am in error in this then I will gladly retract, but during the times I was at the committee meeting I did not observe the Honourable Member for St. George in attendance at the meetings and I'm sure that the Clerk of the House who keeps the record of the attendance will be able to inform me as to the accuracy of my statement. But notwithstanding, and despite the heckling from the friends on the right, I repeat, Madam Speaker, for the fifth time, and it might be just a start of a number of times until I get it into the addleheaded mind of my honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface that this is good

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)... legislation and good for the conduct of public business in the Province of Manitoba, and I'm proud of the fact -- I'm proud of the fact that the members of the New Democratic Party sitting in this House agree with my contention and agree that the activities of our Public Utilities should be revealed openly and under scrutiny by a committee of this House automatically and not by request.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, before we put the question, or take the question, I wonder if the one who has some responsibility for the legislation may be allowed to have a word in this interesting discussion between the two honourable gentlemen opposite. I must say I'm pleased to have the approbation of my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP Party on this occasion. He doesn't always give it to me but he does this time and I think I must say that I think he's right. I am satisfied with the result of the legislation that we are passing. I'm satisfied with the principle embodied in it -- thoroughly satisfied -- because from now on every year we shall, as a matter of statute, perform the function of reviewing the reports of these corporations as we did the other day, and I'm sure that as we get into this each year we'll become more expert in examining them in respect of their statements and elicit more information and further develop the area of communication for the public good.

Now in reply to all those who say, well you don't need the law to do that, I simply make the factual observation that in the -- let me see -- fourteen sessions in which I have sat in this Legislature, this is the first occasion on which I recall that the annual statements of these two bodies were placed before us and examined. Now the committee has met on other occasions and we have examined these utilities in respect to specific matters. I remember when the amalgamation with the Winnipeg Electric was up, we went into that in great detail and it was a very useful meeting, and we had our meeting last year, but I think that it is a good thing that we shall now, as a matter of routine and record, and according to statute, have this committee meeting for the purpose of examining these institutions and developing whatever information we can about what they are doing. It certainly can do no harm and it conceivably will do a good deal of good, and I think it is wise that these statutes should be upon our books.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I rise only to reply to the member for Radisson and his complete inaccuracy. He says I never attended the meetings. The Member for St. James and I sat together and we were directly opposite the First Minister, and I think it ill behoves the Leader of the NDP to make charges like that that are so ill-founded.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I accept the word of the Honourable Member for St. George that he did attend a, or part of a meeting of one of the meetings of the Utility Committee.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, that's a pretty good record as attendances go in this House, if there were just two meetings and my honourable friend attended one of them, because there are a lot of folks that haven't as good a record as that in attending committee meetings, and even in the attendance in the House here there are some who are absent quite often. I'd think we'd better not start going into that question too deeply and advertising it too much to the public of how often some of us are away. I think maybe it would be safer to keep to the merits of this Bill.

I've not objected to the fact that the officials of the Power Commission and Manitoba Telephone Commission are to be called regularly before the committee. I think that's all right. What I objected to was the statement that the Minister made on second reading of the bill. I take the position that the bills are not necessary that this could have been done without them. It was done on former occasions. I suppose it isn't necessary for them to come every year. As the Honourable the First Minister has mentioned, there have been few occasions where the House has felt that they need to come, because it's only been when there's been some specific matter to be investigated or on which further information was wanted. We have depended in this House on getting the information from the Minister. As far as I am concerned, I'm still going to depend on that. We can put this to the test very quickly for we happen to be in the Honourable Minister's estimates right now and I think we'll have the chance to find out whether or not the Minister is prepared to answer in this House.

I suggest to you, Madam Speaker, that nothing that has taken place has made it easier for us to get information than it was before. I suggest to you further that it is not always necessary that we should have the officials of the Power Commission and the Telephone System before us. I suggest to you that the place that we should continue to look for the information on matters of policy -- yes, and even on those matters where the administration is left to the

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd)... board -- is in this House, and where the Minister is not able to give it, then he receives it in the same way that Ministers do the information on other questions that they are unable to answer here.

So in voting against the third reading of this bill, I am not particularly opposed to the legislation that makes it mandatory that the reports be referred to the committees. What I am voting against is any suggestion -- any lingering suggestion that the Minister in any way divest himself of responsibility to answer for these Commissions under his department in this House.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, I for one am very puzzled by the attitude of the Liberal Party in this Chamber with regard to these two particular bills. In fact, I would go so far as to say that their attitude at times takes on the appearance of petrified adolescence because I've heard at least two speakers of the Liberal Party say that the legislation in itself is not objectionable, that what they were objecting to was some particular interpretation which they drew from the introductory remarks made by the Minister of Public Utilities.

Subsequent to that, however, they have got ample assurance from the First Minister and from the Minister of Utilities that those introductory remarks were perhaps not put quite correctly and, if anything, overly interpreted by the Liberal Party in the direction they wanted to interpret it. The fact of the matter is we have had adequate assurance from the government that they do not intend to use this particular legislation with a view to sealing off any questioning of the Minister with regard to the operations of these two Crown Corporations. Having received that assurance, what in the world are they now objecting to? It seems to me when we vote on a bill -- on legislation, we vote on the merits of the legislation and not some chance remarks that may have been made pertaining to the legislation by a Minister when he was introducing it.

After all, it is possible you know that a Minister may make a remark inadvertently. I understand the Minister of Health made a remark the other night that was inadvertent. We have to take his word for it when he says he didn't mean that particular statement. Surely it's good enough to be given assurance by a Minister that his original remark was perhaps not putting it quite rightly when he gives us on the second round -- when he gives us his second thoughts on the matter we should accept it. In the final analysis, we vote on the legislation itself and I think that members of the Liberal Party shouldn't forget it.

Of course I know what's behind all this too. I have heard a Liberal member some few years ago say in this Assembly that the duty of the Opposition was to oppose for the sake of opposing, and it seems to me that's what they're doing now, and I can't think of any greater perversion of parliamentary democracy than that.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, will the honourable member permit a question?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes.

MR. MOLGAT: Was he observing that when the Minister made his statement it was a prepared statement that the Minister was reading, and that he read this on the record as government policy, not an inadvertent statement?

MR. SCHREYER: The Honourable Leader should know that a written statement is merely one's thoughts put in print, and if you can make a comment inadvertently while you're speaking off the cuff, you can also make a mistake when you're putting your thoughts down on paper. What's the big difference?

MR. STEINKOPF: I'm still at a loss to know what mistake was made.

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

MR. MOLGAT: The Yeas and Nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the third reading of Bill No. 38.

A standing vote was taken the result being as follows:

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

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 37; Nays, 13.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for St. James and the proposed amendment by the Honourable the Member for Wellington and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, you will recall that I adjourned this for the member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that copies of the First Minister's statement and the reply by the Prime Minister of Canada will be distributed, I beg the indulgence of this House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Carillon and the proposed amendment by the Honourable the Member for Fisher and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, you'll all agree that any good industry is Manitoba is very desirable at the present time. We know that industry continues to mushroom in eastern Canada. We'd like to be able to get our share of industry here in Manitoba. Of course we know that they have the population and they have greater markets in the east and it is hard for us on the prairies to compete against such odds, especially in the heavy industry.

Manitoba relies greatly on agricultural products for industrial expansion, industry which derives from industrial products. It is absolutely necessary for Manitoba to expand its industries in order to increase revenues and build up the economy of our province, and I believe that another sugar factory in Manitoba would greatly increase employment in an industry which all of us agree is not at the present time saturated. We were told by previous speakers that only about 15 percent of our own requirements are produced here in the Province of Manitoba. Therefore, Canadians consume much more sugar than what Canada produces. Of course we've got some competition from the cane sugar industry which is a great problem, and then again the distances to main markets. As I mentioned, population centres in the east -- freight -- distance to the market -- therefore the freight becomes prohibitive.

But I think that the main problem is the lack of a national sugar policy. In the meantime I would say that it takes time to establish a new industry so every effort should be made by this province, by this government, and also by the federal government, to adopt a national sugar policy, and I would say that that's where the present government could come in, because I know that since now they would be dealing since a year ago with a government that is quite reasonable, you all agree, they shouldn't have too much difficulty in trying to persuade the federal government to adopt some kind of a national sugar policy. I think they should adopt a regional sugar policy, a policy which would kind of introduce a happy medium where the price in sugar would not fluctuate as badly as it did in 1963. I say a sort of happy medium should be sought to establish and create a stable production and a healthy industry. I can't see any harm in planning for another factory now. We know that the factories don't grow up like mushrooms, it takes time, but I feel that this serious problem created by high sugar prices in 1963 should act as an inducement for proper action with regard to adoption of a sound national sugar policy.

Of course another point that should be considered is availability of labour in the area of the proposed industry. I know quite a few sugar farmers who dropped out of this sugar production just by reason of shortage of labour during the summer months, so if another sugar factory is established it should be established in an area where labour is quite readily available.

I believe that these obstacles could be overcome with the co-operation of the two levels of government, the co-operation which does not seem to exist at the present time when we notice that the Honourable Minister of Agriculture did not think that there should be industry established. I shouldn't say industry -- this particular industry to be right we should not go ahead with establishing a new factory for reasons that he had outlined in his speech, but I'm sure that the Industry and Commerce would like to see more industry in the Province of Manitoba because it could be of great help to the Province of Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? -- The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. MORRIS A GRAY (Inkster): Am I supposed to close the debate or not? .

A MEMBER: No, it isn't yours.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, 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 Inkster. The Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I wonder if we may have this stand. The Honourable Member for Elmwood had to go to Kenora due to a death in the family and will be away for the balance of today's sitting.

MR. L. HARRIS (Logan): Madam Speaker, I wonder if I may say a few words on this.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: "Grow old along with me, the best is yet to be, the last of life of which first was made." That is from Browning. Now when I speak I say this, that -- interjection -- you don't want to get old. You're going to grow old anyway; you're getting gray like me. But I say, I listened here, I listened to my friend from Burrows and he was talking about contributory pension, it's a fine thing. I agree with him wholeheartedly on that but I say, what about these twilight people in between? What're we going to do about them?

Now when we get down to facts and we see these things -- in 1963 there were 962,884 Canadians receiving old age security pensions from 70, and 103,106 others between 65 and 69 who were receiving the old age assistance after a means test. Together they number well over a million, or one out of every 19 Canadians. Every Canadian citizen over 70 is entitled to receive the old age pension. From the Premier of this province to our Opposition Leader, we're all getting old. As we say, we're all going gray. Your mother or grandmother, they're all going to get the old age pension, but most of them would find it impossible to eke out a bleak existence on only \$75 a month pension unless some supplementary aid was given by the municipality and provincial government for those who are eligible.

The present old age pension of only \$75 a month is less than half the monthly wage earned at the minimum wage rate. The minimum wage rate is set at the lowest at which human beings can exist, and yet we expect our old people to live on a fraction of this amount. It would seem that when people reach the age of 70 they are expected to lose half their appetite for food; wear only half the clothing they previously needed; require only half as much heat to keep comfortable; and somehow manage to live in dignity and ease in substandard conditions.

Of course this is something -- nonsense, I should say. As people grow older they need more of all these things. Quality if not quantity is required in food. Warmer clothing is needed. The ageing body feels comfortable at higher temperatures and it is essential that older people are in pleasant and well ordered surroundings that will enable them to live out their lives with a dignity that is the right of all human beings. Modern medicine is prolonging life beyond normal expectations, and still we do nothing to alleviate the distress of old people who are no longer able to work because of lack of demand for their service or because of illness.

Seventy-five dollars a month does not even allow old people without other means to live in a decent dwelling. This is the first consideration. The next is food, an item that is skimped on after the rent has been paid. Clothing and medical care cannot be budgeted for under such miserable pittance. So many of our older people die neglected and alone because there is no money for the basic necessities of life. Forget the money for a moment and try to think of what we owe to the poverty-stricken pensioners that cannot be paid in cash.

Most of our old age pensioners did not form the companies, buy the bonds or invest their income in this wide, rich forgetful country of ours. They did other things just as important, however. They swung the picks and felled the trees, ran the threshers and laid out the railroads, dug the mines and built our towns and cities. The women raised their children on small wages, taught them morality and religion and what passes for decency of living; and most of them soothed away our fears, bathed us, bandaged our fingers and wiped the very noses that are uptilted away from them today. We, in our gratitude, throw them an extra \$10.00 a month now and then as an election bribe to cover our lack of interest or our guilt.

In my estimation, \$100.00 would still be not sufficient to cover all the necessities. There should also be a supplementary allowance of at least \$20.00 for people with no other income. Instead of giving our old people empty titles like "senior citizens", let us give them instead

(Mr. Harris, cont'd)... the means to enjoy the so-called "golden age" period. The people who desperately need an increased pension are the people who built this country without the benefits which we enjoy today, and who have never been eligible for unemployment insurance, family allowance or union wages.

What we the citizens of today do for the good of our people will shape ; the world of tomorrow, and if they are to be free and secure and enjoy happiness in their old age we must lay the groundwork. It is to build a better world, as has been said, that maturity of a nation may be judged by the way in which it treats its very young and its very old. Madam Speaker, I thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed to have the motion stand? Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Inkster. The Honourable the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Fort Rouge): In the absence of the honourable member, I wonder, Madam Speaker, if this item could be allowed to stand.

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

MR. FRED T. KLYM (Springfield): Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this resolution stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, the fact that the Honourable Member for Morris is in the hospital and has been for a few weeks, I was wondering if anyone wished to speak on this debate sooner than allow it to die on the Order Paper?

MADAM SPEAKER: Any member wishing to speak on the debate.

MR. EVANS: I would point out to the honourable member that in my years in the House I've never seen a resolution die on the Order Paper. I'm sure the House would be agreeable to allow the matter to stand if no one wishes to speak.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Lakeside as amended, and the proposed amendment by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. The Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I'm delighted to see that the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has just re-entered the Chamber after a short temporary absence. I am not so optimistic as to believe that he came in just because I was about to address the Assembly, but his presence here is most appreciated because I would like to ask him if he would not consider making a slight change in this amendment.

May I say at the outset, Madam Speaker, two things that will interest the House I am sure. No.1. I am prepared to accept the amendment. No.2. I do not propose to speak long in so doing. I have only one suggestion to make though, and that is that I have a question in my mind as to whether it is good procedure or good practice to send an instruction to a Standing Committee.

Now I'm aware that committees can consider only those matters that are referred to them by the House, and I must confess that I am not able to quote any rule that says that it is not permissible to give instruction to a committee, but even so I rather harbour the feeling that it's not logical to tell the committee what it is to do. Having that feeling in mind and being prepared to accept the amendment, I was going to propose to the Honourable Minister that perhaps he would change his amendment or get someone from his Party to amend the amendment so that we would simply accomplish the same thing right here in the House without it going to the committee because as it's now worded, it is an instruction to the committee to do certain things.

After all, what matters is to get the rule so that there'll be no question about it in the meantime. Quite frankly, as I have tried to point out before, I don't think the amendment is necessary; but on the other hand, I have hesitated to propose a further amendment to it myself or to get one of my colleagues to do so because from previous experience, not only in this session but in other ones, I would not be too sanguine of a proposal that I made or one of my colleagues made on my behalf achieving the support of the honourable gentlemen opposite regardless of the merit and logic of same. But if I could persuade my honourable friend to make the change, or someone in his Party, then it would be very very helpful.

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

On the other hand, if he's not willing to do that, I have no alternative but to accept the amendment, and in plagiarizing my Honourable Friend from Inkster, I would content myself with the expression that "half a loaf is better than no bread," and with the best grace that I could muster, agree with the Honourable Minister that the discussion has perhaps served some useful purpose. I make that suggestion hoping it might find some consideration. If it doesn't no harm will be done.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, speaking to the point of order which has been raised by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, and I don't know of any other way that I speak to the question that he just spoke on without dealing with it under "Point of Order" heading, I would point out to him Section 304, Item 3, Page 245 of the Fourth Edition of Beauchesne dealing with instructions to committees, because at first blush I was of exactly the same opinion as he, namely that it might not be desirable to instruct the committee to do a certain thing. But on considering Beauchesne and on looking at Item 3 which reads as follows: "When it has been thought desirable to do so, the House has enlarged the order of reference by means of an instruction, or in the case of a select committee upon a bill by the committal to it of another bill. Mandatory instructions have also been given to select committees restricting the limit of their powers or prescribing the course of their proceedings, or directing the committee to make a special report upon certain matters." While this isn't necessarily directly on point, I think it's close enough to permit us perhaps to let the amendment rest in its present form without infringing upon that principle which my honourable friend quite properly raised. The word "instruct" is perhaps not a happy one, but I don't think it infringes any basic parliamentary rule.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I too am speaking to a point of order, but even in addressing that point of order I still would have liberty to say, I think, that I'm in a very mellow mood today and I appreciated the temperate attitude in which my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources approached this question the other day. He was kind enough to say that he thought perhaps it had done some good in total, and so I'm prepared to let it rest with the amendment.

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

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

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

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

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I introduced this resolution because of the fact that the farmers in the area north and northeast and east of Winnipeg have had bad luck as far as weather goes in the past year, and in two or three municipalities it's been bad luck for a matter of two and three years in a row. It was my wish to try and evoke some kind of discussion on the floor here as to the possibility of making administrative improvements with regard to the feed and fodder and the seed grain purchasing program, and this is the reason that I sponsored the resolution.

I am aware now that the Minister of Agriculture and the Member for Lakeside, both of whose judgment regarding administration I respect very much, both of them are of the opinion that it is simply not possible or feasible at the moment to make any kind of administrative improvement in the way in which farmers needing assistance for seed grain purchase -- that there's simply no way in which this can be improved over the existing situation. The Minister of Agriculture is of the opinion that the present provisions of The Municipal Act cover the situation quite well and he goes on to point out that if municipalities, when they do attempt to help the farmer residents of the area, if municipalities are unable to sell debentures, that the province will come to its rescue.

I just want to make the point here that it seems to me that it is a bit cumbersome to have to do it this way. I think the Minister is aware, as the Member for Lakeside is aware also, that very often municipal councils simply do not have the administrative machinery to be able to make a survey of the requirements in their area quickly enough. Very often they are slow in getting launched on a program of providing seed grain purchase assistance and I would like

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd)... to see sometime some innovation made here so that the provincial department would at least come to the rescue of municipalities in the sense that they would provide some sort of administrative assistance.

This is rather nebulous I know, but I'm sure that if you talked to municipal officials you will get from all of them, or almost all, the same opinion; namely, that it's very difficult to set up a survey, very difficult to gather the information and difficult to make arrangements for the floating of debentures and so on. This is the only major point I wish to make at this time, namely, that perhaps the province will see fit some day toward the making of direct loans to municipalities for this purpose rather than waiting until the municipalities are unsuccessful in floating a debenture for this purpose.

The Member for Lakeside said the other day that some people might be inclined to argue that some municipalities move slowly in granting seed grain and fodder and other types of assistance, but he goes on to make the point that this is the best place, namely, at the municipal level, to leave this sort of decision, and I would agree with that completely. Certainly we can trust that the municipal officials are fully aware -- not fully aware, but more aware of what local needs are, so perhaps it will be possible some year soon to compromise by implementing a slight administrative change whereby the provincial department will provide municipal councils with a little more administrative assistance in making surveys; and also perhaps they will think in terms of making direct loans to municipalities for this purpose rather than forcing municipal councils to go through the cumbersome procedure of floating debentures, sometimes which might not be taken up very successfully.

So that's all I wish to say, Madam Speaker. It's an administrative proposal which I put forward after reflection. I suppose the Minister and the Member for Lakeside are right, so I shall simply leave it at that.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Madam Speaker, I hope that by next Tuesday I'll be ready to deal with it. May I ask permission to allow this to stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. John's. The Honourable the Member for Selkirk

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, I adjourned this debate simply on account of the fact that the very point raised by the Honourable Member for St. John's in this resolution was the subject matter of part of my Throne Speech contribution about four years ago, and at that time I then suggested to the government that it would be wise in Manitoba to follow the same procedure as had been adopted in the Province of British Columbia, which not only licensed all car dealers but bonded all car dealers.

Now I haven't been to the coast during the last two years, but I was in British Columbia for the two years following the introduction of that type of legislation there, and as a matter of fact I have a nephew who is in the car business and he advises me that the introduction of that law in British Columbia was largely responsible for completely -- well not completely, but almost completely doing away with the cases of fraud of which the Honourable Member for St. John's has referred to as existing in the Province of Manitoba.

Now I notice that the Minister responsible for this department did say that he was taking under consideration the advisability of bonding car dealers, and I believe that that is the only effective way that we can curb these dishonest transactions that have been going on in the second-hand car market in Winnipeg during the past number of years. I would certainly urge the government to give this matter another look, and if at all possible at the next session of the Legislature to bring down the necessary legislation to make it mandatory on all car dealers to be bonded, provided of course the Provincial Secretary or the Minister in charge of the department which is responsible for utilities deems it necessary.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, may I reply to the -- I'm happy to have heard from the Honourable Member for Selkirk that this matter was raised by him about four years ago in his Throne Speech. I suppose this is the history of legislation, both progressive and otherwise, that it is raised once and again and again until it receives general acceptance, and I am happy to feel confident that what he said four years ago, and which I apparently repeated this

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd)... year, may yet become law in the near future. I say that with a little more confidence now that I have heard the Honourable Minister speak than I had when I heard the Honourable Member from Souris-Lansdowne speak on the matter, having had the impression that he spoke for the government caucus, and when he did he spoke succinctly, made it clear that he wasn't going to waste any time in just talk and then stated that the Committee on Safety would consider this matter.

Well, Madam Speaker, I had no confidence in that statement whatsoever because I could not then, and I cannot now conceive that the Committee on Safety has any power whatsoever to discuss the question which I raised and that was a question of guaranteeing to defrauded people that they would not suffer financial loss from being defrauded by matters that I raised such as NSF cheques, post-dated cheques and other methods used by unscrupulous dealers.

Now, Madam Speaker, I have with me certain clippings, both of an editorial which appeared in the Free Press on January 2nd of this year, wherein they seem to indicate value in having this type of legislation. Not that I nor probably the majority of the people in this House feel that whatever the Free Press advocates is necessarily to be accepted, but if even the Free Press advocates it then I think it is worth looking at when it is an acceptance of a proposal coming from a member of the Party to which I belong. They do state that in their opinion, in the editorial, and I quote: "Suckers are still being born every minute and there is probably no way for governments to protect them from themselves, but it should be possible to ensure that a used-car buyer operating in normal good faith is not made the victim of ruthless cheating."

Well, Madam Speaker, I am looking forward to strengthen legislation on the basis of incarcerating or otherwise punishing people who are guilty of fraud, but as indicated by the Honourable Minister in reply to a question that I asked of him, there is nothing that has yet been able to be done for the people who are defrauded except the feeling of satisfaction that the man who defrauded them may now be in jail, and that being the case, I am glad that he seemed to recognize that there was value in this.

Now he stated that he is looking for a means whereby to accomplish the purpose that I suggested, and stated that he thought that it were possible that this Committee on Safety might deal with the problem. Madam Speaker, I don't believe that the committee could or would be charged with the responsibility of doing it, but I am happy with the Minister's statement appearing on Page 1202 of Hansard to the effect that: "It would be our intention to bring forth the necessary legislation at a very early date in order to protect the man who is fleeced by these scoundrels."

Well, Madam Speaker, I don't really understand the reason for the decision to vote against this resolution and to defeat it. I have difficulty in believing that the government would be jealous of giving credit to either the Honourable Member for Selkirk or to me or to any other opposition member for what the government thinks is a good idea, and if the government felt that it was being tied to the acceptance of the principle of bonding, then probably they could have, by amendment, made some variation that would make this whole approach a little more general so as not to commit them.

I myself cannot conceive of any other method than bonding. I hope the government will not consider any assurance fund because I don't think that the honest should have to contribute to the causes for losses created by the dishonest, and since bonding seems to be to be the only approach, and it is the only approach that has been suggested in this House, I don't understand the reason for the government's apparent refusal to endorse the principle. But if the government in its wisdom sees fit to reject the resolution as presented by me and has not seen fit to amend it, then I must assume that they are opposed to it and I therefore see no point in attempting to urge them any further than I have tried to do up to now.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Yeas and nays, please Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. John's.

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

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

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. John's. The Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, in the absence of the honourable member may we have the matter stand, please.

.....Continued on next page.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. John's. The Honourable the Member for St. Matthews.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Madam Speaker, the resolution presented to the House by the Honourable Member for St. John's is very interesting from the point of view that it brings into focus this whole question of pre-marriage counselling. I suppose there was never a time when more interest was taken in this subject than today. We find it in churches, YMCA's, YWCA's, and adult clubs and so forth, that courses are being given and clinics held in order to assist young couples as they embark upon this important step. The Manitoba Conference of the United Church of Canada last year appointed a minister especially trained in marriage counselling and in family life work to give his whole time to this task, and his work has proved to be very successful. But I would like to point out, Madam Speaker, that if this work of counselling in marriage is to be successful it must be carried out on a voluntary basis and not made necessary by processes of law.

This is where I come in opposition with the resolution as presented by the Honourable Member for St. John's. The work of the counsellor is not to make decisions, just to make suggestions, to point out to the young people who come to him what might be involved, not to decide, not to treat the couple as children, not to take away from them their sense of responsibility, and at all times and at all costs he must respect their self determination. They come to him. He says "I'll give you the benefit of my opinion. I'll suggest this or that. But the decision is entirely up to you. I'm not the judge and jury in the case." Sometimes when they come they present real difficulties, their fears and misgivings as to the step that they are taking, and it may require personal adjustment; and I don't think that generally speaking the solution to their problem can be found within the compass of say an hour interview. He's got to be a good listener. He's got to sit down and hear their story, and then as a result of his experience and his specialized training, to make a suggestion. That's as far as he has any right to go. In other words, his work is limited and restricted, and therefore, Madam Speaker, a mandatory certificate declaring that an interview has taken place with certain individuals as specified here in the resolution, without any evidence of the motivation of the person concerned, has little value.

My honourable friend is not in favour of any examination or any test, just that they come and have an interview. He says he would like perhaps a little more impediment. He would like to make it a little more tough for them but just to come and ask them if they will sign, the preacher, or the doctor or whoever it might be, that he will sign this certificate without any question of the result or offering any opinion, is to my mind useless. He points out that in certain trades before they can be qualified to do the work of that trade they must undergo rigorous tests and examinations. He cites the man who would operate a motor vehicle, or a high pressure boiler in a heating plant. He refers to doctors and nurses and teachers. He intimates that to be properly prepared and ready for their work they must pass examinations in order to have certificates to qualify them for their task. Well every one will agree of that, but he also implies that preparation for marriage is equally important. To say, Madam Speaker, that all that is required is a signed certificate indicating that the interview has taken place, I don't think gets us anywhere. A young man thinks he would like to go into medicine. Well, he decides that he will go out and have an interview with the registrar, or he will attend a course of lectures, but that's all, without any examination, without any test. He has had the interview, he has gone to lectures, and all that is required then is to go home and hang out his shingle.

In trades and in professions there is a mandatory certificate with proof of qualification. I don't quite like the idea of placing the sacred marriage pact on the mundane basis of qualifications to know how to operate a high pressure boiler. It may turn out to be that later on, one can never tell. But marriage problems develop, perhaps long after the marriage takes place, and I repeat that the value of counselling and of help to these young people; and I believe most sincerely that my honourable friend is very much concerned about this, but I say that the value of the counselling is to point out to the young people the possibility of the dangers and how those dangers may be avoided and how the question may be met. He sees them there getting into their boat and going down the river. Everything is calm and lovely. But he knows there may be a Niagara Falls in the distance, so he warns them to make sure that they steer their boat

(Mr. Martin, Cont'd.) . . . in the right direction. To my mind, Madam Speaker, the interview is in the nature of handing them a life belt. It's up to them whether they want to use it, and if they don't use it, it is to their peril.

I was interested also that my friend suggested courses of pre-marital counsel may amount to nothing. These words -- if people don't want to listen, they won't listen. You can't get a couple to sit down and pay attention to something like that if they're not inclined to do so, but you see that's the weakness of the mandatory clause. If they come of their own accord, if they come voluntarily, then a great good may result. He wants a mandatory certificate the same as in a blood test, and before the license issuer can issue the marriage license he must have in his possession this certificate. I'd like to point, Madam Speaker, that the license issuer does not necessarily see the blood test certificate. Marriage licenses can be issued three months in advance. The blood test certificate, the medical certificate, is not of any use beyond thirty days. The marriage license issuer has no responsibility along those lines, but woe betide the clergyman if he attempts to perform their marriage without first having in his possession the blood test certificate. I remember some time ago having to send a young couple away -- I think the man went -- back to East Kildonan to pick up the blood test certificate that they had left there.

When I say that the license issuer has little responsibility in this matter, I'm not so sure, Madam Speaker, perhaps there should be a change in this regard, that the blood test certificate is valueless beyond thirty days, and my suggestion is that the marriage license should be issued within the thirty days, so that the license issuer before he hands to them their authority to get married with all the other requirements fulfilled has to also see the blood test certificate. The result of the blood tests is indicated on the certificate. Now this is a point I want to make. In the interview, there's nothing but the signature. A couple comes, the minister perhaps says, "Well, they're a good-looking young couple. I think that's all right. Sign it." There'll be a teacher, a daughter, somebody who won't hesitate to sign it, and there's nothing to show anything by way of result, but the result of the blood test is indicated on the certificate. And may I interject this remark, Madam Speaker, that the pre-marital medical test which we have here in the Province of Manitoba is a vital piece of legislation. It marks a forward step in the field of public health in dealing with venereal disease control. They have that test made. The test shows the result, positive or negative. If it is positive, the doctor who makes the test immediately warns and advises the young people concerning treatment. The result of the test also goes to the Department of Health and they likewise step into action, suggesting immediate treatment. But this certificate suggested in the resolution bears no evidence at all as to the result of the interview. The resolution starts out with a reference to hasty marriages, often resulting in unhappy and unfortunate problems harmful to the individuals involved and to society. I say, Madam Speaker, that the word "often" is from my point of view grossly exaggerated. I would have much preferred if my honourable friend had said hasty marriages "sometimes," and not "often". And of course the unfortunate aftermath of the marriage may in no sense be the result of a hasty marriage. It may not appear until months and perhaps years after the marriage takes place; and sometimes engagements last for a long period -- several months, a year or more. Well, that's before the marriage takes place. There should have been ample opportunity to consider questions of incompatibility of temperament; and if this interview is mandatory, may I suggest that perhaps it should precede the engagement, not just before the marriage, then they'll have time to think it over.

Now, I've been interested in this, Madam Speaker, because I've had a wide experience in the performing of marriage ceremonies to this extent. I was thinking the other day that if all the couples that I have united in the bonds of holy matrimony -- it's a physical impossibility but had it been possible for them to be brought together, the numbers would pack the Civic Auditorium. Now that's a lot of marrying in one's career. I can speak and point on the fingers of one hand the number of instances that have come to my mind as after-marriage domestic tragedy. Well, of course, a lot of the people you'd never hear about. They wouldn't come to you with their troubles, but very many people, people beyond my counting, I've met them in different places. I've met them on the street. I've met them in the store. I've met them many places; and there's a twinkle in their eye and a smile in their tone when they say; "You know, you married us." Perhaps, Madam Speaker, I might go a little further and say that

(Mr. Martin, Cont'd.) . . . perhaps one reason for my substantial majorities in St. Matthew's was that many of the voters said: "Sure I'll vote for you. You married us." That's something to keep in mind. One reason why perhaps a preacher might go into politics. And then they will come afterwards; they bring their children to be baptized; and again: "You married us." Later than that, they will bring their children to be married, and with the same credentials: "You married us." And I think, Madam Speaker, if we investigate the Department of Vital Statistics, we shall find the record of thousands of marriages -- thousands in the Province of Manitoba in one year -- many thousands. But the records of divorces granted in Manitoba will be just a mere trickle in the mighty flow of marriage contracts. The vast majority of those who get married in this land, in this province, regard the marriage bond as an honourable and revered and sacred contract.

I would like to say before closing, Madam Speaker, I would like to emphasize in this field the need of public education, pre-marriage preparation and counselling on a voluntary basis. I think there's something to be said in favour of the setting-up of an enquiry committee composed of qualified and responsible people who are trained and experts, specialists in this field -- a committee which would have representatives of the church and of existing voluntary social agencies, representatives of high school associations and high school staffs. The subject of the preparation for family life I think, Mr. Minister of Education, could well have a place in our high school and college curricula. Young people are not well-informed on many aspects of this vital question. The girls have a slight advantage over the boys, because they have some scant training in family life by their home economics course, but the boys are just left outside. And also I would suggest that if this is important -- and my honourable friend refers to the teachers -- that the students at the Teachers Training College and the Faculty of Education should also have the subjects of training for family life in their curricula. And I think something further. The marriage -- the license is a very scant thing. Time was when it had considerable detail concerning married life, but it's getting less and less. The names of the parties, and not much about where they were born or their occupation, their parents, and so forth; the question if there's any divorce, the absolute decree -- dates put in there. The bulk of the responsibility is left, I'd say, to the clergyman. But I think it would be a very fine thing if there could be attached to the marriage license a pamphlet dealing with marriage preparation, with a heading such as: "Age for Happy and Secure Family Life." We're concerned with material and economic problems.

The Minister of Agriculture stands in his place in the House and gives us eloquent speeches on animal breeding and places before us a formidable array of statistics, but very very little study has been given to what happens, as someone has said, the paragon of animals -- man, the upward-looking. And though I say, Madam Speaker, that I oppose of course the principle of the resolution because of its compulsory and mandatory nature, I repeat again that if counselling is to be any good and any help to the young people as they face up to the responsibilities of family life, it should be done on a voluntary basis, I say, without the necessity of law. Having said that, I say something more must be done to strengthen the bulwarks of family life in our communities and to impress upon youths that marriage is setting forth upon a great adventure of mutual affection and understanding and purpose, where the fiction of the fairy tale will give place to the indisputable fact "they lived happy ever afterwards."

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

MADAM SPEAKER: I didn't hear your seconder.

MR. WRIGHT: The Honourable Member for Inkster, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Thank you.

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 Elmwood. The Honourable the Member for Swan River.

MR. J. H. BILTON (Swan River): Madam Speaker, I've read this resolution very carefully, and agree with my honourable friend from Elmwood that there is room for improvement in the field of handling firearms, but I am in doubt that the registering of every firearm, that is rifle and shotgun, on distribution throughout the province and the nation is the answer. Inquiries reveal that the number of firearm accidents in Manitoba line up well with other provinces

(Mr. Bilton, Cont'd.) . . . throughout Canada. By this I mean we can be thankful that they are somewhat limited in number. I say this by reason that during 1963, 37 accidents occurred of which five were fatal. This in a population of almost a million people is far from high. No one would be happier than myself to see this total downgraded -- that is, the total of accidents downgraded in Manitoba -- and lead the nation in the lack of firearm accidents. I do not believe that licensing of rifles and shotguns will prevent accidents. In passing, I would like to refer to a personal friend of mine who was considered one of Western Canada's expert marksmen in rifles and revolvers. He was a man that made firearms a hobby. Whilst duck hunting one day, travelling in a boat, he had occasion to reach for a shotgun and unfortunately the trigger caught on a nail, discharging the full blast to his head. The answer of course is obvious.

I suggest, Madam Speaker, that we cannot and never will be able to legislate against carelessness. Believe me, I have known many situations which have occurred through the misuse of firearms, and with sporting guns. Carelessness, carelessness for the most part has been responsible. I believe the endeavour should be directed toward education in the handling and the use of firearms. This I would say was commenced last year by the Province of Manitoba, with the appointment of a firearms safety inspector or officer as recommended by the Kimball firearms enquiry. This report reminds us, Madam Speaker, that 67 percent of all firearm accidents during the enquiry was caused by people whose firearms were loaded when they should not have been loaded. I reiterate that education is important, for all the permits in the world will not remedy the situations I have endeavoured to outline.

Speaking of firearm education, I would like to compliment and give credit to the junior rifle clubs throughout the province, the Air Cadets and others, all of which I feel have done their part in keeping our firearm accidents to a minimum. I think of farm tractors, lawn mowers if you like, chain saws, etc., all of which, Madam Speaker, are potential killers and take their increasing toll year by year. Not always, but more often than not, brought about by carelessness. Are we to expect that these implements should be licensed? Surely the public is burdened with too many licenses now, and far too many regulations. I want to make it abundantly clear, however, Madam Speaker, that small arms weapons that can be concealed, should be registered, for this is a possible deterrent of theft and helps in the bringing to time and tracing of criminals.

Since my friend put forward his resolution, the federal government has shown an interest in the subject of firearms. The Minister of Justice said in the House of Commons recently: "The criminal code now makes it an offence for any one under the age of 14 to have a firearm or an air pistol, or ammunition for them, unless he has a permit authorized by the Commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, or the Provincial Attorney-General." He also said that the government is considering new powers for registrars of firearms to deny renewal of permits for revolvers and pistols. Is this, at this particular stage, not enough? I would like to see an end to these unfortunate accidents, Madam Speaker, that occur from time to time and I suggest the adoption of the scheme of registration would, of necessity, let loose more regulations requiring more and more inspectors and will create a problem almost unsurmountable, keeping in mind the thousands of rifles and shotguns presently privately-owned, and those that can be obtained through departmental stores, hardware stores, and catalogues which are received in the mails from all points of the compass. What of the thousands of United States hunters who visit our country every year? They would, of necessity, have to comply with such regulations. I am told that according to the American Constitution, every American by right, can have a rifle in his home, without registration, as a constitutional right. While I have every respect for the thoughtfulness of the contents of my honourable friend's resolution, I wonder if the restrictions he advocates will gain the end results he has in mind. I, for one, do not think they will.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I learned that one of the expressions with which one starts an address that isn't ready, made before you, is to say, "I didn't intend to speak on this matter but . . ." Madam Speaker, I listened with interest to the calm, dispassionate manner in which we heard the last address, and I noted the equanimity with which he approached this problem, and although I think that my tone of voice now is somewhat akin to his, I must confess, Madam Speaker, that I do not have any sort of feeling of equanimity at all. As a matter of fact, I feel rather angered with the attitude expressed by the honourable member, and I would like to

(Mr. Cherniack, Cont'd.) . . . say a few words hoping that I can temper them or temper my anger to some extent.

The honourable member spoke, pointing out that the accidents that are indicated by the report which was recently received line up well with other provinces. It is a matter of pride for him, Madam Speaker, that we have only -- no, Madam Speaker, I was going to say only killed five people in the last year. It's not the way he would have put it, but he did certainly feel that in the light of the almost million people that we have in this province, and in the light of the records of other provinces, we do not have to feel that badly to the extent that we should force or consider, consider the feasibility of requiring the registration of firearms, which is the exact motion before us. Well, Madam Speaker, when the honourable member tells us that education is important I agree with him, and when he speaks of the report made last year which apparently was prompted by a certain number of accidents which occurred as a result of firearms, I agree with him that the suggestions made there are important. We should educate. And when he says you cannot legislate against carelessness, I'm inclined to agree. You can't. Nevertheless, most of the car accidents that occur in this province and anywhere else are caused through carelessness, and if you accepted the honourable member's suggestion that you cannot legislate against carelessness, why do we legislate to the extent that we do by requiring registration of ownership of motor vehicles, and by making owners of motor vehicles liable for damages caused by the negligence of the owners of the vehicles, or rather of the drivers of the vehicles? If it is negligence which we cannot legislate against then why are we doing the very things that it is suggested could be done in connection with firearms accidents, and which the motion very carefully says should be considered. It doesn't say, "Let's compel it." The resolution says, "Let us consider it."

Now finally, when the honourable member points out that accidents occur from chain saws and lawn mowers and some other device that I didn't catch too clearly, as being potential killers, Madam Speaker, it occurred to me to wonder why a lawn mower was built, sold, and used, and my impression is that the purpose of a lawn mower was to mow the lawn, and to that extent it might be a danger to grass and be designed for that purpose; and a chain saw, I assume, is used to sever apart wood or trees or branches, but Madam Speaker, to put them in the same classification as firearms surprises me, because I am under the impression that the purpose for a firearm is to kill, or it is to maim. It is to injure, to say the least. Now I'm told "not necessarily," and I am reminded of the fact that the honourable member referred to a friend of his, an expert marksman, with whom firearms were a hobby. Well if they were a hobby to look at, or to put on the wall, then they wouldn't be loaded, but this firearm to which he referred was loaded and this person who used the firearm used it for one of two purposes, either for marksmanship to pride himself with his ability to aim a rifle or a firearm and to hit a little mark some distance away from him, or it was used. . .

MR. BILTON: I'm sorry I misinformed the member. I obviously did. I should have said that he was duck hunting and going along in a boat. Not being the long-winded type I sort of abbreviated it and overlooked that point, and I'm sorry for that . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm glad the honourable member interrupted me and corrected the misapprehension under which I was labouring. Well this man then did carry this firearm and Madam Speaker, I don't want it to be interpreted that I'm speaking about a man who apparently suffered serious injury or fatality, I'm not clear, in any casual way. I'm fully sympathetic with what happened and that is why I'm so strongly interested in supporting this resolution. Apparently this man, like many others, was carrying a weapon with the intention of killing or wounding a living thing -- a duck, I gather, in this case. Well, Madam Speaker, I don't know of any other reason which he could have had for carrying that weapon around, and I don't want to deny him or any other duck hunter the right to carry a weapon, but Madam Speaker, if he wants to carry a weapon which has one function only and that is to kill or to maim, then it is not asking too much to ask him to go to some police station, some fire station, some municipal office, anywhere, in order to record the fact that he owns that weapon. If he wants to own it and if he wants to use it I don't deny him the right to do so, but I think I have a right to say I want to know that you have it, and I want you to register it, and if it's too much of an effort for you to go down and register, then Madam Speaker, I have to say to him, I don't think you have a right to own or possess it.

(Mr. Cherniack, Cont'd.)

Now the second portion of the resolution, with which the honourable member did not deal at all, is the question of responsibility for a weapon. If you have a weapon which is built for the purpose of injuring or killing, then Madam Speaker, shouldn't you be responsible for the damage it may do? If it is going to injure a person so that he suffers in some way, both financial loss and pain and suffering, if not death, then surely, Madam Speaker, we ought to make sure that the person who is responsible for the fact that there was a firearm in the possession of the user of it, should be legally liable for the damage that is caused by it. That's not unreasonable and that is not denying to him the right to own it, nor to use it, nor to lend it to someone else, but it puts on him a responsibility which he ought to have assumed without being forced to do so, and I do not believe that the honourable member who, as I say, spoke with equanimity, really meant to be casual about this matter which I think is very serious and which he indicated, too, is serious, but he seemed to feel that the need for inspections -- and Madam Speaker, I'm not sure that there is a need for inspections just because there's a need for registration. I would say if a person is found with a firearm without a registration certificate or unable to prove that he had registered the weapon, he is then accountable, but I would not suggest that we increase the force of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police for the purpose of having them visit every home to find out whether or not there is an unregistered weapon. All I say is, I have the faith in the vast majority of the people of this province that if they know that a firearm should be registered they will register, nor am I fearful that people coming in from the United States to spend their money here in Canada would object to the fact that it is recorded somewhere that they are bringing a weapon into the province.

So, Madam Speaker, I feel that this is a resolution which ought to be fully supported in that it does not say that it shall be done -- it suggests that it be considered; and it does not put any hard and fast form of imposition on an owner of a fire weapon, a weapon designed to kill or to injure; to do anything that is costly to him, that is onerous on him, that is unfair to him. All it says is, let him register it so we know who owns it -- number one. Number two, let us make sure that the law clearly makes him liable for damages caused by the negligence of the person who uses the weapon which he assumed the responsibility for ownership of. That is not unreasonable, Madam Speaker, and is something which I think would have a great deal greater effect than the possibility of saying to a 15-year old child who may have killed somebody with a weapon: "The law says that you shouldn't have had this weapon until you were 16," which is apparently the looked forward amendment that we can see in the Criminal Code. Madam Speaker, that amendment is probably a sensible one but it is one that does not answer the challenge brought forth by the mover of this motion, which I believe still merits the support of this House.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the 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 La Verendrye. The Honourable the Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. P. J. McDONALD (Turtle Mountain): Madam Speaker, may I have the indulgence of the House to have this stand, please?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. McDONALD: Well Madam Speaker, I haven't had a chance to get to the post office in Killarney to weigh it so I'll bring it in Monday.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Gladstone and the proposed amendment by the Honourable the Member for Dufferin. The Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I was a little concerned over the statements -- the very brief statements -- that the Honourable Member for Dufferin made about the resolution on the Order Paper. It was very very brief but I think in no less than three places he has indicated that I am making a mountain out of a molehill by putting the resolution on the Order Paper. He says in his opening paragraph that he doesn't think it warrants the case. Later on down he says, "In my opinion the actual damage is very small," but then he goes on,

(Mr. Shoemaker, Cont'd.) . . . a little later on, to admit that it is serious enough, serious enough to have that the government has had it under consideration for some time, so it must have come to their attention otherwise they would not have had it under serious consideration. Then he goes on to say that surely the landowners concerned are able to look after their interests in this matter without anybody's help and so on, that if it was -- he says, "I know if I was approached by a pipeline contractor to lay pipe across my land it would be under my personal supervision regarding soil replacement." And then he says, "I don't think the situation is quite as serious as the Honourable Member for Gladstone-Neepawa has reported."

Well, Madam Speaker, my honourable friend, the Minister of Agriculture -- he is in the House I believe. He can probably hear me, even though he is sitting in the back benches -- but he knows that this whole subject matter of soil fertility was brought to his attention fairly forcibly the end of last year or the beginning of this year, or both, by a group of farmers from the Oberon-Brookdale area who met with him, and later on, about January 9th of this year, the Rural Municipality of North Cypress considered it of such importance that they drafted a resolution at their regular council meeting of that day, January 7th, and forwarded it to the Minister of Agriculture, I believe.

Now Madam Speaker, the resolution that was drafted by the R.M. of North Cypress, I would like to read you the two paragraphs to indicate what they consider the loss to be. It says, "Whereas easements have been granted to pipeline companies for the laying of transmission pipelines across the province, and whereas the improper back filling of the trenches dug for such pipelines have resulted in land erosion and land value depreciation and crop reduction up to 50 percent, and whereas the landowners so affected are of the opinion that the use of a strip-ping method, i.e., the peeling back of the topsoil when digging said pipeline trenches, would greatly reduce the various problems so mentioned, be it resolved that the council of the R.M. of North Cypress go on record as unanimously endorsing the efforts made by its resident farmers in their appeal to the Province of Manitoba through the office of the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation, to encourage legislation concerning methods to be employed by transmission pipeline companies in the back filling of trenches dug for the laying of transmission pipelines, and requiring said pipeline companies to comply with the rules and regulations set out by the legislation governing land restoration resulting in the conservation of Manitoba's farm lands."

Now it is true that I said when I first spoke on the debate that the farmers had received some compensation. That is true. They received, I believe, in 1963 from the Trans-Canada Pipeline, which was laid about 10 years ago, the sum of \$100.00 per acre for loss of crop for all those years, so that would be approximately \$10.00 per acre per year. The farmers, a group of 16 -- I don't know whether all 16 of them met with my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture or not -- but it was a group of 16 that refused to sign the easements a year ago that were being asked for by the Petroleum Transmission Company. They claim that the value of their land has been reduced by 10 percent. Now in that particular area -- the Oberon-Brookdale area and west of there, Cordova and so on -- the land is worth in the neighbourhood of ten to twelve thousand dollars per quarter section, so if you reduce that by 10 percent it is quite a sizeable amount. I believe that the companies to date have been able to get easements for \$45.00 per acre -- that is, they originally get a farmer to sign an easement for \$45.00. The farmers all claim that this \$45.00 is not sufficient in light of the method they employ in digging up the soil. Now my honourable friend from Dufferin I don't think is fully aware of the facts, because he says, "I think about 24 inches in depth and 30 feet of easement is effective." Well he said he thinks that. Well the facts are that the pipes -- and I'm referring to these Trans-Canada pipes; I'm not referring to the pipes that are laid all over the Town of Neepawa; I've got them on all sides of me and they're not doing any harm at all. They're those little 3-inch pipes that the Inter-City Gas lay. There's no problem there. I'm referring to the big 34-inch lines that go from Alberta to Montreal -- that's the ones that I'm talking about -- and they are buried in a trench about seven feet deep, six to seven feet deep, so there's a lot of soil that is dug up. When they dig a trench for one of these, they have to dig a trench about eight feet wide and about six or seven feet deep, and there's a lot of soil removed. It's just dug up, piled on one side, they lay the 34 inch pipe in and then it's pushed back in again in any old fashion at all.

(Mr. Shoemaker, Cont'd.) . . .

Now the farmers, or certain farmers, certainly one that I know of, in order to prove that it would be no hardship on the contractors to remove the topsoil first and then proceed in their normal fashion, they hired machinery themselves, this one fellow did, and he did three miles in this fashion. That is, he took about eight inches of topsoil right off the top for the entire width required and he claims that it cost him only 1/300th of the amount of the contract for digging, that is the amount that was paid the contractors for digging.

Another problem that it has created, that is this manner in which they remove the soil, is that by leaving the subsoil on top of the ground as I stated before and piling it up, it created a soil erosion problem and it starts a drifting condition that just doesn't know where to stop. The whole point is that there is really no reason on earth why the contractors, because it is the contractors who are hired by the transmission lines, there's no reason on earth why they cannot take the necessary steps to preserve this fertility. They have taken the necessary steps in Alberta. There's nothing to it, it's just a straight matter of forcing them to do it.

Now when the 16 farmers as a group refused to sign an easement last year they were then taken into court, I suppose for arbitration, because the pipeline companies can acquire the land the same as the city did or the province did to acquire land for the floodway. They can get the land all right -- there's no problem there for them. Apparently they have power to do so under The National Energy Act, and when they were taken into court at Brandon, and I'm quoting now: "When we are approached we are told that the land will be left as nearly as possible in its original condition and this is a requirement of The National Energy Act. When this is not done and we assure you it is not done, we are told in answer to our complaints that this Act can only be interpreted as meaning that the contour of the land will be restored. No consideration is given as to the position of the topsoil or subsoil in relation to its original state."

Well now, Madam Speaker, I don't intend to take up too much time of the House. I'm nearly prepared to go along with the amendment that was made by my honourable friend. In spite of the fact that he has suggested that I am making a mountain out of a molehill, he does recognize that there is a problem. He claims the government is presently studying this matter and hopes to reach an agreement. Well, Madam Speaker, I have been long enough in this House to know that a lot of studies that have been made and reports tabled have not soon been implemented, and so, Madam Speaker, I intend to move a further amendment.

So I move, Madam Speaker, and seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the amendment be amended by adding the words "before December 31, 1964," after the word "contractors" in the third line of the final paragraph of the amendment, and by adding the words "for implementation at the next regular session of the House" after the words "legislation" in the fourth line of the same paragraph.

Madam Speaker read the amendment.

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to take this amendment under consideration and I'll give you my ruling at a later date.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I'd like the indulgence of the House to allow this motion to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GUTTORMSON: May we have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand, please.

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

MR. CAMPBELL: Could we make it unanimous, Madam Speaker, please?

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

MR. R.O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, I wonder if the House would agree to let this matter stand please.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GUTTORMSON: May we have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand, please.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 73. The Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, I was waiting for some information, that's why I've asked the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand. I received this information now and I'm fully satisfied and don't wish to speak on this.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 80. The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I might have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 87, an Act respecting Wellington Credit Corporation Limited, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, this bill will allow this Ontario loan company to carry on business in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I'm only interested in one thing and that's in the bill at the moment. Why does everyone who wants to get their head problem incorporated go to one man in Winnipeg. Why don't they come to me at least for once? Being a record at least for once I could introduce a bill.

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

MR. HILLHOUSE presented Bill No. 91, an Act to amend The Law Society Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Would my honourable friend care to give us the benefit of his advice on this matter.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Believe me, Madam, I am only sorry that I cannot acquiesce in the request of the Honourable Member for Inkster and allow him to introduce this bill.

Madam, Section 1 of this bill simply changes the type of investments that can be made by the Law Society. The original Act was quite antiquated and it dealt with a lot of investments which are no longer available, and this new Section 1 brings the type of investments that it can make more in line with modern trends. Now Section 2 has been made necessary by reason of the fact that we have changed the judicial boundaries — or are changing the judicial boundaries in Manitoba. Section 3 also deals with the date for electing the benchers which has been made necessary due to the change in the judicial boundaries in Manitoba. We have added another boundary and it will be next year before we can create that district. Now Section No. 4 deals with the powers of the Law Society in disciplining members. At the present moment the Law Society has no power to impose a fine on a member for any breach of the rules of society and it wishes to obtain that power. Section 5. At the present time the Law Society has no power to reprimand a barrister or solicitor or a student, or it has no power to order a barrister, solicitor or student to pay a fine, and it's asking for these powers. Section 6 is only in line with Section 5. Section 7 is simply to correct a typographical error in the 1961 Statutes.

MR. GRAY: Madam Chairman, I understand the Law Society now is in existence for about 60 or 70 years. Does it take that long, by trained lawyers, to find their own faults?

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

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne) presented Bill No. 94, an Act to amend an Act respecting the Town of Souris, for second reading.

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

MR. F. GROVES (St. Vital) presented Bill No. 95, an Act respecting business Tax within The Rural Municipality of Fort Garry, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. GROVES: Madam Speaker, by way of background, in 1960 there was legislation passed in this Chamber to validate By-Law No. 4225 of the Municipality of Fort Garry which generally provided for the imposition of a business tax. Since this time, with the negotiations between Metro and the Municipality, they find it advisable in the light of the adjustment of the

(Mr. Groves, Cont'd.) . . . division of business tax between themselves and Metro to vary the rate provided under the By-Law and to seek the power to make such variation without a separate Act each time. In 1963 a similar Act was passed giving the same authority to the City of St. James.

Also included in this Bill is the provision for additional power to vary the classes of businesses themselves. I should state that this is a bit technical and the solicitor for the municipality will be at the committee in order to answer any questions which the members of the committee might have.

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

MR. STRICKLAND presented Bill No. 96, an Act to validate By-Law No. 405 of the Village of Shoal Lake and By-Law No. 750 of The Rural Municipality of Shoal Lake, for second reading.

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

MR. McKELLAR presented Bill No. 97, an Act to establish Riverside Cemetery Board for the Operation serving The Rural Municipality of Dauphin and The Town of Dauphin, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Well, I'm sorry. Do you want his explanation first?

MR. McKELLAR: Madam Speaker, this bill just sets up a board for the operation of the cemetery between the Town of Dauphin and the Rural Municipality. It's similar to the one I presented last year between the Municipality of Glenwood and the Town of Souris, and it's just more or less to handle the affairs of the cemetery and see that the dead are well looked after.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I apologize for interfering with the sponsor of the bill. The question I'd like to ask is this, whether the cemetery is a municipal enterprise, a private enterprise or a church enterprise?

MR. McKELLAR: Madam Speaker, this is a municipal enterprise.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, as we have arrived at government business, may I ask you to refer to the bills on the last page of the Order Paper, the adjourned debate on Bill No. 76.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 76. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. ROBLIN: He's not here, so we'd better ask for that item to stand, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed.

HON. S. E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(Dauphin) presented Bill No. 92, an Act to amend The Expropriation Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, as I indicated when this bill was in committee stage, there are a number of amendments here proposed, or suggested and recommended by the Land Acquisition Committee, all of which are designed to improve, we believe, the position of the person from whom land is being expropriated. They're in detail and not especially related one to the other, and I think lend themselves to detailed explanation in the Law Amendments Committee. There is a provision which will remove the necessity for the posting of security for costs in the case of an owner who wishes to appeal from a decision in an expropriation proceeding.

Arrangements will be made for the Chairman of the Land Acquisition Committee, together with the Legislative Counsel, and of course as in the customary way, and others, to be available for such detailed explanation as may be helpful to the Law Amendments Committee.

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

MR. ROBLIN: May I request, Madam, that Bill No. 99 be called now.

MR. McLEAN presented Bill No. 99, an Act to amend The Liquor Control Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, the amendments proposed do not follow any particular principle. Many of them are -- in fact almost all of them are for clarification purposes,

(Mr. McLean, Cont'd.) . . . certain changes that are eliminating provisions that are now out of date or no longer of any use in the Act. I would think that perhaps it would be more useful for us to discuss it in detail in the Law Amendments Committee since, as I say, it is primarily a tidying up and clarification job that is attempted by the amendments which are before the House in this Bill.

Members of the Legislature will note that there are no provisions here relating to the subject of liquor advertising, a subject which has received some public notice. There is no legislation touching upon that subject in this bill.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, The Liquor Act was in existence for so many years. How does it happen that despite so many years of operation by the Attorney-Generals and by the supervisors of the Liquor Commission that you have found right now in the year of 1964 so many amendments necessary. In other words, I'd like to find out what happened this year compared to last year that you brought in so many amendments? Either for improvement or not I really don't know yet. I couldn't understand as it is in the Bill. But my point is, what is the reason to come in year after year, year after year and make some amendments? Do you intend to make drinking a little bit easier? -- Perfectly all right. Do you intend to have a little bit more profit? -- Perfectly all right, but let us know about it.

Now for instance you have the -- where liquor could be kept. Can I keep liquor in my office? Does it mean this? I don't know. Can I buy a bottle and keep it in the Legislature? I know this is against the law. Does it mean anything in these here special sections that I can? It's almost -- to me it's strange. He got up and he said, all will be dealt with in the Law Amendments Committee. Couldn't we get a little explanation before we come into Law Amendments Committee and be as wise there as the others are?

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I rise to say that I'm certainly in favour of this Bill. I think that it is a step forward. There are some points in there that I have been advocating for a number of years. I certainly think it is a step in the right direction and I congratulate the Minister who brought this bill in today. I think that it is not just minor points, I think there are certain things that'll please people and that'll make their life much easier.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I am in favour of this bill too, Madam, but there's one thing that I'd like to point out to the Attorney-General, and although I know that you are supposed to discuss the principles of the bill in second reading, this bill here has as many principles you might say as it has sections. Take Section 10 of your bill, the new Section 3 (a) that's going in, where an accused is charged with an offence under subsection (1), the court may acquit him if it is satisfied (a) that the person under the age of 21 years to whom the accused is charged with giving, selling or supplying liquor appears to be over the age of 21 years. Now there's no offence to give or sell liquor to a person of the age of 21 years, but here you're only allowing this defence if the person appears to be over that age.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this Act, on a general point

MR. ROBLIN: . . . his comments after the dinner hour rather than interrupt him in the middle of his speech.

MADAM SPEAKER: It is now 5:30. I leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.