

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock Friday, March 26th, 1965

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface) introduced Bill No. 88, An Act to Validate By-law No. 4525 of the City of St. Boniface.

MR. JAMES COWAN Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 85, An Act to Validate By-law No. 2169 of The Rural Municipality of Rockwood and By-law No. 713 of the Town of Stonewall.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne) introduced Bill No. 83, An Act respecting the Rural Municipality of Victoria.

MR. COWAN introduced Bill No. 103, An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956 and to validate By-laws Nos. 18929, 18930, 18931, 19016, 19051 and 19061 of The City of Winnipeg.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks) introduced Bill No. 91, An Act to Validate By-law No. 715 of The Rural Municipality of Old Kildonan, By-law No. 26/65/B of The City of West Kildonan, and an Agreement between The City of West Kildonan and The Rural Municipality of Old Kildonan executed pursuant to those by-laws.

MR. WILLIAM HAMILTON (Dufferin) introduced Bill No. 97, An Act to incorporate The Corporation of The Bergthaler Mennonite Church of Manitoba.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF (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 to consider the following proposed resolutions standing in my name and in the name of the Honourable the Minister of Labour.

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 from Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. STEINKOPF: The Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions recommends them to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The first resolution before the Committee is: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Manitoba Hydro Act by providing that the amount of money that may be borrowed or raised by Manitoba Hydro for its temporary purposes by way of overdraft, a line of credit, or a loan or otherwise on the credit of the corporation, be increased from ten million dollars to twenty million dollars of principal outstanding at any one time, and thereby increasing the amount of such borrowings, the repayment of which may be guaranteed by the government.

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, there is a great saving annually if the Hydro is permitted to borrow short term money as against long term funds. The present line of credit is \$10 million that they can borrow on the short term money market and it is proposed in this resolution to increase that to \$20 million.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could explain why it is necessary though to have this extension. Is it not normal that they pay more money or more interest on short term than long term money, and it would seem that \$10 million is a very substantial overdraft even for as large an operation as the Manitoba Hydro. Now there may be some very good reasons, but I would just like to know why it is that they require as much as \$20 million of an overdraft.

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, I really don't think it is an overdraft in that sense. Short term money, 30, 60, 90 day money is always quite a bit cheaper than long term money, and the field of short term money is something new in this area and in Canada.

MR. MOLGAT: The Minister really is not thinking then of an overdraft in the normal terms that we talk about an overdraft at the bank. This is the use of temporary funds that may be available from other corporations such as the grain industry, which are at certain times of

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) the year very big users of capital and other times have free capital. This is to permit the Hydro Board to make use of that particular market. Is that correct?

MR. STEINKOPF: Yes, and to keep rolling it over as long as those funds are available, thus saving the difference in the interest between that and long term funds.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that it seems to me pretty clear that this resolution has a beneficial effect. The greater the opportunity for the Crown Corporation to avail itself of short term credit the cheaper it will be, and I suppose it will be passed on to the consumers of power, even if in a very indirect way, so there would be no objection to this resolution on our part I would think.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The second resolution before the committee is: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act by providing, among other matters, (a) for the increase of the maximum earnings which will be deemed to be an average annual income consequent upon which increased compensation may be payable under the Act; and (b) that persons ordered to assist, or assisting under the direction of a fire chief, in fighting fires, and employees who are members of the family of employers that do not live as members of the employers' household, are covered by the Act and that employees who have developed silicosis that is not evidenced by X-ray appearances but is evidenced by results of scientific tests or examinations may receive compensation.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Mr. Chairman, I believe this resolution is quite self-explanatory. I would be glad to answer any questions on it.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): I think the Resolution actually requires considerable explanation in all due deference to my honourable friend the Minister of Labour. May I first of all be permitted, Mr. Chairman, to say that it is a rather hodge-podge draft of a resolution because one has to read it two or three times over to gather the significance, because it does seem to me that in respect of section (b) particularly there are three distinct and different items that are covered by this resolution. At first glance it just seems to be two components to the resolution, (a) and (b), and I respectfully suggest to my honourable friend that it may be better to spell them out a little more distinctly in the future, and I really mean no severe criticism when I say this.

However, Mr. Chairman, if I may deal with the contents, "the increase of the maximum earnings which will be deemed to be the average annual income consequent upon which increased compensation may be payable under the Act," I wonder whether or not the Minister may indicate at this time whether this will apply in respect of compensation that is now being paid, because, Mr. Chairman, one of the areas in which there is a considerable amount of complaint insofar as The Workmen's Compensation Act is concerned, deals with the level at which the maximum on compensation is arrived at. Now I would imagine that what this actually means is that the increased level of -- I believe it's 6,000 at the present time, or 5,500 -- is going to be increased, and I hope that when I read the bill it will be 7,000 or something along that line.

However, apart from that, Mr. Chairman, I trust and hope that this will be retroactive insofar as those ceilings are concerned, because this is an area in The Workmen's Compensation Act that causes a considerable amount of trouble and a considerable amount of loss of income. I have, Mr. Chairman, a number of cases which I'm not going to cite specifically at this time, but merely to illustrate that a person when on compensation receives every two weeks a payment of \$69.70 whereas at the present time his earnings could well be over \$90.00 a week. The reason for the reduction, Mr. Chairman, is due to the fact that the accident for which the individual employee is receiving compensation occurred a number of years ago when the earnings were less, but notwithstanding what that particular individual is receiving today in wages, his compensation on a recurring accident is based on what he was earning at the time of the accident.

I respectfully suggest to my honourable friend that the government should give consideration to this, if indeed, Mr. Chairman, it is not included in the Act. Now knowing, or presuming the progressive mind of my honourable friend the present Minister of Labour, it could well be, Mr. Chairman, that provision for this is in the Act -- I regret, Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend shakes his head -- so apparently he is not quite as progressive as I thought that he might be.

Then may I enjoin him to consider this matter because the man is being penalized even more today by virtue of having to stay off as a result of an accident that happened two or three years ago, Mr. Chairman, than he was even at the time of the first occurrence of the accident,

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) because at that time, when the accident first occurred to him, say for instance his wages at that time was \$50.00, that was generally considered as the wages in relation to general accepted wages; if he's earning today \$70.00, he still is only as far as compensation is concerned based on the \$50.00 that he may have been earning at the time of the accident.

So he is being penalized in two ways I suggest, Mr. Chairman. First, he's being penalized because of the fact that he had the accident and he is continuously requiring treatment as a result of the accident; and secondly, he is having to pay a financial penalty in addition to all else. So I ask the Minister for comment, if he would, on that.

The other point, Mr. Chairman, in the resolution that I would like to have a further explanation if possible from the Honourable the Minister deals with the last portion -- "employees who have developed silicosis that is not evident by X-ray appearances but is evidenced by results of scientific tests, may receive compensation." I hope, Mr. Chairman, in this particular section that this will be construed as being retroactive back over a considerable period of years in order to give due cognizance of the fact that silicosis takes a long time in some cases to show up either through X-ray or test. I've had drawn to my attention one or two cases, Mr. Chairman, of the possibility of the incident of silicosis taking place 20 or 25 years ago, that only now is becoming evident and showing up.

So I hope that in respect of this particular section that there will be a full provision for anybody who has been engaged in those industries for which silicosis is suspected as being a part of those industries, that this section at least will be retroactive in order to cover the persons who may be affected.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to comment on the matter of silicosis, in that I am pleased that the government has seen fit to acquiesce to the requests of the mining industry and the mining associations in that this truly has created a great deal of hardship on the miners in our province as well as in other parts of Canada. It's something that the average miner does not know he is getting it, and I am very much pleased to know that there will be recognition given to acknowledging the fact that a man may have had or has silicosis which will not show up on X-ray examination, but there are other means now that will be able to show up that the man is silicotic and that he will be entitled to workman's compensation. I am pleased to see that this has been considered on those basis.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister what is the maximum limit that he is setting in this part, because I'm sure that he will recall last year in Committee I proposed an amendment to the act or to the bill last year to raise the maximum. I believe from five to six or 65 -- I'm not sure, I just don't remember what it was but I know my amendment was ruled out in Committee because it was for expense monies. I'm glad to see that he has taken my advice and is raising it at this time. We'll be probably getting the bill pretty soon, so I will know what the maximum will be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Speaker, the Committee has adopted certain resolutions and has instructed me to report the same.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. STEINKOPF introduced Bill No. 96, an Act to amend The Manitoba Hydro Act.

MR. BAIZLEY introduced Bill No. 92, an Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 114 pupils from the School Division No. 35 comprising schools from Swan River, Birch River, Benito, Bowsman and Minitonas. These are Grade 9 to 11 students, under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Kitsch and Mr. Hooper and Mrs. Hooper. The Birch River students are from the constituency represented in the House by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare; the others are represented in this Assembly by the Honourable the Member from Swan River. I understand these students have travelled some 300 miles to be with us this afternoon. There are also some 55 Grade 11 students from William Morton

(MADAM SPEAKER cont'd.) . . . School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Sharratt. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Gladstone. We do have 24 Grade 5 to 8 students from Shoal Lake Indian School from the Province of Ontario under the direction of the Rev. W. Donovan. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you.

MR. MOLGAT: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to address a question to the First Minister. In view of the announcement by the Federal Government indicating that they are prepared to increase their grant for the Pan-Am Games by one quarter of a million dollars, and prepared to go beyond this on a sharing basis with the province, has the First Minister decided whether he will go ahead with the cost sharing with Ottawa?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): I thank my honourable friend for the question, Madam Speaker. I can tell him that the Government of Manitoba was represented at a meeting this morning between themselves, Mr. Culver Riley, and the sub-committee of city council on Pan-Am Games, and all I can say at the moment is to report progress.

MR. MOLGAT: Satisfactory progress, Madam Speaker?

MR. ROBLIN: I have no complaint.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, yesterday I was asked a question by the Honourable Member for Gladstone whether or not there was any truth in the rumour being circulated in the Town of Neepawa and district that it is the intention of the department, or their department, to remove the health unit and/or the diagnostic services from the Town of Neepawa. The answer is "no."

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to address a question to the Honourable the First Minister, and I apologize for not informing him of this question. I understand, Madam Speaker, that letters were addressed to the leaders of all political parties in this House from the Co-operative Union of Manitoba respecting the situation in regards of the tax rebate on Willow Park Development. My question, Madam Speaker, is, has the First Minister received such a letter? Has he given it his consideration? And if so, what are the results of his consideration?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I'm not sure

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, is it permissible to smoke when the Speaker is in the Chair?

MADAM SPEAKER: allowed. I did not notice any.

MR. ROBLIN: Referring to the question, Madam Speaker, I'm not aware of any recent correspondence in the last day or so that my honourable friend appears to be alluding to. I think there has been some correspondence with a housing co-operative, and I presume it's the same one, and at the present time there is no proposal I'm aware of to amend the legislation. We rather hope that they may find some way themselves of conforming with the regulations in order to become eligible for the rebate.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that an order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) How many members of the Department of Highways are engaged full time in promotion of highway safety; (2) How many traffic deaths occurred in Manitoba during 1964; (3) How many persons were injured in 1964 in the Province of Manitoba; and (4) What was the total property damage in all traffic accidents in Manitoba in 1964.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, before the question is put, may I just say that we will answer it as best we can if the information is available to us. I have some doubts about the total property damage figure, whether we can obtain it.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Carillon, that An Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) How many persons were convicted of using purple gas on Provincial Highways in 1964; (2) What was the total amount in fines for gas misuse in 1964; (3) How many inspectors did the government employ for inspection; and (4) Was anyone jailed for breaking the law

(MR. VIELFAURE cont'd.) respecting misuse of purple gas.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, we'll accept the question and provide the information for the year 1964.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Burrows.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return for each of the last five years, the following information with regard to the Manitoba Trade Directory: (1) How many were printed; (2) How many were distributed; (3) How they were distributed; (4) What the total cost of printing was; (5) What the cost of distribution was; (6) What other costs were involved; (7) The name of the firm or firms doing the printing; (8) Whether this was let on public tender; and (9) The amounts bid by all tenderers.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: 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: The reasons for the Court's failure to convict the defendant in the Brown Steel Tank case and, specifically, any weaknesses in existing labour legislation which affected the Court's decision.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, in part this question may be answered perhaps not using the terminology that has been used in the question. We could provide the reasons for the Court's decision, and to the extent that that decision might refer to what might be termed weaknesses if any in existing legislation, that will be revealed in the decision itself. Beyond that we would be unable to provide any information which would only be speculation about weaknesses if any in any legislation, or in particular with regard to this. So in answer to this, we can only accept it insofar as the provision of the Court's decision in this particular case, and that can be certainly provided.

MR. PAULLEY: We accept it on that condition, Madam Speaker.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: 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: The reasons why the Brown Steel Tank case was not referred to the Labour Board for settlement rather than to the courts; and if this was not done because the Board lacks the necessary powers, what powers would have to be delegated to the Board in order to make recourse to the courts unnecessary in further actions of a similar nature.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, here again we would be able to advise after examination of the necessary documents the reason that may be disclosed for having the matter referred to the Court. We cannot answer the question framed in the negative, that is to say as to why something was not done, but we can answer to the best of our knowledge why it was referred to the Court. The second part of the question we cannot accept because that would involve an opinion on legislation, and also might involve advice that would be given to the Executive Council.

MR. PAULLEY: Acceptable, Madam Speaker.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: 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 cost to the Government for the Inquiry Commission; (2) The cost of legal fees; and (3) The cost to the Government of action in the Magistrate and Appeal Court; resulting from the alleged infractions by the Brown Steel Tank Company of The Labour Relations Act.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, we accept this question just subject to the comment that I think I would wish it to be clear that the answer to question No. 3 to some extent overlaps No. 2, and I just want that to be clear, that the two really in a sense refer to much the same thing.

MR. PAULLEY: I think that's generally reasonable, Madam Speaker.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: 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) Mineral Royalty Tax; (2) Other Mining Revenue; (3) Any other revenue accruing to the Treasury of Manitoba in respect of the developments at Moak and Mystery Lake, including the vicinity of Thompson, under development by International Nickel Company for each of the years since the start of production of minerals in the area; (4) The amount of Provincial Income Tax paid in regard to the above by International Nickel for each of the years since commencement of production; and (5) The amount of Provincial Corporation Tax paid as above.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I was talking with my honourable friend about this question and we can supply the answers to questions 1 and 2, which I take it are the total received by the province for Mineral Royalty Tax and other mining revenue. With respect to Question 3, this question appears to deal with the very broad matter of all kinds of revenue that are collected in the Moak Lake area and of course we don't have that breakdown. Sections 4 and 5 -- I think I'm barred from answering because of the provisions of the Federal Income Tax Statute. I think now my honourable friend and I understand each other on these points.

MR. PAULLEY: That's true, Madam Speaker, unless in the possibility in Item No. 3 there may be revenues from lease agreements that might be readily available that do accrue to the province, and I would suggest to my honourable friend if that's possible I would like that. I accept however his reservations on the other items.

MR. ROBLIN: We'll look into that.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The third reading of Bill No. 71. The Honourable the First

MR. MOLGAT: I rise to find out what the proper procedure is here, on a point of order if I may. It seems to me that according to our rule book, and I'm referring to Rule 19, Page 10, that we should not be proceeding with third readings and with Committee of the Whole on government bills on either a Tuesday or a Friday. I rise really because if this were established as a precedent, then it could at times interfere with Private Members' Day according to our rules as laid down, because the rule states that on Tuesday and before 5:30 Friday, the Order should be "Questions, written," and then "Motions, other than government motions." It would appear to me that both the third reading and the motion to go into Committee of the Whole are government motions.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, it's an interesting point here. I think the rule that my honourable friend read may be modified by Rule 22 (1) on Page 11. If we just turn to that and I'll read it: "Orders of the Day for the third readings of bills shall take precedence of all other Orders for the same day except Orders to which the House has previously given priority." Now whether that's to be interpreted to mean that the Order as it appears in the Order Paper is correct or not is an open question with me, but it does appear that it probably requires some elucidation.

MR. MOLGAT: Reading 22 (1) I would agree presumably -- I want to check this further -- presumably a third reading of Bill 71 would be in order, but then the Committee of the Whole I do not believe would be because that is definitely a government motion. -- (Interjection) -- That's reports from a Committee of the Whole though, it is not a motion to go into Committee of the Whole.

MADAM SPEAKER: of the House that this has been the procedure adopted by the House, that third reading is in order even on Tuesdays and Fridays.

MR. MOLGAT: I see insofar as the third readings, Madam Speaker, as I read the next rule, but I don't believe that a motion to go into Committee falls into that category.

MADAM SPEAKER: Section No. (5) of Rule 22, reads, "Bills referred to a Committee of the Whole House shall be placed for such reference on the Orders of the Day following the Order of Reference, in their proper order next after bills reported from Standing or Special Committees.

Bill No. 71, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ended the 31st day of March 1966, was read a third time and passed.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell):

Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that Madam

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd.) Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the following bills standing 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 from Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

Bills No. 5, 7, 8, 9, 10 were read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 11.

MR. PAULLEY: I just want to make one comment in connection with Bill 11 dealing with the premise that a voting in the part of a rural municipality only can take place. I raised the question when we were having the bill under consideration at second reading respecting the apparent getting away from uniformity in legislation, and I raised the question as to the effect of this on The Liquor Control Act, whereas under The Liquor Control Act in exercising local option the whole of the municipality concerned votes on a particular matter, and under The Liquor Control Act the biggest effect may be felt on a large community within the town, village within the area of the municipality, I posed the question to the Honourable the Attorney-General at that time as to whether or not in order to retain some semblance of uniformity in our laws whether or not he would take this under consideration in respect of The Liquor Control Act.

Again as I say, Mr. Chairman, we are deviating from the generally accepted principle of dealing with municipalities on a local option basis. We are now, insofar as the Lord's Day Act only, we are making it possible that certain parts of the municipality may only be affected respecting the Lord's Day. I raise the question for the consideration of my honourable friend the Attorney-General in respect of similar parts only of the municipality generally being affected by The Liquor Control Act. My Honourable friend nods his head. I don't know what that means.

MR. McLEAN: I think I said we would take it under consideration. I don't want to be misunderstood now -- I wouldn't expect that we would have any legislation on that topic this session with respect to The Liquor Control Act, but certainly it is a matter that we will give very careful consideration to.

MR. PAULLEY: then, Mr. Chairman, I didn't hear my honourable friend say that. I accept that and enjoin him to do so.

Bill No. 11 was read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 14.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted on Bill No. 14 to make a comment or two because it deals with the relationship of the municipalities and the rules governing municipalities and assessments. On Orders of the Day, today, I asked the Honourable the First Minister if he had received a letter today concerning the application of the tax rebate to Co-op Housing. My honourable friend referred to some past representations as I understood him, or if I understood him correctly, in regard to this matter, and he stated that the Co-op Housing Development itself should try to come to some arrangement as to the repayment of the rebate.

Now I would like permission, Mr. Chairman, to refer to the letter that I received today, which I understand was addressed to other Leaders in this House regarding this matter of the rebate, and I think I'm in order, Mr. Chairman, to raise this, because The Municipal Act deals with such matters as assessments and that is the reason that I'm doing it. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, you will find in this bill reference to assessments.

The letter I have in my hand, Mr. Chairman, is addressed to me from the Co-operative Union of Manitoba and reads as follows: "Dear Sir: The Board of the Co-operative Union of Manitoba has instructed me to write to the Leaders of the political parties in Manitoba to make known our concern and disappointment that Part 10 of Bill 2 passed at the last Legislature pertaining to school tax rebate was so worded that the occupant owners of Willow Park Housing Co-op are not eligible for school tax rebate.

"Our purpose in initiating the organization of the Co-operative Housing Association of Manitoba, which in turn organized the Willow Park project, was to demonstrate that co-operative methods of self-help would enable people to obtain good housing without subsidy. While we accept that people in the lowest income levels simply cannot afford to pay for modern standards of housing and need to be helped by government subsidized programs, we know there is a considerable segment of the people who, given the advantages of non-profit development and

MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) co-operative ownership and imaginative architectural techniques, can achieve good housing at the cost they can afford without government or other subsidy. We would like to stress that the people in Willow Park will have an equity in their homes by way of down payment much as do purchasers of conventional detached homes, with the resultant responsibilities and interests in the community which ownership normally engenders.

"While this project is the first of its kind in Canada, it is not a new development. Co-operative housing has been highly successful in many countries including the United States, where in New York City in particular, co-operative housing has been highly successful and has been encouraged and assisted by the state and city governments.

"The present form of the school tax rebate legislation discriminates against the Willow Park project in that it does not recognize Willow Park occupant-owners as payers of school taxes. We are therefore appealing to the leaders of the political parties in Manitoba to regard this as a matter of urgency. This project is being closely watched by people in agencies across Canada. We would hope that the measures of success it achieves will be in direct proportion to the merits which we believe this concept in housing has. It would be most unfortunate if provincial legislation would handicap this promising project."

Again I say, Mr. Chairman, that the reason that I'm raising this at the present time is due to the omission in the bill that we have at the present time before us to allow for the purpose of establishing assessments and thereby acknowledging contributions for the purpose of school taxes to developments such as this co-operative development, Willow Park.

Now I know that a considerable amount of discussion has taken place in this Assembly in respect of the situation of tenants and leaseholders, but I think even in this there is a third area, Mr. Chairman, that I think the Minister of Municipal Affairs would be well to consider, because here are people banding themselves together, they all increase their equity in the properties concerned, and I am convinced that in any fair and reasonable assessment of the situation that one could not but come to the opinion that they should -- because of the peculiar set-up of the development in Willow Park and other co-operative housing developments -- they should be entitled on a per unit basis for a tax rebate as announced by the Government of Manitoba.

MR. SMELLIE: Although we have given some preliminary consideration to this matter, our consideration is not complete and I'm not prepared to introduce any legislation at this time. I would tell my honourable friend however that the matter is under consideration and if a feasible way can be worked out to look after people like this, we will certainly try to do so.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, with thanks to accept that of the Minister this afternoon, and may I respectfully suggest to him that if at all possible that the consideration that he and his department is giving to this important matter reach a conclusion before this House rises, whenever it is going to end, in order that there may be equitable treatment of these people.

MR. SMELLIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't like to give any undertaking on that matter. However, I would assure my honourable friend that we will examine the matter and if it is possible soon to do something about it we may do so, but there's certainly other things that are also pressing at the moment and I'm sure my honourable friend will understand that.

Bill No. 14: Sections 1 to 10 were read section by section and passed.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, I propose to point out to this committee again that this section, this proposed section perpetuates the idea that a tenant of premises is not as capable or as responsible or reliable in making a decision as to the expenditure of municipal funds raised by borrowing as is the ratepayer.

This section again states that there is a difference in acceptance of responsibility between the ratepayer and the person who is an elector. It means that the wife of a -- or rather -- yes, the wife of a man whose property is valued at \$700.00 is not as capable to make a decision as the wife of a man of property assessed at \$800.00. It is to me a completely nonsensical approach to the responsibilities of electors.

It means to me that a person who is given the responsibility in this democracy of voting for public representatives, who may spend large sums of money, is yet a person who under other circumstances is considered not capable of deciding whether or not to approve of a by-law of a municipal corporation involving the expenditure of funds. It means to me that a person who is affected by funds that may be borrowed and spent by a municipality will not have an opportunity to vote against the expenditure of funds, and rather than say that a person who is an elector is likely to spend more than future generations to pay. I would indicate that the possibility is

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) that a non-resident ratepayer might have an opportunity to vote down needed services and to spend money for services which are not needed without reference to the people who actually participate in the payment.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I would like to move -- and I'm not sure of my procedure so I'm sure you will correct me -- but I wish to move an amendment, and I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that Section 543, subsection (1) as set out in Section 11 be amended by deleting all the words from and including the third line, to and including the third last line thereof. This, Mr. Chairman, would have the effect of making Section 543 (1) read simply as follows: "Every person male or female who is entitled to vote at elections for members of the council of the municipality is entitled to vote on any by-law of the municipal corporation that requires the assent of the ratepapers."

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): If I may speak very briefly on this, I think that the section that the bill contains is a proper one. If we have people voting on by-laws that will not be responsible for paying the debt later on, I don't see quite eye to eye with what the Member for St. John's said, because the way the section now reads people that vote are also responsible people and I think that's the way it should be.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, Mr. Chairman, the suggestion of my colleague from St. John's is to establish that those people simply because of the fact that they haven't got \$400.00 in assessment are equally responsible as those that have. I think my honourable friend for Rhineland really is turning the clock, or wants to maintain or retain the fact that the clock back in the old days when the old feudal baron was the only one that had any say insofar as the direction of the community is concerned. I frankly confess that we have come a little way away from that now that we have a limitation of \$400.00, which may be considered peanuts to some people but it's a lot of money to the Leader of the New Democrats, but apart from that we have come a considerable way. Of course I don't know if my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland would also want to go back to the old days when even members of Legislative Assemblies like this had to be men of considerable wealth in order to sit here. Again the objective in this resolution of course, Mr. Chairman, is the recognition of the responsibility of those who pay taxes or rentals within the community are just as responsible as those who happen to own \$400.00 worth of property.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think the Leader of the NDP Party must realize that if a certain number of electors in a given municipality, or a ward or whatever the case might be, are able to pass a by-law involving a certain indebtedness, later on they might move out and who would be left to pay for the debts? This would certainly be the taxpayer, so I think it should be the taxpayer who decides.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if my honourable friend would suggest that we turn back the clock insofar as voting on school by-laws are concerned, because here we've recognized the principle that it is the resident electors and not the owners of property who have built the schools and the reason that we did that, Mr. Chairman, I recall quite well. My honourable friend was not a member of this House at that time but the reasons that we changed the act insofar as voting for the construction of schools was because we found that those who owned the land were voting against the advancement of education in this province, and changed the act so that it was resident electors, not resident ratepayers who voted for the provision of schools.

I want to say to my honourable friend that I would imagine if his philosophy held true that he just enunciated in respect of general by-laws were concerned, if the same application was in effect insofar as our schools are concerned, that many youngsters that are now going to reasonable schools would not be going to them. So I say to my honourable friend that if this is his psychology, may I respectfully suggest to him that he carry through his proposition, and when we are dealing with the question of the voting on schools at the local level that he bring in an amendment to put back into effect that only those who have \$400.00 worth of property be entitled to vote as to whether or not we'll have our schools built. I think he would find no support whatsoever.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think our ratepayers are responsible people as well, and that if they see a definite need is there, they will vote for it.

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

MR. PAULLEY: A standing vote please, Mr. Chairman.

A counted standing vote was taken, the result being as follows: Yeas, 13; Nays, 28.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost.

The remainder of Bill No. 14 was read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 19.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C., (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would permit a question. In the Winnipeg School District or Division, voting on a school money by-law is still confined to ratepayers, is it not?

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, I don't know. I believe that section would be found in The Public Schools Act, is it not, and not in The Municipal Act.

Bill No. 19 was read section by section and passed.

Bill No. 21: Sections 1 to 2 (c) were read section by section and passed.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make sure. Did you say 21?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Bill No. 21.

MR. CHERNIACK: What are you on now? What did you just pass?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 2, clause (c).

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you.

Bill No. 21: Section 2, subsections (d) to (j) were read and passed.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, on (k), I waited for the right spot. I've been looking at this act and I have re-read the discussion and the comments of the Honourable Minister on this, and I cannot justify in my own mind the exclusion of the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg from the whole principle behind the act involving public housing, urban renewal, and a complete redevelopment of such a major area of this province. I don't know of any place other than in Metropolitan Winnipeg where the need is so great for a proper rehabilitation task. The public housing area and the limited dividend area are all matters which are much more needed in Metropolitan Winnipeg than anywhere else in the province.

Now the only reason given by the Honourable Minister for the exclusion of Metro is that Metro does not have the responsibility. But my question is not why is it excluded, but rather why has it not been given the responsibility? It is generally recognized, Mr. Chairman, that the whole purpose for the creation of Metropolitan Corporation has very many factors behind it, but one of the main, and in my estimation the main reason for Metro, is a proper planning authority and a proper -- although some people think we have a great deal to go before we achieve "proper" -- but yet a -- let me say a more proper distribution of the cost of providing services which are metropolitan in nature.

Mr. Chairman, if the planning authority is given to Metro because it is important that planning be looked at from the standpoint of the metropolitan area rather than what may be the vested interests of any one of the area municipalities, and if the whole problem of sharing of responsibility and cost is distributed amongst all area municipalities as it is in Metro, surely then all the suburban municipalities, the area municipalities, should make their contribution to a proper public housing scheme no matter where it is within Metropolitan Winnipeg. Poverty, like other matters, does not know municipal boundaries and know how to recognize them. Deterioration does not recognize municipal boundaries, and if in the City of Winnipeg there are slum areas, those slum areas have been created by the trend into the centre of the urban area of people who are under hardship, under financial hardship throughout Greater Winnipeg, and possibly also with an impact in the provincial area.

So that it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that it is only right for the planning -- for proper planning, for proper carrying out of the function of a planning authority such as is given to the Metropolitan Corporation, the authority and the responsibility of participating in public housing should also be in the Metropolitan Corporation. Furthermore, as far as the cost is concerned involved in public housing, that should be borne by the area, by the entire area of the Metropolitan Winnipeg, because any improvement and any planning for public housing, for limited housing, anything along these lines is beneficial to the entire metropolitan area and should be paid as such.

Now it is true that the Federal Government recognizes that all of Canada is concerned with poor conditions in any part of Canada, and the province by its contribution recognizes that all of the province is concerned with a special area of the province, but in the case of the Metropolitan Corporation the boundaries are just not recognizable except by municipal politicians, and, as such, it should to my estimation be a recognition that when public housing or any planning authority in housing carries out a task anywhere in the metropolitan area, it is beneficial to, and the responsibility of, all the people of Metropolitan Corporation and not only that of the municipality.

The result may well be that the Municipality of Brooklands, which is one of the poorest -- I think it is the poorest municipality in Greater Winnipeg -- which may be in the greatest

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) need for public housing, which is in the greatest need for limited housing, which has the greatest need for a proper development in subsidized housing, which may yet be one of the more prominent areas for urban renewal, may never be able to come to the province and participate in a proper redevelopment scheme because the municipality of Brooklands is poor, and it is too poor in my estimation to undertake any sort of proper rehabilitation of its area without the assistance of the Metropolitan area of Greater Winnipeg, and it is only right that that is so, because as I say the boundaries are there that are not recognizable to the people who must live within one or another municipality, and the benefits to be derived from a proper urban renewal, in let us say Brooklands as an example, is beneficial to all.

I don't know that it's necessary to move an amendment which would be easy. It would just be a question of deleting the words "but does not include" and replacing them with the words "and includes." I don't think it's necessary to move the amendment because if we could persuade the majority of this House to do so, it would be more fitting that the Minister of Municipal Affairs should make the amendment, but at least I would like to invite a review, by the Minister or anyone else interested, of my suggestion that it would be proper that the Metropolitan Corporation be involved in this work rather than excluded completely from everything but the question of zoning and streets and whatever else is involved in the physical plan.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, I think my honourable friend has pointed out that the costs are in fact now spread over an area much larger than the municipality itself that's concerned with any housing project or any urban renewal project, because in fact most of the costs are borne on a 75% basis by the Federal Government and this bill itself would provide for most of the cost to be borne, an additional 12½% by the province, which leaves the small portion of 12½% of costs to any one municipality.

He may be right that certain municipalities would find it impossible to undertake an urban renewal scheme or a public housing scheme at this time. However, I think it's also true that the powers that have been given to the Metropolitan Corporation, generally speaking, have been those powers that were required to have such an authority as a Metropolitan Corporation where the municipalities acting independently were being frustrated in many cases by the action or non-action of other municipalities in the same field, for example in the fields of planning where we were not having any coherent planning crossing municipal boundaries. I think that at this time, until it is demonstrated that the municipalities themselves are unable or unwilling to assume the responsibility for urban renewal and for public housing, that I would not be prepared to move the amendment my honourable friend suggests.

I think that the municipalities, particularly in the Greater Winnipeg area, have taken hold of this matter. They have done some preliminary work, and particularly in the City of Winnipeg they have done some practical work that is moving along, perhaps slower than some people would like to see, but certainly they are achieving practical fine results in the field of urban renewal and public housing. It is expected that at least one of the other municipalities in the Metropolitan area will present a proposal soon for a similar project, and I for one would not be prepared at this time to take this authority away from the individual municipalities and give it to the Metropolitan Corporation. I think we must recognize however that the Metropolitan Corporation, although they are not the initiating body in any such scheme, that they do have a significant part to play in any scheme that is undertaken.

In the first place, Metro have done some of the preliminary studies which lead to the preparation of urban renewal schemes, and I think it is certainly true also that no urban renewal scheme in the Metropolitan area can go very far without the active co-operation of the Metropolitan Corporation in the preparation and completion of that scheme, and certainly the land use planning and the land use control that will be necessary in that area. At the moment, we are able to work out in a satisfactory way arrangements between the municipalities and Metro to proceed actively with such schemes, and so long as the present machinery is able to work, I would propose no change in it. If it is demonstrated that the municipalities cannot or will not undertake this responsibility, then I think the time might be right to consider giving this additional responsibility to the Metropolitan Corporation.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, this is an interesting statement because we now know that the municipalities must -- no, until it is demonstrated, not the municipalities must demonstrate but something must demonstrate that the municipalities cannot or will not. I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister how they are going to demonstrate a negative fact? How will they show that something is not being done, Mr. Chairman? Will there be a time element involved, as to the time by which something should be done or will there be a prodding?

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.)

Now we understand, if the Honourable Minister is right, he said that Metro will not initiate anything like this. Does the province undertake that it will initiate something where it will be demonstrated that a municipality does not accept it? How can we possibly say that a municipality is not doing something unless it is in some way being asked to do it, or unless it is demonstrated that it need be done. The demonstration of this negative factor is one which I find difficult to understand.

The Honourable Minister does refer to a machinery which is available, which is able to do the job, but as far as I know it has only been done in the City of Winnipeg. I would not be surprised to hear that St. Boniface is thinking about it. I'm not aware of any other municipality that is -- although knowing municipalities don't find it necessary to inform me of it, but I'm not just aware of it from reading the newspapers -- and I'm wondering just how many municipalities have already indicated that they want to do something positive.

Therefore, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister firstly, what has been done? Secondly, what is now being done in terms to indicate that some municipalities are attempting to work out a project, and how and what will have to happen to make this government feel that it has been demonstrated that a municipality cannot or will not do it? Will this government, through its commission or any other planning body, attempt to stimulate work? Will this government, through whatever agency it has, go to a municipality and say, now we think that this or the other scheme ought to be looked into and proceeded with; or will this government through its agencies sit back and wait for a municipality to come to it to make a proposal. This is the two-way street that I'd like to have explained, whether it is a two-way street or just one-way in that respect.

MR. SMELLIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that we are all of us aware of areas in the province where there may be some need for urban renewal schemes. I don't think that this fact needs any demonstration. We were aware for many years of the need for this sort of thing in some parts of Winnipeg. The fact that action is being taken in at least one of those areas now -- action has been taken, and action is being now taken in other areas of that same municipality, and at least one other municipality in the Metropolitan area has indicated that they wish to proceed with a study, the municipalities have indicated that they are willing to proceed with this matter when the need develops in any given municipality.

I think my honourable friend will agree also that there are other municipalities within the Metropolitan area where there is today no evidence of serious blight, and where those municipalities would not be expected to be considering an urban renewal proposal. For the information of my honourable friend, I would advise him that there is at least one other municipality of the province which has applied for a study under the National Housing Act recently, so that at the moment I think the municipalities are accepting this responsibility and no evidence has been given to me that they have not been willing to undertake this or that they have not been able to where they did have the desire.

There may be some instances such as the one that my honourable friend suggests where it may be a physical impossibility. That is another situation, and perhaps the situation in the Village of Brooklands itself is something else that should be looked into, a separate problem on its own rather than the problem only of urban renewal.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm sorry the Honourable Minister has so far indicated that Winnipeg -- and we all know Winnipeg is doing something. He mentioned another municipality that is considering it and then later he mentioned again another municipality that is considering it. I think he meant still another one possibly outside of Metropolitan Winnipeg -- the Minister nods his head which means that we now know of three municipalities in all of Manitoba that have indicated an interest.

But the very fact that he stated, Mr. Chairman, that we have known for many years of areas in the City of Winnipeg that are in need, indicates to me that many years may yet go by before we do something in a positive way, and the Minister did not answer my question as to what device will be used to initiate or to prod municipalities into considering their problem. Is the province going to take an active interest in suggesting that there be something done in one or another municipality, or is the province going to sit back and wait for applications?

Now I think it is important that we know this, who is involved in this planning problem. Metro is not involved in this particular problem. Metro will do planning study but Metro has no authority to go out and start suggesting that it be done. Who is going to start it if not the municipalities themselves, and if it's somebody else, I think the Minister ought to make it clear

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) so that those of us who are interested should relax and say well somebody is doing something positive, not sitting back and waiting as was the case in this province for a large number of years, until after many years of knowledge of what was going on in the City of Winnipeg something was done in this city.

MR. SMELLIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, generally speaking I think it would be true to say that the initiative is left to the municipalities, although this has not always been the case, and I must confess that on at least one occasion the province did approach a municipality with a suggestion that they might consider a further study.

Now I think that generally speaking, however, the matter would be left to the initiative of the municipalities themselves, and ordinarily this is initiated by the municipality coming either to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation or to the province and making enquiries about the procedure to be followed and what sort of financial help could be received.

The remainder of Bill No. 21 and Bill No.38 were read section by section and passed.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, I am called by my colleagues quite often "the late Mr. Gray," and I have missed 20 when you were reading it. I would like to ask the Minister what's the necessity of Subsection 20? I apologize for not getting up in time, but

.....

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I'd suggest you ask if the honourable member has consent of the Committee to re-open the question. As far as this side of the House is concerned, we'd be glad to give consent.

MR. GRAY: The only time, Mr. Chairman, I could be in order is to break the rules.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the Committee agreed to look at Section 20?

MR. SMELLIE: This is the section that deals with accountable advances. The present section reads that the Metropolitan Corporation may make accountable advances to different branches of the Metropolitan Corporation up to \$100,000. One example of where this is done is the change that is given out to the drivers of transit vehicles every morning. They find that \$100,000 leaves them a little bit short for other things. They may have to pay fees to boards and commissions and this sort of thing, and they make accountable advances out of this fund. They tell us that \$125,000 would be adequate for the purpose, so that this amendment will change the maximum limit of the accountable advances that may be outstanding at any one time from \$100,000 to \$125,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Speaker, the Committee has considered Bills Nos. 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 19, 21, and 38 and has adopted all these bills without amendments.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that the Report of the Committee be received.

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

Bills No. 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 19, 21 and 38 were each read a third time and passed.

. continued on next page

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

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I would ask for permission to have the matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Inkster and the proposed amendment in amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk. The Honourable the Member for Emerson.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, in his absence I adjourned the debate on behalf of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I am generally in agreement with the resolution. However, on reading it over more carefully I felt further amendment was in order, in order to more sharply define and clarify certain sections of the amendment. So, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that the resolution as amended be further amended by: 1. Placing the letter (a) before the words "That dissolution of marriage may be claimed by either husband or wife on the grounds that the respondent;" 2. By changing the numbering of the present paragraphs (1) to (4), both inclusive, and substituting therefor the letters (i) (ii) (iii) and (iv); 3. By deleting the present paragraph (5) and substituting therefor but numbering same (v) the following: "(v) has where the wife is the petitioner been guilty since the celebration of the marriage, of rape, sodomy or bestiality or:" 4. By deleting the present paragraph (7) and substituting therefor but renumbering same as (vi), namely: "(vi) has been legally separated from the petitioner for at least three years by virtue of a judgment of a court of superior jurisdiction on grounds on which an order of separation can be made under The Matrimonial Causes Act, 1857 (Imperial) and amendments thereto," and 5. By deleting the present paragraph (6), renumbering same as (b) and substituting therefor the following: "(b) That any married person who alleges that reasonable grounds exist for supposing that his or her spouse is dead, may present a petition to the court to have it presumed that the said spouse is dead and to have the marriage dissolved, and that by such proceedings the fact that for a period of seven years or upwards the other party to the marriage has been continuously absent from the petitioner and the petitioner has no reason to believe that the other party has been living within that time, shall be admissible in evidence as prima facie proof that the other party is dead."

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, I would like to address myself to this amendment and to further explain to the House that one of the main reasons for bringing it in is, firstly, to correct what was considered an error in grammar and an error in syntax. If the honourable members will take a look at the resolution as amended on the Orders for the Day, they will find that it reads, "that dissolution of marriage may be claimed by either husband or wife on the grounds that the respondent;" Then it goes on to list (1) (2) (3) and (4). Now number (5) is completely dissociated from the others because it's only on the petition of the wife. Number (6) is one which is available to both husband and wife and invokes the seven-year rule. Now if you read on, you have No. (7) which is completely dissociated from the first portion of the resolution, and in its present location it doesn't make sense, so for that reason it was felt that dissolution of the marriage may be claimed -- that would be sub-paragraph (a). Then (1) (2) (3) and (4) would be (i) (ii) (iii) and (iv). Then we move number (7) up and make it sub-paragraph (b), but in order to get away from collusion and connivance which would result if this sub-paragraph (7) were left in its present form, we have inserted therein a separation granted by a superior court on grounds available to a petitioner under The Matrimonial Causes Act. Now the reason why we have done that is because we have felt that the members of this House did not want to make available grounds for divorce in this province which are grounds for divorce in some of the states in the Union, particularly Nevada, and by putting this in and qualifying the separation as being a separation granted by a superior court under The Matrimonial Causes Act, we are making it necessary, in order to get that separation, for the respondent to have been guilty of offences under The Matrimonial Causes Act which would give rise to a legal separation.

Now going back to the original amendment as it was made, simply a legal separation, I pointed out to the Court that this in effect would give to a police magistrate under The Wives and Children's Maintenance Act jurisdiction in divorce.

A MEMBER: You pointed out to the House,

MR. HILLHOUSE: Yes, to the House -- I'm sorry. It's all the legal minds in here -- they get me confused. I pointed out to the House that if we left it in its present form it in effect would be giving divorce jurisdiction to a police magistrate. Now one of the cardinal principles of matrimonial offences is that there must be no connivance or no collusion, and when an Information is laid before a police magistrate for a breach of The Wives and Children's Maintenance Act by a lawyer there need be no evidence as to whether or no there was collusion or connivance there at all. As a matter of fact, the wife could lay a charge against her husband of assault; the husband could appear in court and he could plead guilty to that charge -- no evidence taken at all. A week later, the wife could go back to the same court and by virtue of that assault ask the magistrate to grant her an Order of Separation under the provisions of The Wives and Children's Maintenance Act. The husband could appear and he could agree to that order being granted. Now, if we leave this in, this resolution in its present form, we are creating that situation, and I suggest that we're making a mockery out of our matrimonial laws. And I feel, Madam, that this amendment as moved by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie should be accepted by this House, because I think it puts this resolution back into the place where it rightfully belongs as a serious resolution, and does not grant divorces for petty reasons.

Now, I know my learned friend -- I know that the Honourable Leader of the NDP raised the point that it was the separation for three years. But I take the different view. I take the view that the separation in respect of the judicial separation must be for some legal ground, and I take the view too that the best legal grounds are those grounds set out in The Matrimonial Causes Act, because if we allow separations to be recognized as grounds for divorce, which were granted by a police magistrate, I think we're making a mockery out of the whole situation. And I therefore, Madam, commend it most highly to this House to pass this resolution as amended by the Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Madam, I rise on a point of order. I didn't want to interrupt the Honourable Member from Selkirk, but I wonder whether it is in order for this House to amend a motion which has been passed, and then re-introduce it having been amended?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, spoken on it.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, at the outset I wish to thank the honourable members of this House for the friendly discussion on this subject. I'm going to support the amendment to the amendment. I'm supporting the amendment and I'm supporting the original motion, because it is an improvement. In the last -- what they say 170 years -- it's a definite improvement. And if you can't get a whole loaf of bread now, we'll be satisfied with a half a loaf. The very fact, however, that the honourable members here have shown such a friendly attitude and sympathy to those who suffer of the lack of law as to getting a divorce, in my opinion it's a very encouragement, and it will be well received by the people and particularly by those who are badly in need of some improvement of the divorce laws.

I have received many letters, very pathetic, tragic letters, but I have thrown them out because none of them wanted to have their names known, and I realize that a letter read must be tabled, and I had to respect their wishes. But I have taken the liberty of a case, just one case out of the many, which perhaps will indicate -- it's not a letter -- which perhaps will indicate one of the tragic situations. It will only take me a minute or two to present it to you, and I shall not occupy the time of the Legislature because I think that the situation is well known and well understood by everybody. But just a typical case.

This lady told me that she married a Canadian airman in England during the last war. She was 20 years of age, with a daughter who was then three months old. She and the child came to Canada in 1945 and were reunited with her husband. Her husband took her to his sister's house and there they stayed for three years. During all this time her husband never worked, and she was the bread-winner for the family, being a registered nurse. She worked very hard and her husband never provided for the family at any time. Their son was born in 1947 and she worked all during her pregnancy. Her husband got gratuity money, but drank every cent of it. He would take off for days at a time on a drinking spree along with his kind of women. After this gratuity money ran out, and if she didn't give him money for his drinks, he beat the children until she was forced to give the money. Finally, the break came for her out of this nightmare life when an uncle of hers and his wife came to visit her. They realized the predicament she was in and so offered to take her and the children to their home in Western Canada. She got a legal separation from her husband and he was to maintain the children.

(MR. GRAY cont'd) That was 17 years ago, and she has never received one penny from him. She always worked hard to maintain her children and while she worked and for them, she finally saved what she thought was a lot of money, to pay a lawyer \$750.00, which he in turn paid to a detective in Ontario to track her husband down. But it was to no avail; they could not locate him. For the past four years she has been living common law. She met this man seven years ago, and after going steady for a few years they had no alternative but to live together as man and wife. They were happy, but they both knew that their so-called marriage was not the ideal marriage that they would both like. They have their own home, free of debt. She says he is a wonderful husband to her and an excellent father to the children. At present they are expecting a baby in July. She can't help but feel sorry that this baby, as it was now, it will be illegitimate.

And similar letters I've received which I said I am not going to read. I think that the attitude taken by the Legislature is a marvellous one, a wonderful one, and a humane one. And something should be done. One of the amendments or the original motion I respectfully urge should be carried and save thousands of tragedies similar to those that I have just presented to you now. So again, I pray that any of the amendments -- I'm going to vote for the amendments and the amendments and the motion -- should be carried in this House.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MRS. CAROLYNE MORRISON (Pembina): I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, 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, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for St. Matthews. The Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, the Member for Elmwood adjourned the debate for myself, and with your permission I would proceed.

Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendment that was put before us by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews. There are several reasons for opposing it and conversely, therefore, for supporting the original motion, one being that to support an increase in the Old Age Pension, one reason for doing so is a very obvious one -- the kind that is given by the Honourable Member for Inkster time and time again in this House -- and that is on the ground of humanitarianism. It is a fact that many, very many indeed, of the elderly people, the older people, do have inadequate purchasing power and therefore as a result they are not able to buy enough of this world's goods and services to make their lives as comfortable as they might be; also, not nearly as comfortable as the lives led by people of younger ages; and if anyone deserves more comfortable living, a more comfortable life, it is the older people. A second reason for supporting the idea of an increase in Old Age Pension is not a humanitarian one. It doesn't mean it's anti-humanitarian, but it's simply a matter of economics, and I suggest that one of the problems in our society is that there are too many people still without adequate purchasing power, and you combine the total and the result is a society with, or an economy with inadequate aggregate demand. This is the economist's term.

Now there are some people who would argue that the economy of a country can be made to grow, to be kept buoyant by means of ensuring that investment opportunities are sufficient in number, that the attractions for investment are sufficient so as to induce people with money, the investor, to invest in the economy and thereby create jobs, etcetera. Those who support that theory without reservation are in fact then supporting the "trickle down" theory, that if you have enough going on by way of investment at the top that somehow this will all trickle down to the many and the economy will be healthy. The converse of that theory is one that I hold to, and that is that if you can put enough purchasing power in the hands of enough people, investment demand will take care of itself, since investors will respond to market demand and market demand will be high if purchasing power is there and well distributed, and so I suggest, Madam Speaker, that we would not be making a mistake on economic grounds if we supported a motion asking for, in effect, an increase in the purchasing power of the elderly.

I think it is still true to say that despite the increases made in the old age pensions over the past eight or nine years, despite that and despite the supplementary social allowances program, etcetera, that the older people in our province still have, relatively speaking, low purchasing power, and we can do something about it. I think the economy can stand it. We manage to expend large amounts of money for various programs at the federal level, some of

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) them foreign, some of them domestic, and I don't think that this will ruin the Canadian economy -- it might even stimulate it; and the most important thing of all is economic growth. We can assist in that regard by means of increasing the Old Age Pension, so the argument has both a humanitarian aspect and also an economic aspect.

I think, Madam Speaker, it is only a matter of time, ten years perhaps, twenty years, when in North America we will be paying out social dividends to people of not the elderly only, but also to people, able-bodied people of middle years, simply because they will be under-employed if not unemployed, and because of their under-employment will really not be making enough to work, through the concept of jobs and work will not be making enough to have sufficient purchasing power that is necessary to keep the economy moving; and it might sound quite nonsensical at the moment, and radical -- perhaps even crazy -- but so help me, some of the most serious, some of the most respected and even some of the older economists in the U. S. are coming around to this view that it perhaps is a matter of a decade or two when social dividends of some kind or another will have to be paid, not for the sake of welfare but also for the sake of keeping the economy moving ahead. If it's not doing that the alternative is recession, and it is argued that there is no necessity whatsoever to have to go through a depression or recession again. Never. That it is within the means of government to prevent recessions and depressions for all times providing they follow the proper fiscal and monetary policy. If they manage the fiscal and monetary affairs of the country properly, recessions and depressions can be prevented and avoided for all times.

It is in this spirit, or in this direction, that I am speaking when I say that to support a higher old age pension, a flat old age pension, at \$100.00 per month is merely one way of protecting ourselves against recession by means of ensuring adequate aggregate demand and at the same time, an even more important reason, we would be acting with humanitarian feeling.

Now I don't want to even question for one moment the motive of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews. In fact, I'm sorry I even put it in those words, but I suppose he introduced this amendment because he is of the old school of economics, one who thinks that we must not go too far too fast; we must not jeopardize the fiscal or budgetary position of our governments and so on; but I would ask him to look into some of the recent news magazines or learned journals coming from the U. S. and Canada, wherein they speak about federal government fiscal and monetary policy as being capable of preventing recession in the future by means of injecting purchasing power into the economy by way of tax cuts. That's one way it's being done, and the other way by means of paying out, if you like, pensions or social dividends to give people enough purchasing power, and so I certainly do oppose the amendment and would ask members to oppose it.

In any case, there is reference in the amendment to a means test. There is reference there to assistance being paid out on the basis of need. Now, the needs test or the means test -- and by the way, I've checked it in various periodicals; you can't find the distinction made too often. Most of the time the needs test and the means test are taken as being synonymous, or virtually so; and the means test is a bureaucratic contrivance. It does succeed in doing one thing and that is, it does succeed in keeping people who are of moderate means and of wealthy means, it does succeed in keeping them out of obtaining a pension, but the numbers involved are very small. It also succeeds in another respect. It succeeds in impinging upon the dignity of the elderly individual who needs this assistance. I think that the means test is and should be regarded as being regressive, and we in this group certainly have no intention of supporting a measure that contains a regressive element in it.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Would the Honourable Member permit a question, Madam Speaker? Is the Member aware that the means test is not synonymous with the needs test in the Province of Manitoba? They are quite different.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I would answer the Honourable Minister's question by making a request of him. Would he please send me a memorandum indicating what the difference is? I would be most grateful.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GRAY: May I close the debate now?

MADAM SPEAKER: the amendment. We're on the amendment.

MR. GRAY: I wish to speak on the amendment. At the outset, Madam Speaker, I would like to say

MR. ROBLIN: my honourable friend, has he not spoken on it before? He

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd) hasn't spoken on it before? I think he did.

MADAM SPEAKER: the honourable member has spoken on the amendment.

MR. GRAY: I have spoken on the amendment?

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak at this particular time, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, 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 by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, The Honourable the Member for Rhineland,

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. George, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for St. Vital, and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Member for Gladstone, The Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I already spoke at some length on the question of this unfair tax. The only reason why I will say a few words today is that after all the accusation, I might say, or after the members of the government having so many things pointed out to them on this tax, that no members of the cabinet felt that this was important enough to defend their position. There were only two members of the government who spoke, and there are some questions that were asked and that have never been answered. Now I would like the First Minister or somebody from that side of the House to please answer some of these questions.

The tax was collected from October 19th, the tax that was collected through The Motor Fuel Act. Now, through The Revenue Act the collection started anywhere from December 1st to the end of December. I would like to know if this is considered fair; why is this being done; should this be changed? Now to help those who started paying earlier, it was decided to charge them a little more. Under The Revenue Act it's a straight five percent, one cent on twenty, but under the Motor Fuel Act it's a cent on a gallon; in other words, a gallon of propane, 16 cents, you are penalized; you are paying one cent on sixteen. I'd like to know why the discrimination, Madam Speaker. This is already the most expensive form of heating -- that is, the propane and the oil, and it is -- the tax is one cent on 16 or 17 instead of one cent on 20, and on bunker oil, by the way, it is one cent on 24.

Now I think that this should be answered. I don't think that it's quite proper just to ignore these things and not answer. There is certainly some discrimination here. If it is the intention of the Government of discriminating, well all right; we'll accept that. But if it's an error, if there was a mistake made, I think it should be corrected as soon as possible. The Honourable Member from Churchill feels that this is not much of a tax; it's only 25 cents per week, but I'd like to inform him that I've paid for 100 weeks already, because my tax bill is only \$24.78, an increase of \$2.30 since the last time I spoke to you. Now the First Minister said that it was about 60 cents a month. He must have had the month that he was away and the thermostat was at 42 or something, because I can't see how he can get away with this.

The Member from St. Vital felt that we should criticize when there's something to be criticized about; we should criticize the tax that was put in at the last session or we wouldn't be doing our work. But then he tells us that it's unfair to criticize here. Why? Because we should not divorce this tax, we should keep all the taxes together. But then he tells us himself that he agrees that as soon as one tax can be lifted it should be that one. Now he tells us that he can take one at a time, remove one tax, but we shouldn't criticize if we don't criticize all the taxes. We've criticized all the taxes and the way they were brought about and the shift and so on. We've criticized that, but this is one tax that we feel is more cruel than the others.

Now he tells us that -- he brings in the smokescreen of the general sales tax. Nobody's talking about general sales tax. We haven't got it here in Manitoba. We're just saying that this is an unfair tax and we're not saying that it should be replaced by the sales tax. We're just saying that it should be abandoned; it should be lifted. That's all we're saying.

The Honourable Member from Churchill started by telling us that he also had reservations, he was worried about this tax, was very much worried about this tax. Then he went around Churchill around the north and he realized that thousands of people wouldn't have to pay the tax because they were still using lumber so it was all right -- or wood -- so it was all

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).right because the people up north, according to him, did not have to pay the tax so it was all right. A while ago he told us that for all these new things that we have, somebody should pay for. He had a very good speech telling us about this new education program up north. I think they had a course from --oh gee, from a dancer to a maid, or something-- they included everybody anyway and I guess he wanted the people of the Greater Winnipeg area to pay for this because he tells us they don't have to pay for it up north.

Now, another thing we've been told is that we should not, if we're not ready to say where will this money come from and where will they replace the tax that they take away, we are told that it's not fair to criticize it. Well I don't think it has to be replaced. I think the government should be a little bit more careful. They should be careful -- when they make deals of expropriating they can save \$100,000 to \$125,000 once in a while. They could forget about this-- just when they know that there's going to be a new flag coming in, of ordering the school boards or having the school boards spend another \$10,000 on flags. I think that things like that they could save enough money. I think that--the First Minister spoke strongly about the priority, about the need of priority. He's giving a lesson to the Federal Government. Well I think that we should apply this here. We should have priorities here also.

Now this is supposed to be a great tax; this is a good tax because it is supposed to just shift --take another tax from people and it puts another one on. Well I don't know how this works. I see by the paper that the school board of Winnipeg only, will have to pay \$26,000 because of this tax, so if I understand this right, they are taxed \$26,000.00. That will go to the Provincial Government. The Provincial Government feels that education costs is too high so they will rebate \$50.00 or less to the people of Manitoba, and then because of this rebate -- they needed this tax to rebate-- so then the school board will have another cost and education will go up again.

Well I can tell you, there's one thing about this government, it certainly has the money circulating, I can tell you that. No, Madam Speaker, I think that these questions should be answered. I think there definitely is discrimination. This is an unfair tax. They can talk until they're blue in the face, nobody'll make me understand --believe or understand or admit that this is not a sales tax. A sales tax --to me a definition of a sales tax is very easy. It's a tax on sales, and every time you buy fuel, on what you've bought --or what's been sold I guess-- you're paying a tax, and if this is not a sales tax I don't think anybody here knows what a sales tax is.

Madam Speaker, I think that the government were wise enough, they forgot about this tax, or at least they're not talking about this tax on the transfer of the property. I think that this is worse. The members of the government have listened to people making representation about this other tax but I think that they should listen to the small property owner, the border case that is paying a very unfair tax.

Now I say border case because we were told that the people on welfare will receive a little more money to compensate for the tax, but what about the thousands of people that probably should be on welfare but the people that have a lot of pride, the people that'll tighten their belts a little bit and don't want to be on welfare, they want to work. These are the people that --this is why we're saying this is an unfair tax. These are the people that are paying this tax and these are the people that we would like to see get a fair break. It seems that everything will go against them, the cost of living, everything is against those people. They want to pay their own way. They should be admired for this and I think that we shouldn't try to give them a larger load.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert-Plains, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable the Member from Winnipeg Centre.

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

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

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd).....Honourable Member for St. George, that whereas the university of Manitoba, the affiliated colleges and other post high school institutions are finding it increasingly difficult to cope with the educational, administrative and financial needs of higher education in this province, and whereas there is a need to consider the establishment of new institutions of higher learning such as community colleges in other parts of the province, and whereas there is urgent need to define the responsibility of government to all institutions of higher learning, and to establish the relationship and responsibility of these institutions to higher education in Manitoba, therefore be it resolved that the Provincial Government appoint as a permanent body, a council of higher education and that this council, as its first responsibility be instructed forthwith to study and report not later than December, 1965, a proposed plan to meet the present and long term needs of higher education in this province.

MADAM SPEAKER: I have had this resolution of the Honourable the Member for Emerson under consideration, and this motion of the Honourable Member dealing with the appointment of a permanent body, a council of higher education, in my opinion is covered in the statements in the Throne Speech, and I quote, "A council on higher learning will be established to assist the university and affiliated colleges to deal with emerging problems in their field, "

Therefore, in the light of this statement I must rule under our Rule 31 of Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, that the proposed resolution is out of order.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I feel that I should accept your ruling. I also feel that I didn't anticipate because my resolution was in before the Throne Speech. However, after I see what the government proposes, I may submit another resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Lakeside and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, it was not my privilege to be a member of the special committee which sat in 1960 to consider the rules and orders and forms of this Assembly, and I therefore am unable to contribute anything as to the reason for any difference between the report of the committee and the adoption of the new rules as they appear in our rule book at the present time.

However, I would be bound to observe this, Madam Speaker, that it would not seem unusual, to use the words of the original motion moved by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside, that there could be a variation both in language and principle from Rule 33 as recommended by the committee and as adopted by the House. What I'm saying, Madam Speaker, is that oftentimes recommendations or reports of committees are not necessarily adopted by the House in their exact form or that these reports or recommendations find their way into legislation, or in this case into the rules, in the form that they are recommended, and it would seem that this Assembly must always be sovereign in such matters. So I make that observation as to the general problem that's posed by the motion moved by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

Now we have had excellent presentations of the viewpoint as expressed by the original motion and of the viewpoint as expressed by the proposed amendment which is now before this Assembly, and I would like to suggest, Madam Speaker, that there is a very simple solution to our problem that exists by reason of the motion and the proposed amendment, and that is that we should reconvene the Special Committee of the House to consider the rules and perhaps recommend for the consideration of the House what ought to be the position with regard to this particular rule, and indeed there may be many other of our rules that now require consideration or ought to have consideration in the light of our deliberations since the rules were last reviewed.

It would be my purpose, and I must apologize for not having watched the proceedings as closely as I ought to have, it would be my purpose if the amendment moved by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party were defeated by the House to propose when we are back on the main motion an amendment which in effect would call for the establishment of a special committee of the House to consider the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings and to review them and make recommendations. That proceeding it would seem to me would enable consideration to be given to the question which has been raised by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside as well indeed as the question raised by the contrary view expressed by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party, and further provide an opportunity for a full consideration of all of the rules. I'm regretful that I didn't move this perhaps before,

(MR. McLEAN cont'd). because in saying that I believe that the amendment proposed by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party should be defeated, I mean that in no unkind sense but rather as the mechanism for getting back to the position which I think would be most helpful to us in this matter.

Madam Speaker, may I also say this, that if this were the wish of the House, that is to say that the amendment were defeated and I were able to propose an amendment to the main motion, and if that received the approval of the House it would also be my view that at an appropriate time provision should be made whereby that committee could sit after prorogation, during the time when the House is not sitting, so as to provide ample opportunity for the careful review of our rules that would be most helpful to us. And so, Madam Speaker, I would like to suggest to the members that they might consider voting against the amendment now before the House, and if that is the wish of the members, I will be prepared to make the other motion at the appropriate time in these proceedings.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, may I be permitted the courtesy of the House, or the leave of the House to say something in respect of the suggestion of the Honourable the Attorney-General? I would be prepared, Madam Speaker, by leave of the House, to withdraw my amendment without the necessity of a vote, on the undertaking of the Attorney-General that a committee will be reconstituted as he has suggested. I don't know if this is within the power of the House. I certainly offer this as far as my part is concerned, that I would accept the suggestion of the Attorney-General in this regard without the necessity of a formal vote,

MR. McLEAN: I would be prepared to give that undertaking to propose that motion.

MR. EVANS: This, Madam Speaker, would be agreeable on this side of the House.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, this must be pretty nearly a "Red Letter Day" in this present session, I think, because even I am agreeable.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg leave to withdraw the amendment that I proposed to the Resolution of the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the honourable member leave to withdraw his motion?

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, if I may now speak on the main motion, I have already said all that needs to be said, and would move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that all the words after "March 1st, 1960," in the first line of the second paragraph thereof be struck out and the following substituted therefor: "And whereas it is deemed advisable to have the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Assembly examined with a view to recommending such amendments as might be deemed in the interests of the orderly and efficient conduct of the business of the House, now therefore be it resolved that a Special Committee of the House consisting of Madam Speaker and nine members be appointed to give consideration to the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Assembly and to report thereon to the House."

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: I'd like to repeat, Madam Speaker, if I'm in order to do so, that as I indicated earlier it would be my intention to propose at a later time the resolution that would allow this committee to meet after prorogation.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FROESE: I would like to have a look at the resolution first.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The Adjourned Debate on the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for Lakeside, as amended.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak on this, I would move the adjournment to close the debate.

MADAM SPEAKER: Your seconder?

MR. CAMPBELL: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

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

MR. EVANS: I wonder if the honourable member would wish to commence at this time or if he would prefer to begin at 8:00 o'clock, in which event I would suggest that you might recognize the fact that. . .

MR. WRIGHT: I was going to ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before we go on with the proceedings of the House, I would like to ask permission of the House to introduce to the members some 108 students from the Glenboro

(MADAM SPEAKER cont'd). Collegiate who are in the gallery just at this time. On behalf of all members of this Assembly, I welcome you.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I suggest that you might wish to call it 5:30.

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