

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
10:00 o'clock, Friday, March 10, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills

I wonder if I might take a moment to direct the attention of the Members to the gallery where we have eight students from the Grunthal School with no teacher in attendance. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rhineland. On behalf of all the members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

Committee of the Whole House

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health)(Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand until Monday. Monday is the beginning of National Health Week in Canada and it seems to me that that is an appropriate time to introduce a resolution of this type.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I thought maybe he was postponing it to help out the inflation problems in Canada.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, before we proceed with the Orders of the Day, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the news of the death of a former member of this Assembly who had a very distinguished career in the Legislature as a member and as Speaker for many years, and I refer to the late Phillip Adjutor Talbot.

Mr. Talbot came to Manitoba around the turn of the century, I'm informed, from the Province of Quebec, and in the year 1915 he entered this Legislature and I think had a rather interesting career when he was here, in view of the interest that he took in matters concerning the use of the French language which was then under very active discussion and consideration.

He became the Speaker of the House on January 18, 1923 and he held that distinguished post, Sir, until June 12, 1936 and he was elected to the House on no less than five different occasions. After he ceased to be a member he was made the Clerk of the Executive Council, a post which he held for some eight or nine years.

I had the pleasure of knowing Mr. Talbot in his role as a retired private citizen. He and I ran across each other in political activities in the constituency of La Verendrye from time to time and I found him to be a most charming and interesting old gentleman. He had an acute sense of humour, a real interest in politics - he was completely abreast of what was going on although when he died he had reached the vast years of 89 - and altogether was quite a charming and delightful person to know.

I therefore would like to move, and I associate with this motion the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, the following resolution: That this House convey to the family of the late Phillip Adjutor Talbot, who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement and its appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of active community and public service, and that Mr. Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, first may I thank the First Minister for associating my name with this motion. I never really knew Mr. Talbot but I can very well remember meeting him in what I think was the last year of his political career. At that time I was about 12 or 13 years old and I was introduced to him by my grandfather as the man who was representing us in the Manitoba Legislature. I remember him as being a tall, slim man and the expression of kindness and sincerity that one could visualize in the man is something that impressed me very much at that time and it is one of those things that stayed with me, and even though I never met the gentleman after, I can say that I have heard on many occasions how devoted he was to his constituency. I can remember at this particular time he was at the other end of the constituency with a Model A or a Model T Ford going around visiting his constituents, and the memory that is left in the constituency is that he was the type of a man that would always look after whatever problem was brought to him. If he couldn't be there in person, he would write or take the necessary steps to see that these people's demands were looked after.

(MR. VIELFAURE, cont'd)

The fact, I think, that he was 14 years as Speaker of this House explains very well his devotion to duty, and at this time I would join with the First Minister in expressing to Mrs. Talbot and family the condolences and appreciation of the devoted services rendered to the Province of Manitoba by the Hon. Mr. Talbot.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, may I on behalf of our Party be privileged to associate ourselves with the motion to the late Mr. Talbot. I didn't have an opportunity of being in the House with him, however we do know of his history because I recall as a youngster, or an almost youngster, coming here and seeing him in the Chair that you are occupying at the present time.

I think it's always worthwhile, Mr. Speaker, for those of us who are in the House at the time of the passing of a former member to pay tribute to that person whoever they may be, because while we do receive brickbats from time to time, I'm sure it is generally recognized that people who are elected - and I'm not preaching for a call - to this Assembly generally are respected or must be respected in their communities in order to be elected to this House, and it is only fitting and proper that those of us who are privileged to follow in the footsteps of men such as Mr. Talbot should on occasions such as this pay a tribute to their service to Manitoba and to their community.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I have not had the privilege of knowing the deceased, the late Mr. Talbot. Nevertheless, he must have had a very interesting career in the many years that he served the constituents of his riding and the people of Manitoba and such. I think it would not be a bad idea to probably on some future occasion invite all the past members of this House so that we as members would get to know them, and when situations of this type arise, so that at least we would have had made their acquaintance. A list of these would certainly be valuable.

Then, too, I think as the Leader of the New Democratic Party has mentioned, it is very fitting that we recognize the services that these people have given and that we pay tribute to them on occasions of this type. Thank you.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Talbot had been a Member of this House for approximately seven years before I arrived here, but in the ensuing 14 years I got to know him very well and to regard him as a personal friend, and as far as I was concerned, a very valuable instructor.

As the Honourable the First Minister has mentioned, he became Speaker of the House in January, 1923 and he was Speaker at a time, Mr. Speaker, when the House was more evenly divided than it is at the present time. In those days there were just 55 members and the government group, after the House had elected Mr. Talbot to the Chair, was exactly even with the combined opposition - 27-27 - and as I had the opportunity of serving as whip in those days, you can imagine that at times I had a rather busy day.

Notwithstanding that fact, and I have not checked the record to be sure that this is correct, but my recollection is that Mr. Talbot only once had to cast the deciding vote, and it might be interesting to recall that the occasion on which he cast that deciding vote was on the matter dealing with the liquor business in this province. That was the year of the famous Moderation League campaign and the vote that was held - or at least not necessarily that year, but during Mr. Talbot's first years in office - when the vote was held and there was a question that agitated the public mind greatly and the minds of the Members of the Assembly here as to whether the vote regarding over-all consumption of liquor and beer and wine should be held on two days or on the same day, and it was not a question on which the government presented a government bill and everyone was free to vote as he wished - he or she wished, because I should recall that there was one lady in the House at that time - and, Mr. Speaker, the Speaker of that day was placed in the position of giving a casting vote. I used to tease Mr. Talbot in recent years telling him that he was undoubtedly wrong because he gave the casting vote against the way that I had voted in the House on that occasion. You would expect that I had voted for all to be held on one day because it would be the cheapest that way.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as has been mentioned, Mr. Talbot occupied your Chair, that distinguished office, for 14 years and he was certainly as good a Speaker as I have ever sat under; then he became, after his retirement in 1936, the Clerk of the Executive Council, and there too he rendered distinguished and capable service. I have always regarded Peter, as he was known to us, as a personal friend as well as a valued colleague. At times in recent years I have - although he was in failing health - I have spoken to Madame Talbot and have followed

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) with interest the fact that though in failing health he continued an active interest in public affairs right until the very end.

I certainly join with those who have spoken and with all members of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, in extending sincere condolences to Madame Talbot and the family and expressing heartfelt appreciation for the distinguished service that this very excellent gentleman rendered to this province.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add a few words to the words already spoken in this House.

I did not know Mr. Talbot too well, although he was a very good friend of my father who always spoke quite highly of this man and spoke especially of his courage. I think that he is a man who could be singled out for having the courage of his convictions. He loved his Party dearly but he placed certain principles above everything else. I think that he did a lot to eradicate prejudices in this province. He fought for certain causes that are not popular now and that were less popular in those days. I think that we've come a long way since his days in this House in being able to live together in harmony, although there is still much to be done in this respect. Nevertheless, although some people might have felt at the time that this man might have been a little gullible, I think that the majority of the members of this House certainly respected him, although they might not have agreed with him in all instances, but I think the fact that he was chosen as the Speaker of this House would indicate that everyone here respected his honesty and his courage.

It might be just a coincidence, but to me it means something that he passed away on the day that the beloved Governor-General of Canada was buried, another man who pretty well had the same strong courage of his convictions as Mr. Talbot, and I certainly would unite with all the speakers here to offer to Mrs. Talbot and the family our most sincere sympathy.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with the business, I would like to reply to a question addressed to me by the Honourable Member for St. George in which he made reference to a newspaper report which purported to quote the Chairman of the Boundaries Commission with respect to the location of schools and pressure. I have referred both the newspaper report and the question of the honourable gentleman to the Chairman of the Boundaries Commission and he informs me that the article in the Winnipeg Free Press is completely erroneous, that no such statement was made by him at any time or by any other member of the commission, and that all the members of the commission who were present at the meeting have commented upon the inaccuracy of the article. I trust that satisfies my honourable friend's question.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister. Has the Honourable the First Minister had an opportunity to check on the matter of the report regarding the study that's been made on the question of vegetable marketing in the Province of Manitoba, and particularly with reference to the statement that the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture made that a draft report had been received.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I am elucidating that problem and will report.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, before we go on with the Orders of the Day, I would like to ask a question or simply to comment on the use of the flags out in front of the Legislature. I was informed, or I read somewhere - I don't recall which - that when a flag is flown at half mast, it is first raised to the top and then lowered the width of the flag. Now the flags out in front are lying very much down, about the lower part of the flag pole. The flag on the right as we come in, the Manitoba flag, is flying so low that it is caught on the branches as of a tree, and the one that is flying on the flag pole above the entrance is sweeping the snow off - or seems to be - off the upper part of that arch, and I just wondered whether this was the correct way to fly flags or whether the men who raise the flags had not been properly instructed.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to lay on the table of the House the Annual Report of the Manitoba Hospital Commission for 1966.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to reply to a question placed - I think two days ago - by the Honourable the Member for Hamiota respecting the matter of transfer of vehicle registrations. The Highway Traffic Act provides that on a transfer registration at any time during the registration year a flat fee of \$2.50 is imposed, as indicated by the honourable member at the

(MR. McLEAN, cont'd) time of his question. This requirement applies only to passenger vehicles and not to trucks.

Prior to 1953 the legal requirement was that on the transfer of a type referred to by the Honourable Member for Hamiota, the flat transfer fee was payable, plus any difference in registration fee attributable to the increased wheel base of the new vehicle. Conversely, where the new vehicle was on a smaller wheel base, a proportionate rebate was paid. The Stevenson and Kellogg Limited report presented to the Government of Manitoba in December, 1952, recommended the abolition of this practice on economic grounds in view of the large number of transfers, their distribution between rebates and surcharges and the greatly increased amount of administrative work entailed in processing the rebates and surcharges. That recommendation was accepted and has been acted on ever since. The number of transfers involved in a year is approximately 67,000 at the present time.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, the Honourable Member of Wellington reminded me when he spoke about flags, a few evenings ago I was sitting in the gallery with a guest and he remarked about the significance of our time-weathered Union Jack standing to your right, Sir. I would suggest perhaps if the flag could be cleaned up a bit or if a new one could be replaced, because sitting in the gallery it does look rather dusty and dirty - and I am sure that it's not - it's just that its stood the ages of time and perhaps a new flag would be in order.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think the point is not probably one that should be discussed at the question period, but I think I should tell my friend that that is a particular flag that is there and therefore we have no intention of cleaning it or repairing it or doing anything to it; it's there for a particular reason. I only wish I could recall, because I myself questioned the Clerk about this some time ago when I first assumed this responsibility and he told me the story of that flag. I'll try and get it for my honourable friend and tell him because he should know and members should know that it may look a little dingy but there's a reason.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities, I guess, but in consideration of the fact that many farmers in the province are finding it next to impossible to obtain farm help, I wonder if he would give consideration to the advisability or the possibility of issuing a restricted driver's licence to farm boys that are age 14 and 15, restricted to driving a farm truck. Many farmers have raised this point; in fact many farm boys are driving without a licence. I wonder if he would give consideration to that.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that I would never be so ungracious as not to give consideration to any suggestion that was made, but may I remind the honourable member that this matter was discussed I believe at some length during the time that the Committee on Highway Safety sat and no changes occurred as a result of their consideration of it, and at the moment I would say that we do not have any changes of this nature under consideration.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. He was in attendance at a meeting at Woodlands the other evening regarding a delegation of people who are concerned about the fact there was no vote in the Interlake. Is it correct that the Minister of Agriculture told this group that the Federal Government had issued instructions that there should be no vote in the Interlake?

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): No, Mr. Speaker, this was not said at that meeting.

MR. GUTTORMSON: It is correct that this decision to have no vote in Interlake was taken by the Provincial Government. Is that correct? --(Interjection)-- Thank you.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the First Minister indicated today that a press report was entirely erroneous, is this press report then equally erroneous, because the press report indicates that someone at that meeting said that it was Ottawa that had decided there should be no vote. Was that not said at that meeting?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, that's precisely true. Someone at that meeting said that. I think if you read the press report, that wasn't attributed to me.

MR. MOLGAT: A subsequent question then, Mr. Speaker. Did the Honourable the Minister correct that false impression in the minds of the meeting and make it clear that the decision for no vote was that of the Provincial Government?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I merely indicated to the meeting that in the overall plan for the Interlake and the that the federal authorities in co-operation with the provincial

(MR. ENNS, cont'd) authorities agreed that education was of prime importance in the Interlake and they suggested that implicit with this some form of consolidation or single divisions would have to be agreed upon in the formulating of the plan, and in this way and in this way only did the federal authorities enter into the education problem at the Interlake.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities. I've received phone calls regarding the safety check on cars, or the legislation my honourable friend brought in just a very few months ago regarding the check on used cars and the certificate that must go with them. It has been reported to me that some cars are being sold with a sticker on them simply saying, "For wrecking purposes only", and yet people can go down and get these automobiles licenced because there is no means of checking by the Motor Vehicle Branch. Is this correct?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, the words I hear at this very moment are the first time that I've heard of this and I'm not aware of this practice. In the amendments to The Highway Traffic Act which will be before the members soon, we have some proposals with respect to the way in which this matter will be dealt with and which I believe will be satisfactory. Otherwise, I'm not familiar with the matter to which he's made reference.

MR. MOLGAT: A subsequent question. Could the Minister indicate what methods the Motor Vehicle Branch take to ascertain when someone comes in to get a licence that in fact the car is in working order?

MR. McLEAN: I think that they're not at this moment in a position to take any action, but hopefully will be after the amendments that will be presented to the Legislature.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would answer another question. Is it the intention to include in these amendments a certificate regarding new cars? In the light of what has transpired recently about the inspection at the factory not being adequate, I wonder if we should not introduce into our Highway Traffic Act a law that no new car be sold in Manitoba unless it had a certificate of mechanical and other perfection.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable Member for Selkirk will know, The Highway Traffic Act now and for some time has provisions with respect to the equipment and other things of a car, and the legislation that we will have for consideration will refer to both new and old cars - new and used cars.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. Is it correct then that this certificate which is to be prepared by used car dealers is really ineffective at this time? If there's no means of verification by the Motor Vehicle Branch, then how does the law take any effect with the purpose at the moment?

MR. McLEAN: Well, we have no inspection system, that is independently of the inspection that may be made by the dealer or on his behalf. I don't know that I can answer the question to any greater extent than that.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Provincial Secretary. In view of an increasing interest in automobile safety, does the Manitoba Government have a minimum list of safety requirements for an automobile that they purchase?

MR. McLEAN: Yes, they are in The Highway Traffic Act.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to anyone on the government side, incidentally, with regard to Bill 56. To date, we have not received too many answers to some of the questions posed to the government and I have had numerous retailers asking me for advice as to whether or not they are going to be in a position -- that they must buy new cash registers to facilitate the collection of taxes and so forth, and of course I gather that this may not be so, but apparently cash register companies in Manitoba are using intimidation of this sort or suggesting that the only way to avoid a shut-down under a clause on Page 10 which states that where in the opinion it is in the public interest to do so, the Minister may suspend registration certificate for any period not exceeding 30 days. These companies are suggesting to retailers that to avoid this type of situation that they should purchase new cash registers, and I'm wondering whether we shouldn't have some clarification before too many people get fooled on this one.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer)(Fort Rouge): I don't think the honourable member should use such terms as intimidation when he is referring to a commercial organization without either naming them or making specific charges. In the second place, if my honourable friend will ask any question he wishes to ask during the course of the debate, I'll answer it when

(MR. EVANS, cont'd) I am closing the debate at second reading which is on the principles of the Bill. He will have further opportunity to ask detailed questions at the Committee stage.

MR. USKIW: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I am only using the words that were used

MR. SPEAKER: You have a supplementary question I take it?

MR. USKIW: No, I haven't.

MR. PAULLEY: I believe my colleague was attempting to reply and clarify the use of the word "intimidation" that was referred to by the Honourable Provincial Treasurer. I think he has that right.

MR. SPEAKER: clear in my mind too. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Yes, it is the people that have questioned me that suggested there was use of intimidation. They implied it was intimidation but it was a sales talk really, but they implied it was a form of intimidation and I only pass this onto the House.

MR. EVANS: If my honourable friend will provide me with the names of the people who have complained, I'll see that the thing is investigated.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Education. Does he agree with the statement that was attributed to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture that was supposed to have been made by him a day or two ago at a public meeting, at which time he said that Manitoba education is about 20 years behind the times?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education)(Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I think my honourable friend, as a school teacher, is well aware of the leadership in education in Manitoba today.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Order for Return. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. The names and addresses of the members of each of the Boards, Commissions, Committees and Agencies listed in Order for Return No. 42, dated March 17, 1966, where these were omitted in said Return.

2. The individual annual or other salaries, wages, allowances, expenses, etc., of each of these members where omitted in said Return.

3. The names and addresses of all members presently serving on each of the Boards, Commissions, Committees and Agencies, if different to item number 1.

4. A list of the Boards, Commissions, Committees and Agencies established by the Government of Manitoba since those given in said Return, giving date of establishment.

5. The names, addresses, bases of remuneration and terms of appointment of all members of the Boards, Commissions, Committees and Agencies referred to in item number 4.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, the reason that I asked question No. 1 is because in the Return referred to, No. 42, the question was asked as to the names and addresses of all members presently serving on each of the boards that were given in that return, and when I look at the return, I find that though the remuneration in this case is given in the very first one named, The Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, the names are not given. In the next one, the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation, neither the names nor the individual salaries are given. In the next one, the Manitoba Hog Marketing Commission, the names and the individual salaries are given, which is according to the request asked for. In the next one, the Manitoba Potato Marketing Commission, neither the names, addresses nor remuneration are given. So question No. 1 is intended to bring that return up-to-date where those matters were omitted.

The same applies to No. 2, simply a case of bringing them up-to-date. And then No. 3 is simply in case there have been changes on any of these agencies that we could have a list of the ones who are now on them. The 4th one is the one that I am most interested of all, and that is to get the number of new Boards, Commissions, Committees and Agencies that have been established since the date of this return. The 5th question deals with the names and addresses and the bases of remuneration of those newer appointments.

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd)

So, Mr. Speaker, this is simply a case of first bringing the Order for Return No. 42 of March 17th, 1966 up-to-date and in conformity with the questions that were asked, because it was deficient in some regards, and then getting similar information regarding all Boards, Commissions, etc., that have been established since that time with the names, addresses and remuneration of the people who are on those agencies.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on second reading Bill No. 38. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, I would wish to speak briefly on the subject of this Bill, and my main objection to the proposal to open the advertising facilities to the advertising of the sale of liquor or alcohol. Whether a cocktail lounge or a beer parlour opens an hour earlier or closes an hour later is of complete indifference to me. I don't think that there will be that much additional liquor consumed. In due course people will select their own time to go home or to arrive, but my main objection is to the advertising.

I had been going to have with me here a copy of a recent issue, whether it's the February or the March issue, of the Consumers Reports. Unfortunately, in the confusion of gathering together a great bulk of papers of one kind or another I neglected to bring it, but I can give, I think, pretty well what the content of the article was.

The Consumers Reports, I think as most members know, is an organization that examines and tries and tests various products for the information and for the protection of the ultimate consumer. One of these tests had to do with 33 different brands of Canadian whiskey and American whiskey. There were 33 different brands and they said that in their analysis, with experienced testers and experienced tasters, even from the cheapest brand and up to the most expensive there was no appreciable difference, and they carried out, according to their description, some rather extensive tests. I take from that laughter that some of the members would have wished to have been in on the testing and the tasting. The article described to some extent the manner of tasting. Each taster took a drink of the particular liquor poured into a glass, and as they say in the article, he rolled it around in his mouth and then he spit it out. It would be too great a temptation to some of our members I believe in the House to swallow it rather than to waste it. But of all of these brands, there is no appreciable difference, and they say that a man can buy a bottle of expensive whiskey, and use it of course, and then for the rest of his life buy the cheapest brand and pour it into the expensive bottle and even his most discriminating friends would not be able to tell that there was any difference. --(Interjection)-- I'm not making any pretensions here as to not having some knowledge of the pleasures and also the penalties of taking a drink, although I don't believe that I have suffered as much or as often as some of the Members may have, although I have had many pleasurable moments.

Now the matter of advertising is the part that concerns me and I feel that any effort at advertising would be nothing but a deception and a delusion, and to introduce an "Irishism", I would say not only a deception and a delusion but completely unnecessary. Those who want a drink know where to go and get a drink; those who do not want to drink will not be persuaded by advertising of whatever kind that they should go out and begin to drink. Their ears will be protected, their ears and their eyes will be protected against the -- they will not be insulted rather with liquor ads in the newspapers or in periodicals or on the radio or on the television as our ears and our eyes are now being insulted every day whenever we examine magazines or watch television or listen to radio with such things as cigarette ads or tobacco ads and they are not the only ones. Many of the commercials that appear in the public media - TV, radio, newspapers, and so on - are insulting to our eyes and to our ears and they are insulting to people's intelligence, and additional advertising of liquor, of alcoholic beverages would be of a similar nature, no matter how the government or anybody else or whatever agency might try to restrict them or to hold them down.

We know that the tobacco advertising is strictly directed to youth which may not yet have begun to use tobacco in any form, and the cigarette and the tobacco companies are recruiting new customers. They are endeavouring to recruit new customers and the liquor advertising will be in exactly the same category. The appeal will be to the youthful, to the virile, the manly, and so on, implying that it is the proper thing for a man who wants to be a man to drink, and a similar appeal emphasizing femininity will be made to the ladies, to the girls.

(MR. PETURSSON, cont'd)

I met the Mayor of Winnipeg in the Members' Locker Room here a couple of days ago and Mr. Juba said - I don't know why we happened to get on to this particular subject but we did - and he is all for advertising. I don't know whether he owns an advertising agency or not or has an interest in it, but he's all for it. If I recall correctly, he said that he could prove that not one man has become an alcoholic because of advertising in other places. He said not one man has been induced to drink, and if this is so, then I would ask what is the purpose of advertising if it is not to induce people to drink, to use the product that is being advertised, if the advertising isn't for the purpose of gaining customers? That is the reason why tobacco is advertised; that's the reason why soap flakes are advertised, in the hope that additional customers may be won over and additional profits therefore gained.

As far as I am concerned, the government can extend the hours to whatever day of the week they wish, whether it is Saturday or Sunday, and to whatever extent they wish, but I can't understand why the advertising outlets should be opened up to the liquor concerns. Whatever reasons were originally advanced with the introduction of the present Liquor Act for prohibiting advertising I think still stand. I haven't heard anything to say that they are not still just as valid now as they were then, and I feel very strongly that the same conditions should still be permitted to prevail.

The liquor manufacturers have said that there are other provinces that allow liquor advertising, that it is allowed in the United States and that liquor

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the honourable member but I do notice there is considerable conversation going on which makes it rather difficult to hear what is being said. I wonder if some attention might be given to the honourable member that has the floor.

MR. PETURSSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The louder they talk, the louder I'll talk, and I hope in one way or another to drown them out. I do not suffer from weakness of voice when the necessity arises. They may become so intoxicated with what I have to tell them that they will become convinced in their helplessness.

I was saying that the liquor interests claim that other provinces permit advertising and that in the American journals liquor is advertised and that these come flooding into Manitoba. I can't see that that is any kind of a valid argument. There are many unsavoury things that come to us, into our province from other places - I don't think I would begin to mention any names - and that doesn't mean that that is any reason we should begin to develop unsavoury attitudes or approaches. The fact that others permit advertising doesn't in itself mean that we should also permit it. If it was wrong when The Liquor Act was originally introduced, it is still wrong, and the fact that others are committing wrong doesn't mean that we should also commit it. Two wrongs - this is an old platitude, cliché - don't make a right, and I think that where we stood on advertising we should continue to stand.

Of course profits will be made from advertising, but if, as Mayor Juba says, not one additional customer will be added by advertising, then advertising in itself must be a philanthropic or a charitable endeavour, a subsidy to the advertising agencies, and I didn't know that they had ever been in need of charity or philanthropy. If the liquor interests are concerned with keeping advertising agencies in business or if the government is interested in keeping the advertising agencies in business, it is very kind of them and very considerate, but this is a competitive world and I think that the advertising agencies are doing very well without the overt support of the government of this province, and if the liquor interests, as the Mayor says, do not stand to gain anything by it, that is no additional customers, I cannot possibly believe that they would feel inclined to advertise. They advertise, as all the other advertising concerns do, for the purpose or with the expectation of profiting by the things they advertise, and therefore by advertising - and this is the one and only purpose - they would be urging those who now consume alcoholic beverages to consume that much more; and those who don't, they would be urging to begin and the sooner the better; or it may be that the government feels that it is in such dire straits financially that it needs the additional tax funds that it would acquire from the additional sale of alcoholic beverages due to advertising in these advertising outlets, through the development of increased consumption by those who now consume and the development of additional customers.

But there is another aspect to this question of alcohol, the increased sale and the promotional - what would I call it - endeavours? --(Interjection)-- Aspects - thank you. Along with freedom, along with the liberalizing of the sale of alcohol with the extended hours and with the beer and wine on Sunday - and I wouldn't deny any man that privilege if he wishes

(MR. PETURSSON, cont'd) to have it and I don't think that the United Church, which is I understand opposing the advertising of alcoholic beverages, I don't think that the United Church is opposing the extended sale of alcohol - but along with the freedoms, along with the liberalized proposals, there should also be a recognition or the acceptance of additional responsibility.

It is not enough to enact laws for extended hours and a general easing of regulations unless those who enjoy and take advantage of this more liberal approach also do it as responsible individuals or unless they are prepared to accept certain restrictions as well as certain freedoms - certain responsibilities - and involved in this acceptance of responsibilities, I feel, is the mixing of gasoline and alcohol, the driving of motor cars.

I have a little story in that connection that I think I could tell. Three weeks ago - it's only three weeks ago tomorrow, Saturday - five o'clock in the afternoon, a man knocked at our door. He had with his car become stuck in the lane in the soft snow along a fence that borders the house behind us. We have a house on the corner of a T-lane - members know what that is. He ran off the packed snow and into the soft snow and knocked a couple of boards off the fence, saw lights in our house and came in to use the telephone. My wife answered the door and showed him where the telephone was and then she came in to me and she said, "I think that man is drunk." So I went in to where the telephone was and he was drunk. He was leafing through the telephone directory and completely incapable even of seeing the numbers let alone finding the one he wanted, so I offered to help him call a garage at the corner, which I did, to bring a truck. While we were waiting I suggested that he have a cup of coffee, and I took him out into the kitchen and my wife made coffee and he sat there and drank it - quite soused. I kept my eye on the kitchen window so I could see when the truck came. I told him, the truck is here and I'll go out and I'll help them get your car out and you drink your coffee and I'll come back in and get you. I did; I went out and helped the truck driver get the car out and came back in, after I had had the truck push the car around the corner, down to the corner garage and leave it there on the lot. I went back in and told the man that's where his car was; when he wanted it he could go there and get it. In the meantime, I gave him some more coffee. We got into conversation and found that - well, there were some common areas - I was able to talk with him and he talked with me. Altogether he stayed in the house for five hours - I wasted the whole evening. I asked him before he left to phone me when he got home to make sure he got home all right. He'd sobered up considerably, enough to begin telling me what a fine fellow I was and things of this sort and how lucky he was to have come into our place. He didn't phone. The following morning, Sunday morning, I phoned his place and he'd arrived home all right.

But the thought that occurs to me is that if this man had been out on a highway - as he well could have been - as incapacitated as he was, what chance do innocent drivers on the highway have and how tightly are the restrictions that now are placed on drivers being enforced, or do we have to do something more than what is now being done to prevent men who are badly under the influence of liquor - of alcohol - to prevent them from endangering the lives of other people, because this is exactly what they are doing. Along with the liberalizing of The Liquor Act, I would strongly urge that something would be done to make sure that the acceptance of responsibility would be impressed upon all of the citizens of this province who drink along with the acceptance of this more liberalized Act. I'm not for giving people freedom without impressing upon them also that they must accept some responsibility in return for the freedoms and the rights that they are being given.

It's a matter of complete indifference to me whether cocktail lounges and beer parlours open an hour earlier or close an hour later. I can see it's a matter of such things as what they do the day after is a matter for the individuals themselves to determine, whether it be going to church or staying away from church or anything of that sort. But the thing that does concern me is the acceptance of responsibility along with the slackening of restraints and this area should - while it's in a different department I believe than what the liquor bill itself is, there is some communication between government departments I am sure - the department responsible for the placing of restrictions and the enforcement of restrictions should also be accepted and I would strongly urge the tightening up all along the line.

Now there are -- if we say and use as an argument that other provinces and other countries permit the advertising of alcoholic beverages, there are countries that prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages and I would wish that we would use these countries as our example rather than the others that do advertise - Scandinavian countries among others. I

(MR. PETURRSON, cont'd) hesitate to keep talking about Iceland because second to my loyalty to this country in which I have lived all my life then Iceland certainly comes second, and I wouldn't -- if anybody presses me to say which comes third, I would also mention that but that doesn't enter into this argument.

This I think, Mr. Speaker, is my submission: no advertising; acceptance of responsibility; the tightening up of restrictions along with privileges that are being given. We have a great country that we live in. I experience a personal little thrill every once in awhile when I think of it and there are ways in which we can continue to keep this country great, keep our province great, and every incentive should be given to our people to accept their rights and privileges and at the same time to accept and be aware of their responsibilities. Without that kind of an acceptance, then every privilege and every right would simply become licensed and eventually anarchy in which every man goes his own way. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. CAROLYNE MORRISON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. John's in further amendment thereto.

Having given this matter my undivided attention, I feel there are some basic principles dealing with this sub-amendment commonly known as a six month's hoist. These principles are that the six month's hoist only applies to readings, that is second or third reading of a Bill, or to a motion which requires second reading or concurrence. I would refer the honourable gentlemen to Beauchesne's 4th Edition, Citation 202, sub paragraph (11) in this regard. The amendment of the Honourable Member for St. John's proposes to amend the amendment of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition which is a declaratory resolution and, as such, is neither a motion nor the second reading of a Bill or a motion which would require second reading or concurrence. Our authorities, Beauchesne, Mays and Bourinot, all refer to second and third readings of Bills with respect to the six month's hoist by leaving out the word "now" and adding "six months" or any other terms beyond the probable duration of the session. Beauchesne's 4th Edition in the chapter dealing with forms and formulae under the heading of "Amendments - Form 92" on Page 396, sets out the wording for a six months' hoist amendment as follows: "The question being proposed that Bill No. so and so, intituled so and so, be now read a second or third time. Mr. So and So moves in amendment, seconded by Mr. So and So, that the word "now" be left out and the words 'this day six months' added to the end of the question. This amendment may also be moved on the second reading of a resolution."

For the moment, it would appear that the amendment put forward by the Honourable Member for St. John's is contrary to the accepted procedure that was just outlined. To go a step further, the motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, which the Honourable Member for St. John's wishes to amend, does not constitute second reading of the Bill. As a consequence of all these things, I must rule the sub-amendment out of order.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to challenge your ruling. I have considered both of those viewpoints; I think there is an alternative, but as I say, there is no challenge intended by myself to your ruling. We intend to move a six months' hoist after the amendment to the Honourable Leader is disposed of if we have that opportunity.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt at this time, but I have given my ruling and I don't need to remind the honourable members that there is no debate from that point on.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, now that the proposed sub-amendment has been disposed of, I would like to say a few words with regard to the amendment that is before us. I would have spoken on this Bill

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the honourable gentleman would wait until I call the amendment.

MR. CAMPBELL: Is it not automatically before us, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: I was going to come to it.

MR. SPEAKER: In view of the opinion given, we now move back to the amendment. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would have spoken on this Bill in any case

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) because I consider it to be one of the most important to come before this Session, but I am particularly encouraged to say a few words at this time because I want to refer to what the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party has said in commenting on the amendment that emanates from this Party.

I am so well acquainted with my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party that he never surprises or astonishes me, Mr. Speaker, but in this case I think that he almost exceeded his usual performances. I have quoted, I am afraid too often in this House - but it seems to me so often to be apropos - the comment of Joss Billings, who said, "Our troubles ain't caused by what we don't know, but what we know that ain't so." This is such a common complaint in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, that I do have to refer to it occasionally, and I think we have had a conspicuous example in the case of my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

My honourable friend was so interested to try and attack the Liberal Party in this House that he dashed in where angels would have feared to tread just as soon as this amendment was moved, and hastened to treat the House to an almost perfect exemplification of the Joss Billings formula, because my honourable friend has erred of course, as is so frequent, in trying to establish something that simply is not capable of establishment. My honourable friend, Mr. Speaker - and it's an easy mistake to make - but when he boasts of the length of time that he has been in this House and how familiar he is with the rules of the House and its procedures, he falls into the error of not making the proper distinction between what he refers to as money bills, and having fallen into that error, he tries to get the House to believe that the former Liberal government - and this is what he berates the present representatives of that Party with - that the former Liberal government, according to him, never sent - never sent money bills to a Committee outside of this Chamber. What does he mean by money bills? Mr. Speaker, if you want to take the wide definition of money bill, you could assume that every bill that is introduced by a Message from His Honour is a money bill. I think that this is quite arguable, but my honourable friend was talking about tax bills and he went on to assert, with no qualification whatever, that these were never sent out in the time that this Party formed the government of the province - never sent out to another committee.

Consequently, he said we were "Johnny come lately!" on this procedure that is suggested in this amendment. The only trouble with his argument, Mr. Speaker, is that that just isn't true. The money bills that we consistently referred to the Committee of the Whole are those bills that deal with ways and means, and these I think anyone, no matter how democratically inclined he may be in feeling that the public has a right to be informed on questions of this kind and make their representations thereon, would still agree I think that after we have in the Committee of Supply gone through the estimates and decided that so much money is needed for the public service, then we go into Committee of Ways and Means to decide how we are to raise that money.

Well now, I think almost any democrat would say that there isn't any great necessity of referring that question to the public. Logically, we're the people to decide that, and so it has not been the custom in this House for that bill to be sent outside and it wasn't in our time, but when my honourable friend asserts that it is not the custom to send out tax bills, then he is completely wrong - completely wholly wrong. This isn't the first time that my honourable friend has made this assertion and I have on other opportunities suggested to him that he check the facts. Apparently he has not done so, and so I am under the necessity of presenting the facts to him.

The predecessor government to this one, Mr. Speaker, perhaps it established a reputation for itself in not imposing very many taxes during the time that it was in office. My honourable friends will say, "Oho, but you didn't give the services" - yes, and they could enumerate at great length about where we failed to give the services. Well, I'm always prepared to debate this question with my honourable friends, but maybe they would concede that at least we didn't very often raise taxes. We raised the gasoline tax twice during the time that I - and I'm speaking from memory in this regard, Mr. Speaker - but my recollection is that we raised the gasoline tax twice during the ten years that I had the honour to lead the government of the province - two times, three cents per gallon each time. We did what other governments always propose that they're going to do. We let the improvement in the economic conditions - and I'm not trying to pretend that they were wholly inspired by the fact that that government was in office - but we let the improvement in the economic conditions in this province and in the country generally take care of the increased expenditures,

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) and there were drastically increased expenditures in those times. However, that's not the point that I'm debating. We raised the gasoline tax twice, and, Mr. Speaker, both times - both times that we raised the gasoline tax - the bill which did so was referred to the Law Amendments Committee.

Now, what does my honourable friend who boasts about the length of time that he's been in the House and how he's in a position to give advice to the House as to what they should do and in a position to criticize this Party for moving this amendment, what does he mean when he takes a position like that without checking his facts? Well, he won't want to be satisfied with my recollection on the matter, so I would like to refer him to the Journals of the Legislative Assembly of 1955.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I didn't take the trouble to go through all the years since gas tax was introduced. I have only checked the two that I have mentioned, and they were during the time when we were in office. My guess is that a similar practice was instituted the very first time that gasoline tax was instituted in this province. I gave quite a history of the gasoline tax here a year or two ago - I think perhaps it was the last session and I'm not going to burden the House with it again - but it started with one cent per gallon, the very first year that that government I was speaking of a little while ago was in office. I haven't checked this. My guess is that if you'll go back to the 1923 session that you'll find that that measure went also to Law Amendments Committee. It would be interesting to check but I haven't done so. The ones that I was interested in were the two changes that were made during the time that I was heading the government. Here we have on Page 241, the 1955 session, "The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Honourable Mr. Turner for second reading of Bill No. 99, an Act to provide for the imposition of a tax on purchasers of gasoline, and the debate continuing and Mr. Roblin having spoken, and the question being put, it was agreed to. The Bill was accordingly read a second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments". If my honourable friend wants to take the time or wants me to take the time, I would be willing to follow it through and he will see that it was reported from Law Amendments and considered in Committee of the Whole before it was passed.

That was in 1955. My recollection is - I have not taken the trouble to check this - my recollection is that this was a consolidation of the tax bill and that there may have been the implementation of a tax change just before that again. But the whole bill on that occasion - I checked not the bill, but the statute - the whole bill was before the committee at that time. It wasn't just a minor amendment. Frequently, there were minor amendments put in which increased the exemptions or made some change in the exemptions one way or another, widened the base of them or increased the amounts or something of that kind, but this occasion that I referred to was when the whole bill was before the committee.

In 1956, and this is some indication, Mr. Speaker, of the way the government of that day was spending money and found it necessary to raise some additional tax. Quite frankly, I ask the House if they will recall, but my guess is that this was the only major tax that we raised during the ten years that we were in office. We raised it twice, a total of six cents in the two raises. My honourable friends have raised it six cents in the first six years that they were in office.

But to get back to the question of 1956, it was raised again. And here we have on Page 219 of the Journals of 1956, the 29th day of March, "The Honourable Mr. Turner moved that Bill No. 87, an Act to amend The Gasoline Tax Act, be now read a second time. The debate arising, and the Honourable Mr. Turner and Messrs. Kardash and Gray having spoken and the question being put, it was agreed to. The Bill was accordingly read a second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Law Amendments". Once again my honourable friends may take the Journals and follow them through and find that it was reported back from the Law Amendments, considered in Committee of the Whole and passed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my reason for raising this is simply to suggest to my honourable friend, and surely he shouldn't need it as much as the newer members of the House, that before we waste the time of this House - and I apologize for having to waste it over a question of this kind - before we waste the time of the House and make it necessary for somebody to correct the record, that we check the facts and see what we're doing, and do not let, I suggest to my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party, do not let your wishes to try and catch somebody else or some Party off base lead you into making statements that you can not only not back up but that are simply demonstrably incorrect and should not be made.

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd)

Now, Mr. Speaker, the amendment that is before us is that the motion should be amended so that we declare that in the opinion of this House, having regard to the public interest in this question of taxation, having regard to the serious effect that this taxation can have on the development in the future of our province, having regard to the need for full disclosure of the potential impact of such taxation that the regulations for Bill 56 be immediately made public and that Bill 56 should be referred to the Standing Committee of Law Amendments for consideration and report after full authority. I say to my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party, this is not a new procedure in this House; this procedure was followed at the time that the predecessor government was in office over there and it's since this government has come into effect - this government which my honourable friend so frequently supports - it was since they have come into office that the change has been made.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is a good - a good procedure for us to follow. We don't follow it with respect to the Ways and Means Bill - of course not. But with respect to this Bill, certainly there's a public interest, and why shouldn't we follow the time-honoured practice of because the public - a few of them can come and sit in the gallery here and hear what's going on but they can't make representations - why shouldn't we follow the time-honoured practice that on matters that so vitally affect the public of the province that they have the opportunity to come before a committee and make their representations. And not only is it the right of the public in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, to come before the committee, but it's of benefit to the government itself that they should come, that they should come and they can give good advice as to the implementation of this particular type of legislation. There are problems in instituting a procedure of this kind, and the other honourable members have already pointed out how many inconsistencies and inequalities that are apparent on a casual reading of the Bill. Well, the public could give you some good advice on that, and this, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion is one of the good reasons of why the regulations should be available to us now before we go into that committee so that not only we, but the public, would know what is proposed.

As my honourable friend the Leader of this Party has pointed out, it should be no great difficulty to promulgate those regulations because other provinces already have this legislation and no doubt their regulations have already been studied; no doubt they're already fairly well known. So I say that not only is this a time-honoured practice, only recently abandoned since my honourable friends have been in office, a time-honoured practice, that we - that we honoured, Mr. Speaker, not only in connection with the gasoline tax bill but when one of the biggest financial operations of this province, the purchase of the Winnipeg Electric System, was before this Chamber. That bill also was sent out so that we could have the benefit of the public advice and so that we could present in public, where they could be heard, the arguments that we felt were pertinent with regard to that bill. So this is returning to a time-honoured practice that was observed by the government that was in office for ten years before my honourable friends took over. If my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party thinks that I speak with some heat on this matter, it's because of the fact that I am sick and tired, to use a time-honoured expression, of having my honourable friend, in an effort to try and gain some political advantage for himself at the expense of another Party, misrepresent what happened during the ten years that we were in office in this province.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, we have a chance here, we have a chance to return to the proper practice, this amendment gives us the opportunity to do so. It's not only a case of returning to the proper practice, Mr. Speaker, it's because this is an important bill, this is a bill whereon the best advice that we can get is necessary and will be useful. If we have the regulations placed before us, then the people who are going to have to deal with this matter, the people who are going to have to act as the agents of the government can give valuable information to the government and to the members here, for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, as far as the Bill itself is concerned, I am not going to take the time of the House with any lengthy discussion. Perhaps I shall speak later if the opportunity arises, but, in passing, I might re-emphasize what has already been pointed out by one honourable member, that when we come to the question that's on Page 3 of the bill of an exchange and a backer being covered by the imposition of the tax, surely, surely this is in general

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd).....unimportant, and as someone has mentioned previously, to pass an Act or a provision in an Act that we know at the time is unenforceable, is simply courting disrespect for the law.

There are many other matters that I might mention, Mr. Speaker, but I don't want to take the time because a lot of them have already been covered and no doubt others will. But I do notice on Page 6 a principle that I think could be discussed, Mr. Speaker, that I notice that in the one section the language is used that "The Minister shall refund the amount of the tax payable under certain conditions," but a little later on on the same page, "If the Minister, upon evidence submitted to him, is satisfied of the existence of the contract, he may refund." Well now, Mr. Speaker, it's a detail but it may be an important detail. Why should we have "shall" in one case and "may" in another? If it is established in good faith that these things that are mentioned have been done, then in all cases the language of the statute should be that he "shall" make the reimbursement. Page 6 of the Bill.

I notice in connection with - this is also on Page 6 - that when they're dealing with the fact that no taxes payable under the Act in respect of the consumption of the following classes of tangible personal property, we get the children's clothes and children's footwear "as defined in the regulations." Surely, Mr. Speaker, it's not difficult to define those now, or if we can't have them defined in the Act, which they are not, then surely we could have the regulation of that and I suggest of many others as well.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to take the time to go through the Act now. Perhaps we'll have another opportunity later on. I submit to you that it's good practice, it's sound practice, it's the democratic procedure, it's the time-honoured procedure in this House to follow the advice of the amendment and send this Bill, if it's going to be sent at all, to Law Amendments Committee where the public can be heard as they have a right to be heard, and where they can render valuable advice to we who have to take the responsibility of passing or turning down this statute.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, that the debate be adjourned.

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

.....continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Bill No. 18. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be very brief on speaking to this Bill, as usual. Earlier today, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Lakeside spoke on an Order for Return, Order for Return No. 42 dated March 17, 1966, and I don't think that he commented on that time as to the number of boards and commissions that were set up but I believe that the answer is something like 56 different boards and commissions in the Order No. 42, and it appears that we are now going to set up another one, which will then of course make 57 if my arithmetic is correct - unless, of course, a lot of these have been dissolved and served their purpose. --(Interjection)-- It doesn't set up another one? Well, I thought it provided for the setting up of --(Interjection). It just changes. So we will have, then, 57 plus all the ones that were set up since March 17, 1966. But my point is that surely to goodness we could give some of the 56 boards and commissions that are presently set up, some additional duties. I mean, is it possible for, say, half of this number, say 30 boards and commissions to have duplicate work? Could we not even give 10 different boards and commissions several duties and thereby make it possible to dissolve or do away with about 30 or 40 of the different boards and commissions that are presently set up - and that have been set up by this government? That is, if their duties are not too burdensome and cumbersome.

I know that the people of the province are becoming a little bit concerned about this whole subject of transferring responsibility from the government to boards and commissions; and to point up what I am saying, one of the persons that petitioned the government recently on the proposed five percent sales tax on laundry and dry-cleaning took the opportunity on the petition to say this -- and I'm going to quote what he said, and he's not a supporter of this group either. But he said: "If governments, both federal and provincial, would think twice before giving themselves a 300 percent increase in salaries, and if governments, when elected, would govern instead of setting up Royal Commissions for every little thing and problem, and if we returned to the two-party system, sending home all those who are elected to the third and fourth parties, we would not need any increase in taxes." Now here is a fellow who has said that he thinks that when he elects people to govern, that that is what they should do instead of appointing 56 or 57 -- or more, because this Order for Return is not up-to-date by any means; it's a year old -- boards and commissions, and I'm wondering if it isn't possible, Mr. Speaker, to have some of these boards and commissions fill a triple role, perhaps, instead of appointing a whole new number of boards and commissions all of the time.

And so, Mr. Speaker, that is the comment that I want to leave with my honourable friends at this time, and warn them that the people are catching on that it is not in the public interest to set up, as this government has done, at least 56 or 57 boards and commissions since they have taken office

MR. EVANS: ... comments? If there are no further comments, Your Honour, I'd just make a few remarks in closing the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister may proceed.

MR. EVANS: Well, I thank my honourable friends for the contributions of the debate. I think the Member for Gladstone, as I indicated by an interjection, was perhaps not talking to the principle of the Bill, because this Bill does not establish the Mining Board; it merely changes its composition and procedures to correspond with those of the Oil and Natural Gas Board. Those two boards have been operating successfully for some time. They are comprised of technical people who are able to discuss technical matters with the mining people on the one side or the oil and natural gas people on the other. As far as I'm aware it's been a success. It's staffed by civil servants who are, I understand, giving satisfaction in the role, and so I think my honourable friend was really addressing his remarks to a different subject and he'll perhaps forgive me if I don't make any further comment on what he said.

The Member for Portage indicated that the lack of a fixed term that really -- he referred to the phrase that it was "at the pleasure" of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council which is one of the traditional phrases of merely saying that they're appointed without fixed terms. That's the way the Act was brought in in the first place and so that's the way they're appointed. I see no significance in it. Presumably the influence that a government might bring to bear upon civil servants who comprise the board is neither increased nor diminished by the presence or lack of a term of office. I see no significance there. If the government wished to make its views known to the civil servants that comprise the board it could easily do so, and indeed has responsibility for conducting this technical matter. We assume responsibility for it, we

(MR. EVANS cont'd).... assume responsibility for the actions of the civil servants comprising the board, and I see no significance to that remark concerning the fact that they might be subject to influence by the government.

He asked me if I could give further definition of the term "undue delay" as found on Page 565. I'm not able to. I should think these things are often determined by the circumstances of each particular case as they come along. It wouldn't be possible to lay down in definite lengths of time what constitutes a "reasonable" delay in a given case, put it down in a statute. I think the circumstances of each case must be judged by a competent body to determine whether the delay in the particular case has been, I was going to say due or undue. I've never seen a case where anybody could set down a length of time which was regarded as an undue delay in circumstances affecting a variety of cases with a variety of circumstances, so I'm not able to suggest any further definition which might help to relieve that indefiniteness in the term to be found in that section to which my honourable friend refers. And so I commend the amendment to The Mines Act to the House.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General. Bill No. 44. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, QC (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Due to the honourable member's absence, I presume there would be agreement to allow the matter to stand, unless someone else wishes to speak:

A MEMBER: Here he is now.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 44. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

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

MR. LYON: be good enough to turn to Page 4 of the Order Paper to the item: Second Reading of Public Bills, beginning with Bill No. 35. If you would mind, Sir, calling Bill 35 and the succeeding bills in that column.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading. Public Bills. Bill No. 35. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain) presented Bill No. 35 an Act to validate By-Law No. 30-1966 of The Town of Killarney and By-Law No. 11-1966 of The Rural Municipality of Turtle Mountain and to add a portion of the south east quarter of Section 3 in Township 3 and Range 17 west of the Principal Meridian in the Province of Manitoba to The Town of Killarney, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DOW: Mr. Speaker, the Town of Killarney, one of the attractive tourist towns in Manitoba, in following the slogan of the Member for Gladstone to Linger Longer, have come to the position in their administration of a town corporation. In 1903 the corporation was set up and the boundaries were extended in 1946 and in 1963. They have found, due to the fact of having the natural asset of the lake within its boundaries, and a portion of it in the rural municipality of Turtle Mountain, that to accommodate the public, to accommodate the tourists and to accommodate the expansion of the corporation, they have found it necessary to ask for an Act to increase the boundaries of their town. This has been amicably agreed upon by the Rural Municipality of Turtle Mountain. They have agreed to dispose of their land as far as assessment purpose is concerned for the small sum of one dollar, and the owner of the land has sold to the town and it will be an added portion to the townsite of Killarney. The Bill is all set out with the various by-laws from the rural municipality and the town, and wishing to expand to be in the position to accommodate the needs of the community. This is what the Bill refers to.

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

MR. JAMES COWAN, QC (Winnipeg Centre) presented Bill No. 29, an Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter 1956 (1), for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I propose to speak on the more important amendments in this Bill. The Bill provides that the owner of property connected to the City's waterworks mains shall reimburse the City for the cost in cutting off any connection at the waterworks mains where the service is permanently discontinued. At present, the cost of cutting off the sewers in such a case is paid for by the owner of the property, and in the past in most cases the owners have voluntarily paid for cutting off the watermains, but the City did not have power

(MR. COWAN cont'd).... to require the owners to pay for cutting off of the water mains and the City wishes to have that power. They feel that generally speaking when the service is discontinued, the property is being re-developed and the owner is in the process of making money out of the property, it is being done for the owner, that the owner should pay for that service.

Another amendment provides that the City may assess the cost of lighting lanes against the owners of properties abutting upon the lanes that are so lighted, in the same manner as in the case of other local improvements.

Another amendment provides that the City may require fire alarm systems to be installed in buildings designed for a single family and occupied by eight or more persons where sleeping accommodation is used above the second floor, and may delegate to the Chief of its Fire Department, authority to establish standards subject to an appeal to the Better Housing Commission of the city, which commission may grant an exemption where the building is equipped with a fire escape or other adequate means of egress from the third floor.

Another amendment is with regard to a change that we made a little while ago which allows the City to enforce standards of maintenance of exterior surfaces of residential buildings, and of porches, sheds, exterior steps and fences in connection with a residential building, or any building in a residential district, which was not occupied by the owner and members of his family. The proposed amendment would extend this right so that standards of maintenance could be enforced in respect of buildings, residential buildings in residential districts occupied by the owner and the members of his family. The purpose of this amendment is to prevent the depreciating of property, prevent the downgrading of properties in the City and so prevent the growth of slum areas, and the need for expensive urban renewal developments in the future. These developments, as you know, are paid for to some extent by the Provincial Government and the Federal Government as well as by the City, and the City hopes with this change to do something further towards the prevention of slum areas and to helping to keep up the standard of residential property in the City.

When this proposed Bill goes to committee it is also proposed to add another section to the Bill whereby the cost of obtaining a tax certificate from the City of Winnipeg will be increased from 50 cents to a dollar in the same way as the committee has approved of the amendment to the City of St. Boniface charter increasing the cost of the tax certificate, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs has also announced that there's the intention to increase the cost of the tax certificate in respect of all other municipalities, so that if this is done with regard to Winnipeg the cost of the tax certificate will be uniform throughout the province.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, there's one comment I would have on Bill 29. It's in connection with clause (8), or item 8 dealing with Section 707A, and it is the one that requests the power "to enforce standards of maintenance of exterior surfaces on owner-occupied residences and buildings." Now this introduces a completely new concept which I, for one, am very doubtful about, and I think we have to look very closely at it before we pass anything of this nature. I know that the City of Winnipeg amendment last year, or two years ago, did request powers to enforce standards on other than owner-occupied residences and I think this made sense, because these are rented premises and I agree with the Member from Winnipeg Centre that it is this type of rented premises usually which tends to deteriorate over the years because they are not properly maintained, there is no interest on the part of the owner except perhaps to gain revenue from the building or from the home. But here we are introducing something new. We are introducing the fact that owner-occupied homes shall be maintained and shall be maintained under an authority vested in the City.

Now we all know there are many older homes, homes which people have over the years acquired by virtue of having lived there for 25, 30 years; this is their only asset. They have bought these homes many years ago, they have paid them off finally, and now they have retired in them. These are the people who are the ones really caught in the squeeze between the present high taxes and the high cost of living and the fixed income, and I know from personal experience that it is these people who are having difficulty keeping their homes, let alone going to the cost and the difficulty of maintaining them up to a supposed standard. On the whole they do a fairly good job, but I can recognize that sometimes they do fall down, but it is simply because they don't have the means and I would hate to see us do anything which would penalize these people and force them into a position from which they have no recourse, which would hurt them to the extent that they might really lose their home, something that they have saved for for years. So I would suggest that we look at this, very very carefully, and in Law Amendments certainly, I think I would tend to oppose this extension of powers to the municipalities,

(MR. MILLER cont'd).... something beyond which has never been done in Manitoba and I don't think we should entertain at this time.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): to those the Member for Seven Oaks has mentioned, I find myself objecting to certain sections of this Bill but will vote for it to go to committee where we may look at it and examine it and maybe suggest some further amendments.

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I too have many reservations and serious reservations on some of the contents of this bill. However, I think it would be wrong at this stage to prevent it from going to second reading because I would like to have an explanation from the city officials, so on that basis I will at this stage agree with the second reading.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I simply rise to say that our group is not going to object to second reading but we have our reservations and want further explanations when we reach the committee stage. We are prepared to have the bill go forward.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that there are appeals from any decisions or any orders with regard to maintenance that might be made by a city inspector to the Better Housing Commission, which is an appeal board set up for the purpose of enforcing this proposed amendment as well as enforcing the laws that now exist, and this consists of five responsible citizens and of course the city council can always - they are given the power to put this into effect; they don't have to put it into effect if they think hardship is being caused, and I think we can be assured that the members of this appeal commission and the members of Winnipeg City Council are just as much interested as we are in preventing hardship in individual cases.

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

MR. STANES presented Bill No. 31, an Act to Amend The St. James Charter, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, just a brief explanation. St. James Council have realized for some time the importance of recreation. In light of this, this Bill separates Recreation from Parks, sets up the Parks Board, four members of Council, four members of citizen members, and with one mill limit. Recreation is set up under complete control of council and will not be a limit. I shall in committee make a motion, Mr. Speaker, taking out Section 4 which puts the one mill on recreation. Recreation will be treated in the same way as other services, fire, police and so on.

MR. MILLER: a point for clarification, if I heard the member right that Section 4 that I am questioning, that this -- there's a suggestion that an amendment will be brought in on Section 4. Fine.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: The same applies to this bill. My group is prepared to have it go to second reading and we will discuss it at that time.

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

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 49, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Sinking Fund Trustees of The Winnipeg School Division No. 1, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, the effect of this bill is to raise the remuneration of the Sinking Fund Trustees for each meeting from \$15.00 to \$25.00 each. The trustees administer a sinking fund which has over \$3 1/2 million in it, and they administer the Pension Fund for the Winnipeg School Board employees other than the teachers, and in that fund there's about \$4 million, and the Winnipeg School Board feel that the trustees should be remunerated in accordance with the proposed amendment.

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

MR. DOW presented Bill No. 37, an Act to validate By-Law No. 770 of The Town of Deloraine, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DOW: Mr. Speaker, this bill is a validating by-law of authority that the Town of Deloraine constructed a water line outside of the Local Improvement District. The Minister of Municipal Affairs has an amendment to this bill which we have discussed and I agree with, to bring this into line with the total local improvement areas in the balance of the Town, and if on that basis it can go to second reading, it'll be brought up in committee, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 60, an Act for the Relief of The Town of Tuxedo, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, in 1965 the Corporation of Metropolitan Winnipeg called for tenders for the construction of an interceptor sewer on Grant Avenue in the Town of Tuxedo. However, due to problems associated with the joint use of sewers it was decided not to proceed with the construction of this interceptor and subsequently Metro Council rejected the tenders received, but the Town of Tuxedo made plans for development on the basis of the interceptor being constructed. They purchased the plans from Metro and went ahead with the construction of the sewer at a cost of \$98,000 and paid for it in cash.

In 1966 the Committee on Waterworks and Waste Disposal of Metro decided that they wanted to have this interceptor sewer as part of the Metro system and they recommended to council that Metro take over the sewer and pay the costs. Unfortunately, the way the Metro Act reads it was impossible for Metro to pay the cost to Tuxedo, as the Act had been drawn up on the basis that the Metro Corporation would assume any debts owing against the sewer that they might take over, and in this case the Town of Tuxedo had paid for it in cash and there was no debt to assume, so this bill is for the purpose of allowing the Metro Corporation to pay the Town of Tuxedo the sum of \$98,000 for this sewer.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, this bill deals with the relief of the Town of Tuxedo and I think that's what caught my eye when it was first put on my desk, something I didn't think I'd see - I've never seen before certainly, and I don't know if I'll ever see again in quite that form.

This is a very dangerous bill that we have before us, Mr. Speaker. It's fraught with danger in that it can open up many things within the Greater Winnipeg area which could lead to a great deal of arguments, bickering, and perhaps law suits even, between Metro and the member municipalities, because when - and the member for Winnipeg Centre is correct - when Metro was established, the Metro authority was to take over the debentures of various municipalities which they might owe on not only sewers but also on roads as well, and this was done. But there were many municipalities which didn't have their roads covered by debenture issue but rather either through revolving funds or through internal financing or they had paid cash and were repaying it to themselves, and as you all are aware, a municipality cannot owe money to itself; it's not considered a debt. Consequently, when the take-over came, and this I am working from memory, about eight or nine million dollars within Greater Winnipeg was simply left to the municipalities to pick up; Metro could not at that time take over these debts. And I know from my own experience that we tried awfully hard to convince Metro to do it but there was no legal way in which it could be done, and I am suggesting that if we accept this bill there is a danger, and I know frankly I would go back to the City of West Kildonan and tell them to re-open the case. The danger is that municipalities would then be able to go back to Metro and claim that if special consideration is being given in this case, then certainly they should be given consideration for the costs that they had incurred in previous years.

Now, I agree that perhaps the Town of Tuxedo should be heard, but there's one other point I'd like to bring out. In a matter such as this I don't think we should be amending the Metropolitan Act because of a request by a member municipality. If an amendment to the Metro Act is requested it should be by the Metropolitan Corporation. We shouldn't be using a back-door means of doing it; I think it's wrong in principle. And so although I am prepared to hear the arguments in Law Amendments Committee, I think we should be very careful about how we approach this matter.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add a few words to what has been said by my honourable colleague for Seven Oaks. On the face of it this appears to be quite a reasonable suggestion that something that was supposed to, or was intended to have been done by the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, was done by a municipality; they paid the cost of it, therefore it was intended that this would be a Metropolitan project and that the Metropolitan Government should pay for it. However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate that this type of situation has occurred in many, many instances and unless the member introducing the bill can demonstrate that the Town of Tuxedo has indeed been discriminated against with regard to this particular project, then I think that we would be putting this municipality in a rather preferred position, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that whenever I have spoken about government projects and government relief and welfare and education and

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . . health, I believe that it should be given to the rich people of our community as well as the poor. I don't think that there should be any distinction. It's not a question of us saying that other municipalities should have something and this one should not, but I don't think that the Town of Tuxedo has shown that it's been put in a discriminatory position. What it says is that "we have done something which is now conceived to be a Metropolitan responsibility."

Well look, Mr. Speaker, at what the City of Winnipeg has done and paid for with all of the debentures paid off, which is now conceived to be a Metropolitan responsibility, but there's no suggestion that we pay back to Winnipeg what they have done which is now conceived to be Metropolitan in nature. Nor any of the other municipalities, and some of the other municipalities, Mr. Speaker, and I believe I'm speaking with authority although I stand to be corrected, and if the honourable member who introduced the bill can correct me, then certainly we'll have another look at it, but many sewer systems were intertwined with the Metropolitan Corporation Sewer System, and the corporation took over the debenture debt, but the debenture debt did not necessarily mean the cost of the project. Half of it may have been paid off by the time Metro took it over, and I don't think that because a particular municipality has done something which is conceived to be Metropolitan in nature that they get a refund of that money, because this was done by every municipality.

I remember when I sat on Metro Council that certain streets were put into the Metropolitan system and certain streets taken out. As I recall it, the City of Winnipeg wanted -- the Minister of Highways will recall the meeting we had -- that the City of Winnipeg asked for streets to be put back into the City system and many of the outlying areas who were perhaps a little more astute, said that we should put their streets into the Metropolitan system, so the City of Winnipeg ended up by getting it from both sides. They not only had to pay for their own streets entirely without the assistance of the Metro area generally, but they had some contributive streets that were put in by the outlying areas who saw this as a means of financing their roads.

I don't think we can go back to try to now create equity as between the various municipalities who have done work and paid for it on their own and have now found it to become a Metropolitan responsibility. That's what this bill seeks, and unless the mover of the bill can demonstrate that there is a particular discriminatory situation which has been faced by the Town of Tuxedo, I don't think that we can support this bill.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, just a few words in connection with this bill. I certainly do not subscribe to the principle and therefore I would reserve my decision on this. I would like to have it go to committee in order to hear the explanations by the Party concerned. However, I am not sure to which committee this bill will be referred to. Will it be referred to Law Amendments, or is it the Municipal Affairs, or even Private Bills, and whether I'll be a member of that committee at that particular time, so at least I hope I'll have the opportunity to sit in at the particular committee hearings where this bill will be discussed and then make my decision later.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to honourable members that there would have been no problem whatsoever if Tuxedo had borrowed the money or had issued debentures. It wouldn't have come here. They thought and so did Metro, thought that if Metro should decide they wanted to make use of this interceptor sewer being built in 1965, five years after the Metro corporation was established, that if Metro decided they wanted to use it that Metro could take it over and pay for it, and then they discovered that because Tuxedo hadn't issued debentures or hadn't borrowed the money, that then they had to have this bill in order to reimburse Tuxedo for the cost. Metro had called for the tenders; Metro had paid for the plans; and it was only after the tenders had been called that they decided not to go ahead with it at that time. Tuxedo had made plans on the basis of it being going ahead with and they said, "well, if you're not prepared to go ahead with it now, we would like to, and if you decide later to use the interceptor sewer then you can use it and pay for it."

This is quite different from anything else that has been mentioned because this was constructed in 1965, long after Metro was established, and it was impossible, as the Honourable Member for Inkster has said, to try and unravel the items that he mentioned in respect of matters which were constructed years ago and in respect of which this House has already made a decision.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question before the formal motion is called? I'm sorry I was absent on the introduction of the Bill into the House.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).... Has Metro been informed of this Bill and do they agree with it?

MR. COWAN: Yes, Metro agrees with it and approves of it.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the honourable member another question, and that is, did the honourable member say that the Metropolitan government could not make this interceptor sewer a part of their sewer system without the passing of this Bill?

MR. COWAN: No, I didn't say that.

MR. GREEN: Well then, could the honourable member tell us whether the Metropolitan Corporation could make this interceptor sewer a part of their sewer system without this Bill?

MR. ROBLIN: take place in the committee stage where the Metro people will be present to speak for themselves. That's the best evidence.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, Mr. Speaker, in reference to the statement of the First Minister, it might affect our vote, particularly that question that I asked the first time.

MR. COWAN: The answer is simply yes, they could make it part of their sewer system without the passing of this Bill but they couldn't pay for it without the passing of this Bill.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 66. The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. LISSAMAN presented Bill No. 66, An Act to Amend The Brandon Charter, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Speaker, this Bill really requires little or no explanation; it's quite simple. The first clause increases the members on the Parking Authority from seven to eight in number. Section 2 gives authority -- or 49 (t) at least gives authority to have a machine sign cheques and names who the signing authorities will be; and subsection (3) would permit the Chief of Police to suspend a member of the force, but he could not be dismissed without a hearing before the Board of Police Commissioners. It is my understanding he didn't have this authority previous to this.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to oppose the Bill; I intend to support it. We'll let it go through for second reading and see what happens in the committee and hear the representations at that time. I'd just like to say though that when I first saw that we were getting a Bill to amend the Brandon Charter, I wondered if my honourable friend the Member for Brandon was possibly bringing a Bill to expand the boundaries of the City of Brandon, because I believe there is a particular problem in that regard and I thought that maybe this was the action that he was taking. I wonder if he could maybe inform the House whether or not he has any plans for bringing such a bill during the course of this Session.

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Speaker, if I may, although it certainly isn't connected with the Bill, I believe discussions are going on with the Boundaries Commission in this regard.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you'd be good enough now, Sir, to call Bill No. 21 on Page 4.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on second reading of Bill No. 21. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes remaining at my disposal, I will attempt to explain to the members why I think that they should give second reading to this particular Bill and endorse the principle which the Honourable Member for St. John's is trying to legislate and put on the statute books.

One might say that there really isn't a need for legislation of this nature in our province because occurrences where employers dismiss employees because they've attracted garnishment proceedings occur very rarely or maybe not at all. However, I would have to agree with both the Honourable Member from Selkirk and St. John's who have spoken previously on this bill that these things have occurred all too frequently and quite often there is a great deal of suffering because the particular employee involved has, through misfortune or misadventure, attracted garnishment proceedings and has suddenly found himself completely discharged from his job, his credit rating of course unduly affected and without employment, and the people who are attaching his wages have found themselves without anything to attach at all.

Now one might also say that organized labour, through its collective agreements and through union contracts, should be protecting their employees against such proceedings, and true, many organized unions do in their contract have provisions preventing such an occurrence from taking place. But there are thousands of people in the Province of Manitoba who are not protected by organized labour or by any contract, and it is these people as well as those others

(MR. STEEN cont'd).... that are so protected but do not have any contractual section to give them any additional protection that I think that a Bill of this nature is necessary to put on the statute books.

One of the things that I dislike about the present practice is that too many employers are able to impose upon their own employees their own moral and ethical standards, and just as we disapprove of the employers trying to force their employees to have certain religious convictions or certain political convictions, we cannot attempt to condone the present method taken by some of allowing the employers to force their own standards of credit upon their employees. Some could say this is an infringement upon the traditional and the inherent rights of management, but I don't think it is when those very rights are exercised judiciously and responsibly by management. The main purpose of this particular bill is to allow each employee to have his day in court and the Bill has set up that the Labour Board would adjudicate on the various disputes which might occur.

I have certain reservations about the Bill and I think at the committee stage would be the appropriate place to make the necessary amendments. I think the Bill as it is now worded goes a little too far and might extend protection to many irresponsible people and many dead-beats, and I think that the provisions of the Bill should be curtailed before the Labour Board would find itself necessarily exercising far too much discretion.

I also think that the second section of the Bill which allows a 90 day, as it is now worded, appeal period should be reduced to 15 days which is the standard notice period in most labour negotiations. However, The Employment Standards Act, which is the actual Bill that is being so amended, provides for even less than 15 days in some of the appeals in that particular legislation as it now stands.

I also think that the Bill, which now says in Section (2) that it would come into effect upon receiving Royal Assent, should be amended so that it would come into effect upon proclamation which would give the government and the Manitoba Labour Board the necessary facilities for setting up their offices so they could receive and adjudicate upon the various appeals which would start coming in the following day. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I take it that the House is prepared to call it 12:30. It is now 12:30 and I'm leaving the Chair to return again at 2:30 this afternoon.