

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Thursday, May 4, 1967

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk, would you proceed.

MR. CLERK: Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,395,607, Urban Development and Municipal Affairs.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hamiota, that while concurring in this resolution, this House regrets that the Government has appointed a political partisan Boundaries Commission and has thereby prejudiced the value of this important Commission.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, this resolution is quite self-explanatory but much more serious than the wording describes. By now, all of us know and are aware that 59 boards and commissions have been set up by this government since 1958, plus the one that was set up yesterday, namely the Transportation Commission; therefore a total of 60 boards and commissions. In this particular resolution we are dealing with the Boundaries Commission, a commission consisting of 14 members, and I have heard it said that five of these gentlemen are defeated Tory candidates, and most of the others known Tory supporters.

Mr. Speaker, how can this be an independent commission? How can the people of Manitoba, who hold various political beliefs, have confidence in this type of a commission? How can municipal people, who have to and must at various times hold responsibilities in informing the public as to various decisions, how can they have the confidence in a commission like this? Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion a commission of this type should be a non partisan commission.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Clement, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Froese, Guttormson, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker and Tanchak.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Craik, Doern, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Fox, Green, Hamilton, Hanuschak, Harris, Jeannotte, Johnson, Kawchuk, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Miller, Paulley, Petursson, Roblin, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Uskiw, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 12; Nays 41.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. CLERK: Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$34,416,933, Resolutions 115 to 119 separately and collectively, for Welfare.

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Elmwood, that while concurring in Resolution No. 115, this House regrets the Government has failed to provide for needed expansion in personal care homes and other facilities required for increasing senior citizen population.

MR. SPEAKER: In view of everything that has gone before, I declare this motion out of order.

MR. PAULLEY: May I have some indication as to why it is, Mr. Speaker. I am not challenging your ruling; I just would like to know for the future.

MR. SPEAKER: I feel that having dealt with the Department of Welfare, in which there was considerable debate, and the fact of our Rule No. 31, "No member shall revive a debate already concluded during the Session."

MR. PETURSSON: Could I make this motion in connection with No. 119?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated a moment ago there is no question of us challenging your ruling. It may be that we will have to devise other means of the introduction of resolutions in the future. I do not challenge your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it from the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party that there may be another resolution in this connection?

MR. PAULLEY: ... Mr. Speaker, but you have sown seeds of thought in our mind for some other methodology for the future.

MR. SPEAKER: I would ask the Clerk to proceed.

MR. CLERK: Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$40,990,000 for capital expenditures. Requirements, Schedule A: The Manitoba Telephone System \$19,750,000; The Manitoba Water Supply Board \$690,000; The School Capital Financing Authority \$10,000,000. Schedule A Total - \$30,440,000.

Schedule B, Other Requirements: The Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation \$4,000,000; Red River Valley, Assiniboine River, Seine River and Lake Manitoba Flood Protection, Soil Erosion, Water Control and Drainage Projects \$6,550,000. Total \$10,550,000. Grand Total \$40,990,000.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Moved by the Honourable Provincial Treasurer, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the Resolutions reported from the Committee of Supply be now read a second time and concurred in.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Ways and Means for the raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

MR. CHAIRMAN: The first resolution before the Committee: Resolved that towards making good the sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the province, the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1968, the sum of \$339,213,530 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, before we deal with the resolution itself, I just wanted to mention that the last time that we were in Committee of Ways and Means, my honourable friend the First Minister and I have a little memory exercise in that we were discussing whether the resolution for the Ways and Means on the whole amount of the estimates should be passed at that time. My honourable friend was very definitely of the opinion that that procedure was the usual procedure in the House, at least the usual procedure since the new changed method of presenting the budget and the motion to go into the Committee of Ways and Means for Supply had been the practice of the House. I was wondering if my honourable friend had had an opportunity in the meantime to check on the correctness of his representations at that time.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I have had no cause to change my view. The House obviously -- the committee obviously yielded to the blandishments of my honourable friend in dealing with it this way and I certainly raise no objection, but I completely reserve my position with respect to the authorities in the matter.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, what I was enquiring about was if the Honourable the First Minister had checked the record to see if his recollection was correct about the motion that you have now proposed having been dealt with by the Committee of Ways and Means while a large portion of the estimates were still unfinished, and my honourable friend at that time was of the opinion that it had. Has he checked the record since?

MR. ROBLIN: I have nothing to add to what I have already said, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CAMPBELL: All I wanted to add was that I have found this to be completely wrong because I checked the last two years and the Committee of Supply had finished its work before the resolution was reported from the Committee of Supply. Now my honourable friend evidently does not remember the debate that took place so I would have to remind him of the discussion that took place on Wednesday, February 15th - that's quite a while ago - we got into Committee of Ways and Means and my honourable friend the First Minister was inclined that at that time, February 15th, that we should pass this motion which authorizes the appropriation of the whole sum of the estimates and my honourable friend thought it was quite proper to pass it at that time. I raised the point that surely we were not going to do so while such a large proportion of the estimates remained unfinished. My honourable friend said at that time - I don't want to take him out of context so I'll have to read a little bit of this - but when I had said, surely it's not intended to pass the motion providing all of the money before the estimates have been at least reasonably well considered, the Honourable the First Minister said this is the procedure that has been followed.

I simply report, Mr. Chairman, that I have checked the record, and when my honourable

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) . . . friend said that it had been done this way for the last several years, or at least since the method of presenting the budget had been changed, I said that it was not my recollection. I have found that I was correct in that and my honourable friend was wrong.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, there's really no point in prolonging the discussion unduly. My position is that it is quite customary in other jurisdictions in other parliaments to deal with it in the manner in which I have suggested, and I just ask the Clerk to check the instance which I had in mind with respect to our own records here, but I see no point in belabouring the point at the present moment.

MR. CAMPBELL: I don't wish to belabour it either, Mr. Chairman, but I do see a point in checking up on my honourable friend when he gives information to the House saying that it has been done in this way and that we're simply following the practice that has been agreed to by the House on previous occasions, and I say at the time that I think it has not been done that way - or rather I was a bit more polite than that - I said I doubted that his information was correct. I have checked and have found that it was not correct. I simply called it to my honourable friend's attention and he doesn't like it called to his attention, but when we have disagreements of this kind I think the records should be kept straight and that's all I am doing.

MR. ROBLIN: But I have absolutely no objection in having the matter drawn to my attention, none whatsoever. As I say, I just made a request that we look at one or two of the past occasions, and if I find any information there of interest to the committee, I'll report it.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, we're dealing with capital supply are we?--(Interjection)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution passed. The next resolution before the committee: Resolved that towards making good certain sums of money for various capital purposes, the sum of \$40,990,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund. Resolution -- passed? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: This is a matter of capital then, is it? I want to raise an objection at this time on this government not following a pay-as-you-go policy and that we do as a government borrow for operational purposes. I think this should not be done. In fact this year when we're increasing the taxes to the extent that we do, that we're imposing a five percent sales tax and expecting some \$45 million a year revenue from this source, and then at the same time still borrow for operational purposes under capital. I think this is wrong and this should not be done and I will not support it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution -- passed. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee has adopted certain resolutions, directed me to report same and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the resolutions reported from the Committee of Ways and Means be now read a second time and concurred in.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CLERK: Resolved that towards making good certain sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1968, the sum of \$339,213,530.00 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Capital Estimates. Resolved that towards making good certain sums of money for various capital purposes, the sum of \$40,990,000.00 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

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

MR. EVANS introduced Bill No. 100, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1968.

MR. EVANS introduced Bill No. 104, an Act to authorize the expenditure of monies for capital purposes and to authorize the borrowing of the same.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Bill No. 100, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1968, be now read a

(MR. EVANS, cont'd)second time, by leave, and passed.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: The motion does not include "and passed" I trust.

MR. ROBLIN: No, it's referred back to the Committee of the Whole.

MR. CAMPBELL: But the Speaker, as I understood it, said "read a second time and passed."

MR. SPEAKER: To make positively sure, I'll read it again. Moved by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that, by leave, Bill No. 100, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1968, be now read a second time -- and passed, it says here.

MR. ROBLIN: I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, it should be "be now read a second time and referred to the Committee of the Whole."

MR. EVANS: I think this is my fault. I picked up the wrong piece of paper to read, but the motion as you now have it, Sir, is correct. I think it has now been moved in correct form, Mr. Speaker, and if I may now let you have this motion to read.

MR. SPEAKER: I regret inconveniencing the House for a moment or two.

Moved by the Honourable Provincial Treasurer, seconded by the Attorney-General, that, by leave, Bill No. 100, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1968, be now read a second time. Are you ready for the question?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on second reading of the bill we're voting on the principle and I have to raise objection on this particular bill because we're asking for more money than we need. I tried to make my point last night and was ruled out of order, but under the education estimates we are asking for roughly \$12 million more than will be used in that department and I feel that this is wrong. We had other matters drawn to our attention, several salary items which were voted on, which we tried to exclude but were unsuccessful, and I bring this to the attention of the House that certainly I have to oppose this principle that is contained in this bill.

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

MR. EVANS presented by leave, Bill No. 104, an Act to authorize the expenditure of monies for Capital purposes and to authorize the borrowing of the same, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to raise the same objection on this one. As I have already stated, I feel that we should be on a pay-as-you-go program and that we should not have to borrow, that we should be paying our way, especially during these periods of time when we have had good times, good crops, and the economy we are told by our government is buoyant, is good, and then have to go into an ever deeper debt position is wrong and I cannot stress this point too much. I also feel that since, as already stated, we are asking the people to pay more taxes and at the same time still go deeper into debt, I just have to oppose this principle.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider Bills No. 100 and 104.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee ready to proceed? (Bills No. 100 and 104 were read section by section and passed.) Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has passed Bills No. 100 and 104 without amendments and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. BILLS No. 100 and 104 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, we should now proceed I think to the Committee of the Whole to consider the two bills referred.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

MR. ROBLIN: I move, seconded by the Honourable Provincial Treasurer, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider Bill No. 60 and Bill No. 119.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 60. I would ask the Honourable Member for Brandon to please take the Chair as this is a bill which I sponsored.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ready to consider the Bill? Bill No. 60, an Act for the Relief of the Town of Tuxedo.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Chairman, in accordance with the discussion that has been held since the Committee last met and since the Bill was up for third reading, it has been proposed that the preamble be amended. The preamble originally set out statements which were in accordance with circumstances at the time the bill was drawn up, but as the Honourable Member for St. John's pointed out, at today's date the preamble isn't correct in all its aspects, and so I would move that the last two paragraphs of the preamble to Bill 60 be struck out and the following paragraph substituted therefor: And Whereas the Town of Tuxedo carried out the construction and installation of the sewer and did not create a debt for the purpose of financing such work; and Whereas if a debt had been created and the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg had assumed jurisdiction over the sewer it would have paid to the Town of Tuxedo before due date all amounts of principal and interest, including sinking fund installments becoming due on any outstanding debentures issued by the Town of Tuxedo, or becoming due in repayment of monies otherwise borrowed in respect of the money; and Whereas in the particular circumstances hereinbefore recited it is deemed appropriate that upon the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg assuming jurisdiction over the sewer that the Town of Tuxedo be compensated therefor."

MR. PAULLEY: ... just on a point of correction. If I listened correctly to my honourable friend in the second paragraph, or the second "whereas", the last word in the copy that I have is the word "sewer", and as I listened to my honourable friend he used the word "money". I wonder if he could -- was it just a mistake on your part my friend or ...

MR. COWAN: Yes, it should be the word "sewer", the last word in the second paragraph. I would point out also perhaps at this time, Mr. Chairman, that I intend to move another motion to say that the Act shall come into force on the day fixed by proclamation. The idea of that is this, that it is hoped that the Metropolitan Corporation and the Town of Tuxedo will work out a satisfactory date on which the sewer would be taken over, and of course at that time then arrangements can be made for payment of the money. But I'm just moving the one motion in the meantime with regard to the preamble.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the question as to whether or not the bill as amended would mean that it would be up to the Metropolitan Corporation to say if and when it takes over this sewer. The preamble now says: "It is deemed appropriate that upon the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg assuming jurisdiction over the sewer, the Town of Tuxedo will be compensated." So something would be required from Metro indicating that they are taking over the sewer. The Act does not require them to take over the sewer.

MR. COWAN: That is correct.

MR. GREEN: ... to initiate now the taking over of the sewer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You've heard the amendment to the preamble.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 1 of the bill has been passed. Section 2 --

MR. COWAN: I have an amendment to Section 2, that Section 2 of Bill 60 be struck out and the following section substituted therefor: This Act comes into force on the day fixed by proclamation.

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

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, before we close, I would like to thank the Minister for co-operation in this matter in helping to clean up this bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Bill No. 60 was read and passed.) Bill 119. Agreed we shall consider this bill page by page? (Agreed).

MR. LYON: On any questions with respect to any of the sections I will attempt to give answers, but there are some of the sections which are semi-substantive in nature. I have fairly full notes and will attempt to give the Committee any answers that they wish with respect to any of the sections that might come under question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 119 - Pages 1 --

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, on Page 1, if I may have permission, No. 8 - is this a departure from - is this not a more substantive amendment that should possibly require a change in the statute directly than by the method in which it is being done? I noted too, in connection with the changes respecting the St. Boniface Charter - I presume this was agreed upon, at least generally speaking, because of the change that was made in the City of Winnipeg Charter to make provision for the -- not requiring the present procedure insofar as tax sale notices are concerned as to the amount of money. I think it was done in the Winnipeg Charter and I guess this, as far as the St. Boniface Charter in this Act, is bringing it into line, but I would like to hear from my friend the Attorney-General, who is sponsoring this bill, in respect of Section 8. Is this in effect changing a basic principle within an Act that would normally be done in the Act itself rather than by an Act that covers a multitude of statutes such as this one?

MR. LYON: The only substantive change in Section 8, Mr. Chairman, is that we are by this amendment requiring a person who wishes to utilize the Change of Name Act to have been resident in the province of Manitoba for three months. Heretofore that residence requirement was not required, but now it's three months.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, is this not changing a basic concept or a basic principle of the Change of Name Act that normally, or more properly, should have been done by a change directly in the Act, and I'm really in this thinking, Mr. Chairman, of my friends in the legal profession that here there would be another Act that they'd have to look up insofar as the Change of Name Act is concerned, and if I'm not preaching for a call to the profession there are others apart from the legal profession that are interested in the Change of Name Act. It would be more confused than ever. So I just wonder on that particular point whether, by this bill, the Statute Law Amendment and Statute Law Revision Act, whether or not we're departing from the past procedures, as I understand them, of tidying up typographical errors and the likes of that within the bill, and whether we're departing to some considerable extent from that principle.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned before, the main purpose of this was to provide or make certain in the Act that the Change of Name Act applied to residents of Manitoba. Heretofore the department apparently have been receiving applications from New York or from Arkansas or from other places - non-residents asking for change of name, and as a matter of administrative practice they have refused to accept those applications. And this merely brings the action of the law in conformity with what the previous practice had been, namely, to make it apply to residents of Manitoba and to ensure that our law is not being used in Manitoba by persons outside of Manitoba for some purpose that might not be in the public interest. And insofar as this point is concerned about substantive matters, there have been always some substantive matters and I mentioned on second reading that there would be some substantive or semi-substantive matters in this bill. I think if my honourable friends recalls back to six or seven years ago, all of the onus sections in our statutes were removed in the Statute Law Amendment Act, so I'm advised by the Legislative Counsel, and there are some of these here and I will attempt to explain them, as I mentioned at second reading and again in committee, because there are some that while they didn't justify a separate Act on their own, were felt as desirable changes to be made in the statutes and are included here.

Insofar as the question is concerned regarding the St. Boniface Charter, this was just to clean it up and to bring it into line with the Municipal Act and the Winnipeg Charter. The Municipal Act having been amended last year and the Winnipeg Charter this year, there was verbal consultation with the solicitor for the City of St. Boniface and they agreed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much what the Attorney-General has said, and he also has indicated that there are some changes, other changes in the tidying up of

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) the Act, as I prefer to call it, but he did say that there were substantive changes or some changes that could be of a more or less substantive nature. We're dealing with the bill page by page; I think it would be an advantage to the committee if my honourable friend would point out, as we deal with the bill page by page, if he would make references to what we might term substantive changes as we deal with those pages.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, on this section; in the first place I would like to suggest that we're paying a little too much attention to protecting people on change of name. I don't think that the name should be such a valuable asset or danger to a person so that it has to be guarded so zealously when it comes to permitting a change. I've had - and I won't bring it up now at this time, but I have had discussions with the Honourable the Provincial Secretary wherein I pointed out to him certain inconsistencies that I felt were in the Act which didn't take care of exceptions where a hardship was actually imposed by the rigidity of the Act. In this particular case, there is a provision that the applicant must have lived in the province for three consecutive months. I don't consider that to be too great a hardship, but I'm wondering about the reference to the Canadian citizen. You find people here in this province who have been useful people in society and may have been here any number of years, have residence here, may not have the right to change their names anywhere else, and I am not aware that there ought to be any restriction on granting a change of name to a person if he is not a Canadian citizen. This is not a change in the law. I'm raising this point now because we have it before us and I am asking the Honourable Minister whether this is the proper way to consider changes when, if we had a separate bill, we could have dealt with these other factors, so I'm raising the question now as to the need for the person to be a British subject, the justification, because we are in effect re-enacting a section.

MR. LYON: This just makes a reference to Canadian citizenship in addition to British subject. If you read the section, "any person the full age of 21 years who has resided in the province for at least three consecutive months and who is a Canadian citizen or other British subject."

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . criticize the Honourable Minister for not hearing what I said. He was busy and we all have that. I know what this does, but I say, once we are changing this section we have a right to look at it and say: why should he have to be a British subject or a Canadian citizen for change of name? There are many people, as I say, who may have lived here for many many years and who don't have the legal right to change their name in any other jurisdiction, and I don't see why there should be a disbarment. That's my point. And I certainly wouldn't at this stage try to make an issue of it, but possibly the Minister -- well he said he'll look at it which means not this year; and even that I don't mind. Now that I've raised the point and of course the Minister in charge of the Act isn't here, but there are people here who have his ears and possibly this could be brought to his attention. I do suggest there could be a complete look at the whole Act and a review of the provisions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 1 -- passed; Page 2 -- passed; Page 3 --

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, you're a little too quick for me. What about this provision that seems to negative changes of name that have been put through since 1938 other than in accordance with the provisions of this Act?

MR. LYON: This new Section 16. The old section provided that no change of name had any effect at the coming into force of the Act unless it was made in accordance with the Act. The Act was enacted in 1938 and it's felt it's very unlikely that very many people knew when it came into force. This new section is intended to clarify this by naming the date in which the Act actually came into force initially. It also excludes the changes of name of a child adopted under the Child Welfare Act from the operation of the prohibition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 2--passed; Page 3 --

MR. LYON: The Leader of the New Democratic Party asked if I would bring to the attention of the House any matters that had some substantive . . . 23 and 24; under the forms of the conditional sale agreement required under The Farm Implement Act, there is an assignment of the profits earned from the use of the farm implement which is the subject of the sale. The assignment is intended to be collateral security for the vendor. These two amendments are to make it clear that the assignment is limited to the period during which the purchase price or any part of it remains unpaid.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 3--passed; Page 4--passed; Page 5--

MR. LYON: In Section 32 there, after the war the Leasehold Regulations Act of Manitoba was passed to adopt rental regulations which had been made under the War Measures Act.

(MR. LYON, cont'd) These have been continued under the Transitional Measures Act of 1947. By amendment to the regulations made since then, their application has been cut down so that they no longer apply to self-contained dwellings or to lodgings where new tenants had entered into possession after August 12th, 1953. The effect of the new amendment is that they now have application only to lodgings where the tenant has been in possession since August of 1953, and as this is now felt to be a very small group of people it was thought unnecessary to continue the regulation any longer.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, you will note that under Section 33 this removes hay and cordwood from the definition of livestock. I know this has been raised on previous years; it's a good thing that . . .

MR. LYON: . . . one, and it removes hay and cordwood from the application of the livestock and livestock products.

And 35, while we're on that same page, the section The Marriage Act being repealed under Section 35 required the Department of Health to keep on hand copies of The Marriage Act for which they could charge 10 cents. The Department presently gives free copies of the Act to a large group of people who have to perform functions under the Act, such as clergymen and licence issuers. There appears to be very little call for this section at the present time because the copies of the Act are available through the Queen's Printer, and it's felt that this section could be removed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 5 --passed; Page 6 --

MR. LYON: Section 44; under 77A of the Real Property Act the district registrar is permitted to lapse certain registrations in the general register. The registrations involved are liens which have been in effect for 10 years or more. At the present time, the section excludes assignments and orders in bankruptcy on its application, and the amendment is to allow the section to apply to assignments and receiving orders in bankruptcy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 6-- passed; Page 7 --

MR. LYON: There was one on Section 47, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps I could just put it on the record. The Seed Purchasing and Cleaning Warehouses Act requires seed cleaning warehouses to be licenced and to comply with certain standards of operation. Under The Canada Grain Act all elevators are declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada, and under the Canadian Wheat Board Act all seed warehouses and seed cleaning mills are declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada. As a result, the provinces have no longer any jurisdiction over elevators and seed cleaning mills, and the Seed Purchasing and Cleaning Warehouses Act is no longer of any significance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 7 --passed; 8-- passed; 9 -- passed; 10 --passed; 11 --

MR. LYON: Oh, on Section 83, Mr. Chairman; under subsection (2) of Section 5 of The Prearranged Funeral Services Act, the person selling the funeral service contract is entitled to retain certain moneys to pay administrative expenses. Under Section 15A, the moneys received for the purchase price are required to be held in trust for the purchaser. This is to make it clear, this amendment, that moneys which can be retained from the purchase price to cover administrative expenses are not included in the moneys that have to be held in trust for the purchaser.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 11--passed; Page 12 --

MR. LYON: On Page 12, Section 89. Under The Elevator Act (1963), provisions were enacted relating to the licensing of elevator operators. These provisions were never proclaimed and no licensing of elevator operators has been required since 1963, so provisions relating to the licensing are therefore repealed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 12 -- passed; Page 13 -- passed

MR. CHERNIACK: Is there not an explanation for 94? Is that not a substantive change?

MR. LYON: 94; Under The Elderly and Infirm Persons' Housing Act, if the municipality is going to borrow moneys it must pass a by-law, which has to be submitted to the ratepayers as are all borrowing by-laws. It is, however, possible under the Act for a municipality to undertake to make grants for which it is not required to borrow money. However, in some instances the grants are not required to be paid out of the current year's revenues but will be continuing grants payable over a number of years. The effect is, therefore, that although they are not borrowing, they are creating a liability to pay money over a period of years and there has been doubt as to whether or not they should pass a by-law which would be required to be assented to by the ratepayers. The amendment is to make it clear that the provisions relating to obtaining the assent of ratepayers apply to by-laws authorizing grants to be paid

(MR. LYON, cont'd) out of more than the current year's revenue.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that this is a very important amendment which is being brought before us, and I think that it's not a clarification of law so much as a making of law, and is now establishing a principle that these grants must be referred to the ratepayers. Now it is my impression that if grants are made over a period of time, it's a promise, not a guarantee, and I think we went through this when we dealt with the YWCA and the City of Winnipeg last year, or Metro rather, last year, and, I'd like to suggest that this matter is of sufficient importance that it is entitled to have the time and study given to it which it would receive in the normal course of the readings of bills, and I would like to suggest that this section be not proceeded with but that it be dealt with in a proper way, with proper representation and proper investigation. I don't know any of the background of this and I don't apologize for not knowing it, because all I did was see the section and the note, but I do think it's very important and I don't think that we should be in a position where we endanger the development of elderly and infirm persons' housing projects. We should do everything possible to encourage their being built and assisted by municipalities, and I don't think we should put any blocks in the way.

MR. LYON: I stress, Mr. Chairman, that the firm advice we received is that this is only a clarification, because the Municipal Act is quite firm and quite distinct in saying that if a municipality creates a debt, then there must be a money by-law, and that is the over-riding provision. The purpose of this amendment is merely to ensure that, regardless of how that debt is incurred, there must be a ratepayer by-law to back it up. Now this is not creating new law, it is merely affirming what the present law is, on which there has apparently been some misunderstanding.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well Mr. Chairman, if it's affirming the law, then let's let the law stand as it is, and the question of clarification could then be gone into by this Legislature at a time when it has time to do so, but I don't think the Attorney-General ought to put us in the position of accepting his statement, "This is the law." I don't deny that he may be right, but I am saying, if this is the law then we don't need to set up a section. If it's just a question of bringing it to the attention of the municipalities, which are the only ones concerned, then that should be a comparatively simple matter and would not offend against the principle of giving this House an opportunity to really satisfy itself in this regard.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I'm of the position that all it's doing is bringing into force of effect under this Act, a principle which is embodied in the Municipal Act. --(Interjection)-- Not as far as a municipality is concerned. A municipality doesn't have to go to the ratepayers if they are going to incur a debt and pay it out of current revenue, but if they are not going to pay it out of current revenue they have to go to the ratepayers, and that's all that this is doing.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well I understand that, Mr. Chairman, but it could make the grants each year as it goes along and it doesn't have to do it in any year, and therefore I think we are being asked to debate more than just a restatement of the law, because if it were restated it wouldn't be necessary.

MR. LYON: . . . debt because these are apparently agreements to make grants that are required under the CMHC requirements for this type of housing. I am assured that it's not so much a new principle as it is a clarification.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, that's fine. What would happen if this section were overlooked in the drafting and we had another year under the existing law? What harm, what damage would there be?

HON. MR. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Mr. Chairman, if I could just say a word on this point. It might save a lot of municipalities from going down a few blind alleys and then finding out after that this is a requirement of the Act. It may give them a false feeling that they can enter these agreements without a vote of the ratepayers. I think this just clarifies it and saves a lot of inconveniences and explanations that might be embarrassing to the municipal officials at a later date.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well that's a good answer, Mr. Chairman. How will the municipalities learn about this change?

MR. CARROLL: It would be in the Act.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well that doesn't mean they'll learn about it. It will be a change. It will be referred to in the blue section of the back of the statutes as being The Statute Law Amendment and Statute Law Revision Act.

MR. CARROLL: I believe it will be going out with -- any municipalities that make enquiries usually get a copy of the statute that applies, that has effect with respect to elderly persons' housing, and this would certainly be included in any instructions that go out to the municipalities.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well then, wouldn't the law be stated to them anyhow?

MR. LYON: In addition to which, the Department of Municipal Affairs used to follow the practice - I believe they still do - of advising all municipalities after a session of the Legislature, as to the effect of any sections that were passed to clarify, such as this, or to create new law. So it's brought to their attention that way.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well I see in which direction this is tending. May I point out that in the same manner in which this would be drawn to the attention of municipalities, the present law as it is under the Municipal Act could be drawn to the attention of the municipalities and they would have the same notice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 13-passed; Page 14--

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I too want some clarification under the Section 95. I am concerned with what is being attempted here and I see that we are excluding these people from the definition of Civil Servants - the people that work for the commission or the board themselves - which I agree with. I am wondering whether it's intended, and I hope it's intended, that these people will be considered ordinary employees under the Manitoba Labour Relations Act, because if they are, I think you have to go a little further.

MR. LYON: Under Section 5 of The Natural Products Marketing Act, it appears that all employees of marketing commissions and producer boards are required to be employed under the Civil Service Act, and this is not the intention and has certainly not been the practice. The amendment is to clear this matter up so that only the Manitoba Marketing Board employees are civil servants, and the employees of the producer boards and the marketing commissions will be employed by those boards and commissions independently of the Civil Service Commission.

MR. GREEN: That's what I sort of hoped that it's doing, but if it's intended that these people then be considered ordinary employees for the purposes of collective bargaining, I think that the Act has to go a little further because this will not be one of the commissions or boards named in the Labour Relations Act, and therefore the Act wouldn't apply to them. I think that's their problem now. I wonder if the Minister follows me, that the Labour Relations Act now applies to certain people and certain boards, and it doesn't apply to any that are not named, and the Vegetable Marketing Commission wasn't named in the Act and therefore these people couldn't bargain collectively even though they were not civil servants, and I hope that what the government is trying to do is to clarify the status of these people, and I feel that perhaps this hasn't gone far enough.

MR. LYON: ...does not change their status vis-a-vis the Labour Relations Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 13-passed ...

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman ...section 98. In 1964 we introduced a new uniform Wills Act which had been recommended by the uniformity commissioners. The new Wills Act contained a provision, Section 22, which had not previously appeared in the Statutes. It dealt with the matter of tracing monies and interest in property which, although mentioned in the will of the testator, had been disposed of by the testator before his death. Our own Law Reform Committee here recommended that the provision be inserted in the Act but not come into force with the rest of the Act. It was intended that further research would be done to see whether or not the section would be useful. A considerable amount of time was spent by a sub-committee studying this matter, and they recommended that the said section not come into force at all but be deleted, and this is what is happening in this amendment. It's never been enforced and we are now taking it out of the statute.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 13-passed; Page 14--

MR. CHERNIACK: On 104 (a). Is there any additional explanation or is that all ...

MR. LYON: 104 (a). Under Section 18 of the Highways Department Act, the Minister is required to file each order closing a road. In many instances there have been no registrations with respect to the roads in the Land Titles Office, and the registration of the order closing the roads does not affect any previous record in the LTO. The amendment is intended to relieve the Minister of the necessity of filing the order where no previous registration has been made.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well Mr. Chairman, I think it relieves the Minister further. I think it relieves him of the necessity of filing this order even where there has been a registration made, and -- well, it says, "may" instead of "shall".

MR. LYON: ...registration has been made, my understanding is he still has to file the order.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well Mr. Chairman, I don't see that he has to; I think he can get out of it.

MR. LYON: It's pointed out to me that it is only permissive, but to a certain degree, in fact generally it's because if anybody wants to deal with those roads, they have to deal with the government in any case. This amendment, I should also add, is similar, exactly the same as an amendment that was passed to the Water Control and Conservation Branch Act vis-a-vis drains, an amendment that was passed by the Legislature this year.

MR. CHERNIACK: Of course, the fact that that was done doesn't make it necessarily right. And what I am afraid of here is that a person searching a title and finding that there is a record of a highway on the title, would not know that there was an order closing the highway unless he made further enquiries beyond the title, and I think that there should be the requirement on the Minister that he "shall" file a copy of the order when there has been a notation on the title, and I'm afraid that this is sort of a, if I may use the dirty word, bureaucratic approach to it saying, "well if we slip up then it's not our fault and we can't be out of court because we have the permissive section," and I would like to suggest that it ought to say that "in cases where" there is no record of a highway, then he may file it, but I fear that where there is a record he still may not file it.

MR. LYON: The practice, up to the present time of course, has been to file everything, and the volume of these is rather large. I understand that the practice will be that they will continue to file where these are in existence as registered plans, but not where they are not planned, because -- the following subsection of course is an explanatory note; even prior to that, my honourable friend will realize, as most of us do, that titles to highways seldom if ever exist. You can't find them. They're just noted by plans in the Land Titles Office, and registrations against them in the case of the better known highways and roads and so on. But many of these are small municipal or even trail types of roads that have no previous registration, and it's meant apparently to clear up problems in the administration where they've been receiving an influx of these things which have no meaning.

MR. CHERNIACK: I wonder if the Minister will agree with me that it would be a good idea that where there is a highway registered, a record registered, then he shall be required to file the certified copy of the order closing it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 14--passed; 15--passed; Page 16--passed; Preamble --

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could trouble the Minister to ask him one further question on Section 47. I know he's given an explanation on it but I would like to know from him whether all the seed cleaning plants, once this is passed, are subject to The Canadian Wheat Board. Would that be ...?

MR. LYON: Subject to the Canadian Wheat Board?

MR. FROESE: Yes.

MR. LYON: Under the Canada Grain Act, all elevators are declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada, and under The Wheat Board Act all seed warehouses and seed cleaning mills are declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Preamble -- passed; title--passed. Bill be reported. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee has passed Bill No. 60 with amendments, and Bill No. 119 without amendment, and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. BILLS Nos. 60 and 119 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, we have now reached that point to which we have all been striving to reach for the past five months, the end of government business, and while we're still on our regular Order Paper for today, I believe it's the practice that we would now move on to the Private Members' resolutions and attempt, I would hope with expedition and with brevity, to clean up as much as possible of those resolutions. I should say, however, that with respect to the final two resolutions on the Order Paper, the second last one was received on the 20th of April, the final one was received on the 2nd of May, that there would not be any disposition on the part of this side of the House to consider those matters which were brought in so late. They can well be matters that will be considered another time. But we'll see what progress we make on these other matters. I trust we will deal with them with our usual dispatch.

MR. SPEAKER: We proceed now to Page 2.

MR. LYON: Page 2, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Lakeside, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I commenced speaking on this resolution on a previous occasion, however, I think members today are in no mood to have a long debate on this particular resolution. I would just like to raise a few points in connection with it, however. I note that in the Resolved part of the Honourable Member for Lakeside's resolution it mentions to declare itself on the principle of having a permanent Speaker, and then, too, consultation and agreement among all parties in the Assembly that such an officer or Speaker be appointed. Then we find the resolution is being amended by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, which would refer it to the Committee of Rules, Orders, Forms and Proceedings.

Now I think we're starting off on the wrong foot. I think we're starting off in a biased way on this, because the original resolution called for consultation with all parties; now we find that it's being referred to a committee which will not include all parties, and therefore not all parties in this House will have a voice in the matter of debating this resolution and bringing in their views and possibly putting forward amendments and so on. I object to this amendment on this score. I voted for the original resolution, but to have it referred to this particular committee where our particular party will not be able to participate to the fullest extent and bring forward their views and amendments and so on, I will have to oppose the resolution.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the main motion, as amended?

MR. CAMPBELL: If no one else wishes to speak, Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to take my accustomed 40 minutes. I'd just like to express appreciation to the House for the consideration that has been given to this resolution, and while I would have preferred the other committee, as one of the honourable members used to frequently say in the House, a half a loaf is better than no bread and I think that we got considerably more than a half a loaf out of this one, and I believe that in the committee we'll probably be able to do something really constructive with regard to a very important matter for the benefit of the House as a whole. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working under your Chairmanship with the other members of the Rules Committee, and I appreciate the consideration that's been given to this resolution.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. OSCAR F. BJORNSON (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I was moved to take the adjournment on this resolution when the Honourable Member for Gladstone challenged any member from a rural area to get up and say that they had an adequate supply of doctors, dentists and nurses in their area and have some to spare so that we could export it to his part of the country, and these were his words. And I could not help but reflect on the very fine and adequate health facilities that we have in my constituency at the present time. While it is true that we do not have a doctor resident in our area, or a dentist or a hospital in our village, what we do have is, within 17 miles of the Village of Lac du Bonnet, one of the most modern hospitals in Canada. It's located in the Town of Pinawa. The capacity is 17 beds; they have three doctors and a dentist. Here are two private practitioners whomaintain an office in the Village of Lac du Bonnet and they take turns for two full days a week to attend to the medical cares of the people of our village. Now, prior to the inception of Pinawa, our people had and still have a very adequate facility in the Pine Falls Hospital where there are 49 beds with three doctors and a dentist.

(MR. BJORNSON cont'd.)

In making these statements, I do not want to appear naive. I realize why these hospitals are located where they are. I appreciate the fortunate circumstances that make it possible to have this adequacy of health care for the local citizens in our community, and I realize that these circumstances cannot be duplicated in all the rural areas. It was industries that brought enough people into our community to make it feasible to have these facilities, to have them available not only for those involved directly but those who reside close to the project. I don't want the Honourable Member from Gladstone to think that I am trying to refute his submission wholly on these fortunate circumstances.

I think there are other considerations, too, that discourage some doctors from taking a rural practice, and I would like to quote from a report submitted to the Manitoba Hospital Commission, entitled: "Studies on Supply of Doctors," dated February 7, 1966, and I quote: "Brief resume of a meeting held in the Fort Garry Hotel, January 14th. At a meeting held on January 14, 1966, to discuss the position in Manitoba relative to the supply of physicians, members of the Department of Health, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Manitoba Medical Association and the University of Manitoba Medical College reached no consensus that an over-all shortage of physicians does or will exist in Manitoba. However, individual and group opinion did indicate that shortages have existed and will continue to exist under certain circumstances such as geographical areas to be served and certain specialties."

And from the same report, another quote: "In discussing the supply of physicians in Manitoba and any statistics relating to them, one must consider the large concentration of specialists, more than half of the practising physicians in the Metropolitan area who serve the whole population of Manitoba plus adjacent areas of Saskatchewan, Northwestern Ontario and Northern United States. A real area of concern is the distribution of doctors between urban and rural practice, and this is an area which needs improvement."

These are the views, Mr. Speaker, of those people who are most vitally involved with the supply of doctors and hospital personnel, and are to some extent the experiences of our rural areas. We have attracted doctors in our towns and villages from time to time. If they were young and ambitious we soon lost them to greener fields. If they were old and experienced, they retired or died off. Other reasons were that the area was too small to produce the income that a doctor thought was adequate, and also did not offer the challenge of the capabilities of the individual in the rapid evolution of medical knowledge.

I'm certain most of us know and appreciate the fact that there are shortages of doctors in the rural areas. We also know that it's receiving the attention and the efforts of a lot of our educators, our health officials and our government. While there is every need for concern, there is no need to panic. Province-wide we seem to be holding our own. In the year 1956 we had 961 licensed medical doctors serving a population of 850,000 people with a physician-population ratio of one physician to 884 persons. In 1966 we had 1,188 licensed MDs for a population of 958,000, or a ratio of one physician to 806 persons. In the years mentioned, the numbers of physicians registered in our province increased by 227.

There are 203 dentists actively engaged in private practice in the Greater Winnipeg area giving a ratio of one dentist to approximately 2,460 people. These figures approximate the projected estimates of the Royal Commission on Health Services for the dentist-population ratio to all of Canada by 1991. Facilities are presently adequate in Winnipeg to meet the demand for dental services. An independent survey on the length of time required to wait for a dental appointment in Winnipeg ranged from half a day to 34 days with a mean waiting time of 6.2 days. The type of dental service requested influenced the length of the time. Nevertheless, the study showed that 40 percent of the dental practices in Winnipeg will see a dental patient within two days of a request for an appointment, and 25 percent of the practices will handle children's appointments in two days. Emergency dental service, such as the relief of pain, is handled almost immediately by most dental services 24 hours a day.

Dental practices outside the Metropolitan area are classified as rural practices. This includes seven locations with a population of over 4,000: Brandon, Portage la Prairie, Dauphin, Flin Flon, Selkirk, Steinbach and Thompson. There are presently 57 dentists actively engaged in private practice in this area, giving a ratio of one dentist to approximately 8,400 people. These figures are misleading in that nearly half of the rural dentists are located in those centres having 4,000 or more population.

There are a number of factors influencing dental services and health in the Province of Manitoba; population trends, social changes, improved transportation facilities, to mention a

(MR. BJORNSON cont'd.) few. Rural Manitoba residents have become conditioned to travel reasonable distances to obtain or purchase goods and services, including health, from a common larger market. Another fact of consequence is that nearly three-quarters of the population resides within 75 miles of the southern border of this province. These factors have and will continue to influence the future growth and development of dental facilities in Manitoba. The problem is not peculiar to Manitoba. The Royal Commission on Health Services recorded that the remainder of Canada is confronted with similar problems.

The Member from Gladstone made quite a pitch on a questionnaire that was sent out to twelve communities by the Minister of Industry and Commerce in 1965 regarding their potential in providing adequate services to the people in their area. Lac du Bonnet was one of these constituencies. To myself, this is like writing to Santa Claus to let him know what you would like for Christmas, an exercise that most of us indulged in as children. It is ludicrous to suggest that because twelve communities asked for more doctors, dentists and optometrists, that these should be supplied forthwith as a policy of this government. The government must exercise government control over expansion of facilities and the overlapping of services.

The Member from Gladstone also chided the government for a lack of policy in regard to its commitments. Would it be just too trite for me to say that the policy of government must be to furnish the best health facilities to the greatest number of people in Manitoba, at the least possible expense, and consistent with adequate care. The thought is so simple that I would suggest that it would be almost obscene in its simplicity, and yet is this not just what our government was doing when this Assembly, when we passed the estimates of the Department of Health with a whopping total of better than \$83.5 million?

I say that this government was not lacking in policy when the Manitoba Hospital Plan was inaugurated, and I say there was no lack of policy when this government provided the magnificent hospital complexes that we see in the City of Winnipeg and in my own constituency of Lac du Bonnet. Sometimes I feel that the Member for Gladstone speaks with his tongue in his cheek. I can imagine him representing Podunk Corner and Lower Slobovia rather than Gladstone-Neepawa when he suggests that his constituency go on a spending spree whenever they go for a dentist appointment in Minnedosa or Brandon or where they choose, and I think he is aware of this exaggeration and he knows that his constituents are much more sophisticated than he would give us to believe, and he is much more sophisticated himself than the image he presents to this Assembly. The people in my constituency certainly, certainly appreciate the standards of health care they're getting now and what lies for them in the future. My own observations are that healthwise we never had it so good. For these reasons I cannot support his resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I guess I have the opportunity of closing the debate and I also find that I have my name in a hat pool here as to when the Session will end; and there's another resolution on the Order Paper and I have the whole control of when we will rise in my hands; I guess I'll have to just put this timetable out here and govern myself accordingly. -- (Interjection) -- My honourable friend wants to know who can get in on the pool. I think that you could. See our Party Whip and see who . . . Well, get after him then.

Now my honourable friend the Member for Lac du Bonnet I noticed after five months, after five months got around to speaking on my resolution. I think there's only about three of us that have spoken on it and it's been on the Order Paper since December, I believe. So it has taken them about five months . . .

MR. BJORNSON: On a matter of principle. Could I say something about this? I've had it in my hot little hand for about seven weeks here ready to speak, but somehow or other it's never got to the right place on the Order Paper.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, that's not my fault, Mr. Speaker. It's been on the Order Paper. It's been on the Order Paper.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question before he gets too far into his discourse. I don't want to interfere with him but I'm wondering if he could tell us what hour he has in the pool so that we could act accordingly.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party, it is this afternoon.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, fine.

MR. SHOEMAKER: So that will raise hopes, I am sure.

MR. DESJARDINS: It's past. It was at 4:00 o'clock.

MR. SHOEMAKER: But my honourable friend's figures, the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, are pretty well accurate. They are in accord with an Order for a Return that I received from the Department a little while ago, and it all points up exactly what I say in the resolution that is before us, namely, that three-quarters of the doctors are in the City of Winnipeg and only half of the population is in the City of Winnipeg. We've established that beyond any question of doubt. My honourable friend says that they are pretty well looked after out in his area by reason of the fact that they can go to Pinawa and have all of their medical, dental, optical needs taken care of. But my guess is, and I'm not certain of this, but my guess is that there's a federal hospital over at Pinawa, and if it wasn't for the federal works out in that area there probably wouldn't be the facilities that there are, so that's no credit to this government. That's no credit to this government at all. It's fortunate, indeed, for Lac du Bonnet, I'll admit that, but the credit for the facilities should all go to the Federal Government. So surely to goodness this government should not take care of that.

Now I do want to thank my honourable friend - this is twice I've thanked him for recognizing the need for medical centres, because he has provided us with Bill 102 which we all passed very willingly and quite quickly, and I want to thank him for that. What I have said time on end is that even if there were, even if there were sufficient doctors and dentists now, as of this date, what about when Medicare comes in? We'll need twice as many.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident that we could again defeat the government. There's only about a half a dozen over there and two or three of them are asleep. So I don't know whether we should just rise and my honourable friend put the same motion again that he did this morning because in fact they're less in number. There goes the Whip now. I guess he'll ...

MR. DESJARDINS: We'll give you five minutes.

MR. SHOEMAKER: We'll give them a little time to get in -- and wake up the other ones that are here too, Mr. Stanes.

MR. M. E. MCKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): I rise on a point of privilege. I wasn't sleeping.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Did my honourable friend the Member for Souris-Lansdowne want to get in on this debate? I have another one that I hope he does get in on.

MR. MCKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I wasn't sleeping.

MR. SHOEMAKER: You looked like you were asleep.

MR. MCKELLAR: I wasn't sleeping.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the honourable gentleman might proceed to make his few brief remarks without any further interruptions.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I won't get many interruptions because there are very few people across the way to make them. But no reflection on me. They didn't all leave, you don't think, because I got up to speak, it's just usual with them. --(Interjection)--Well thanks very much that's a compliment to me.

MR. DESJARDINS: They heard you're speaking and they're coming back.

MR. SPEAKER: ... address his remarks to the Chair he probably would ...

MR. SHOEMAKER: Instead of to the Leader of the New Democratic Party, I think that would be better. When the honourable the First Minister, not speaking - well speaking about the resolution that is before us and dressing me down for having put it on the Order Paper - he said that all these towns in Manitoba should have a doctor in them and they should have a dentist in them and so on. And do you know what he said? And maybe they should. He said maybe they should. He agreed with me and he said, but we have got to add up the cost. O.K. he is saying we need them. The Honourable Member for Roblin said they have no dentist there. Half of the members from the rural area have no dentist in their town.

Now the honourable the Minister of Welfare - no, Health - the Minister of Welfare isn't here - in fact there are only two Cabinet Ministers here so it must have been the Minister of Health. He cited pretty well the reasons, the combination of factors that you did require in the rural areas in order to attract doctors there, and he has now made provision in Bill 102 to see that this is met to some degree. This wonderful report, Mr. Speaker, that I referred to earlier today, the Third Annual Report of the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board, on Page 34 shows that there were in fact 50 doctors that graduated in the year 1965, I suppose, because this is the 1966 report, but do you know what happened to them? Fifteen left immediately on graduation, and then 45 other established persons - doctors - left to practice elsewhere, so that we graduated 50 and 60 left for a minus of 10. Now I know it is true that a number of

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd)... persons entered to practice from outside of Manitoba, but who paid for the cost of graduating these 50 doctors? And then 60 left, 15 of the ones that graduated plus 45 other ones, a great cost to the province, and these are the things that we have got to look into, Mr. Speaker.

Well, I know that you don't gain any marks by talking at this stage in the session. I know that that is -- but I want to remind my honourable friend the Member for Lac du Bonnet to go down and have a heart to heart talk with the new Minister of Industry and Commerce, that shining star, because he said in effect that all of these publications and all of the work that took two years for his department to compile in respect to the 12 communities and towns that were under microscope were of little or no value, because everything that I read in my first speech came directly from the 12 reports, and I would commend this reading to him as well.

Now in Carman, for instance, and in the Carman report I have attached to it right on the inside cover from the Tribune, I believe, of June 27th 1966, an article headed, "Trade Survey Results Told to the Carman Chamber of Commerce," and like they did in the other twelve towns, or the other eleven towns, a very efficient fellow from the Department of Industry and Commerce went down there to their Chamber of Commerce meeting, told them all about their survey and presented it to them at that Chamber Meeting. "At a Chamber of Commerce luncheon meeting in Carman, attended by more than 60 persons, results of the Carman town trade survey were released. The need for more professional people in town and improved eating places topped the list of improvements desired by the consumers in the area." And what topped the list by far? Doctors - the need for doctors - right at the top of the list, and this went on in the whole 12 surveys that the Department of Industry took two years to prepare. Not what we say but what they say, and if they are of no value at all, then let's quit spending money on stuff like this.

Mr. Speaker, they are taking my material away from me as fast as I pick it up here and that indicates I suppose that I have made a strong case ...

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the honourable gentleman would not agree with me that when he tabled this resolution he gave us a recitation from almost all the books, and probably that's why the honourable gentlemen have taken them now.

MR. SHOEMAKER: The books that I have always used are published by the government, because I always put a great deal of faith in the publications that are put out by the government. Surely there is nothing that's more convincing, there's no set of statistics that are more convincing than those that are put out by the government themselves. I know - I know that they don't like a lot of the statistics, in fact they use their statistics to suit themselves and we use their statistics to suit ourselves. Mr. Speaker, I would think that I will have the opportunity to speak on the other resolution that's on the back of the Order Paper and, as such, I will win the pool and I'm prepared to share the proceeds with all members of the House, provided they will co-operate to the same extent that I have.

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

MR. SHOEMAKER: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker, for sure.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. For the benefit of the honourable members that were not in the House during the very recent debate, we are dealing with the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Clement, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Hillhouse, Johnston, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak and Uskiw.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Roblin, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 24; Nays, 28.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost.

Before we proceed, I wonder if I could have the attention of the honourable members for a moment. I have a very important ...

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I believe one member wishes to reflect upon the vote.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): I was paired with the Provincial Treasurer. Had I voted, I would have voted for the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much, and I am sorry. I have a letter here from the Governor of the State of Nebraska which I would like to share with the honourable members. "Please convey the sincere and genuine thanks of the Nebraska people, and myself, to your Legislative Assembly for the fine resolution they passed pertaining to the Nebraska Centennial. Let me, in turn, convey my very best wishes to all Canadians during their centennial year. We in Nebraska feel very close to our neighbours to the north, so much in fact that we are arranging with your Manitoba Centennial Commission and the Winnipeg Jaycees a fine joint promotion probably to be held in August of this year. Our centennial commission, in co-operation with the O'Neill Nebraska Jaycees, are planning the re-staging of General O'Neill's raid on Canada and the site to be Winnipeg.

"I am sincerely hoping the dates they select will coincide with my schedule to permit me to visit your fine province on this occasion. I'll hope to have the pleasure of meeting you and members of your Legislative Assembly on my next visit to Winnipeg. Cordially yours, Norbert T. Tiemann, Governor."

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I want you to assure the Governor of Nebraska that we'll not give him the same reception that we gave General O'Neill.

MR. SPEAKER: I'll be out there in front. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. MCKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that the Honourable Member for Gladstone was very interested in getting through this debate at an appropriate time, I'll try to be as short as possible because I think this is the only resolution that all of the members of the Legislature are unanimous on, because our party is going to vote for the amendment of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. So I think this is a fine way to end our proceedings in the Legislature at this session on a unanimous note. I think also, too, that I only wish the potato producers could end up in the same way as what we are so unanimous on, our thoughts on the policies to the wheat farmers of Manitoba and also for Western Canada as a whole.

I think that we're all aware of what took place in both the amendment that I proposed to the resolution of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, and also that we did vote against the two-price system of wheat, and while the present amendment doesn't say two-price system for wheat, I think it is the intention of the member -- this is his thought and mine. I'm not voting for two-price wheat when I'm voting for his amendment, and I'd like it to be made known at this time. But I do hope that something is brought about in the Geneva Conference that we will get an increase in our price of wheat on the world market and also on the price of wheat that is consumed in our own country.

We're approaching the 1967 crop seeding season and I think that about three weeks today we'll be able to identify the farmers in the Legislature a lot better than we can today, because I think many of us will be sporting a new suntan about that time - at least I hope we are anyway - about the 24th of May because of the May hot winds. I only wish that the weather changes and lets us get out by at least the 15th of May, because I know many of us here have a lot of centennial celebrations that we are going to attend and I know that all will be looking forward to getting our crop in as soon as possible.

So with those few words, I hope that all the farmers in Manitoba have a 40-bushel to the acre wheat crop, they are able to sell it, the markets are good, and their pockets are full of money at the end of the year. Thank you.

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

MR. SPEAKER put the question on the main motion, as amended, and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I will try and follow the good example set by the member for Souris-Lansdowne, although my efforts may not yield quite as satisfactory a result as his had.

I'd like first of all to congratulate the member for Assiniboia for introducing this resolution, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is an important one in the development of housing for the people of our province. The Minister of Municipal Affairs has indicated an interest in this and during the course of the session we have passed a bill which is intended to facilitate this, and there is certainly a need for further housing, particularly housing available at a price that

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd)...people can afford to pay for. The purpose of this resolution by my colleague is exactly that, to make available to more people the type of housing that they can afford to buy. There are many cases now where families can not get into apartment blocks, or there's some reluctance because they have children, and yet if they're allowed to buy within a block this would make it much easier for them. It is well-known that for equal square footage you obviously get a better deal in an apartment block than you do in a private home. You can get the same amount of square feet, that is, for less money in a block than you can in a home when you're purchasing, or when you're building.

The Province of Ontario have passed such an Act, Mr. Speaker, and I'd just like to quote from some of the statements made in Ontario and how important they consider this condominium Act of theirs, and I'm quoting from the Globe and Mail of March 25th this year. The story says, "The Condominium Act is the Ontario government's biggest weapon in tackling the housing crisis, yet there is a strong danger its value will be seriously jeopardized. Mr. P. E. H. Brady, Deputy Managing Director of the Ontario Housing Corporation, said yesterday 'that of all the government's programs under the home ownership made easy plan' - and I quote again - 'the Condominium Act is the most important piece of legislation.'" This is a statement, Mr. Speaker, by the Deputy Director of the Ontario Housing Corporation which is similar to the corporation we have just passed here in the Act a couple of days ago.

And here's what an outsider says. This is not a government man in this case but an outsider, Mr. Grant Duff, and he's the President of the Urban Development Institute. This is a group that represents a number of developers, so this is the other side of the story then, the people who are going to put up the buildings which is essential if the program is going to work. He says, and I quote, - "This is the only step that the Provincial Government has taken that is meaningful." He goes on to say - and it reminds me of some of the things I hear in Manitoba at times - and I quote again, - "The rest of the home program is strictly electioneering; it does nothing to relieve the housing crisis." Well I'm not accusing my honourable friend of having passed an electioneering act in the Housing Act but I did express some reservations the other day that it not be a delaying tactic and another board to prevent things from happening, but I would point out to her the high hopes that Ontario puts both from the government side and the private industry side in the condominium idea.

So I was a little disappointed, I must admit, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister in charge decided to send this back to another committee, and I must confess I had prepared an amendment originally to her amendment which would ask the Law Reform Committee to report back to this Legislature for action. I'm sorry the Minister has - I see her whispering something to me, Mr. Speaker, and she'd have to be a little closer for me to hear - but the amendment as I read it is that this be referred to the Law Reform Committee. As I say, I was going to propose an amendment but at half past four on what appears to be the final day of the session, I have my doubts that an amendment proposing legislation at this session would receive very favourable support.

However, I am concerned about the Law Reform Committee, Mr. Speaker. When some questions were asked earlier there appeared to be a great deal of confusion as to who was on the Law Reform Committee or what the Law Reform Committee did or when it might do it. I put in an Order for Return asking about this committee and it must be a very complicated committee because I still haven't got my answer and I've had the report in now for - oh, I would guess something like a month or a month and a half - asking who are the members of the Law Reform Committee and when they met, and I haven't seen the answer. So I would hope that they will be operating a little more quickly on this action than would appear to be the case right now.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I regret to see that the Minister has decided to refer it to this committee. However, I'm not going to object to that too much as long as it doesn't mean that we won't have legislation for the next session. This I think is the important part, because when I look at what Ontario says - and they are following this legislation directly on the heels of their own housing legislation - and this is the type of legislation, Mr. Speaker, that brings in private development into an area where there is government responsibility, but the two work together and I think that this ideal.

So very reluctantly, Mr. Speaker, but nevertheless having prepared it for some time now, I feel I must move an amendment to the resolution. I don't think it will hold up the debate at all; I think it is one than can be accepted by the government. It only makes it clear that we will have legislation ready for the next session, or at least that it will be discussed at the next

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd)...session. And so in the light of the importance of the condominium proposal, the need for it to tie in with the housing act, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk, that the amendment be amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and adding thereto the following words: "to the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs no later than 1 July, 1967; And Be It Further Resolved that the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs be empowered to sit between sessions for the express purpose of receiving the report of the Law Reform Committee; And Be It Further Resolved that the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs be instructed to make specific recommendations on this subject for legislative action at the next session of the Legislature."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, we have heard sufficient described about the value of the condominium concept and operation to the housing needs of the Province of Manitoba and I will not repeat them. It is clear, and I think the Minister herself has accepted that the possibility of bringing in the condominium concept into Manitoba could promote additional housing which is of course what is necessary, and I don't want to repeat what has already been said.

I would like to point out that there has not been enough done in the field of co-operative housing and I'd like to pay tribute to those people in the community who have actively established a co-operative housing organization which has a number of - several hundred now - co-op housing units not only built but occupied and is already looking into the possibility of expanding it. There is a distinction between co-op housing and condominium housing. Both have their great advantages, and their differences make it possible to adapt to the requirements of the different potential owners of units and occupants of them.

So that having said that much, I'd like to agree with what the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party said and what has been said before about this Law Reform Committee. I think we're pretty sure there is one; I think we're also pretty sure that it does not meet except on occasion; I think that we're pretty sure - and I'm saying all these things because we really don't know - that they meet at the request of some person in authority like the Attorney-General, and of course they are not bound to meet or continue to meet because they are an advisory committee established for the personal assistance to the Attorney-General under The Attorney-Generals' Act. They have no legislative responsibility of any kind, and this amendment of the Honourable the Minister for Municipal Affairs does not require a report from that committee.

When one reflects on The Limitations Act and the length of time it took for that committee to deal with the matter, then the question of a deadline does make itself a matter of interest. I don't know whether I heard this in committee, in Law Reform Committee or outside of the committee, but I am under the impression again that the Law Reform Committee did not meet very frequently in dealing with some of the other matters and that therefore it's a pretty nebulous thing.

I think, therefore, that the amendment of the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs should be rejected because it's not needed. Surely the government does not have to come to us to ask us to have the Attorney-General speak to the Law Reform Committee. She certainly has the ear of the Attorney-General much more than does the House itself and surely she could prevail on the Attorney-General to request the Law Reform Committee to study the problem; surely the whole matter of bringing this amendment is to divert the intent of the resolution itself into a cul-de-sac where it will fit neatly until the government has finally completed its investigation and become ready to deal with this matter.

Therefore, feeling as I do that it was not necessary for this House to ask the Attorney-General to do what is probably his duty, what he probably should have done a long time ago, because the question of condominium came up over two years ago - and I recall that it did because it was just to the stage where I had started to learn something about it and acquired some information on it - and it was discussed in the House at that time and surely the Ministers involved and indeed the Law Reform Committee could have done the investigation. If they say they have been studying it but are still cautious, I would understand that would be consistent with the actions of some of the Ministers, but the reference itself is completely unnecessary; it could have been done without the help of this House. I think that the government should have acted.

I look at the resolution itself where it speaks of -- that an Act be passed by this Legislature, and I thought it meant this session and I thought well, that's a hopeless sort of a thing, but there's still value to the resolution as it stands because this Legislature, I would expect, will continue into the next year because certainly this government would not risk an

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)... election and therefore we are sure that we will be back next year in the same Legislature to deal with this matter and hopefully by that time the government will have an Act, and just since we don't have enough faith in seeing to it that the government will have an Act --(Interjection)--well then if the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs is disturbed at my suggestion, let her consult some of her fellow Ministers who have been in this Cabinet for a longer period than she has and let her ask them how quickly they have produced legislation of a vital nature such as the Consumer Credit legislation; let her enquire about The Expropriation Act; and let her reflect on The Elections Act which is still lying around somewhere; and let her then say that it is possible that this work will not be produced at the legislation.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs)(Cypress): ... some we have done.

MR. CHERNIACK: There has been a great deal of work done. I want to agree with the Honourable the Minister that there has been a great deal of work done. There has been a great deal of work left undone, and the fact that I say that there's a possibility that we will not have a condominium Act is supported by my statement that there is work not done. I hope the Honourable the Minister will be able to bring something into the next session, but she is stuck because all she can do - all she can do is ask the Attorney-General to request the Law Reform Committee to investigate the matter and to report. And to report to whom? Presumably to the Attorney-General who should then presumably pass on the report to her.

Well, we want to participate in this process and I therefore feel that the amendment brought in by the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party has great validity because then we would be able to assist the government, and assistance it needs in order to prepare the proper type of legislation. I think therefore that we can and should, and I invite the Honourable the Minister herself to support the amendment to the amendment as brought by the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party, but if they reject it, then it seems to me we ought not to encourage the government to continue in the manner it has up to now.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: I noticed the Honourable Member for St. John's is trying to out-talk the lady.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Clement, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Hillhouse, Johnston, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak and Uskiw.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Roblin, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 23; Nays, 29.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment to the amendment lost.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the main motion as amended?

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I would like to at this time just say a few remarks and they'll be very brief. I wish to thank all the honourable members who have taken part on this motion because I believe the motion is certainly timely and very important as far as the housing industry is concerned. I certainly at this time would like to say that reading the speech that was made by the Honourable Minister, she certainly did try and do some research, as I read by the Hansard, but the thing that really concerned me is the reservations that she had as far as condominiums were concerned. I've marked so many and I'm not going to point them out, but she says that a condominium is usually or mostly suitable for wealthy and rich people; and the other point here, what would happen if somebody would lose his job and unable to work and pay his rent? Well I would say it's no different than someone owning a home and not being able to pay the rent. The same problems would be in a condominium as a home because the mortgagee could foreclose on a condominium which would be no different.

Now I don't agree with the Honourable Minister that this is only suitable for wealthy people, because from the information that I have, it is today accepted in every State of the Union

(MR. PATRICK cont'd)... in the United States except one, and is a very well-accepted form of home ownership. In the first month of this year there was over 3,000 applications waiting for units to be approved by the federal housing in the States.

Now it is not completely new legislation that we don't know anything about because this was in France in the 16th century. It was introduced in Italy in 1934, in Spain in 1939, in Austria, in the Netherlands, and most of all European countries have condominium legislation, and if you go to Rio de Janeiro or Sao Paulo, Brazil, 80 percent of the commercial properties is all condominium, so this isn't something that's new and that we find anything about. And closer to home, Alberta and British Columbia have condominium legislation; Ontario introduced it at this session of the Legislature, and the Minister there said that this was their solution to the housing problems in Ontario, so they're certainly taking the condominium legislation quite seriously in Ontario. I understand Quebec is considering introducing it.

So my concern here is with some of the remarks in Hansard of what the Honourable Minister had such reservations. I'm quite concerned because I think that this legislation should be introduced as soon as possible to this House because I do think it would be good legislation, and people not only in high income but many people find it a very good form of acceptable shelter on low income brackets, and particularly old aged people as well. So I hope that we will have legislation come next session.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member from Churchill and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, my remarks shall be quite brief in supporting the resolution of my deskmate the Honourable Member from Churchill, his resolution asking us to renew the Roads to Resources program, and I could not sit back and have the NDP caucus put a sort of a socialist border around this resolution.

The Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains stated in Hansard, Page 2669, that "I have to agree with the Honourable Member from Churchill and I would like to come to his rescue." Well if you read his amendment you can see how he came to his rescue. I think he's attempting to use a socialist approach in his amendment because the first part of the amendment changes the entire meaning. Development is going on in the north as was announced the other day, "the new program which shall take place in Thompson" and what the resolution states is that development can continue in an orderly manner as it is at present and I cannot say that is being seriously delayed.

In the second amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains, he says in offering his amendment, "So I would like to come to the assistance of the Honourable Member from Churchill." Well if you read his amendment you'll see how he come to his assistance. Then the third part, the amendment, I think he just substitutes the two words 'alternative' and 'competitive'; and in the fourth proposed amendment, it opens up the resolution to what would include I think every other agency, department and Crown corporation of all governments of Canada. This is I daresay, Mr. Speaker, commendable, desirable, but not practical, because after all we are dealing with roads and transportation in this resolution. So I urge the members of the House to vote against the amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say one word. I reject completely the contribution that the honourable member who has just taken his seat has made in this debate. I think my honourable friend has completely, completely misunderstood the proposition of my colleague from Ethelbert Plains. How he can stand up and say that my colleague from Ethelbert Plains is incorrect in saying that the development of northern Manitoba is not seriously delayed as a result of present government activity both in the provincial and federal fields is beyond my comprehension. Now I appreciate like my honourable friend, the member who has just spoken, that we're at the termination of a session, but I say to my friend, when we come back, when we come back to consider the affairs of Manitoba in a few months I want him to look at the propositions of the government of which he is a supporter and seriously consider the same. I want him to realize that insofar as the highway system is concerned and the transportation that it's not a question of creating competitive programs but alternative.

My honourable friend is so indoctrinated with what he considers is the proper approach in the so-called free enterprise system that he allows his eyes to be clouded with phraseology rather than reality and, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that my honourable friend has not given the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)... consideration to the amendment proposed by my colleague from Ethelbert Plains but rather that he has, the member who has just spoken, adhered to hackneyed phrases of proponents of the so-called free enterprise system who know not where they are going and who from time to time place roadblocks in the progress not only of Manitoba but of the economy of Canada as well.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I can't let him get away with that, Mr. Speaker, not even in the dying moments. If private enterprise doesn't know where they're going I'm sure the Leader of the New Democratic Party is close behind because he has shown he doesn't know where he is going either. If you're talking about alternative and competitive I think you're splitting hairs pretty close but certainly what we require up there is competitive transportation routes so that there is competition, and whether you wish to support the Canadian National Railway, it's up to you, but I think that they've proven that they've got to have competition if we're going to get southern rates. That's certainly proven in Thompson itself. This is competitive types of competition to bring competitive rates.

I think that when the Member for Ethelbert got up he said, "I can now support him," or "I will support him because private enterprise has not undertaken to build roads." Certainly we do not want private enterprise to own roads, to have toll roads. They support it through tax. So I would join the Honourable Member for Roblin in voting down the amendment and would hope that those across the House will support the original hope that we will get roads to resources programming as we have had in the past and get along with the orderly development of northern Manitoba as we have seen it in the past and we visualize it in the future.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays if you don't mind, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

For the benefit of the honourable members that might not have been in the House during recent debate we are voting on the amendment of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains to the motion of the Honourable Member for Churchill on Page 5.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Cherniack, Doern, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Kawchuk, Miller, Paulley, Petursson and Uskiw.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Clement, Cowan, Craik, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Einarson, Enns, Froese, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Molgat, Patrick, Roblin, Shewman, Shoemaker, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Tanchak, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 10; Nays 42.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost. Are you ready for the question on the main motion?

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Provincial Treasurer. Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Churchill and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate for the Honourable Member for Churchill who at that time was momentarily out of the House.

MR. BEARD: I'll be very short I promise you, Mr. Speaker. It appears again that we're trying to bring in an amendment as the Honourable Member for Roblin referred to as a 'socialist border'. I'm afraid the Honourable Member for Ethelbert takes great glee in pointing out that capitalist money has again failed and private enterprise is going down the drain and we must rush to assist it. I would point out to him though that he has lost the real concept of CBC at the time that it was initially conceived because if the Honourable Member for Ethelbert recalls, he will remember that CBC was brought into effect to support the small areas of Canada and to gather together to bring unity and to bring a service to areas that would otherwise be without. And this is what is happening --(Interjection)--Yes. And this is what is happening in Churchill today and this is what's happened before.

Does the Honourable Member for Ethelbert remember that -- that's for his information --radio is under management of CBC up there? The CBC do control radio; they have controlled it for many years. Before that the army had it. It was not large enough for free enterprise to

(MR. BEARD cont'd)... look into at that time and we are asking that CBC continue on in this way with television for the Port of Churchill, which it has undertaken to do, with other areas of northern Canada. So if the Honourable Member for Ethelbert will follow through he will see where this blends in with what has been done or is being done with the rest of northern Canada; and if he happened to notice in the paper, I believe it was either yesterday or today, he will find that it has already been approved at Lynn Lake - "CBC for Lynn Lake." So he can see that this is what we're trying to bring about that CBC will look after the facilities of Churchill, bring to them TV assistance, and assistance to bring the modern amenities up to a standard which would be enjoyed in other areas of northern Manitoba and northern Canada in effect. So we're really not asking for any more than what is being given to the other areas, and I can't see the point of an amendment which would over-ride what has already been proposed. And with these few points I'll sit down.

MR. PAULLEY: I just want to make one comment to my honourable friend. A resolution has just been defeated which in the opinion of my honourable friend established a socialistic concept against that of free enterprise. My honourable friend the Member for Churchill was joined with the Member for Roblin in opposition to the principle of public ownership.

Actually the amendment of my honourable friend the Member for Ethelbert Plains was drawing to the attention of the Honourable Member for Churchill, that only under public ownership has the community of Churchill been enabled to have some television services, because in the opinion of my honourable friend the Member for Churchill, by his resolution, pinpoints the fact that whereas private enterprise and community fund raising organizations have found it impossible to provide a stable basis on which television can be successfully promoted at Churchill. Now can you have it both ways, Mr. Speaker, I ask my honourable friend the Member for Churchill. He says that private enterprise has failed and failed dismally, and I agree with him; the purport of the amendment of my honourable friend is a tribute to public enterprise particularly in the field of television and telecommunications, and I would suggest to my honourable friend that if it was not for the Manitoba Telephone System under the leadership of his colleague, the Minister of Public Utilities, that they may not even be provided with telephone communication operated as a public and not a private enterprise, and that is the significance of the amendment proposed by my colleague from Ethelbert Plains. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if my honourable friend as the representative for Churchill wants to oppose the hand of thankfulness to the publicly operated TV organization at Churchill, then the alternative would be to go back to private enterprise which has failed and failed dismally to provide the services that he wants for his community.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think we should have a vote in support of public enterprise.

MR. SPEAKER: That will make me feel better too. Call in the members please.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. For the benefit of the honourable members that may have been out of the House at the time, we are voting on the amendment of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains to the resolution of the Honourable Member for Churchill on Page 6.

A STANDING VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Cherniack, Doern, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Kawchuk, Miller, Paulley, Petursson, and Uskiw.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Clement, Cowan, Craik, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Einarson, Enns, Froese, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Molgat, Patrick, Roblin, Shewman, Shoemaker, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Tanchak, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 10; Nays, 42.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the main motion?

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable Provincial Treasurer. Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

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

MR. LYON: ... proceed on a point of business of the House I believe that there is a disposition on the part of most of the members to consider sitting through the dinner hour and

(MR. LYON cont'd)... trying to clean up our Order Paper, and in order to accommodate the Honourable Member from Selkirk who has another engagement, a request has been made that he might be allowed to bring on his resolution which appears on Page 9 standing in his name and if there is agreement I would certainly suggest we do that to accommodate the honourable member and to permit us, if that suggestion is agreeable, to carry on and finish up our order paper.

MR. MOLGAT: I was just going to say that this would suit us. We would ask for one more matter in that case, whether it would be acceptable to the House that other members of our group move the last resolution which is also in his name - simply another member of the House would move it for him.

MR. LYON: ...the Minus One resolution ...?

MR. PAULLEY: The one dealing with the Minus One, is that the one Mr. Molgat that you refer to?

MR. MOLGAT: I will move that one for him.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that as far as we are concerned that we would agree with that, on the understanding of course that -- and I'm not making this a condition -- that we would have agreement to proceed in the House until the termination of all of the business on the Order Paper. I am sure that my colleagues would agree with the accommodation of the Honourable Member for Selkirk, but if there is any disposition of stopping at 5:30 that would present a different problem. But if the understanding is that my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk introduces his resolution and then we attempt to carry through without the observance of the 5:30 rule, we are perfectly ready and willing that this be done.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I would like to thank the members for the consideration they have shown me, Mr. Speaker. I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, WHEREAS the perpetuation of a democratic system of government is largely dependent upon a free and open discussion and debate on all matters within the jurisdiction of any such government; and

WHEREAS there is a tendency on the part of all governments to delegate to the Executive Branch thereof matters that properly should remain with and be decided by the Legislative Branch thereof; and

WHEREAS Section 4 of The Executive Council Act provides: The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may fix the salary, allowance, fees or remuneration of the Ministers; and

WHEREAS in the interest of democracy it is the considered opinion of this Legislature that said Section 4 be repealed;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba give immediate consideration to the advisability of repealing said Section 4 and substituting therefor the following:

4. The salary, allowances, fees or remuneration of the Ministers shall be such as are provided in the estimates.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I'll be as brief as possible. This resolution was prompted by the recent action of the government in increasing the salaries, allowances and expenses of its ministers by an executive act - namely by an Order-in-Council. Now we never challenged at any time the legality of such an Order-in-Council, but we did challenge the propriety of it and this resolution is simply to place the fixing of the salaries, allowances, fees or remunerations of the Ministers of the Crown under the same provision as a member's indemnity, a speaker's allowance or a Leader of the Opposition's under the Legislative Assembly Act.

Now it's perfectly true that the First Minister mentioned the fact that this House did have to approve the appropriations, that is quite true, but we did not at the last session approve any increase in the indemnities, allowances or expenses of the Ministers. That was done by an executive act and when this House met that was a fait accompli and we had no say in it. It's perfectly true that we have voted this year the allowances and the expenses of the members of the Executive Council but there's nothing, unless this amendment is put through, to preclude the government from increasing these allowances by Order-in-Council immediately upon the prorogation of this House, and that is the only reason why this amendment or resolution has been suggested. It is to place within the jurisdiction of this House all matters respecting moneys so that nothing can be done without the approval of this House. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is the essence of democracy and that this resolution should be adopted.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to give support to the resolution of my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk.

MR. SPEAKER: ...the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party. It is now 5:30; I wondered if he wished to continue when we come back again.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I believe there is agreement on all sides of the House that we will carry on past 5:30 and try to complete the Order Paper without the usual adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER: I regret I interrupted the honourable member.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I have to leave now and I hope that members of the House will excuse me but I thank them for the consideration...

MR. PAULLEY: I'll only be a few minutes if you want to wait. Mr. Speaker, I've already indicated as far as the New Democratic Party is concerned we're prepared to continue the business of the House till its conclusion. I do want to say to my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk that we support his resolution and believe that it is based on a firm proposition. We protested, as I indicated the other day, the methodology which was used in arriving at the increased salaries for Cabinet Ministers and I want to thank my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk despite the differences of opinion that the two of us may have had insofar as debates in this House on this matter may be concerned that I agree with the principle that he's enunciating in his resolution here this afternoon. I'm sure that the Honourable Member for Selkirk will appreciate, as I do, that in debate sometimes because of the fact that we're of opposite opinions as to methodology and what we're desiring to accomplish, that there gives rise sometimes to a little heat and a little basis for misunderstanding as to what we basically mean insofar as our verbiage is concerned. However, Mr. Speaker, I, too, do not wish to delay the proceedings in the House. I accept the sincerity with which the resolution is presented by the Honourable Member for Selkirk. I think that it would be well for the government to agree to this resolution.

I'm not sure that I would agree with the basic premise of the Honourable Member for Selkirk that after we get out of here, if we indeed do get out tonight, that the Cabinet or the government will increase their salaries once again. Heavens to Betsy I think that they have learned their lesson now and I'm prepared on behalf of the group that I have the honour to lead to agree to the resolution of my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk and as he is leaving now I extend to him the spirit of co-operation for the future.

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

MR. MOLGAT: ...must be a misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker. Ayes and Nays.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Clement, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Johnston, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak and Uskiw.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Roblin, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 23; Nays, 29.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. ROBLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to consult the House about our timetable because His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor is not within easy reach. I have to give him reasonable notice to attend to the matter of Royal Assent and prorogation. I wondered in view of the fact there are quite a number of resolutions which have not even been moved yet, whether the movers felt they would like to move them or whether there's any that might be dropped. If I could have some advice from the members of the Chamber on that point I would then know probably a little better what to say to His Honour with respect to the time of his arrival here.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I intend to drop my resolution on encouraging the Federal Government to - Page 10 at the bottom - which asks that the Provincial Assembly ask the Federal House to permit members of the legislature to run for the House of Commons without resigning. In view of less than enthusiastic support and in view of the speed-up I intend to drop that.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, it was my intention to move the resolutions in my name. There will not be lengthy speeches as far as I am concerned, but I would like to have them moved and an expression of the House opinion on them; but my comments will be brief.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated to the House Leader that I would move my resolution and not speak on it, just move it.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I have a resolution, I believe it's on Page 8, to do with housing. I would be prepared to withdraw it and any comments I have could be made next year on the performance of my honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs on housing. But I would like to reserve the right to speak on the detention bill for juveniles because I have something to say about the Portage Home for Boys that has been mentioned in an unsubstantiated letter that was tabled last night.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, ... introduce a number of amendments to the resolutions that are standing on the Order Paper, but it is now the intention of the caucus of the New Democratic Party to forego the time honoured custom of bringing into proper perspective resolutions that are introduced by others and it will be our intention not to introduce amendments to the resolutions.

MR. ROBLIN: I couldn't persuade the Honourable Member for Elmwood to drop his resolution on the Arts Council if I told him that there is an Act on the statute books about an Art Council but it is not yet proclaimed? So we wouldn't have any trouble in supporting your resolution but it is a work of super arrogation as the theologians say, and perhaps you might be willing to drop it.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, That's the very reason why I brought in that resolution.

MR. ROBLIN: Well from what I've heard I think perhaps I might suggest to His Honour - 6:30. Perhaps, I'll try 6:30 and hope for the co-operation of the House in not keeping him too long. So thank you very much, Mr. Speaker; I appreciate the information I've received.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it we go to Page 6. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Hamiota, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party in amendment thereto. The Honourable the Member for Hamiota. --(Interjection)--The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. D. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, ... concerned about this matter. I would like to convey my appreciation to the Honourable Member for Hamiota for so effectively outlining the problems facing the community of Rivers and many of the other outlying communities in the area. The Honourable Member from Brandon brought the importance of this issue before the Legislature and in a very effective manner. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party has brought in an amendment which I feel unhappy about. I believe in looking ahead but I don't believe in crossing the bridge before we come to it. We, the people in this area, feel the port should exist as is, and I find it hard to accept any other decision because this was one of the first tri-service bases in Canada. I feel the facilities must be retained; first, because the very existence of the community of Rivers depends upon them; and second, they have contributed so much to the over-all economic good of the province. I think it's very easy to take an industry, if you could call it an industry, out of, say, the area of Winnipeg and nobody would miss it, but take this out of that area and it's felt all across the western side of the province.

The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party mentioned the abandonment and final dismantling of the Cordite Plant near his City of Transcona shortly after the war, and I as an ex-serviceman have seen destruction caused by war but somehow the impact of seeing a building lying in ruins does not hold the same value as seeing supposedly sensible people - those in government - order perfectly serviceable buildings to be torn down or closed up. A destruction order is given and there is some indication it might, perhaps not this year but probably in the near future. I feel Ottawa is shirking its responsibility in not coming up with a more positive statement.

In the case of Rivers, Mr. Speaker, we see by reports there is some assurance the base will not close this year, but there has been no assurance or thought given for the retention of the base in the years ahead. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this House should press for a thorough study to be undertaken by the Federal Government - yes, another Royal Commission, if you like - to look into the situation, not only for Rivers but at communities where other federally-owned bases are located, those that are threatened with having their economy disrupted because of federal action. They deserve compensation in one form or another in contemplated areas

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd)... such as the base at Rivers, and I hear many rumours that if it's closed it goes down East to eastern, out of Montreal, St. Hubert is the one mentioned, and it seems rather ridiculous to move equipment and men from -- where the land value of Rivers is not nearly as high as the very expensive land in the St. Hubert area.

I would suggest that the urgency of this matter is so great that if the Federal Government refuses to undertake such a study, then this government should carry it out and then hand Ottawa the bill. It seems ridiculous that we should permit ourselves to be led down the garden path by Ottawa, permit that level of government to make installations upon which a community depends and on which the economy depends, and then quietly accept upon short notice a decision to close, and I think since I became a member here in 1963 I have commuted out of Rivers during the winter every week and during all the year at least every other week, and I've many times got on the train and sat down with many of the officers from Rivers, and I feel that this is a military decision rather than an economic or any other approach, and I think if we look at our today's paper we'd see countries that have been forced to be taken over by military rule, and I don't want this step to enter into our political picture.

I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to bring in another amendment to the main motion. I do urge however, Mr. Speaker, that when a submission is made to Ottawa on this matter, the immediate need for a thorough study not only of the situation in Rivers but in every district in Canada where communities may be affected by the closing of government installations, and if then I think, if this decision does come in a positive manner, then we can look to the suggested amendment by the NDP, but I'm one who wouldn't suggest that amendment at least until that decision has been reached. Thank you.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm frankly astonished to hear the member who last spoke state quite frankly and without equivocation, and without attempting to rationalize in any way, that he is prepared to have that military installation stay there for no other reason than that the economy depends on the continuing existence of that military installation. Now it's always been the case, Mr. Speaker, that those people who have argued for the retention of military installations and the production of munitions and other weapons of war, it's always been their rationalization that these installations, these systems for production are required for the sustaining of their nation or their power block or what have you, and that particular contention, Mr. Chairman, has sometimes in my opinion been shown to be nothing but a rationalization. Indeed there is something to be said for keeping a military base in existence if it's needed for defence purposes, but what the member who has just spoken has said is that the installation must be kept regardless of whether it's necessary for defence or not. What the Leader of our Party has proposed is that indeed the economy of Rivers is one that can be sustained, that there is a way of decentralizing economic units in our society, that if the government will put its mind to it it can do these things and that it can do them for peaceful purposes, and that if a particular base is no longer necessary as a military installation, that the government should make every effort to see to it that it is converted for peaceful purposes. But the member who has just spoken is not satisfied with that. He says that even if it's not needed for peaceful services it should be maintained as a military installation for the sake of it being there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as a young child I remember seeing movies about wars that were initiated for the purpose - or not initiated, kept going, or attempts not made to stop them - for the purpose of serving the munitions industry. Indeed, one of the first recommendations made on people who are in favour of public ownership is that public ownership should apply to the munitions industry so that there would be no vested interest in the continuance of that industry, that it would be only kept for the purpose of keeping peace and for defence. I think that even some of the early westerns indicated that certain rifle manufacturers kept the Indian wars in existence because it served their industries, and we're hearing the same kind of callous and inhuman type of rationalization or suggestions by the member who has just spoken. The proposal that is made by the Leader of the New Democratic Party is indeed that these installations be used, that the government make every possible attempt to utilize them for peaceful purposes, that there is room for decentralization of industry, for decentralization of various peaceful installations for use in our society, and that where we have one and a community depends on it, that it should continue in existence, but we can't adopt the contention, Mr. Speaker, that regardless of whether it's needed for these purposes or not it must be kept in existence for the economy, and we consider that to be a proposal which is unacceptable and we would ask the members of the House not to accept it and to vote for the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is the amendment of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the amendment lost.

MR. CHERNIACK: Ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Cherniack, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Kawchuk, Miller, Paulley, Petursson, and Uskiw.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Clement, Cowan, Craik, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Einarson, Enns, Guttormson, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Molgat, Patrick, Roblin, Shoemaker, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Tanchak, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 10; Nays, 40.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable Member the Provincial Treasurer, and if I had voted I would have voted for the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the main motion?

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, I know that we are pressed for time but I do think it necessary that on a very important matter like this I say a few more words. First of all, I do want to thank the Members from Brandon, Churchill and Virden who supported this resolution, because they thought it was a necessary one and because they believed in what had been presented. I want to say that at the opening of my remarks the first time I proposed this resolution, I was very, very careful to say that the people in my area believed in integration, and if an air base or army base had to be closed to save money, they certainly went along with this, but in this particular case it was not so; it was not to save money. The things that were at the base at Rivers were to be built and duplicated in another area of Canada which was down East, and this was and is our quarrel.

I was very, very disappointed that this resolution did not go through without any amendment, but of course when one thinks the thing over it's very easy to understand. There were four people who spoke for the amendment, there was one person who proposed the amendment, and I might say that at first I was disappointed but after thinking the situation over I realized that this was the party of the doubt. This is the party that doesn't believe we should have any armed forces. This is the party that believes some other country should defend us. Had the Leader of the NDP, the Member for Radisson, taken the time to read my remarks in Hansard, he would have noticed that I had mentioned that we did not quarrel with integration and that we did not quarrel with saving tax dollars; I simply mentioned that the facilities were going to be duplicated. But I get the impression that the Leader of the NDP cares very little about the rural areas, and as far as he is concerned the Armed Forces can be abolished.

Then we had the Member from St. John's, who stood up after the Member from Churchill, made a few remarks in support of this resolution, but the Member for St. John's in his sanctimonious attitude, his holier-than-thou attitude, had to stand up and twist and distort the facts that the Member from Churchill ... The Member from Churchill knows and understands the problem ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. I wonder if the honourable gentleman would kindly moderate his remarks a little.

MR. DAWSON: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. The Member from Churchill understands the problem that we are faced with in that area, and I am sure that he concedes that the base should remain open, not because we are trying to keep a little industry in our area, because we believe that this is the proper thing to do. We believe that the West should have an opportunity to receive some of the defence contracts and have some of the armed forces bases.

A few people are interrupting me with your caucus there; I can't concentrate. And I notice the Member from Burrows; he was one that I thought had a little better approach to the problem. He at least suggested we might put a school in there, but it is a little ridiculous to put a school in an army base that has had a payroll of \$9 1/2 million. We would probably have to have, I don't know, up to how many thousands of students in there and be paying them a wage to ever duplicate that \$9 1/2 million payroll that would be in there. And then you, my friend from Inkster; I thought that you were the bright light in that party and knew what was going on, but I was very disappointed in your remarks up-to-date too.

(Mr. DAWSON cont'd).....

Now I want to read something that the people of the area of Rivers first proposed. Actually this is a brief from the Chamber of Commerce, and in their very first remarks - and I want to read them into the record, it says: "The Chamber of Commerce would like to inform the Minister of National Defence that we are not representing a body opposed to integration, and also we too are anxious to economize for the welfare of Canadians as a whole. Our previous briefs presented to the Minister and Deputy Minister Cadieux, have dealt extensively with the advantages of the military base at Rivers." Then it goes on to say - I'm missing parts of it: "We are representing a body of people who would like to point out the economical advantages of maintaining the Rivers Base." And then it goes on to say, "There are 405 homes at the base as well as living accommodation for many service men within the town of Rivers. The movement of men and their families to other locations also necessitates additional housing elsewhere, as well as facilities which already exist at the base here. We feel that from an economical standpoint retention of the base would be a great saving." And I could go on and on and on. I have an Ottawa Hansard here where the Honourable Member from Brandon on the federal scene goes on to mention many of the things that I have mentioned here, and he is in favour of the retention of that base, not because he feels we are going to subsidize the area, because he believes that that base is a necessary thing for the defence of Canada.

And then we go on. Here is a magazine - it's entitled "The Sentinel". It's the new integrated magazine; Army, Navy, Air Force are all in the one magazine. One of the articles I have here is "They go to school in whirlybirds." This article was written in March and the person who wrote it is someone from the Armed Forces, and he goes on to illustrate the wonderful advantages of the Rivers area and the Rivers base for training helicopter pilots. He goes on to say, not only is there lots of air space there, but there is lots of land to land on. He goes on to say in this particular article that this is the thing that we are short of down east, is air space, and we have plenty of it, particularly down in that front row. (I'll be through in a moment.) He also mentions in here that for the pilots to land these helicopters in the various farm yards, that the farmers in the area of Rivers and Minnedosa and all through there, do not charge the Federal Government anything, but they do down east; and this we feel is another advantage. And I could go on and on and on with the advantages that are down there.

--(Interjection)-- Beg your pardon? No, I have no problem. I have lots but I am sure the Honourable First Minister knows the problems we face. He has taken an interest in it as has the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and I was pleased to see the Minister of Industry & Commerce have a short talk with me today in regard to the base, and they realize the problem and I'm sure that they will be supporting this resolution, as everyone should, and let's see what we can do towards giving the people in the Rivers area some satisfaction and some reassurance that the base will be retained in that particular area. Thank you.

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

MR. DAWSON: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

A MEMBER: Well no one is disputing that.....

MR. ROBLIN: ...members who really want to vote on this thing.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs: Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Clement, Cowan, Craik, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Einarson, Enns, Froese, Guttormson, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Molgat, Patrick, Roblin, Shoemaker, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Tanchak, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Cherniack, Doern, Fox, Green, Kawchuk, Miller, Paulley, Petursson and Uskiw.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 41; Nays, 9.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, again I get up to say I would have voted against the resolution, only I was paired with the Provincial Treasurer, Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Selkirk. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: On this matter, I rise to say that I certainly am prepared to support this resolution, if we can read the remarks of the Honourable Member in introducing it, as I think we can. The only words that concern me in the resolution are the final ones in the final paragraph, where he talks about "with one Canadian domicile", and if he meant that to be an unrestricted Canadian domicile, then I would have to object to it, but by referring back to his speech of April 18th when he introduced the resolution, I read these words with which I certainly agree, that "the sound and humane policy would seem to be to give this jurisdiction where the husband is domiciled anywhere in Canada and neither party is bona fide resident in the province where the action is brought," and so as not to prolong the debate, I merely say that, because there would be many disadvantages to one unrestricted Canadian domicile. It could become an instrument of abuse by one spouse against another and it is not a concept that I think that honourable members of the House would wish to support if they were fully apprised of all of the disadvantages. But as I say by looking at the remarks of the Honourable Member from Selkirk I believe that he does not mean an unrestricted Canadian domicile; I believe that he means there should be some qualifications to establish domicile and therefore we find ourselves in agreement, we find ourselves in agreement with the general purport of his resolution and I, for one, am prepared to support it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Emerson. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: We endorse this resolution; we hope it will pass the House because we feel with the expenditures being made in education today with one-third of the \$350 million being expended in education it is high time that a standing committee on education be set up in this House, a committee that can study matters not only during the time the session is on but in between sessions and so I think by doing that can become more knowledgeable in educational matters and probably and possibly could even eliminate some of the unnecessary debate that sometimes comes on simply because members aren't entirely aware of what the problems are. A committee of this type I think could go a long way to keeping members informed and as I say might even help in reducing some of the debate that we hear in this House. I trust that this resolution will be acceptable to the government and it will pass.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. --(Interjection)-- I would advise the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that there are several members of the House.

MR. MOLGAT: All right, then ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order please.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Clement, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Johnston, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak and Uskiw.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Roblin, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Masniuk, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 21, Nays, 29.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, I would have voted for the motion but being paired with the Provincial Treasurer ...

MR. ROBLIN: ... members would not take it amiss if I were to suggest that we all remain in remain in our seats for the next little while so that if we have further votes they may be conducted as expeditiously as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: ... withdraw my resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Hamiota. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I had earlier on planned to introduce an amendment to this particular resolution but it was the agreement among us, our group, that no amendments would be introduced. There are members --(Interjection)-- I'm just going to say that. Certain members are withdrawing their resolutions and it was agreed among us that no amendments would be introduced. The amendment had to do with things additional, that is to curling or hockey because it was --(Interjection)-- Yes, you made the speech for me and I can ... there are other activities besides curling and hockey that can be carried out in rural parts as in the city, there are cultural, recreational community activities that include drama, handicrafts and other activities. These would have been included in the amendment but having undertaken to withdraw the amendment I do not introduce them and leave the motion as it stands and to the original mover.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: ... ask a question of my honourable friend, the Member for Wellington. Do you mean, Sir, that you will leave the resolution as unintelligent as it is at the present time?

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, isn't it usual that an unintelligent question comes from an unintelligent person?

MR. PAULLEY: That's right.

MR. SPEAKER: I am very pleased with the mood of the House but I would ask you to give your attention to the Chair until we complete the business and let us ... There's a long night ahead.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the resolution lost.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Selkirk. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. MOLGAT: That one's last Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh yes, I beg your pardon. The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: ... Honourable Member for St. George. Now, Mr. Speaker, if it were agreeable to the House I could forego the reading of this provided that it will appear in Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George WHEREAS in 1961, the Attorney-General, the Hon. Mr. LYON, stated that "plans are afoot to replace the primitive detention facilities with more decent living accommodation"; and

WHEREAS, 1965, the then Attorney-General, the Hon. Mr. McLEAN, is reported in Hansard as saying:

"the Juvenile Detention Centre will follow as project number two and it will follow shortly and indeed we are already laying our plans with regard to, that is making our arrangements, in order to complete our arrangements, in order to complete our plans for the construction of that building"; and WHEREAS on April 1, 1965, Mr. McLEAN stated again that there would be no delay in proceeding with the Juvenile Detention Centre; and WHEREAS in February, 1967, the original "primitive detention facilities" are still in use; and WHEREAS there is urgent need for proper juvenile detention facilities providing sufficient space for segregation and training;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Government of Manitoba to give consideration to the advisability of proceeding immediately with the development of a proper juvenile detention centre; AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House request the Government of Manitoba to negotiate with the Government of Canada to take over that part of Fort Osborne Barracks which has been declared surplus, for possible use as a Juvenile Detention Centre and other provincial government services.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, this subject came up for discussion last night and while it had been my original intention to speak at some length on it I will moderate my comments today. The comments that were made in the House last night by my colleague, the Member for St. Boniface constituency and by myself dealt with the Vaughan Street Detention Home. I understand that there has been a fair amount of newspaper publicity regarding the school for boys in Portage. I want to make it very clear that my comments and any of the comments that I heard in the House dealt with the Vaughan Street Home and my resolution here deals with the Vaughan Street Detention Home. The basis of my resolution, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that I believe the government has been very delinquent in moving on this important problem. Back in 1961, Mr. Speaker, the then Attorney-General who left the post for a while and then returned to be Attorney-General now was quoted in the newspapers on the 6th of July, and this

(Mr. MOLGAT cont'd).... is the Winnipeg Free Press. The headline is, "New Detention Home Mooted." "Attorney-General Sterling Lyon is planning to place a trained social worker in the Vaughan Street Detention Home and plans are afoot to replace the primitive detention facilities with more decent living accommodation." It goes on, "At present the detention home where children may spend as much as three months awaiting trial or placement has absolutely no recreation facilities, no provision for outdoor exercise of any kind, no trained staff members."

Well in fairness I must say that there has been some steps taken insofar as staff, Mr. Speaker; but there has been nothing done insofar as the facilities themselves. And as my resolution points out this goes back to 1961. In 1965 the then Attorney-General, now Provincial Secretary, made a statement clearly in the House indicating there would be no delay, that this would be proceeding there and then, that he in fact had people making plans at that time for the building, and still nothing has been done, Mr. Speaker.

Last night the Attorney-General told us that there was an explanation for this. The money had gone to fight the flood last year. Well, Mr. Speaker, if last year the money had to go and fight the flood, that was 1966. Well what happened in 1961 when the Attorney-General said he was going to do something - and in 1962 and 63 and 64 and 65? There weren't floods in all of those years but there was no building built. So for the Minister to say that priorities are priorities you know and it just couldn't be done just doesn't stand up when he was prepared to admit back in those days. He had plenty of advice from other people as well, Mr. Speaker. There was for example the brief to the Community Welfare Planning Council, the Committee on Services for Juvenile Adult Offenders. This was prepared by the John Howard-Elizabeth Fry Society. We received it in March of 1962. What did they say speaking about the Vaughan Street Home, going through, detailing what the appearances of the building were and they finished off this way on Page 29 and I quote: "We suggest that such an institution has no place in a civilized Canadian community in the latter half of the twentieth century and that it should be replaced immediately with a building adequately designed and constructed for its purpose." Back in 1962, Mr. Speaker. So the government admitted back in '61 that something needed to be done; they had statements from outside sources that something needed to be done and they have done nothing, Mr. Speaker.

I only regret that it is so late in the session that I cannot go into more details on this matter because I consider it to be a most important one. We are dealing here with the youngsters. This is the time to prevent crime. This is the time to do the proper things that need to be done in segregation, in retraining and in everything that can help to prevent these people from becoming hardened criminals and it's just not being done, Mr. Speaker, and it's not the fault of the staff because they have no facilities to do it. And when you look at the length of time that some of the youngsters have stayed in there, here's a record on April 5th: One boy 14 years of age had been in that detention home for 58 days. Another one 15 years of age - 44 days; 16 years of age - 42 days; 16 years of age - 30 days; 16 years of age - 33 days. When you look at the type of offences for which they've been -- or at least admitted for, ranging from as far as rape to theft, to assault. And they're all there together Mr. Speaker, with no segregation and no possibility of segregation -- I demand that something be done at once. There simply cannot be a situation where you say - "there are other priorities and we had to spend the money elsewhere," when you've had since 1961 to do it.

So, Mr. Speaker, we recommend in this resolution that there be a positive step taken because the Federal Government have indicated that they are going to release a portion of Fort Osborne Barracks as surplus to their requirements. I recognize that they are not the most modern facilities; on the other hand I think it's fair to say the armed forces have kept their quarters usually in good condition. I happen to know Fort Osborne Barracks well and those buildings are in good condition; they're not new buildings but they are in good condition and there are a lot of buildings there. There's plenty of space; there's a drill hall with good facilities; there's a hospital; there are plenty of buildings that could be used for proper segregation, for classrooms, for everything else. In fact there are more buildings there than we can use for purely a detention centre; there would be many other facilities that could be put in there by the Provincial Government. So I urge the government, Mr. Speaker, to delay no longer, to move now, to take care of this urgent problem that they admit themselves, to waste not another day because every day wasted can mean another child lost. Another youngster who could have been rehabilitated and who begins a life of crime.

So I hope that there will be unanimous approval for this resolution.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with what my Leader was saying about the conditions at the Vaughan Street Detention Home and while I have not been there myself I've heard from other honourable members here in this House and we've also read the statement, or the letter that was made by the Superintendent over there.

But, Mr. Speaker, something happened last night in the course of the debate that rather disturbed me and I felt that I should say a few words to perhaps try and correct some impressions that may have been left with the general public. And that is about the - one of the letters that was tabled last night was from a boy who had been in the Portage School for Boys and I would just like to quote from the front page of today's Tribune, and it says that "letters claiming brutality and sexual deviation in the Vaughan Street Home and the Manitoba Home for Boys, Portage la Prairie were written by two inmates age 16 and 18. Both youths claimed they were subjected to continual homosexual harassment from other inmates and were often beaten. A former inmate of the Portage Home told of running away to escape the conditions and being captured by a supervisor" and this is a quotation, "who grabbed me and beat me up and hit me in the stomach and in the head. Then I was given the strap and thrown in the hole for three nights." He ended his letter by appealing that something be done in the name of humanity.

Now Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to comment any further on that. The Attorney-General has stated that he has handed over the three letters for investigation. I'd like to remind honourable members that in 1961 a similar charge was made at the same school, namely the Portage School for Boys by a former inmate. The RCMP investigated and the Boys Home staff were completely exonerated of the charges that had been made at that time. I would like to enumerate for the honourable members the record of the boy who wrote this letter. He is 17 years old; he was brought to the boys home on June 5th, 1966. On June 9th he attempted to escape and he was apprehended on the grounds by a member of the staff and for this he received the strap. Now let not honourable members immediately jump and say that this is brutality and what not; this would be applied in the same manner that a father would punish his own son and certainly there was no causes of brutality I'm assured by the Superintendent. He was moved to another cottage on July 17th after he had complained of homosexuality. The boy had not mentioned it more than the once but however he was moved; he was moved from a group of boys that were 15 to 16 years of age and he was 17. He was moved into a cottage that contained a group of boys of 14 and 15 years of age. I might also say that the boys at this home are segregated as to age and maturity. On February 22nd of this year after requests by the boy himself he was sent to the Carberry work camp. On March 14th of this year, he ran away and stole a car. He proceeded to Ninga, Manitoba and broke into two buildings and he was here picked up by the RCMP.

On March 15th he was returned to the Boys School at Portage by a probation officer and as the car was entering the grounds the boy broke from the car and escaped again. He was picked up on March 19th at Steinbach and returned to Portage. At Steinbach he had broken into a home. He appeared before Magistrate McDonald on April 12th in Portage la Prairie and on the recommendation of the Superintendent of the boys school, Mr. Bruce Jones, was given a further six weeks of retention in the school which brought him to the age of 18. The recommendation was that he be kept until he was 18 years old, which added six more weeks to his time. He was then returned to the boys school and put into upgrading school for half a day which was conducted at the school and he worked for a half a day. This continued until April 16th when at 11:40 at night he broke out again with another boy and broke into the United Church in Portage la Prairie. On May 17th made a number of phone calls to his mother and his friend made a phone call to friends in Brandon. He then stole a car and was picked up in Kenora on April 20th. He was apprehended on April 20th and he is presently there awaiting charges of breaking and entering in Ontario. He has written a letter back to his supervisor asking for his clothes and a letter was sent back to him that his personal effects would be returned and it was pointed out that he would in all likelihood have charges facing him in Manitoba.

I'd like to make a short statement about what I know about the facilities and staff of the Boys School of Portage la Prairie. I am personally acquainted with nearly all of the 56 members on staff. I have toured the home facilities many times. I have worked on various projects with the Rotary Club who for three years had a visitation program and I myself took a boy into my home for weekends for over a year and then I took a boy for a period of about four months full time. So I have worked rather closely with the people there and I am - personally I am impressed by the dedication displayed by Mr. Bruce Jones, the Superintendent, by Mr. Pliszka the Assistant and the others on staff who have shown over the years that they have worked hard not only in the line of duty as house mothers, house fathers, teachers, farm staff, supervisors and others.

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd)....

I would like to point out also that the staff has given time and time again beyond the call of duty in organizing hobby clubs, bugle band, boy scouts, cubs, cadet corps, rifle club, sports days and in general trying to give some parental love and understanding to boys whose only crimes in many cases are to come from broken homes or neglected homes caused by the absence of one or both parents. True, there are boys who have committed serious crimes and because of age are committed to the Boys Home in Portage. One example is in a period of about a year one guard was physically beaten four times. So you can see that the staff have a continuing problem to deal with. The continuous flow of letters from former boys which come back steadily to the staff are in my opinion proof that many many boys have appreciated the love and understanding and the advice which have put them back on the path which has lead to a normal way of life in their later years.

I would end this, Mr. Speaker, by suggesting to any honourable member that may be in the vicinity or passing through Portage that he is more than welcome to call unannounced and the Superintendent will only be too happy to allow him to look or go wherever he wishes and inspect the facilities in the Portage Home.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yesterday I wanted to make a point of the existing conditions at Vaughan Street, and I want to re-emphasize this again today. Both newspapers talk about brutality; I'm certainly not claiming that they misquoted anybody. But I want to emphasize, Sir, that I was talking about mostly the crowded conditions and what it would lend to. I don't know anything about the condition at Portage; it could be better, it could be worse. We're told that it's quite a bit better. I couldn't say one way or another.

Now one of the letters that I did table was from one of the boys as you saw with a very long record and they are some with lengthy records and some that are going there for the first time and I think this is the important thing. I would emphasize that the condition here doesn't change anything from what I said - the conditions in Vaughan Street are very bad. I for one, and I know that the members of my party will keep on pressing for better conditions there.

As far as the staff - as I say Portage I don't know anything about it all - as far as the staff here I think it's a wonder as we heard from another letter that I read here in this House yesterday that they could still keep up and do such good work. So this has nothing to do with the staff. The letter that was quoted today, I certainly can't substantiate. Why I tabled these letters is some of the problems that they have - I can't say if everything that was said in this letter is true or it isn't, but I certainly would welcome an investigation. The main thing I think that we could start, we don't need that much of an investigation, what we need is for the Attorney-General and the Government to look into this immediately to start getting the proper facilities at Vaughan Street that's been promised since 1959 or so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make two very brief points on this resolution. Our party and various of my colleagues have been of course very concerned with the facilities at Vaughan Street Detention home and are urging the government to provide an adequate facility.

We think that any proposal should be looked into but we would ask the government not to take a facility merely because it's available. That if indeed the Fort Osborne Barracks can be used as a proper facility then certainly this is something that can be done. I would urge the government to think in terms of what they need and then seek the facility rather than to take a facility which is not adequate and try to make it adequate. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I think that all of the Members of the House can learn something from this resolution, because it happens to come coincidentally with another resolution which appeared on the Order Paper with regard to the Rivers Base.

Now with the Rivers Base, Mr. Speaker, apparently honourable members had decided that they must keep a military base at Rivers regardless of whether it's necessary or not. They voted against the resolution to consider how that particular base can be used for the social, economic, educational and industrial development of that centre, and it appeared that that they had adopted the fatalistic attitude that if this is not used as a military base it won't be used at all. But Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Fort Osborne Barracks we don't have that type of proposal. We don't have it suggested that we must maintain a military complex there; if we lose the soldiers let's get in a nuclear base or something else of that kind. It's recognized that a facility which was formerly used for military purposes can be used for the productive, peaceful and economic and social benefit of our community. We think that this is a good concept

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . . and we regret the fact that honourable members in the House weren't able to support it, or didn't see fit to support it in the case of Rivers, but see that there is some sense indeed when it comes to the Fort Osborne Barracks.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, just for the record. I don't know what condition these barracks are in, whether this is a good deal or not; however, I am for improving the juvenile detention care and therefore I will note for the motion, not necessarily meaning that this proposition has to be accepted.

MR. PETURSSON: . . . just a brief word. As I sit here and listen to the addresses by the honourable members, I feel as though somehow I've been here before. It's 35 years ago; exactly the same things were being said about other places of detention in Manitoba. It was at one time the Reform School on Sherbrook Street and Portage Avenue, and then some other place, and the treatment then was no worse really than it is now; that is, during that interval nothing has been done. The same words now are being spoken, the same things are being said, the same promises are being made, if they are being made, and the same suggestions for improvements are being made now as were made 35 years ago. It appears as though, when the Attorney-General as he is quoted here said that plans are afoot to replace the primitive detention facilities with more decent living accommodation, it appears that that's a long time ago since that was said, six years ago in 1961. The same things were being said by others - other Attorneys-General - that length of time ago, and no steps indicating any improvement or showing a realization of what the problem is have been effectively taken. What actually is needed is not necessarily just a new place to detain boys - juvenile law breakers. What is needed is a complete and total large department devoted solely to this particular problem if we are going to salvage the lives of potential citizens and turn them back into society as the kind of people that we want them to be. It isn't enough just to move from Vaughan Street to some other detention home; that's been done before. The move was made from the old Reform School on Sherbrook and Portage to Vaughan Street, and the same conditions continued to exist and they will persist unless something major, something drastic is done to take care of this problem, and I support the resolution as far as it goes, but it is merely a makeshift. For the time being it fills the present purpose but is no long-time solution at all.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I hope to be extremely brief on this matter by saying, first of all, that we agree with the resolution, and while I had intended to move a slight amendment to change some words, I am going to enter the caveat verbally rather than by amendment, and our vote will be subject to this caveat. Our only consideration is that the resolution advises the government to proceed immediately with it. We will proceed with it as soon as feasible; as soon as feasible. --(Interjection)-- Well that may be but it's one thing to talk about what should be done and it's another thing to have to do it, and we are in the position of having to do it and we accept the resolution, subject to that caveat, "as soon as it is feasible" it will be done, because I can stand before this House tonight and say that there is no person in this Legislature who wishes to have new facilities more than the person who is speaking to you right now, but it's a question of feasibility. I can also say to my honourable friend from Wellington that there is much in what he says. Some members may not have been listening to him, but I was, because I think we do tend to become mesmerized by physical surroundings from time to time because we can see them. What we can't see is the kind of treatment that goes on and this is the important thing, and it very often doesn't matter whether the treatment goes on in a tent or in an open field if the right understanding attitude is present on behalf of the people.

MR. PETURSSON: May I just for one sentence interrupt the Honourable Minister. Treatment begins at the moment that the culprit comes in contact with the law-enforcing authorities.

MR. LYON: I know what my honourable friend is trying to say and I agree with him, but much more could be said on the whole subject. Suffice it to say at this stage that we have already -- insofar as the second part of the resolution is concerned, no direction is necessary; the government was in touch with the Department of National Defence in January; we have had people from the Department of the Attorney-General tour the Fort Osborne Barracks already, and we are presently in negotiation with the Federal Government to see if these facilities will be available. We agree we would like to get the new facilities; we want as well to carry on with the important part of the program as well, of keeping trained people in our correctional institutions and in our probation services where they are equally as important as detention facilities. This is one aspect of the total program, an important aspect, but it is not the all-inclusive aspect that my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition would have us believe.

(MR. LYON cont'd).... Nonetheless we agree with the resolution, subject to the caveat that I have entered, and we intend to vote for it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: ... only a word. I am pleased to see the government is going to support this. The Minister says that there is nothing he would rather see. That's what he said in 1961, though. I would hope that this time it will be done. In very quick reply to the Member for Inkster regarding why Fort Osborne Barracks as against Rivers; the answer is very simple. The Canadian Forces has built a very large base in Winnipeg. The total of the training headquarters is here now - a very large expansion - but it happens to be out at the airport. These particular facilities are now surplus because they have built something else, and this is the situation. It's been an expansion, not by any means a retraction.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I would just like to take a moment in the proceedings on behalf of the honourable members just in case time runs away with us, to thank on behalf of the honourable members, the Clerk of the House and his assistant, and the pages, and all the members of the staff for an excellent job during the session.

At the same time, I would thank the honourable gentlemen for their tolerance toward me throughout the entire session.

The proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, WHEREAS United College, through its distinguished record of academic and community achievement, has demonstrated its qualifications for recognition as a university; THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government consider the advisability of establishing United College as a university.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The next resolution I believe is to be withdrawn by the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, by leave of the House, I will forego the reading of this resolution, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have leave to withdraw this? (Agreed)

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I intend to speak briefly on this. It's the second one I'm withdrawing.

MR. SPEAKER: ... the honourable member has leave to withdraw this motion.

Well, will someone please make up their mind?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to forego the reading of it but I intend to speak on it. I didn't mean to withdraw it; I just meant that I would save time by ...

MR. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member proceed without any further delay.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, the reason this resolution was brought in, is because two years ago this House actually passed an Act to establish the Manitoba Arts Council, and the Act was proclaimed and assented to on May 11, 1965, but there are no appointments have been made to it, and it is more as a reminder than anything else that I put this resolution in. I am happy that the First Minister has said that they would naturally support it but what I am attempting to do is to urge him to take some action on this matter. Arts Councils have been established in Ontario and in many centres in the United States. They are efficient means of distributing funds; they are an efficient way of handling the cultural facilities of any area. I am not going to say anything more than that. I think we need one in Manitoba. I think we now have the legislation that is clearly through to bring one in and to consolidate the various cultural facilities that we have. We have a Centennial Complex, so let's go ahead and actually appoint people and get the thing moving.

MR. ROBLIN: The development of the Cultural Centre and associate activities over the last little while has made apparent to us that the Arts Council Act as presently planned is really not the most suitable vehicle for our purpose in this connection, and in the course of the next few months we expect to be revising that Act and to bring in an amended version for implementation the next time we meet. I do not really think we will be proclaiming the Act at the present time, but rather revising it and bringing it back into the House. However, we don't oppose the principle of this thing, so we are not going to ask for a division or oppose this resolution, but I want it clearly understood that it is not likely that we will proclaim the Act but rather that we will bring in an amendment to it to make it more suitable for its purpose.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the next resolution by the Honourable Member for Elmwood has been withdrawn. The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. MOLGAT: ... Honourable the Member for Selkirk, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for St. George, the resolution appearing on Page 11 of Orders of the Day. I would suggest it is not necessary to read it, but it will appear in Hansard.

WHEREAS on April 15th, 1967 the members of this Assembly were presented with a brief on behalf of groups known as "Minus One" and "Women Alone", and

WHEREAS said brief, among other matters, made the following specific requests and recommendations in respect of The Wives and Children's Maintenance Act, namely: -

(a) that changes be made in this legislation to bring about improvements in the enforcement provisions thereof, it being suggested that a defendant (father) report at regular intervals to a probation officer or other designated person to ensure compliance with an order made against him, and that failure to report would be considered an offence under said Act;

(b) that the onus of policing the husband become the responsibility of the Crown;

(c) that a maintenance award fund be set up by the provincial government under which all payments for maintenance awarded by the court and payable to the wife would be paid into such fund by the husband and paid out to the wife;

(d) that the eligibility of a child for maintenance and support continue until such child reaches the full age of 18 years, or until such child completes a Grade 12 education, whichever event last occurs;

(e) that the wife be furnished with adequate legal counsel in any prosecution under said Act against her husband and that the Crown, where the wife is unable to bear the costs thereof, should pay all said legal costs;

(f) that in order to ensure the upgrading of a wife's economic position a completely new approach be considered in determining the basis on which maintenance awards should be made;

(g) that the Crown assume full and complete responsibility for seeking and apprehending deserting husbands and that efforts be made with other provinces and the Government of Canada to establish a central clearing house to which provincial and civic governments would send data concerning maintenance awards and particulars of the men against whom such awards were made; and

WHEREAS the aforesaid matters are of sufficient importance to demand immediate action, and

WHEREAS it is desirable that this House should now accept the principles embodied in the foregoing;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba give immediate consideration to the advisability of enacting the necessary legislation to give legal effect to the acceptance of the foregoing principles and to submit said legislation to this House at the earliest possible time.

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

MR. ROBLIN: ... member would like to make a slight amendment to this.

MRS. CAROLYNE MORRISON (Pembina): I would like to say that, like the Honourable Member for Selkirk, I was much interested in the brief which was presented on behalf of the group known as Minus One and Women Alone. I considered it a very fine brief, well presented, and it contains a number of recommendations worthy of our consideration and support.

However, I do believe their problems could best be solved by joint efforts between the provinces and the Federal Government and therefore in view of the proposed commission being established to assist the Federal Government in an effort to correct some of the inequalities existing in our legislation pertaining to the status of women, I wish to move an amendment seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre that the resolution be amended by striking out all the words after "The Government of Manitoba" and substituting the words "refer the matters to the proposed Commission of Enquiry to investigate the status of women."

MR. MOLGAT: Is it possible to get copies?

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I regret I cannot accept the amendment. This is merely a delaying action by the government referring it to someone else instead of taking action. A good number of things that are recommended here were in the brief and as the Honourable the Member for Pembina said, it was an excellent brief.

The things that they are recommending are things that are within our competence here as a province to enact and I believe the recommendations, not all of them admittedly, but a

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd).... good number of them in this particular resolution are those that the Province of Manitoba could take and should take. There's no need to refer them to a Federal Commission for further investigation so I'm not prepared to support the amendment. I think the government should act on the resolution.

MR. PAULLEY: I think it would only be proper for me, too, to make a comment insofar as this resolution is concerned. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell interjects. I don't know what he says; I don't know whether he knows what he says or not. But anyway I cannot accept the proposition, the amendment that has been proposed insofar as this resolution is concerned, because it says that the resolution be amended by striking out all the words after "The Government of Manitoba" and substituting "refer the matters to the proposed Commission of Enquiry to investigate the status of women." There are two investigations at the present time being conducted into the status of women, one at the federal level and one presumably at the provincial level.

But as I indicated in another debate today or yesterday, we're not quite sure whether or not there is going to be a commission of enquiry at the Province of Manitoba level into this matter. I suggest that this House would be well advised to adopt the resolution as originally proposed by the Member for Selkirk. On that basis a proper enquiry would be made, the necessary legislation or the production or the introduction of the necessary legislation, the onus would be insofar as the provincial aspect is concerned on this government and I join in the opposition to the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Pembina who introduced this because I think that it's further procrastination and delay in trying to remedy in the Province of Manitoba the situation in respect of a considerable number of women that every member in this House accepts and agrees upon. So I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we must reject the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Pembina.

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

MR. PAULLEY: ... provided we're recorded on this as being opposed to the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for ...

MR. ROBLIN: ... the main motion as amended, Mr. Speaker. The main motion as amended.

MR. SPEAKER: We're now dealing with the main motion as amended.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell that WHEREAS the costs of building and maintaining farm buildings in the Province of Manitoba have greatly increased in the last three years; and

WHEREAS the costs of building and maintaining dwellings in the Province of Manitoba have greatly increased in the last three years; and

WHEREAS the costs of building and maintaining buildings used for Industry in the Province of Manitoba have greatly increased for the past three years;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that we urge the Government of Canada to rescind the 12% Sales Tax on Building Supplies.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it that's the honourable gentleman's speech.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, there's been a slight oversight here apparently, because I would like to make a --(Interjection)-- Would you please keep quiet, just for a minute. I would like to move an amendment, Mr. Speaker, with the permission of my honourable member, the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The resolution be amended by adding thereto the following: That consideration be given to the advisability of removing building supplies from the list of tangible items to be taxed under Bill 56, an Act to provide for the Imposition of a Tax on Purchasers of Tangible Personal Property and Certain Services. Seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the amendment is out of order because that is a matter that has already been debated and settled at this session of the Legislature.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I thought with the good feeling that we had here today the government would realize that any tax no matter where they come from, the tax on farm machinery, buildings and so on would be quite difficult. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: I'm a little afraid the feeling is deteriorating and probably I'll add to it. I am of the opinion that during the session, particularly Department of Agriculture estimates, that this matter has been -- and others -- this matter has been dealt with and I declare it out of order.

MR. ROBLIN: ... if we may proceed now with the main motion. I just want to say very briefly that we will not support it, not because we're out of sympathy with it but because we believe that it is not appropriate that we should deal with the matter in this way. I have recently received an invitation from the Federal Minister of Finance that all the provinces and the national government should meet to deal with the Carter Commission in which the question of a sales tax, the Federal Sales Tax, is the matter at issue. I think that we cannot bind ourselves by an instruction such as this when we have to negotiate with the other governments with respect to what should be done about sales taxes in general. Therefore while I am not out of sympathy with some of the sentiments here, because nobody likes taxation whether it's federal or provincial, nevertheless it would be quite wrong I think for me to accept this resolution in view of the fact that we will be negotiating with the Federal Government very shortly on the whole subject.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I do hope when the First Minister goes to Ottawa that he can persuade the federal people not to impose a capital gains tax.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the resolution that we have before us, I'm rather intrigued by the remarks of my honourable friend, the Honourable the First Minister, in that he said that he's not going to support this resolution because of the fact that some consideration is going to be given at Ottawa to the question of the implication of a sales tax in the Dominion of Canada, and other aspects as well.

May I remind my honourable friend, the First Minister, that this is not the approach that he took to the proposition of those of us in the New Democratic Party and the imposition of a sales tax in the Province of Manitoba when we suggested that the said sales tax in Manitoba should not be imposed pending the results or the report of the Carter Commission on taxation. There was a different approach at that time. Now my honourable friend suggested to us that he cannot support the proposition introduced by the Honourable Member for Gladstone because of some conference going to take place in the future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I say as far as the members of the New Democratic Party are concerned, we are going to support the resolution, and I'm glad the Liberal Party in Manitoba find differences of opinion with the Liberal Party who happen to be in power, rather precariously, at Ottawa and we're going to ask that the sales tax on building supplies be eliminated. I know my honourable friend, the Member for Gladstone, as we in the New Democratic Party, would like to have the Government of Manitoba reconsider the five percent additional imposition of sales tax in respect of buildings in Manitoba or the products, but that has been a matter of another debate. So unlike my honourable friend, the First Minister, we are going to support this resolution and vote accordingly.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I haven't spoken on the amendment that is before us. --(Interjection)-- Pardon?

A MEMBER: It was called out of order.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Called out of order? Oh. Well then, I'll just close the debate. I can close the debate. Oh my honourable friend from Birtle-Russell says he wants to make a couple of comments.

MR. CLEMENT: Mr. Chairman, as usual I'll be most brief. It seems to me that everything in this resolution is true, the cost of farm buildings has certainly increased the last three years and it amazes me that the Leader of the present government will not support this thing. This is one that everybody agrees that we don't want, we don't need. I understand the Honourable Member from Lansdowne-Souris, who somehow seems to have disappeared, has had this resolution on the paper other years. I believe the government supported it other years and honestly and I don't like to do this but I challenge any member of the government side and the back bench to stand up and vote against this. They're ...; it just doesn't make sense. I think we should support it 100 percent and with that I'll sit down.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I've always taken the position that two wrongs doesn't make a right -- my honourable friend says that two wrongs doesn't make a right. We had a unanimous vote on this last year and I should keep talking until the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne comes in. He just left and I want to make certain he's here to vote with us on this one.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Do you wish to debate the matter now?

MR. SHOEMAKER: No, I just want unanimous support, that's all.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, with the results being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Clement, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Johnston, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Roblin, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 22; Nays, 28.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost. The proposed resolution ...

MR. HARRIS: If I voted, I'd have voted for the motion. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the resolution appearing on Page 12 of Orders of the Day be now moved.

WHEREAS many of the decisions of government are left to the Cabinet, and

WHEREAS many of these decisions vitally affect the people of Manitoba and have the same effect as statutes passed by the Legislature, and

WHEREAS there is no established method of informing the Members of the Legislative Assembly of Orders-in-Council passed by the Cabinet, and

WHEREAS there is no regular method of informing the people of Manitoba of such Orders-in-Council,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that copies of all Orders-in-Council be printed in the Manitoba Gazette, or that copies be sent to all members of the Legislative Assembly within seven days of their being approved by Cabinet.

MR. ROBLIN: I'd like to suggest that this does not conform with our rules as it obviously involves the expenditure of money. However, I have no objection if the honourable gentleman who moved it would like to correct it. I will not raise that objection to prevent it from being introduced.

MR. MOLGAT: Then I would add the words "give consideration of the advisability of", Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable gentleman kindly make the notation.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I will not make a long speech. What brought the resolution forward really was an event of last week where Orders-in-Council that had been passed last summer and which had not come to the attention of the members of the House were produced here in the House and they affected my opinion materially on some of the debates that had gone on in the House, questions asked of the First Minister to which he had replied never indicating that there had been a change in the procedure. I think that all things considered it would be to the advantage of the House, the members, and the people of Manitoba, if the Orders-in-Council were in fact made public so that the people would know what regulations are coming through by that method. There would be better public information; the House would be better informed; and I think all told, due to the fact that these do form - in many cases have the same value as a statute - that they should be publicly announced.

MR. FROESE: I certainly hope that these would be made retroactive for one year.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to join ... --(Interjections)--

MR. SPEAKER: Now that the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne has been officially welcomed back into the Chamber, may I say a word or two in connection with the resolution that has been proposed by the Leader of the Liberal Party. I want to say that I appreciate very much the resolution and also the remarks of my honourable friend the Leader of the Liberal Party insofar as this resolution is concerned, because he has now endorsed the contribution in a debate made by my honourable member from St. John's who raised the question of Orders-in-Council in this House in respect of the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board. And I might say, Mr. Speaker, incidental to that, we have had no reply to the contention raised by my honourable friend from St. John's either by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce or the First Minister.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, without delaying the business of the House, we accept the resolution and endorse the resolution proposed by the Leader of the Liberal Party that

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . . Orders-in-Council should be given more widespread publicity than they are at the present time, that it is possible - it is quite possible that the government, whether by design or otherwise, can pass Orders-in-Council that do not come under the observance of members of the Legislature or the public generally. So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it would do no harm to have Orders-in-Council published in the Manitoba Gazette, or at least that members of this Assembly should be given the advantage of having the information contained in Orders-in-Council made available to them by some more direct method than that of having to have individual members such as my colleague from St. John's having to conduct investigations.

So I recommend this resolution to the House. I'm sure that my honourable friend the Leader of the government and the government front benches must be in a position if they say - or are prepared to say they have nothing to hide, and I recommend that they should support the resolution proposed by the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party which in effect will substantiate the suggestions of my colleague from St. John's.

MR. ROBLIN: I'll be very brief on this as others have been. I merely say that any Orders-in-Council that are regulations of a legislative nature are already published in the Manitoba Gazette, and in fact also go to the Special Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders for scrutiny and examination by members of the House. Any other regulations or any other Orders-in-Council are available for the inspection of the members of the Legislature, or anyone else for that matter, in the Executive Council office and that is freely available. I have made a calculation and I estimate that if we had to publish all the Orders-in-Council in the Gazette, it would come to something over \$49,000 and I really question whether that expenditure under the circumstances is advisable at the moment. Therefore, at least for the time being, we do not propose to support the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: I'm surprised at the figure of \$49,000 - I didn't realize that that much paper work came out of the Cabinet. The Orders-in-Council that we're concerned about are the ones that were discussed here last week, and where they may not be regulations in the sense that the First Minister speaks, they certainly had a very definite effect on matters of importance to the House. Now how you segregate these I don't know, but surely then the arrangement where members have to trot up to the Executive Council to find out (a) if Orders-in-Council have been passed, and (b) to find out what's in them, does not appear to me to be a better system. So I would appeal to the First Minister to change his mind on this.

I understand from all rumours that my honourable friend may not be with us the next time we meet, and I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it would be a nice parting gesture on his part if he were to say, "Now I recognize that this is a sound practice, and while my successors may not be happy about it, it really is a good thing for the people of Manitoba." And then he would say to his boys right now, "Fellows, let's do it; my parting gift to the House."

In any case, Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend is leaving us, as rumour has it, I wish him well. I regret that at the next meeting we will not be having the pleasure of his smiling countenance across from us and we'll be anticipating with bated breath which one of the honourable gentlemen are going to succeed. I'll be very happy to pledge the candidates or the delegates from my constituency if my friends wish to approach me.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I know that my honourable friend would allow me to thank him for his kind wishes and say that I expect to see him received into the Senate before I leave this position here.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend the Leader of the Liberal Party would -- (Interjection)-- there's my constituent, you never know when he's going to start talking or when he's going to stop. He's either a starter or a non-stopper. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether my honourable friend the Leader of the Liberal Party would permit two questions. A first question would be to my honourable friend: What is the source of information insofar as the First Minister is concerned? And second question to my honourable friend: Can we be assured that he will be here at the next session of this Legislature?

MR. MOLGAT: Certainly.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Same Division, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour: The Legislative Assembly, at its present Session, passed several Bills, which, in the name of the Assembly, I present to Your Honour and to which Bills I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

MR. DEPUTY CLERK:

- No. 15 - An Act to amend The Highways Traffic Act.
- No. 21 - An Act to amend The Employment Standards Act.
- No. 36 - An Act for the Relief of Dorothy J. Ungar.
- No. 38 - An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act.
- No. 39 - An Act to incorporate The Agricultural and Community District of Newdale.
- No. 41 - An Act to incorporate St. Paul's Home.
- No. 60 - An Act for the Relief of The Town of Tuxedo.
- No. 62 - An Act to amend The Limitation of Actions Act and to amend Certain Provisions of Other Acts relating to Limitations of Actions.
- No. 64 - An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956 (2).
- No. 65 - An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act.
- No. 67 - An Act to validate By-laws Nos. 19/66 and 4/67 of The Town of Swan River.
- No. 68 - An Act respecting Insurance of Residents of the Province in respect of the costs of Medical Services.
- No. 70 - An Act to amend The Electoral Divisions Act.
- No. 71 - An Act to amend The Psychologists Registration Act.
- No. 72 - An Act respecting The Rural Municipality of Morris, The Town of Morris, and The Rural Municipality of Montcalm.
- No. 73 - An Act to amend The Attorney-General's Act.
- No. 74 - An Act to amend The West Kildonan Charter.
- No. 75 - An Act to amend The Mental Health Act.
- No. 76 - An Act to amend The Flin Flon Charter.
- No. 77 - An Act to validate By-law No. 214 of The Village of Treherne.
- No. 78 - The Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation Act.
- No. 79 - An Act to amend The Companies Act (2).
- No. 84 - An Act to amend The Department of Welfare Act.
- No. 85 - An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act.
- No. 86 - An Act to amend The Legislative Library Act.
- No. 90 - An Act to incorporate the Diocese of Rupert's Land Development Foundation.
- No. 93 - An Act to amend The Public School Act (5).
- No. 95 - An Act respecting the Protection and Preservation of Historic Sites and Objects.
- No. 99 - An Act validating By-law No. 3916 of The City of Portage la Prairie and other matters.
- No. 101 - An Act to incorporate Atkinson Centre.
- No. 102 - An Act to amend The Health Services Act.
- No. 103 - An Act to amend The Horse Racing Regulation Act.
- No. 105 - An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act.
- No. 108 - An Act to amend An Act to amend and consolidate the Acts incorporating "The Fidelity Trust Company".
- No. 110 - An Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act.
- No. 111 - An Act to amend The Local Government Districts Act.
- No. 112 - The Universities Grants Commission Act.
- No. 113 - An Act to amend The Social Allowances Act.
- No. 114 - An Act to amend The Magistrates Act.
- No. 115 - An Act to amend The Municipal Act.
- No. 116 - An Act respecting The City of Winnipeg and The Young Women's Christian Association of Winnipeg.
- No. 117 - An Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act.
- No. 118 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act (6).
- No. 119 - The Statute Law Amendment and Statute Law Revision Act, 1967.

MR. CLERK: In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, doth assent to these Bills.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour: We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and Government, and beg for Your Honour the acceptance of these Bills:

No. 100 - An Act for granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year ending the 31st day of March, 1968.

No. 104 - An Act to authorize the Expenditure of Moneys for Capital Purposes and to authorize the Borrowing of the same.

MR. CLERK: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to these Bills in Her Majesty's name.

HONOURABLE RICHARD S. BOWLES, Q. C. (Lieutenant-Governor): Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Legislative Assembly: The work of the First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature has now been completed. I wish to commend the Members for their faithful attention to their duties including many hours devoted to consideration of Bills and Estimates, both in the House and in Committees. I convey to you my appreciation of your concern for the public interest and for the general welfare of our Province.

I thank you for providing the necessary sums of money for carrying on the public business. It will be the intention of my Ministers to ensure that these sums will be expended with both efficiency and economy by all departments of the government.

In relieving you now of your present duties and declaring the First Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature prorogued, I give you my best wishes and pray that under the guidance of Divine Providence, our Province may continue to provide the things which are necessary for the health, the happiness and the well-being of all our people.

MR. McLEAN: It is the will and pleasure of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, that this Legislative Assembly be prorogued until it shall please His Honour to summon the same for the dispatch of business, and the Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.