



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



Volume IV No. 27

February 24, 1960

2nd Session, 26th Legislature

DAILY INDEX

Wednesday, February 24th, 1960, 2:30 p.m.

<u>Bill No. 62</u> re Metro, adjourned debate: Mr. Campbell	881
<u>Bill No. 53</u> re Traffic Act, 2nd Reading: Mr. Carroll.....	884
Mr. Hillhouse	886
Mr. Paulley, Mr. Schreyer, Mr. Carroll	887
<u>Bill No. 63</u> re Municipal Affairs, 2nd Reading: Mr. Ridley, Mr. Prefontaine, Mr. Ridley .	888
<u>Bill No. 64</u> re Health Services Act, 2nd Reading, Mr. Johnson (Gimli)	888
<u>Bill No. 66</u> re Psychiatric Nurses, 2nd Reading, Mr. Johnson (Gimli).....	889
<u>Bill No. 68</u> re Taxicab Act, 2nd Reading, Mr. Carroll	890
<u>Committee of Supply: Attorney-General, Administration</u>	891

The Progressive Index of Votes and Proceedings will be
published on Tuesdays on the last page.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, February 24th, 1960.

Opening prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees

Notice of Motion

Introduction of Bills.

The Honourable Member for Dufferin. Orders of the Day.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Mines & Natural Resources)(Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, you have heard in this House before that Flin Flon is a very wonderful place to come from; that it is one of the finest communities in Manitoba; that it has some of the biggest fish; the biggest trout; the biggest pike; the biggest pickerel in Manitoba; that it has the best tourist potential in Manitoba; that it has the best mineral potential in Manitoba; and that it has the prettiest women in Manitoba. You have heard that in the sports field, it's very active in baseball; in hockey--its hockey team won the Memorial Cup. It is leading the Saskatchewan Junior Hockey League at the present time and no doubt will win another Memorial Cup. And last night, Mr. Speaker, we proved all that when four very fine ladies from Flin Flon won the Manitoba Ladies' Curling Championships and are now going to represent Manitoba in BC in the Western Championships. I don't think that any finer team could be found in the whole of Manitoba than these four ladies who represent this province. This is not the first time that they have accomplished this. It is the second time. And I only regret in making this very proud announcement to you today, that these ladies are not in the gallery because they had to leave for home this morning, but I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, you will join with me in acclaiming this very fine achievement of these fine people from Flin Flon and at the same time, acclaim that Flin Flon is the finest community in Manitoba.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Public Utilities & Minister of Labour)(The Pas):

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to engage in a debate here this afternoon with the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources about the relative importance of our two communities. However, I merely point out that The Pas is everything that he claims for Flin Flon, and more. Our women are kept very busy in The Pas and don't get out to engage in these bonspiels, but I would like to point out that the only rink that beat Mac Scales' during the bonspiel that was held here in Winnipeg recently was the rink from The Pas, skipped by Don Fisher.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw the attention of the House to a very important event which is taking place in the province today and that is the Northern Manitoba Trappers Festival which features the World Championship Dog Race. Now this very important and gala event is a gathering of the people of the north for a winter carnival. We have people engaged in this carnival representing various occupations and various racial backgrounds. We believe we have a very cosmopolitan community in The Pas. We also have a variety of occupations represented there which is unusual, I believe, in the province. We will have gathered there today trappers, traders, fishermen, bushmen, miners, transportation workers. And I would like to say it's not just railroad transportation workers which is a very important segment of our population, but also those engaged in tractor train work supplying the north, as well as flying and people engaged in other kinds of winter and summer transportation.

There's a very important--a very festive atmosphere and it's represented by the northern garb which the people of that community wear at this particular season. I have on today my rabbit tie, but the people up there will not only have fur ties, fur hats, but also parkas and mukluks and many other items of clothing which are normally associated with life in the north.

Now there are many winter sports and activities they're engaged in at this time of year, and I'd just like to mention a few of them so that the House will be informed. I regret I didn't have a program to take these down from, but I'm recalling them only from memory a few minutes before coming into the House here. We have fishing through the ice, which is quite a chore where you may have three or four feet of ice to chop through before you get into the water, and the winner of course, is the first one to bring out a fish. We have a trap-setting contest; rat skinning; tea boiling; bannock baking; and outdoor dancing; and many various outdoor activities

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) . . of that kind. We also have a rink program which includes many of the activities which are often engaged in in southern parts, jigging; goose-calling; squaw wrestling--which I don't know whether it's very common down here or not. I had a reputation at one time of being a fairly good squaw wrestler. And this next item will be of particular interest to a gentleman--a colleague we sometimes refer to as "The Minister of Fish"--my close neighbour here from Gimli. We have a fish-eating contest which is extremely popular and very entertaining.

Now some of the other outdoor activities are, of course, the junior dog races called the Soap Box Derby. We have ladies' dog races. Incidentally, one of the champion contenders in the men's race is usually a woman. Unfortunately, she broke her leg a couple of weeks ago in training--she's a grandmother, incidentally--but a very capable competitor. I pay special tribute to her.

We also of course, have the World's Championship Dog Race. This is a far cry from the very gruelling race that took place in the thirties as I remember it. It was a non-stop race, The Pas to Flin Flon and return, which was a great feat of strength, but the race, I believe, is much more humane today. We have three laps of 50 miles each. The first lap left this morning at 10:00 o'clock, from Halcrow Lake, and we expect should be back--should have been back a little while ago.

I draw this matter to the attention of the House and on behalf of my constituents who are some of the finest people in the province, I would invite the House and the public in general, to attend this very important occasion.

The festival is an effort of all volunteer work, and I think it's a great tribute to the Chairman and the members of his committee that this festival has attained the importance that it has in the activities of our province. We feel that it is making a major contribution in publicizing not only Northern Manitoba, but all of Manitoba, through this activity.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): some very disparaging remark here about The Pas. I think I better read it later.

MR. CARROLL: I would like also at this time on behalf of the Festival Committee, to thank the Department of Industry and Commerce, who have throughout the years, lent their support to this activity, and it has been a big help to the committee in photography and in lending their help in publicizing this event. And I'd also like to thank the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, who play a rather important part during this festival as well. We have a very interesting and very realistic frozen animal display up there each year which attracts a great deal of attention.

Now the North, I think, has a reputation which has been well-earned over the years for friendliness and hospitality, and I can assure any of you who may be able to attend, a very warm welcome when you get to The Pas during the Northern Manitoba Trappers Festival.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, for the fuller information of the House, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would answer a question. In the squaw wrestling, are you allowed to pick your own squaw?

MR. CARROLL: The squaw might have something to say about that.

MR. A. E. CORBETT (Swan River): I don't wish to detract from the somewhat bombastic statement of my neighbouring members--the Honourable Member for Flin Flon and The Pas--but I would like to, because what they say is quite true. In fact they probably didn't go far enough. But it might appear to some of you uneducated southerners that their statements were slightly bombastic. But I would like to draw the attention of the House--and this is a very important matter--that The Pas and Flin Flon, to get to them you have to go through Swan River. And those districts were largely settled and opened up through the sterling worth and integrity of the present residents of Swan River and a lot of their people have built up that country. It doesn't detract from our country -- it makes it all the better; but when you are going through the Pas and Flin Flon, don't forget that you pass through Garden of Eden of western Canada -- Swan River.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Labour? As a great supporter of this festival, I wonder whether the House could be adjourned during the time of the festival.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I would have no objection to that request at all.

MR. SPEAKER: You may not adjourn the House before the Orders of the Day. Orders

(Mr. Speaker, cont'd.) . . . of the Day.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, can we bring from Paradise to actual tragic facts. About a month ago, the Honourable Minister was kind enough to give us the number of unemployed in the City of Greater Winnipeg. I noticed in the Press of February 23rd that the reason 381--Greater Winnipeg job-seekers increased by 381 during the week ending February 18th. My question is whether the total is the same as given the House less than a month ago? Or what is the total now?

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that as notice and bring the answer in at first opportunity.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct your attention and the attention of this House to 74 students from Beausejour Collegiate--first, second and third galleries to your right. I might say that after having heard the Honourable Ministers extol the virtues of the Manitoba Northwest, I'd be remiss if I did not say that insofar as Northeastern Manitoba is concerned, one thing is certain that is the students whom I have the pleasure of teaching when I am not here, are among the finest students in the province. And also, I would like to draw your attention to the rather small group in the gallery to your left. Judging by the beards at least, you will have to agree that if nothing else, we can grow fine beards out Beausejour way. They are not angry young men; they are merely entrants in the Beausejour Lions' Club Beard-Growing Contest.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader the First Minister. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. Bill No. 62.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition)(Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, when the Honourable the First Minister moved second reading of this Bill, he described it as a rather important measure. Well I think, Mr. Speaker, that that will probably by the time that this Bill has been finally dealt with, be considered the understatement of the session. Because I think we will find not only potentially, but actually, that it is one of the most important Bills to come before this House in its whole history. And because of its importance, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is entitled, as the Honourable the First Minister suggests, to our very best consideration, to be considered in a non-partisan and non-sectional way, and to have our very most careful consideration so that whatever the final disposition is that we give, all of us the benefit of our advice on this extremely important matter. It's important, Mr. Speaker, not only to one half the population of the Province of Manitoba which it affects directly, but it's important to the whole province, because I as a rural member, and one who has always been so considered, am happy with another opportunity to pay tribute to the fact that Manitoba is one province that the rural part of this province prospers or meets with adversity in direct relationship to the situation in Greater Winnipeg, and vice versa. We are interdependent on one another, and I think that anyone who has the wide interest of the Province of Manitoba at heart, whether he be rural or urban representative, must recognize the fact that anything that is of great importance to either of those important areas is also of importance to the other. So just as I believe the rural part of the province to be essential to the welfare of Greater Winnipeg. I say quite as sincerely that the welfare of Greater Winnipeg is of direct and major concern to the rural part of this province as well.

Now I had the opportunity and it was an appreciated one that I think not many of the members shared--although there were some of sitting in on the two days of meetings that were held between the then-Minister of Municipal Affairs, and some of his colleagues, and the municipal representatives--to hear briefs and have discussions on events leading up to further consideration of this important question. I enjoyed that opportunity. I listened to every brief as it was presented. I have reread every brief since that time, and I am compelled to agree with the statement that the Honourable the First Minister has made, that there was of course no unanimity of opinion in regard to what should be done to meet the situation. In fact, there was a great diversity of opinion. But I think we can agree, as the First Minister stated, that there was general realization of the need for continuing co-operation--and I emphasize continuing co-operation because there already is co-operation in some of these several services--that there is need for continuing co-operation with regard to these services that are at present jointly managed, and that perhaps the area of that joint management should be extended. But particularly, I think, Mr. Speaker, that there is general agreement that a central planning agency is

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . necessary to meet the future growth and the further development of the Greater Winnipeg area. Now that is one of the two cardinal principles that the Honourable the First Minister mentioned in moving second reading of this Bill, and I think that on that one at least, there is general agreement among the municipal people. I suppose it can be properly said that that job also can be done by mutual co-operation. That is true. Theoretically at least, that's I think, unchallengeable, and I agree with that statement. But I think it's also true to say that this further function is so big and it's so important, and it's so complex, and yet so necessary and involves so many further considerations--some or several of which require rather drastic measures--that I think it is not being met at the present time, and likely would not be met in the immediate future, unless some such legislation as this were introduced. So, Mr. Speaker, I think because there is that need and because it's not being met at the moment. Because it's doubtful, taking into account the human frailties to which we are all subject, that it would be met in the near future. That I think is the main justification for this Bill being before the House at this time. And I say "justification", Mr. Speaker, because I believe that justification is needed when a Bill as drastic and far-reaching with so many extremely grave powers, be given to a board--elected board, it's true--and with such an area of compulsion contained in it is presented here. And so my belief is that that justification is mainly in the need of a central planning authority.

Well now, it seems to me that it is logical if the need is there for this central planning authority, that when we set it up--if that is the decision of the House after full consideration--that when we set it up, that we should also sign to it these services that are presently under joint management and control, and perhaps some further services, because if it is needed and I think it is, for the planning to meet the future, then when it is set up to do that job, I think it is only logical and appropriate that these other services should be assigned to it.

So that for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of this Bill going to the committee, and I am glad of the fact that we will at that committee--have the opportunity of, not only further discussion--and I am sure there will be a great deal of discussion in detail--but that we will also have the benefit of representation from those people who are very close to this subject, the municipal representatives of the various councils interested. And no doubt, Mr. Speaker, and the First Minister was frank enough to admit this--that no doubt there can be changes and improvements made. I would think it would be a remarkable achievement if such a major piece of legislation as this could be presented to the House in anything very close to perfect form. And I think it's the duty of all of us to try--all of us who believe in this step being taken--to try and make the Bill just as good as we can after hearing the representations that are made at the committee. I note that the reactions so far as I have been able to gather them from press reports, vary considerably. And that His Worship the Mayor of Winnipeg is quoted as saying that he would like to have assurance that this will lead directly, and I assume quickly, toward amalgamation. That would not influence me in it's favour if such a commitment were given. I would think that it should be given the opportunity to operate on this basis for some time, rather than making any such commitment as that.

On the other hand, I have some brief suggestions to make at the moment. I do not intend to discuss the detail of the Bill. I think the main principles are clear, and it is on them that we should base our decision at this time. But certainly in saying that I reserve my right, as of course every member does, to discuss the detail at the appropriate stage. Some of these however, appear to me to be so important that I think I should mention them now as recommendations and then we will have an opportunity to discuss them further later on.

I would think that there is some advantage in consideration being given to making the Metro-Council, if we may call it that, a body of nine or 12 members rather than ten, with the added provision that three or four as the case might be, should become vacancies each year. That would mean either a three or four year term, and I am not particularly concerned which of those it would be, and of course, the retiring members would be eligible for re-election. But I think there is something to be said for having a plan under which a third or a fourth of that body should retire each year. That would give some continuity and I am sure that that point has not been overlooked by the drafters of this Bill. I know that it can be said that this House is not organized along those lines. We sit for a maximum term, and then our term ends at the same time. I don't know that I would suggest any change in that so far as this House is

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . concerned, although I am free to admit that I think it would have been beneficial if not such a large turnover had taken place at the last election. But the principle is one that I think is deserving of consideration and I mention this now only for that reason. I am not wedded to either opinion, and I am sure that it has not escaped the notice of the government in drafting the Bill, but I mention it now because I think it should receive further consideration.

And then I would like to recommend, and I am sure that this, too, has been considered but I would like to place myself on record with regard to it, that in the establishment of the electoral divisions that it be guaranteed that representation from the adjacent municipalities to Winnipeg should achieve a fair number. I am not anti-Winnipeg, and I do not wish to be so recorded, but I wouldn't wish to see in the establishment of this program, that I think has a great deal of merit and potential for good in the years to come--I would not wish to see the electoral divisions established in such a way that the City of Winnipeg, by virtue of its present population would dominate the adjacent municipalities. Just how that can be done, I don't know, and I have been trying to figure out a system myself, and it seems to me that it could perhaps be done by cutting the--arranging the divisions something in the nature of pieces of a pie, and perhaps at the centre of the pie we might have to have one purely Winnipeg constituency, or perhaps even two. I haven't tried to work it out to that detail, but I do suggest the principle that we try and achieve fairness--complete fairness between all the municipalities.

And then we come to another matter dealing with the question of the establishment of the electoral divisions. And I would think that inasmuch as the principle has been established so far as this Assembly is concerned, that it would be well to carry it forward into this new and important sphere of government by allowing the electoral division boundaries commission to draw the line of these new divisions for the elections to the Metro-Council. It's possible that the present members of that commission might not wish to act in that capacity, and certainly I would think that their wishes should be consulted in the matter. As honourable members are aware, the members of that commission are the Chief Justice of the Province, the president of the university, and the chief electoral officer of this province. I know that at least one of that trio is extremely busy and he sits right before us and guess that the others have plenty to do as well, and it might be that they would feel that it was an imposition of their time and talents to act in this capacity too. But I do think, Mr. Speaker, that having regard to the extreme importance of this measure, having regard to the necessity of getting it started with as much goodwill as possible, that it would be worthwhile considering, if not this commission then at least a completely non-partisan and independent commission, to attempt that chore, rather than leaving it to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. As a matter of fact, one of the matters that I notice in the Bill is that a great deal of authority is given to the Metro-Council. Quite naturally--that's inevitable. And much of it is compulsory--much of it is very wide, but also a great deal is left to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to approve of. And I think this is one place where we could substitute another body for the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

One of the details that I think should and will come up for discussion in the committee is the magnitude of those powers that are given to the Metro-Council. I don't know that they can be curtailed. They need to be very wide; they need to have some compulsory powers, I am sure. But the one point that I would mention at this time is that I think that where provision is made for an appeal that the appeal should be allowed to go further than just to the Metro-Council itself. Because I am a great believer that the ultimate appeal, regardless of the boards and commissions that we set up, and notwithstanding the fact that they will be composed of very, very capable and good-intentioned men, I still believe that the ultimate appeal should be to the court, and that's where the citizen has a right to go if he believes that he should carry it that far.

So, Mr. Speaker, my suggestion is that this is a measure that we should be prepared to send to the committee for further study and for the opportunity of--particularly the councils and other citizens interested--to come and give us the benefit of their advice. And I think it is incumbent upon us, if that is done, for all of us to try and make the very best job that we can to put this extremely important body in a position to make their maximum contribution. Then I would say, and this to me is one of the most important of all the recommendations, that I am enunciating at this time having done that, and having given our very best judgment to all the

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . considerations involved; having got the very best Bill that we can; having--in passing it through this Chamber finally, that we should add the provision that it shall come into effect only when it has been voted on--favourably voted on by a majority of the electors over the whole area. Now some I think will jump to the conclusion perhaps, Mr. Speaker, that in making that suggestion, that there is delay envisioned. I would think that is not a valid conclusion, because there is going to be an interregnum here before the Metro-Council gets into active operation, and I think it would be well worthwhile to employ a part of that time in a public education upon this Bill which would in fact occur if it was to be voted into the Statute Books. And my main reason for saying that, Mr. Speaker, and advocating that course, is because as the honourable members will have noticed, section 41 provides that this Metro-Council will not be required to obtain the consent of the electors to the expenditures of money and the contracting of debts. Now that is a principle, as you are well aware, Mr. Speaker, that has become enshrined in our procedure in the Province of Manitoba. Not in every case it's true, but I think that the electors have come to feel that on these large issues, that they have had the opportunity of expressing their opinion in a very effective way. They have had the feeling--and they have been entitled to it, and I believe it is good, Mr. Speaker, --a feeling that they are on these issues--the Court of Last Resort. And this power is being taken away from them under this Bill, and I'm not criticizing that. I think under the circumstances that that perhaps is necessary. I am not criticizing it at the moment, but I do say that if we put that provision in--if we leave it there; it's there now--then public will be made aware of the fact that that drastic change is being made here, and that they should have the opportunity of passing upon that change. And I think that the submission of the completed Bill to a vote of the people over the whole area would accomplish that purpose, and it would be a very useful one.

So, Mr. Speaker, those are all the comments that I propose to make at this time, and along with all the other honourable members, I shall be looking forward to the detailed discussion when this Bill reaches committee.

MR. R. PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF)(Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. W. B. SCARTH, Q. C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, before that is carried or dealt with, may I ask the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition one question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MR. SCARTH: You suggested, Sir, that there be a reference to a commission to fix the boundaries. Would that reference be a direction that the boundaries should be fixed so that each jurisdiction would have approximately the same population, or would you disregard numbers? I mean that each electoral division would have approximately the same number of people in it? What is your thinking there, Sir?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I would go along with the terms of the Bill as proposed, and as mentioned to the House by the Honourable the First Minister, that there should be approximately the same number of people, and that we should write that feature right into the Act, and any other features such as the guaranteeing of fairly equal representation as between the City of Winnipeg and the adjacent municipalities as well. But that having set the principles that then the actual delineation of the boundaries of those divisions or constituencies, if we wish to so call them, would be left to this independent commission.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and following a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 53. The Honourable Minister of Public Utilities.

Mr. Carroll introduced Bill No. 53, an Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act, No. 1 for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is one which is essentially the same as the one which was before the House at our regular session last year. It rewrites the lighting sections which existed in the other Act in probably more logical order and has probably made them a little clearer, a little easier for the average individual to understand.

The most important part of the Bill deals with the rules of the road. This is part four and part five of the present Act. And the rules of the road are being amended largely in

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) . . . conformity with the conference on the uniformity of legislation for Canada. That legislation is based largely on the uniform rules of the road which were adopted in the United States a few years ago. Now we've had a very large technical committee studying these particular amendments here in the province, made up of representatives of the City of Winnipeg, which included traffic engineering, enforcement. It included our own Department of Public Works and the Motor Vehicle Branch. It included the Attorney-General's Department, the RCMP and many others who deal with the Highway Traffic Act and who are quite familiar with the technicalities of it. This included of course, the Motor Carrier Board and others.

Now, you will note in this Bill that we have written into the legislation, sections dealing with traffic lights which were normally at the discretion of the municipalities in the province. We think that this is a very good thing because we find that we have here in this province one set of by-laws which have application here in the Greater Winnipeg area and another which have application in the City of Brandon. As the province grows, we feel that the need for uniformity becomes increasingly more important. We feel it's important that our tourists travelling to this province from other jurisdictions in Canada and the States--we think it's highly desirable that they should be familiar with the traffic laws as they exist here. And if they are the same as exist in their own home jurisdiction then it will eliminate a great deal of difficulty.

On page 33 of the Bill, we spell out those things over which the municipality has jurisdiction. Things such as parking, one-way streets, loading zones, safety zones and things of that kind are left at the discretion of the municipality.

Now probably the most important change in this legislation is the authority which is being granted to the Highway Traffic Co-ordinating Board which was set up at our legislation during our summer session. This will--incidentally the provisions of this Bill--it's section 70-2 on page 41--which gives the authority to the traffic board to designate restricted speed areas and to exclude from restricted speed areas. Now some may wonder why this section is in here; why this authority is being given. I would like to point out that there has been a very large increase in the number of motor vehicles in the province in the last ten years. We also have what is referred to as suburban sprawl. We have this ribbon development that extends along our major highway routes, leading from any built up area. It's a situation where you have development, building for many miles out of the major built-up area along our highway routes, and this of course, results in a great deal of traffic congestion and many, many miles of restricted speed areas. And an example of that, travelling west, you go quite a long ways out beyond Assiniboia Downs to the--out as far I believe as the cemetery there, in a restricted speed zone with very little just reason for it in the view of many people. Now how are we going to eliminate this situation? Well, there are several problems. We feel that better planning of our highways and those areas adjacent to highways will be one thing that can help us in handling this particular situation. Better use of traffic control devices will be a means by which we can help. Limited access highways is another feature which will help us to control the movement of traffic on to our main highway routes at regular intervals, by spreading them out it eases very substantially the flow of traffic, and we feel that possibly there is some justification for increasing speed limits, particularly in places like--on highways such as McGillivray Boulevard, possibly on No. 1 West, and many other highways leading out of the City of Winnipeg.

Now section 11, which is on page 43 and 44 gives authority to the board to raise the limits above the maximum of 60 miles per hour in the daytime, and 50 at night. Now this is a very controversial amendment, and it's a point on which we are quite prepared to consider the views of the committee when we get to committee stage. We believe that this amendment will facilitate the movement of traffic on those highways or those portions of highways which may be designated for a speed beyond the present maximum. We believe, too, that the Highway Traffic Act should be capable of being strictly enforced, and I believe that anyone who travels extensively on our highways in the province today will agree that there appears to be a general disregard for the present maximum speed limit. Now the Attorney-General in his estimates the other night mentioned that we will be going to radar speed controls in this province on June 1st. Now what does this actually mean to the speed limits which we have on our present highways? It will actually mean a reduction in the speed limit that is enforced on highways in this province, and the reason for that is that it is impossible to enforce a 60-mile an hour limit in the province because of the wide tolerances which must be used with the present inefficient

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) . . . method of trying to enforce our speed laws. Because you must give chase, you have the chance of error on the speedometer of the car giving chase, and you have the judgment of the individuals involved and there must be some tolerance allowed to be sure that this man is in effect exceeding the speed limit. So that if radar controls go into effect, then we have an effective reduction in the enforced speed limit in the province. Now there's certainly no intention for a general increase in the speed limits across the province. It may be restricted to those highways which are known as four-lane highways; it may be restricted to highways that have limited access and things of this kind. It does give us a greater degree of flexibility in our speeds in the province because it not only enables to go above the speed limit, but it also enables the board to recommend speed limits below the maximum and in some cases this too is equally important. We know of many cases where highways could reasonably have a lower maximum speed limit than what is in existence at the present time, so this gives us a degree of flexibility which in the minds of the travelling public will be respected and we feel that this will contribute to safe driving in the province. Now in those cases where the board does recommend an increase, does put an increase in effect, this does not remain in effect beyond 120 days without the ratification of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. So that these recommendations of the board will be pretty thoroughly reviewed before any maximums are raised beyond their present limit.

Now this Bill also points out the responsibilities of drivers for overtaking and passing other vehicles; the responsibilities for turning left; right; and U-turns; spells out the rights-of-way at intersections. On page 59, it gives the duties and rights of pedestrians spelled out very clearly so that there can be no misinterpretation. It deals with bicycles and play vehicles using our roads and highways; it deals with speed zones; railway crossings; school buses; it gives protection there for the safe travel of our children using the highways. It spells out responsibilities at "yield" signs; parking; backing vehicles; and many other things. One other rather important change which I think will meet with public acceptance generally is those suspensions which were made by the Registrar and which are automatic under section 133 of the present Highway Traffic Act. It spells out here, two and a half pages of suspensions which are automatic by the Registrar after notification. But here is the difficulty. A man appears before a magistrate; he is convicted of an offense which will eventually result in his cancellation of licence registration and driver's licence; but the magistrate imposes another sentence. He goes away feeling that he's through and a few weeks later he gets a letter from the Registrar telling him to send in his licence plates and his driver's licence. This now is being spelled out so that the magistrate has him surrender these things. He cancels them at the time that he passes sentence on that individual and we think that this is a good public relations move. The people would feel much better if they know at the time that this is the sum total of their penalty for committing this particular offense. Another amendment that we feel is very necessary--a trucker who fails to go to a weigh scale when he's directed to do so by a peace officer is fined \$10. But the same trucker who goes to the weigh scale and is found to have been overloaded pays a penalty of \$25. And we found by economics that it was to their advantage to avoid going to the weigh scales, and paying the lower penalties, and this is being increased. And there are many other small amendments which will, we think, facilitate the administration and the enforcement of the present Highway Traffic Act.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Speaking on behalf of the official opposition, I think it would be fair to say that we are in general sympathy with the objectives sought to be achieved by these amendments, although quite frankly, we would be much happier had a complete new Act been brought into the House, because it's going to be exceedingly difficult to study this Act since you have to refer back to the old Act in connection with all your studies. But on behalf of the official opposition, we feel that this Bill should go to committee where it can be thoroughly discussed. We can hear representations made by all the officials and all the experts who recommend that these new sections be added to the Act. But we do reserve the right in committee to a full and free discussion, stating our views in respect of each section then.

MR. GRAY: May I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister? In connection with the major changes for the City of Winnipeg, those who are responsible for the directing of this Bill, have they consulted the Traffic Commission of the City?

MR. CARROLL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the City of Winnipeg were represented by their

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) . . . traffic engineer; on occasions by their solicitor; as I recall, always by Mr. Montgomery, their inspector in charge of their traffic. We had other representatives from the city at different times discussing the various phases of this Bill.

MR. J. M. HAWRYLUK (Burrows): two questions to the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: all the questions to be directed to the Minister.

MR. HAWRYLUK: Pardon me?

MR. SPEAKER: Would anyone who wishes to ask questions, direct them now to the Minister, so that he may answer them all at once and close the debate, which is proper.

MR. HAWRYLUK: My question, Sir, is this: In the past it has been brought to my attention that any minor infraction, slight accident which was under \$10 which happened between two cars or some other vehicle, it wasn't necessary or wasn't an accepted fact that it was reported to the police. That is, it wasn't reported to the police if it was under \$10. It was understood that they would repair their own costs -- pay for their own costs. Is it compulsory in this Act that any kind of an accident has to be reported to the authorities? Second question-- would the maximum speed that you are suggesting be pretty well uniform throughout the province, or will it vary on certain roads?

MR. A. J. REID (Kildonan): Mr. Chairman, the new cars that we have now, supposed to be 80 inches in width and over, will it be necessary to install clearance lights on them?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to make any extended comments at this time. I agree with the contention of the Honourable Member for Selkirk that we are reserving some comment on the amendments proposed by the Honourable Minister. I join with the Honourable Member for Selkirk, however, in his contention that it may have been advisable for a rewriting of the whole Act. I particularly would like to ask the Minister this question, however. It appears to me that he has amended the Act, or the Act is proposed to be amended in respect of certain convictions where the judge now will carry through the judgment to the degree of removing the plates or licences and having them turned in. I would like to ask the Minister what consideration if any was given to the amending of section 22 in the Bill, whereby under our present system, and it appears to me as though there's no revision, under our present system, an individual may have two or three relatively minor infractions of the Act, or commit minor infractions of the Act and then all of the sudden is notified by the Registrar that he is no longer entitled to drive a vehicle and then has to undergo further driving tests. And I have numerous complaints directed to me, and I'm sure other members have likewise, that particularly with some of our elder citizens, that this has become quite a burden and they have not been able--and I think in many respects due to their age--to recover their driving privileges. It does appear to me that, in some respects at least, that section 22 of the Act is a little too strict. While we here have no objection to the Minister or the Department having certain powers, we sometimes wonder whether some of these powers do act as sort of an injustice to some individuals, and I would like to know what, if any, consideration that the Minister has given to that. I'm not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that he should have to answer me on the spot this afternoon, because when the Bill is before the committee, I most likely will raise the same point again, and I would be prepared to accept the answer at that time.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, before the Minister closes the debate, I would like to draw his attention once more, -- he will recall I did about a month ago, to the question of speed zones. Now I'm not pressing him for a very exact answer here, but I would ask him if he expects that the new board will have a backlog of considerations to make as regards the imposing or lifting of speed zones? And I would ask him the final part of the question--I would ask him if he could hazard an opinion here as to how many months will elapse before the board will in fact be able to deal with requests asking for speed zones to be imposed in certain areas?

MR. CARROLL: If there's no further questions, Mr. Speaker, I think most of the questions which have come to me on this occasion are questions which should more properly be answered at committee stage where we have the technical people available who can give us the precise answers. However, I'll do the best I can on this occasion. I don't believe there has been any change in the amount of damage which is involved insofar as the reporting of accidents is concerned. I'm quite sure there isn't, although there are some changes in the methods by which accidents are reported. Now the maximum limit will not be the same throughout the province, at least I would think it would not be the same throughout the province, if all

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) . . of these amendments go through, because I think there are some highways--some portions of some highways which could reasonably be increased--the speed zones could reasonably be increased somewhat. Now as far as the 80-inch cars are concerned we do have a provision in this Act which does exclude cars from the necessity of using clearance lamps. I think that was a very important change, although there--I note that the Province of Ontario has not made this change. They're holding firm. But we seem to feel that the number of cars which are sold in the Province of Manitoba, if we keep this on our books it won't discourage manufacturers from making cars which are slightly in excess of 80 inches, and we feel that it's--it gives proper protection to the citizens of the province who might be involved in an accident where this particular point could be raised and used against them through no fault of their own. Now there has been no change in section 134, which gives the Registrar discretion to cancel licences as the result of a number of convictions for moving offences. We feel that this is really the strength of our safety program in this province and I think that we would not want to do anything which would weaken this particular section of the Act. Now as far as the speed zones removing I suppose from restricted speed zones, this won't--I think--won't be a big problem, because I think there are very limited highways on which this particular section would apply. I think there are several highways leading out of Winnipeg, small sections of which could be excluded, possibly from this 30-mile minimum, but once that is done the number of applications that come before the board I think will be rather limited.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 63, The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Hon. M. E. Ridley (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Pembina) presented Bill No. 63, an Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act for a second time.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. RIDLEY: The first section of this Act is to give the Assistant Deputy authority to sign the same as the Deputy Minister has. This is pretty near in all cases in regard to the Land Titles Office. The second part of the Bill--the second section is to authorize the levy upon the municipalities. This come up during our fidelity bond when we had to make the levies across the province. Now this was very well accepted in some cases where you have high assessments and probably they don't handle near as much money as the smaller assessments and over the apportionment this was divided up evenly and I think it was received very well. They all received their fidelity bonds in October and that was the reason for the change being asked for.

MR. EDMOND PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to oppose the Bill, but to me it doesn't seem very clear. It seems the Bill--section two, refers to the way of making the apportionment and it allows the Minister to use some different method than the latest equalized assessment, because the method to be used is not mentioned. And is the word "latest" important? Is equalized assessment of a previous date to be used? Or what method is to be used? It is not clear to me at all. I wonder if the Minister can give us more information. And a second request I might make of the Minister is to explain to us why the retroactive feature in section three.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. RIDLEY: I'll close the debate. Well, as I explained before, this was mostly put in here for--was on the fidelity bond that went out to all the municipalities. It has been done because, for the simple reason that some places had high assessments, but didn't handle near the money that maybe smaller assessments, so on the apportionment that's the way they decided to do it. And all we're asking for the authority that it has been done. To do it on the equalized assessment, they didn't think it was fair, because as I say that with, even with the higher assessment they didn't handle near the money that the lower assessment did, so therefore they needed this protection the same as the high assessment did. That was what was used. They used the total they handled, plus the equalized assessment.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 64. The Honourable Minister of Health.

Hon. Geo. Johnson (Minister of Health & Public Welfare)(Gimli) presented Bill No. 64, an Act to amend the Health Services Act for the second time.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker in speaking to the principle behind this Bill, I would point out to the House that all but section five are really administrative details; section one broadens the definition of the hospital. Hospitals now in the definition now includes the term the hospital of a hospital district, and a medical nursing unit, and a nursing station, and this amendment broadens it to include any building or part of a building for the accommodation of the nursing staff of the hospital. The present wording doesn't make it clear that you can include a separate building such as a nurse's residence as part of the hospital. There's really no change in policy here. It just never arose in the past because hospitals in rural Manitoba have always had the nurses' wing attached directly to the hospital and the Municipal Public Utility Board in reviewing the supplementary schemes of hospitals came across this definition which they wanted clarified. The second section deals with the same thing, the nurses. The section just says, "includes nurses' residence as part of the hospital facility". Section three is just moving these sub-sections from section 53 of the Act, to section 40 3 (b). Sections two and three of section 53 are erased, and whereas these sections now state that "the Minister may, on a petition by the board and upon notice of the municipalities, change the name of a district, and notice of this shall appear in the Manitoba Gazette", it now simply states that this should be done by regulation, and the regulation should be published in the Gazette. This is because the Legislative Council, in opening up this Act to make the amendments, felt that this change was advisable, as apparently a governing board is an incorporated board in legal terms, and this should be done by regulation. And then section four merely says that besides changing the name by regulation, both name and number can now be changed. This change in number is all that section four refers to. Now the real important part of this Bill is the present section 56 which at this time says that a municipality can only pay over to a hospital board of the district money raised by an annual levy for the purpose of setting up an operating deficit. Now this amendment is for the purpose of disposing of surplus levies. Hospital deficits are now made up pretty well by the plan and prior to the inauguration of the plan, hospital deficits were made up by the municipal levy against the ratepayers and these monies could not be--these monies raised by these levies could not be used for any other purpose but paying towards a hospital deficit and by this amendment, certain levies can now be used by the board on the authority of the Minister, for any other purpose permissible under the Act, including a hospital's operating capital. If this amendment were not proposed, it would require a separate Act for each hospital which may now have a surplus. That is, in the spring of '58 quite a few hospitals levied across the district for a little money to meet any anticipated deficit in their hospital budgets and now that they have no deficit in the last year or two, the monies have accumulated and they can't dispose of them until we bring in an amendment of this nature, unless we were to bring in a Bill for each hospital concerned. That's really the important part. The last part, section six, applies only to hospital districts where there's more than one hospital, and again in opening up the Act, the Legislative Council thought that this membership in these committees following a by-law from the board and so on, rather than going into the Gazette in this present fashion, should go in as a regulation.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 66. The Honourable Minister of Health and Public Welfare.

Mr. Johnson (Gimli) presented Bill No. 66, an Act to provide for the Education of Psychiatric Nurses be now read for a second time.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill which we have been working on and meant to bring in at the last session, but there was so much doing then. The principle of this Bill simply regularizes and makes uniform the curriculum of training at our three institutions--mental hospitals and provides for a provincial diploma at the conclusion of the training period which will be acceptable in other jurisdictions. At present, the only recognition which our graduates have is a certificate from the superintendent of the hospital where the training is received and this is not considered adequate. And this new proposal will raise the standards and would improve the quality of patient care and will put our nurses on a par with those from other provinces. I might point out to the committee that the real--one of the other reasons for the government bringing in a Bill of this nature, is that over 90% of all psychiatric

(Mr. Johnson (Gimli), cont'd.) . . nurses in the province are employed in our three mental hospitals and the only facilities for training of such nurses are in these institutions and any program for training psychiatric nurses or care of the mentally ill, outside of the institutions, which is a goal toward which we are all working; if it is to be effective, it should be under the control of the department to ensure the quality of nursing care. All three western provinces, and the Province of Ontario, now have such legislation similar to that proposed here in Manitoba by this Bill, and their graduates in nursing have the status and recognition not now available to graduates of Manitoba. We find it's becoming more important from the standpoint of recruiting new staff--girls to come into psychiatric nursing if they have this uniform training. I might point out to the members that for instance, at our Portage Hospital, it's hard to recruit psychiatric students for purely the pure nursing of mental defectives. The girls now in our other two institutions do not get the balance training in both the care of the mental defective, and mentally incapacitated and mentally ill person. We have, as we come to my estimates later--we'll see that certain plans have been developed in the past year to set up the necessary nursing staff in the three institutions and to provide for this regular, more comprehensive program. Also in this Bill, a curriculum committee is established and would be under a central council, and each school would not separately run its own program; it would be an inclusive affair, and I might also point out to the members another very good reason for this Bill is that we have more requests now for graduate RNs to take affiliate training in psychiatric nursing, and we're not able to offer that at but one of our three institutions at this time. And on graduation, these students will get a provincial certificate.

MR. GRAY: May I direct a question to the Honourable Minister? Will the nurses get paid while in training?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, my comment is largely in the nature of a question too. I was going to ask the Minister, because it's not clear to me from the Bill, I think it is not intended that a pre-requisite is to be a graduate nurse and it isn't intended that this course should be limited to people already have ordinary nursing training or the degree of RN, is that correct?

MR. HAWRYLUK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up that question. I presume the academic qualifications would be that they would still have, to enter this, to have the Grade XI standing in Matric, no? And what about the -- how long does this course last?

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I spoke before. In closing this debate, I'd like to answer the three questions. As the Honourable Leader of the Opposition mentioned, I'm sorry I left any impression there -- no, the present course is offered with a Grade X minimum standing and it's, as I understand it, the curriculum committee intend to continue with that policy of Grade X education as a pre-requisite of admission. I merely pointed out that quite a few graduate RN's who wish to get psychiatric training or a diploma in psychiatric nursing have to spend nine months to a year, I believe, following their regular course in a mental hospital under training. And we can only offer that at Brandon at the present time. The idea with this more comprehensive program would be to offer this in our three institutions. There seems to be a little demand for this and we welcome this. Secondly, the course is a three year course, following which, the graduate also besides getting her psychiatric nursing provincial certificate will have standing as a practical nurse. Thirdly, the same arrangements concerning remuneration will be in effect as are in effect at the present time.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and following a voice vote, declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 68, the Honourable Minister of Public Utilities.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Municipal Affairs that Bill No. 68, an Act to amend The Taxicab Act be now read a second time.

MR. SPEAKER: Would you name another seconder please?

MR. CARROLL: The Minister of Health and Public Welfare.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, these are two minor changes in the Act. When the registration dates were changed a few years ago, somehow or other the date on which a reduced license could be purchased by a taxicab owner was not changed; it remained at August 1st.

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) . . . This change now makes it the same as all other reductions in fee to the 1st of October. The second section provided for interim licenses. This section is not being used since the change in registration dates has taken place and we're taking it out of the Act at this time.

MR. CAMPBELL: the Minister may not have given consideration to the point that I'm going to mention but I would like to suggest to him that if as and when the Metro Council is set up that this responsibility that the Minister now carries in his department should be transferred to the Metro Council. Has he had that consideration before him up to date and if so, what is his opinion regarding this?

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): I presume you're taking that as a question, are you?

MR. CARROLL: Yes

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to oppose this Bill, but I do rise to ask the Minister why is it that it's only in the Greater Winnipeg area that a person can operate a drive-yourself agency. I understand that such agencies are controlled under the Taxicab Act which only has jurisdiction over the Greater Winnipeg area as defined in that Act and I have been wondering why that has remained the law so long by reason of the fact that Manitoba is growing. We have other towns in Manitoba which could very well do business of that type, such as Brandon, Portage, Selkirk, Flin Flon and other places. But my understanding is as the law now stands that you are restricted to the Greater Winnipeg area for that purpose.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CARROLL: question, Mr. Speaker. I think that's the most interesting suggestion that's come from the Leader of the Opposition and one which I feel we would be quite prepared to give consideration to.

With respect to the drive-yourself privilege, in a year and a half, I have had no representations from anyone for this kind of service. Now I suppose if there were a demand it would come to our attention; in any case I'll investigate to see whether this privilege should be extended if the authority isn't there to grant it at the present time.

MR. J. A. CHRISTIANSON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, just to clear the point, we've had a drive-yourself agency in Portage for some two years now.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and following a voice vote, declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of Supply.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and following a voice vote, declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The House do now resolve itself into a committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty. Would the Honourable Member for St. Matthews please take the Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department 7 (1) a

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a word or two on the estimates of the Attorney-General and I assure you it, I don't think, will be any repetition of the ground that was covered at the last sitting of the committee. I do not know where else in the estimates I can raise the question dealing with the Liquor Commission. I think that it would be quite appropriate under the salary of the Attorney-General because of the fact that the Commission reports to him. Now, we did receive the tabling of the Order for Return respecting Store No. 2 -- I believe it was requested by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. I was going to raise the question apropos of that and I'm wondering whether or not the Attorney-General either by himself or through -- could not draw to the attention of the Commission, the most unsatisfactory condition that prevails there at the present time in respect of the parking. I shouldn't say in respect, Mr. Chairman, of the parking facilities but of the absence of them. There is a garage right next door, that is immediately to the east and I note there that in the evening only taxis are in there and it's quite difficult and I've had numerous complaints in respect of the location, which is all right, but the absolute lack of parking facilities. I also want, if it

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) ... is proper, for the Minister, the Attorney-General to give us a resume of the reasons for the most recent price increase in beer by the glass and bottle. I appreciate very much that under the legislation that we passed that the Legislature has jurisdiction over the setting of hours and the Commission over the setting of the price of beer, but I do think that, if memory serves me correctly, that during the period of time that consideration was being given to an increase in the price, that there was a considerable liaison between the Attorney-General and his department and the Commission. Needless to say, there has been a great deal of complaint from the consumers as to the price increase. As a matter of fact, the common ordering reference now, in a pub, so I am informed, is give me one 'Roblin Special' and on request of what they mean by 'Roblin Special', the answer is a ten cent glass of beer for 15 cents. Now then I understand from reading the press reports at the time that one of the reasons that the government took under consideration -- or the Commission, or both -- took under consideration an increase in the price of beer was in order to assist the hotel industry and in particular the smaller hotels who were finding it difficult to bring their establishments up to a level that we in the Legislature had prescribed for them insofar as appearance and facilities were concerned. And it appears to me that not only this was done but an added little amount was put on to benefit the coffers of the province. Now, I might say that on occasions in the debates, particularly in the previous Legislature, we of this group had said that we would have no objection when we were speaking of such things as increases in the cost in the field of welfare, that we would have had no objections to some increase for that purpose. But it seems to me, and I appreciate the fact of the increase in welfare, but it seems to me that in the increases that were allowed in respect of beer, that the government did not clarify, at the time of the changes, its position as to why this increase was necessary, particularly in view of the fact as has so often been stated and in this, Mr. Chairman, I am being repetitious, that the government had promised many things for the people of Manitoba without tax increases. And while it may be argued that this is not essentially a tax increase, it certainly was a revenue increase of great magnitude inflicted on the people of Manitoba who partake in the odd ale. And I would like to hear from the Attorney-General a clarification and further explanation as to the reasons behind the action of the government and why it was that the increase which, according to some sources, was primarily to assist the hotel industry, which I agree from anything that I read, was in rather poor shape -- particularly the small ones that the government was not satisfied to do just that and that alone. And I will not pursue that point any further at this time.

I was very interested the other night when we were dealing with the estimates of the Attorney-General, when in reply to a question from the Honourable Member for St. George apropos of who decides when an appeal is going to be made, that the Minister told us first of all that it was done by the senior officers of the department in conjunction with himself or by himself. And then he went on to tell the House or tell the committee that while he was a Crown Prosecutor and I have his words underlined "I can recall vividly on occasion where I desperately as a Crown Attorney -- this was, working under the former Minister from Ethelbert-Plains, when I desperately wanted to appeal a case, when I as an individual thought that that case should be appealed and the Minister and the Deputy, and I think in retrospect, quite properly, overruled me and said no, looking at the whole situation that it should not be appealed." I would like to ask the Honourable the Attorney-General from the reports that I have noted in the press, whether or not he's trying to make up for lost time, because it appears to me that since the honourable gentleman took over the portfolio that there has been far more appeals than ever before. I would like to know whether this is because of a thought in the mind of the Attorney-General, that the courts are not awarding sentences severe enough in the opinion of the Attorney-General. And I noted also from press reports that the Attorney-General himself undertook to represent the Crown personally in an appeal case and I ask him in an appeal of a sentence -- well, in a trial, all right, that the Attorney-General -- I'm glad to be corrected, I thought it was an appeal but that's fine but I don't think that it detracts from the point that I'm making. It seems to me and I'm subject to correction on this that this is the first time in a long time at least if not in the last 20 or 25 years that the Attorney-General has by himself acted as a Prosecutor in a case of this nature in Manitoba. I appreciate the fact, as I understand it, that in the Old Land, the Attorney-General there on occasion on cases of a very severe nature, as I understand it dealing with poisoning and the likes of that, does act for the

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) ... Crown. But it seemed rather peculiar to me that here in Manitoba that our Attorney-General would prosecute in a trial case -- now that we have that established -- was that done because of any sense of feeling of not having full confidence in his staff or was it done because of the fact that the case may have been a very popular one for an Attorney-General to prosecute in Manitoba.

HON. S. R. LYON (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid I must interrupt on a point of privilege and ask the honourable member to withdraw any of those imputations that he has just made because I will state categorically at this time to him, that I would not go into a court for either of the reasons that he has mentioned. I have a staff in whom I have the highest confidence and secondly any case upon which I do, in my own judgment, see fit to go into court on will not be because of any publicity factor that is attached to it at all. And I suggest that the Honourable the Leader of the CCF knows that and knows better than to make any such imputation in this House.

MR. PAULLEY: You know my honourable friend is no different today than as ever. I was ask ... -- (Interjection) -- You just keep out of this! I was just asking a question

MR. ROBLIN: you need a little correction from time to time.

MR. PAULLEY: One thing I don't need is half the corrections and leadership that my honourable friend the Leader of the House needs.

MR. ROBLIN: That's where you make a mistake!

MR. PAULLEY: Um-hum. There's one big difference between the two of us though ...

MR. ROBLIN: There's more than one.

MR. PAULLEY: ... that where I err, I'm open for correction and I'm big enough to accept it.

MR. ROBLIN: That's something new!

MR. PAULLEY: Yes.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I thought it was only The Pas that had dog-races?

MR. PAULLEY: I accept

MR. ROBLIN: Tommy,

MR. PAULLEY: I are you going to get into this debate or are you going to allow the House to continue? My honourable friend, the Leader of the House is always complaining because we're taking so long and here this afternoon he's cajoling us on this side to enter into a debate with him when I'm trying to discuss the Minister's salary -- the Attorney-General's. May I respectfully suggest that the Honourable the First Minister just calm down and keep quiet?

MR. ROBLIN: I wish I could say the same for my honourable friend.

MR. PAULLEY: I know it and I can appreciate that, Mr. Chairman. And I'm sure that it would serve the purpose of my honourable friend the Leader of the House if we would all shut up on this side of the House because his ideas and his domineering, dictatorial attitude would prevail.

MR. PAULLEY: Now, then the Attorney-General, and I want to say this, Mr. Chairman, that I am not imputing any criticism of the staff of the Attorney General's department. I merely asked the question of the Attorney-General and he's answered me to some degree at least and I was interested in knowing why it was that the Attorney-General of the Province of Manitoba himself took this case and in his reply, if he deigns to reply, I hope and trust will answer that question.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, I just want to speak briefly on one or two other subjects. Unfortunately due to the fact of one of the subjects being before the matter of the courts, I cannot speak of it, namely the question of trading stamps. But there is one, I think, that I can -- I don't know now, we have to be very careful in this House, whether the question of Sunday sport is before the courts or not. But I would like to hear from the Attorney-General in respect of Sunday sport, what his attitude or his policy is in respect of this. And I understand and I'm not sure, Mr. Chairman, whether there wasn't some brief reference made in the Throne Speech or whether there was some announcement that there was that something might be forthcoming in connection with Sunday sports, or maybe it's because of the fact that I noted that the Council of the City of Winnipeg by amendment were going to propose an amendment here. But it does

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) ... appear to me from everything that I can gather that because of the fact that an amendment which was formerly passed by this Legislature to the Winnipeg Charter was not worded, or was rather let's say worded a little loosely, that one section has privileges that the other doesn't have, and that the matter should be made more uniform. And I'd like to hear, if the Attorney-General feels that he's in any position to comment on this, any comments that he has to make.

Now then there is one other subject I'd like to speak on for a moment or two, and I appreciate that this is not within the confines as I understand it of the Attorney-General of the Province of Manitoba, and I refer to the ever-increasing gimmicks which the purchasing population of Manitoba have to purchase when they go to the store. I don't know, Mr. Chairman, whether there's one left yet of a package of soap flakes where you can buy a package of soap flakes without a dish or a towel or a spoon or a fork. The other day my friend, the wife, wanted a tube of toothpaste. I happened to be at home at the time the toothpaste arrived, and lo and behold, Mr. Chairman, what did we get? A tube of toothpaste and a new automobile for 98 cents. -- (Interjection) -- No, it wasn't, Mr. Chairman, and that's the point that I'm making. We didn't buy the toothpaste because of the car but we got the car because of the toothpaste. And I suggest that as good as these cars are, and they are very good, that it is time that we here took what action we could because it only stands to reason, and this is a well constructed little automobile, that contained within the price that has to be paid by the purchasing public is a considerable amount of money on these gimmicks and gadgets. And I would suggest to the Attorney-General that he give consideration, not because of the fact that the Province of Manitoba may have any direct control in this matter, but I'd suggest to him that as the protector of the people of the province that he should take under consideration appealing to the federal authorities under whom this operates, or has the jurisdiction to investigate the whole matter. It may be that even the finances of the Province of Manitoba are adversely affected because of this, in this way, that I would presume that one of the reasons that these are given away, shall I say, is because it will allow the corporations an allowance for advertising and a greater deduction under our income tax law. And as the revenues of the province are affected by the net income tax that is received under our Dominion-Provincial agreement, it could well be that by either reducing the legal amount chargeable in industry for advertising, and hence a reduction in the income tax, that the province could get a greater amount through the Federal-Provincial relations.

Now, Mr. Chairman, they are the only comments that I have to make. I don't think I repeated anything that anybody else -- there's just one thing I would like to do providing the honourable gentleman will accept it. I mentioned that we received the car because of the fact that we needed some toothpaste. Now because of the fact that my name is Andrew Russell, and there is another gentleman in the House who has a son by the name of Andrew, I would like to present this providing he will accept it, to the other Andrew in the House.

A MEMBER: You're bribing, you're bribing.

MR. PAULLEY: That's no bribe, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: that you've made concerning the Attorney-General.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Leader of the CCF has just made the most eloquent and touching speech I've ever listened to in this Assembly. I must tell him that I have the privilege of hearing him often. I think yesterday he was entertaining us on no less than four different occasions on Private Members' Day, and I went home at 5:30 and looked at the other Andrew and I was profoundly grateful that he couldn't say a thing yet. However, I think it would be less than gracious of me if I did not say that I can make a speech for that Andrew now, and to tell my honourable friend that when he grows up and is old enough to learn from whence this charming little souvenir comes, I'm sure that he will be doubly appreciative of my friend's courtesy.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to point out to the Honourable the First Minister that as soon as the other Andrew is requiring the toothpaste that he will be able to get another of those cars.

MR. ROBLIN: He may decide to buy a brand of toothpaste which is not accompanied by a car.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask the Honourable the Attorney-General does he prefer to answer the points that have been raised or would he rather hear the.....

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, Mr. Chairman, just interrupt my honourable friend. I must leave the House, and I want to say to the Attorney-General that I hope he doesn't figure it's a discourtesy on my part, because I have an engagement and I'm not referring to the one at Fort Garry right at this moment -- another one -- and I'm not leaving because I can't listen to his answer. I'll read it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Perhaps under those circumstances the Honourable the Attorney-General would prefer to reply now?

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): If it's agreeable with my honourable friend, Mr. Chairman, and the members opposite, I would just as soon gather up the number of the points that are intended to be raised and perhaps I could answer them ---

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, Mr. Chairman, the other evening when we were on these estimates I'm afraid that I indicated that perhaps ten or fifteen minutes would be all the time that I would be inclined to take, but due to some things that happened at that time and since, I'm afraid I'll have to be a little longer than that but I hope to not weary the House too long.

The Honourable the Attorney-General last year at the last meeting of this House made a very impressive speech telling of things that he hoped to see accomplished, and was quite optimistic at that time. One of the things that he said he hoped would happen would be that the Law Society would spread its legal aid, and here I am quoting: "Throughout the length and breadth of the province". It seemed to me that the Honourable the Attorney-General indicated, although he didn't state on that occasion, that this question of legal aid to persons accused was something that was new, and I was quite conscious of the fact that it had been in existence for some years, and I'm sure that he didn't mean to imply that he had been the institutor of it. But the part that I'm interested in is the suggestion that this legal aid might be spread throughout the length and breadth of the province, and I would like to ask him what has been accomplished in that regard. Has it been extended to other parts and the Magistrates' Courts outside of Greater Winnipeg? Then the Minister also on the same occasion said he was considering establishing a law reform committee to advise him, and if he mentioned the other day on the discussion of the introduction of these estimates what had been accomplished in that regard, I missed his statement, and I would like to hear if anything has been done in that regard.

Then, Mr. Chairman, I don't think, or rather I recall that a year ago, the last time the House met, that the Honourable the Attorney-General referred to the establishment of the commission on enquiring into mineral transactions. At that time he said that, and I'm quoting, "a good number of cases have come to light where through ignorance of their rights or implied misrepresentation, farmers and other owners of mineral rights signed away these rights to agents of companies who are active in the leasing field. The result has been that a substantial number of cases have come to our courts, substantial in view of the limited area affected, where leases have been set aside and rights restored to the original owners." That situation was the basis of establishing the commission. I think the Honourable the Attorney-General did not deal with this commission's report the other day. Well I would like to ask him, Mr. Chairman, if he would do so, particularly with the recommendations that are made on page 17 and 18 of the report, which seemed to me to be pretty important. Now the first of those recommendations is, as the Honourable the Attorney-General will know, that the government give assistance to those mineral owners who allege that they have been deprived of their mines and minerals by fraud or misrepresentation -- such assistance to be the appointment of legal counsel. I would be interested, Mr. Chairman, in knowing if the government plans to implement that recommendation. I would think it has a good deal of merit. I would think, however, that though it has a lot of merit that it probably would establish quite an unusual procedure in the Province of Manitoba. However, I'm certainly not opposed to it. I think it's a good one.

I shall skip two and three with which the Honourable the Attorney-General will be acquainted. Then No. 4, persons obtaining mineral interests in the province by lease be required to be licensed, and those persons purchasing mineral interests in the province be

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) required to be licensed and bonded. Now because this is a matter of some consequence I would ask the Honourable the Attorney-General if he would report on what has been done or is contemplated in that regard. And then, Recommendation 5 (a) and (b) I think are quite important in that it is suggested there that no conveyance of mineral interests separate from the surface rights in real property in the province excluding leases shall be construed to convey any interest in any mineral unless they mineral or minerals -- and I think that should be "the" -- mineral or minerals so intended to be conveyed shall be specifically and separately named therein. That I think is quite important, and (b) is along the same line. So I would think that inasmuch as this commission has been established and has reported making some very interesting and I think important recommendations, that we would appreciate hearing what has been done or what is contemplated.

Then, Mr. Chairman, we have had a very complete discussion, it seemed to me, on the question of penal reform. Well I'm not an expert and don't pretend to be, on penal reform, but what I do consider that I'm an expert in is the matter of checking up on the promises that politicians make. I have made that almost a life study, and recently one of my major avocations has been to try and convince the people of this province, and indeed of this country, that one of the great hazards that we face in these times is the tendency of the politicians to try and convince the people, when they are asking to elect them, that they can do the impossible. And even when it's not the impossible which is so frequently promised, even when they offer or promise to do the possible, then the other point that becomes very interesting too is how frequently the implementation of that promise is delayed. I'm not suggesting that the impossible was promised in this connection, but I definitely am suggesting in connection with the implementation of this Fauteux Report that has been discussed here, that the delay is something that should be called to the attention of the people of this country. Now what the ---and I'm not blaming the Attorney-General of this province as much as I am the government at Ottawa -- but the Attorney-General of this province is to blame to this extent, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, that he, last year when we met, held out to us quite a -- not a promise but quite a definite hope that something was going to be done reasonably soon. I want to read briefly from Page 710 of the Hansard of last July 8th, No. 21, to what the Honourable the Attorney-General had to say in this regard. This isn't all of the quotation but I think it is the important part dealing with this matter. "Overshadowing all developments in this field was the Dominion-Provincial Conference on penal reform which was convened by the Minister of Justice in October of 1958." Now I pause to interpolate that October 1958 is now approximately a year and a half ago, and the high hopes that were held out at that time seem to me to be just about as far away from implementation as they were at that time. Now naturally, if they're really going to be implemented, we're a year and a half closer to them, but I must confess that in cases like this, hope long deferred makes us at least wonder about the implementation, and that's the point that I would like the Honourable the Attorney-General to deal with.

Then he goes on to say, and here I'm quoting again, "Members of the committee will recall, Mr. Chairman, that this conference was convened to discuss the implementation of certain of the major recommendations made in the Fauteux Report. I have no hesitation in saying that much was accomplished at this conference and the course of penal reform, not only in this province but in Canada as a whole, has been marked for years to come." And then the Honourable the Attorney-General goes on to give some information as to what the implementation of the recommendations of that report would mean to this province and I agree completely with what he said. But the thing that I do criticize is the fact that here again with two governments, bearing a pretty close affinity to one another, two governments that were supposed to be dedicated to getting things done in a hurry, that we still have so little to tell the people about a year and a half later. And so my criticism is directed more against the Federal Government it's true, but the Honourable the Attorney-General of this province has to take his share, I think, to the extent that last time we met he was quite optimistic, and I gathered the other day that he was not as optimistic now. I must say to him that I'm not too optimistic because I have seen too often, with other governments in office in Ottawa and other governments in office here, that the implementation of such recommendations as these certainly take a lot of time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I must follow the example of the Honourable the Leader of the CCF

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd).....Party and deal with the liquor business of this province, because I think that this is the only item under the present estimates where we would be completely in order in discussing that major governmental enterprise. Mr. Chairman, I think that members of this House will agree with me that there is a good deal of public concern these times over the continuing increase, and growing increase, in the consumption of spirituous liquors. And I think there's good reason for that concern, Mr. Chairman, because when I examined the report of the Liquor Control Commission of Manitoba for the year ending March 31st, 1959, which is now of course close to a year old, that the statistics that are given therein give us a good bit of cause for concern. I don't suppose that I can blame the Government of Manitoba, not directly at least, for the increase, because that's something that is up to the individual. I think a case could probably be made that the public is so discouraged with the government's lack of activities after its great promises that it's probably encouraged to drown its sorrows to an extent in this way or to seek solace by that method. But I don't hold them -- I don't hold them responsible directly. That's something that the public itself is in control of. But like the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party, I do suggest to the committee Mr. Chairman, that the increases that have been made are in violation -- the increases not in consumption but the increases in price that have been made, which will in total cost the people of Manitoba by my rough figuring, and it's only my own, something in the neighbourhood of five millions of dollars, is a direct violation of the undertaking of this government to not increase the taxes. I agree with my honourable friend who spoke just a few minutes ago that perhaps it can be argued that this is not a tax because the people indulge in it only at their own discretion and are not compelled to contribute in that way. But the fact is, Mr. Chairman, whether you and I like it or not, and we're probably two that don't like it as well as some others, but whether we like it or not, the fact is that the people are indulging and because they're indulging they are paying and will pay a great deal more money because of the increases that have been levied against them-- increases in price.

But the first increase that I want to talk about is this one of consumption rather than of price. If the Honourable the Attorney-General will look at Page 8 of the report that I mentioned he will find that so far as spirits are concerned that the increase has gone, in a four-year period, from 427 thousand-odd gallons --spirits alone-- that is Canadian spirits alone -- to 566 thousand-odd gallons. Well that's a lot of whiskey, Mr. Chairman. That's Canadian whiskey alone. He will notice that so far as imported whiskey is concerned, that in the same period they've gone from 119 thousand-odd to 147 thousand-odd; and that's a pretty major increase. I figured those out just roughly and I think it comes to something like-- it was a per capita one that I was working on, so I'll leave that to a little later. Then if we go down to beer -- and there are statistics given for wines as well, both domestic and imported-- if we go to beer we find that the increase has been from 9 million 800 thousand-odd gallons to 11 1/2 million gallons odd. A big increase too. Well, it was a hot summer, but on the other hand, we had an early snow in the fall so that should have compensated to some extent for it.

And then these figures are reduced to per capita consumption, and there's an interesting note here, Mr. Chairman, that on a per capita basis the consumption in Manitoba of spirits continues to be slightly below, and of beer to be slightly above, the Canadian average. So taking the two together we are just about average in that regard. But the per capita consumption, taking the Canadian spirits alone, went from .66 of a gallon to .82 of a gallon, and if my figures are close at all that's practically a 25% increase in those four years. And taking wine, from .32 per capita to .42, and I figure that to be a 30% increase or more. And then on beer, from 11.95 gallons to 13.21 gallons, which I make to be about 10% approximately. And, Mr. Chairman, when you think of a whole gallon of beer -- an interesting thought I know -- when you think of a whole gallon and then think of 11, almost 12 of those gallons, and not only one person drinking all of those, but the fellow who is drinking them drinking enough to make up for the children and the rest who don't drink them, it is quite a bit of beer. Well it's increasing and I am informed that this is not unique. It's going on in other parts of this country as well.

Taking those increases into account I think that we can understand the grave concern of a lot of people about what appears to be an effort on the part of a good many of our people to drink our way into prosperity, because the fact is, projecting these figures, according to

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd).....my rough calculations, and I don't want to blame anybody else for these figures at all, they're entirely my own, but projecting the increase into the future, I would say that it looks as though we're in the neighbourhood of a \$50 million consumption of alcoholic beverages during this year. Because if you will turn to page 16 of the same report you will see that the sales at the head office and stores and branches and agencies, which is largely spirits, not entirely so but largely spirits and wine, that the total sales are 24 million-odd; beer licensees and vendors, 18 million-odd; making a total of more than 42 1/2 million dollars. Then if you add to the beer licensees and vendors the cost of them retail, which I have estimated to be increased approximately 1/3 above that, taking into account the trend that I have mentioned I think that we are right in the neighbourhood of a 50 million dollar business.

But the point that I wish to make in passing is that as far as this government is concerned it has rushed in to take even more of the profits and to load an even higher amount of costs onto the public of Manitoba, a cost which I reckon to be approximately 5 million dollars in this year that we are in. And what the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party said about some attempt being made to compensate to some extent to the hotel keepers and beer parlor operators for the loss of business they have suffered through increased competition from other outlets, etc. etc., I think that it will be found, if there again the figures are examined carefully, that for every dollar that this generous government agreed to allow to the beer parlors that the government accumulated about \$2.00 to itself. Well that's my estimate and I think it's not far out. So I suggest that the extra cost to the consumer will run to something in the neighbourhood of \$5, 000, 000.

I, last November, saw an interesting press clipping that I thought I would keep until this time to see how our situation appeared to correspond with it. This is from the Free Press of November 13th, 1959, and the heading is: "What, no poor men in Alberta?" Here is the article: "Beer outsold hard liquor and wine in Saskatchewan last year while in Alberta the reverse was true. These facts introduced Thursday during the combines trial of Canadian Breweries Limited in the Supreme Court of Ontario prompted some theories on the reason why. 'I suggest that oil prosperity is greater in Alberta than Saskatchewan', said Defence Counsel C.F.H. Carter. 'Probably that suggests that spirits are the rich man's drink and beer the poor man's drink,' said Chief Justice J. C. McGrewer. 'There aren't any poor men in Alberta at all, are there?' asked Mr. Carter. Then the subject was dropped." Well, considering these figures I would say that we're, in total, about on the Canadian average. The Canadian average is pretty high. This is pretty big business and the Government of Manitoba is not the least bit backward about rushing in to increase its take at the cost to the consumer of a great deal of extra money regardless of its promise at election time.

Well now, Mr. Chairman, in closing, and I am about to do that very thing, I would like to return to the statement that the Honourable the Attorney-General made a year ago and read one brief quote from what he said. At almost the beginning of his estimates at that time, page 708 of the same volume that I quoted a moment ago, July the 8th, the Attorney-General said: "It has always been my conception of the department that I head that its primary function is to attend to the efficient and the equitable operation of the administration of law within our province." That's a good sentiment which I applaud and I think it's quite proper. And we have heard oddly enough, the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party touched on this same subject just a little while ago, and I can assure the Honourable the Attorney-General there was no collusion between my honourable friend and I, he touched on a couple of these subjects that I have, but characteristically as far as the one that I am going to mention now, the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party took quite a different approach to what I take. Because as I have heard the discussion up to date, and this afternoon, the opinion has been expressed to the Attorney-General that there's a tendency to appeal too many sentences. Probably characteristic of the outlook of the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party and I, that I was going to make exactly the other suggestion, that there have not been enough appeals.

I wanted to raise a particular one that I think should be called to the attention of the Honourable the Attorney-General and to this committee and to the public of Manitoba, because I think that this is a point that needs to be emphasized at a time when honourable members of this committee in all parties are spending a great deal of time in declaring the consideration

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd). . . . that should be given to the accused persons and to the prisoners in our institutions. It has been a fact, as I have seen it, Mr. Chairman, in the last few days on these estimates of the Honourable the Attorney-General -- at least not a few days but it has been going on for a few days -- that the members, particularly the CCF Party and my honourable friend the Attorney-General himself, seem to vie with one another in establishing the fact that we are being so extra good to the prisoners at Headingley and other gaols, and the attention seems to be concentrating more and more on what can we do for the accused people. Well I want to ask the question, Mr. Chairman, what about the victims of these people? I think it's time that somebody stood up and said something on the side of the people who were the victims of the folks whom we are talking about. And that brings me to the point of why I think we should have more of these sentences appealed, because I am quite aware of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that it's not in order for us to speak disrespectfully of the courts, but I am not any more speaking disrespectfully of the courts than I am speaking disrespectfully of the members of this House, neither one is allowed, when I say that in my opinion there is a tendency in the courts as well, in some courts, as well as among the membership of this House to concentrate on the consideration that should be shown to the accused person and the consideration that should be shown to the prisoners, and to forget to a large degree the position of the victims of those accused persons and those prisoners. And when I see the amount of trash that appears in the daily papers and through other forms of communications these times about some chap named Chessman out on the west coast - California I believe - a chap who has been under sentence of death I believe for 12 years or something of that kind, it at least makes us appreciative of the fact that we haven't got that bad in the Province of Manitoba or in the country of Canada. And there again when all this attention is being paid to our friend Mr. Chessman out in California, does anybody -- have any of these stories portrayed the fact of what's happened to Chessman's victims? And I read in one of the articles that one of Chessman's victims had actually been confined to a mental institution ever since her assault by him. And somebody, somebody needs to give some attention to these victims of these people and the fact that their side of the case is so rarely mentioned in connection with these discussions.

And that leads me to say that I think that some more sentences should be appealed and I want to mention a particular one. I apologize to the members of the Committee and particularly to young people who are in the gallery for having to give details of such a revolting case, but I think it's necessary in a case of this kind to establish the point that I am trying to make, and that is, that if there is a tendency of some of the courts to become too lenient as well, then it is the responsibility of the Attorney-General's department to keep in mind the other side. They are the protectors of the public in this matter. My honourable friend the member for Inkster made an impassioned plea here the other night that he wanted the Attorney-General's staff to be defenders rather than prosecutors. I say that the Honourable the Attorney-General's staff has a right to defend the public and that they're not discharging their duty completely unless they do that job. And when cases, because what appears to be this prevailing attitude of being soft on the accused, seem to be reaching even to the courts of the province, that it's time that the Attorney-General's department should appeal more sentences, not fewer.

I commend the Honourable the Attorney-General for the fact that his department appealed the Stanley Zedd case, but -- and I have no brief at all for the gamblers. With my name and my reputation you'd know that I wouldn't be very likely to gamble. It would hurt me too severely to ever lose. Of course if I could be sure of winning that would be another matter. My principles might not be so strong under those circumstances. But as one who believes that the violation of any law is a serious offence, as one who believes that if the public support is not behind a particular law that then the law should be changed after due process in order to conform with the majority public opinion. But until it is changed that it's the duty of everybody to obey the law as it is. And so I have no blame whatever; in fact I have praise for the Attorney-General's department in appealing that sentence.

But as bad as gambling is, as bad as operating a gaming house is, I submit that it is nothing, or very little, in comparison with what I am going to read to you now. This is from the Free Press of December the 17th last year. The heading is: "Three men jailed for

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd)...procuring". "Three young men who procured men for two prostitutes aged 14 and 17 were sent to prison for six months. Sentenced in City Magistrate's Court were" -- there's no point in giving the names although I have no objection to, but they are three young men, ages according to this report, 22, 22 and 21, all of no fixed abode-- 'Court was told that the three men picked up customers at cheap local cafes and took them to a motel. The customers were each charged \$10 with the girls splitting the take 50-50 with the men. Police said that during a three day period the operation collected \$440.00" And I want to remind the committee that these were teenage girls, age 14 and 17. "Magistrate C. W. Tupper described the offence as a rotten crime and told the three men that the maximum penalty was 10 years. He said that although the girls had turned out to be juveniles they did appear to be older." Mr. Chairman, they turned out to be 14 and 17, both juveniles. "The two girls have been turned over to Juvenile Court authorities. One of the men also received a consecutive nine month sentence for stealing an automobile." There is some more to the article but I don't need to read any more. It's reported in the other Winnipeg newspaper, the Tribune, in almost exactly similar language. I say, Mr. Chairman, that there is no comparison, no comparison whatever, between the Stanley Zedd case and this one. I would say that this one is the one that should have been appealed. A six month sentence when the maximum penalty according to the magistrate was 10 years in the penitentiary. This I think, and I don't like discussing cases of this kind, but this is something where I think the public needs to be protected. What about the teenage girls in this case? It's all very well to say that they likely hadn't been girls of very good training or standing, but what about their blighted lives? And these were young men it's true, but still adults, and I think there is the kind of a case where the public needs protection and somebody needs to say a word on behalf of the victims instead of the accused.

MR. HAWRYLUK: On speaking to the Attorney-General's Report, I wish to make a few comments that I feel would be of interest to the House and particularly when we have a report given to us about the large number of prison admissions across Canada which runs into a figure of over 100,000. The tragic part of all this is the fact that according to statistics that 70% of these admissions are repeaters who continually come back. Mr. Chairman, it's my firm conviction that no one is born a delinquent unless they are mentally retarded. There are aspects that one has to take into consideration and I believe that the majority of delinquents, provided they are caught and guided at an early age, can be corrected. I was appalled at the figure given by a warden at a well-known prison in Canada who stated that it costs the people of Canada \$25,000 a year to maintain a prisoner -- \$25,000 -- multiply that by 100,000 and it's a fabulous figure in order to house these prisoners. We've had some revealing figures of the situation in the Province of Manitoba. These figures are several years old but I think they are pretty well similar -- possibly similar to figures of recent date. In this case we had 1,890 admissions to our provincial gaol for men and 933 of those were repeaters. We had 176 admissions for women and 50% were repeaters. In the penitentiary we had 167 admissions and 80% of those were repeaters. It appears that for many years that prisons, whether it is in Manitoba or in other parts of Canada, have been functioning almost entirely as places of punishment and possibly very little rehabilitation. We are fully aware that we have received nothing in return and the fact that we have had to increase the accommodation for these prisoners from time to time.

A few years ago back some of us had the privilege to visit the Headingley Gaol at the time of the Headingley riot, and we were amazed. I believe this situation has been rectified. Here we had in a cell 40 to 50 people crowded, and amongst them were juveniles of 16, 17 and 18 year olds. I was amazed to find a 17 - 18 year old lad who had probably just left school to be associated with a hardened, degenerated type of criminal, and yet this condition existed for many, many years. You can just imagine the type of education that particular youngster got on his first or minor offence. And yet whether anything has been done since -- I know that we on this side of the House felt that segregation was a must, a necessity. We were also appalled at the fact that in the case of women offenders that we had to spend quite a bit more it seems for their stay in the institution. Where in the case of the male he was given some guidance, he was possibly offered a trade -- whether that's been expanded at all lately I don't know -- we might get that information later on -- but for many, many years the women

(Mr. Hawryluk, cont'd).....prisoners were given no guidance or any training. There were no case workers to look after them and the result was that they were left idling their time away, and when they were released they were allowed to drift along with the tide.

Now since that time we've had two wonderful organizations formed in Winnipeg, the Elizabeth Fry Society and the John Howard Society, and the reports that we've heard from time to time is definitely very, very interesting and commendable. Because in my mind the fault has been that we've kept these people in for any length of time we've provided no incentive-- we've provided no incentive in the sense that these people could be placed in institutions or industry where they could get a job and start afresh, anew. We are not all perfect. Every person is entitled to a mistake, but it seems that society looks down on an individual if he has or she has a gaol record. In other parts of the world we know that rehabilitation is the most important thing and we know that in many of the states and countries where a person who has a profession or a vocation is given an opportunity to start a new record -- a new life, in an industry of some kind, or in an office, and his past or her past is forgotten.

Now I wish to divert my talk to the problem of juvenile delinquency. It's not something new. According to a recent report we find that Police Chief Taft said that crime is on the increase and particularly many of our youthful offenders appear to be on the increase. Yet, although crime doesn't pay to the individual it seems that it does bring a large source of revenue to the treasury of the city and of the government, amounting to thousands and thousands of dollars, which is only right. We have suspended sentences increased in large numbers and the most significant fight that was brought up by our Leader of the Opposition was the fact that we have more and more individuals involved in the contribution to juvenile delinquency. I'm just wondering whether our government is interested in the revenues that they get from the fines that are handed down to these people who are responsible for contributing to juvenile delinquency; whether there's an ulterior motive in which somebody just merely says to the individual who is before him, you are fined \$50, \$100, \$200, \$400 and off you go scot free to continue your dastardly crime. Why do I say that, honourable members? We have some significant figures here, figures in which -- the heading here for example states: "\$575 in fines levied on morals account." We have another case here where it mentions a figure running into a thousand some-odd dollars. Now these people are the ones that are taking advantage of sentences of this type and are not being curbed in any way. I think from time to time you members in this House, we read frequently of certain types of degenerates, sex maniacs who have attacked young girls, and yet what has our society done about it? We turn around and say we fine you in this case \$500 or five months in one case, \$400 or four months, and so on, and the amount that was donated to the coffers of our treasury amounted that morning to \$1,750. Is that all we should be interested in, is the fines that we get from these contemptible people? I think it's the job of every member of this House to do something constructive. If these people are given these sentences and money comes easy, they're going to go out and do the same thing over and over again until there comes a time that they can resort to murder.

An example of that happened ten years ago or so, where we had two terrible, horrible cases in Winnipeg, in the area I think of Fort Rouge, where two young lads were murdered. The man involved was eventually caught molesting someone down in the City of, I think, Fort William or Port Arthur. They brought him back here; he was judged guilty and sentenced and hanged. Yet when they made a survey of the record of this individual they found that he had been frequently involved in juvenile delinquency -- frequently! He was given a suspended sentence; given a month; a fine; until eventually his temper, in fact in his excitement, he resorted to murder. Just as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has stated, we should worry about the victims where a youngster is molested. I know of one case of a girl who was molested, and that shock is going to remain embedded in the mind of that child as long as she lives. The heinous attack that was made on this particular child, and yet in this case, the party involved got away with a life sentence. I sometimes wonder whether we are too lax in cases of that sort.

We find here a man, a former Liberal member in Ottawa several years ago, who asked for the lash or life for any individual involved in any such crime. This was brought up in the Federal House. A great deal of discussion took place. We got a very interesting reply from

(Mr. Hawryluk, cont'd) the Minister at the time who said that there was nothing that could be done about it. I believe the Minister at the time stated that since 1947 when Section 661 of the Criminal Code had been passed -- remember gentlemen, honourable members -- since 1947 only 20 men in all Canada were given indeterminate sentences under the section dealing with such a psychopath. Twenty people -- 20 of them were involved and sentenced out of the hundreds of thousands of cases that we've had across the country.

Here we have some well-known psychiatrist who comes out with this famous opinion, the sex-deviate is usually harmless, passive, inferior, insecure, law-abiding -- oh, he's law-abiding -- and measures of prevention that cure rather than punishment must be the objective of his treatment. I agree. I agree that there should be some measures of cure, but are we doing that? Can anyone in this House tell me that something has been done right in this province here of people who are responsible in the morals charges that have come up from time to time? Yet we have these well-known psychologists, psychiatrists, and even medical doctors who claim that nothing can be done. A former Manitoba Deputy Attorney-General says no province has legislation regarding operations for sexual offenders and he doesn't see how they can get it. He says nothing covers it in the criminal code. The Winnipeg surgeon says the problem has not been discussed seriously in Canada although there are more sexual deviates than most people realize. The medical society is aware of that. Manitoba medical men suggest sexual offenders be placed in institutions. That recommendation was made to the Royal Commission on Crime and Capital Punishment in a brief presented by the Psychiatric Section of the Manitoba Medical Association.

I feel, honourable members and Mr. Chairman, that it's about time that we considered the victims involved whether it be the children or the parents of these children rather than the type of sentence that one gives. I think we should not be interested in the amounts of money that we can get into the treasury of this government regarding moral charges or anyone contributing to juvenile delinquency. These people should, if they are repeated offenders, they should be given severe judgment and a cure, where it is possible, and as I said I'm not going to go so far as to advocate the lash or the life for that individual. Possibly the lash might be effective.

Now just one other -- very shortly I'll finish -- the reports of the young people that are getting themselves involved in difficulties. I can speak from experience in my years as a teacher in which I have had youngsters, and this can be corroborated throughout the Greater Winnipeg area, where you have youngsters coming into the school who are maladjusted and show signs that there is something radically wrong. We test the I.Q.'s of those children, the Intelligence Quotients of those children are very high, exceptionally high in the cases of some youngsters, and you wonder exactly what is troubling, why is that particular child backward in his studies, is giving a great deal of trouble in school. It's amazing, not through some of my own experiences but through the reports that we get from time to time and you can get it from the Child Guidance Department of the City of Winnipeg, invariably you can trace it to two things. It could be a physical defect that hasn't been discovered, but in most cases we have found that it's the condition in the home. Condition in the home where you have a family, where you have the parents who are neglectful of their duties as parents to their children; where you have a broken home; where you have a home of continual quarrelling and drinking which affect the mind of that child. And what happens? The ultimate is that these children begin to neglect school; they'll play hookey; don't like school; detest it because it's compulsion, it's necessary. They become inattentive in their studies; they let their work slide and you have trouble -- sometimes serious trouble. I believe, my opinion and the opinion of many other people, that where the father or mother or both neglect their duties as parents, I think there should be a definite stand taken in regard to the responsibility they have as parents. I think that these parents should be taken to task, even though it's so far as fining them, if they fail in their duties as parents to their children.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, in many parts of North America it is claimed that there are just as many -- that if there is a delinquent child it's because they have delinquent parents. In New York State, for example, they have gone this far, where they are fining the parents up to \$500.00 and if necessary give them a year in jail. However, it's been said that this punishment has proved to be too severe because very often the parental fault is not any

(Mr. Hawryluk, cont'd).....overt contribution to delinquency but merely a persistent neglect on their part. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that in Canada, just as in this province, we should have a plan in which these neglectful parents should be given more severe talking to or even a type of assistance. We should definitely give great essential assistance to our wayward youth, and most important -- I never had the opportunity to speak during the educational estimates because I was unavoidably away --we must provide other outlets for these young people. We must provide other outlets for our 14, 15, 16, 17-year old boys and girls who are not academically inclined to continue in their studies, and we must provide some other type of work, of studies, of vocation in some other vocational school. I think this is of vital importance if we are to keep our juvenile delinquents down to the level that is reasonable and sensible.

Just one other thing -- I've got three more minutes -- Mr. Minister, I'm just wondering, reading from time to time, the sentences that are given by the judges in the various courts. I remember a sentence which comes to my mind right now, does the punishment fit the crime, or is it the crime that fits the punishment? Well I mean this, it just depends which way justice is meted out. It all depends -- I know it's the first remark. But the point is this, time and time you read as a layman of certain sentences given to people with similar crimes and yet there's a gap of the gaol sentence. That could be it has to do with their background and other offenses, but in many cases the similarity is there. A good example, a year or two ago when we had a young man with several children who under the influence of liquor went and robbed a theatre. He was in no condition to even stand in front of the girl and ask for money. He was caught in a very short time; he was taken to gaol and questioned. They found that this man had never been in trouble before in his life and yet in spite of the appeal, the fact that he was a married man with two children and never been involved before, he was sentenced by the judge at the time I think it was to three years in gaol. Three years in gaol and yet in a later edition, a couple of papers later on, you find where the judges turn around and give to repeaters over and over again, a minor sentence.

I think, Mr. Minister, just as the school teachers have their convention once in awhile -- we have it in the fall, we have it at Eastertime --and I'm just making this as a constructive suggestion, I think the judges --doesn't matter whether it's in the province or anywhere else, should get together and have a convention. Besides having a convention which I don't, and I'm not advocating a social convention, they should get together and discuss the merits of some of the sentences so that they may be able to come to some agreement that their sentences are going to be pretty equal across the board instead of varying up here and varying down there. I leave these few comments with the Honourable Minister and I do appreciate the opportunity to be able to speak here this afternoon. Thank you.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Cypress, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 Thursday afternoon.