

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

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock Thursday, February 13, 1964

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(Dauphin): Madam Speaker, I wish to present the first report of the Special Committee appointed to prepare a list of the members to compose the standing committees ordered by the House.

MR. CLERK: Your Special Committee appointed to prepare a list of member to compose the standing committees ordered by the House beg leave to present the following as their first report: Your Committee met and prepared the following list of members to compose the Standing Committees ordered by the House: Privileges and Elections: Honourable Messrs. Lyon, McLean, Smellie, Weir, Messrs. Campbell, Cherniack, Cowan, Groves, McKellar

MR. McLEAN: It is a rather lengthy list. I wonder if it would be suitable to the members if it were just printed in the Votes and Proceedings of the Day.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? (See List on page 96)

MADAM SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q.C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Birtle-Russell) introduced Bill No. 9, an Act to amend The Municipal Act.

MR. SMELLIE introduced Bill No. 15, an Act to remove The City of St. Boniface, The City of Portage la Prairie and The City of St. James from Supervision of The Municipal Board.

HON. C. H. WITNEY (Minister of Health)(Flin Flon) introduced Bill No. 13, an Act to amend The Psychiatric Nurses Association Act.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 17, an Act to incorporate Tri-State Mortgage Corporation.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day I would like to attract your attention to the first section on my right where there are seated some 15 Grade 11 students from Sacred Heart School. They are here under the direction of their teacher, Sister Wilfred. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Logan.

Nous vous souhaitons la bienvenue ici cette après-midi. Nous espérons que tout ce vous avez vu et entendu à l'assemblée législative vous sera utile dans vos études. Puisse cette visite vous inspirer et stimuler votre intérêt dans les affaires de la Province. Revenez encore nous visiter.

We welcome you here this afternoon. We hope that all that you see and hear in this Legislative Assembly will be of help to you in your studies. May this visit be an inspiration to you and stimulate your interest in provincial affairs. Come back and visit us again.

Orders of the Day.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Public Utilities)(River Heights): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I beg leave to table the 46th annual report of the Civil Service Commission describing the work of the Commission and the administration of The Civil Service Act during the calendar year 1963.

HON. GEO. HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to lay on the table of the House the annual report of the Milk Control Board of Manitoba for the year ending September 30th, 1963.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are entered into I want to propose a motion which reads as follows: that the House do now adjourn to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely, that the government by its wording of the Throne Speech has deliberately and undemocratically attempted to prevent members of the Opposition from introducing for discussion matters of urgent and prime concern to the people of Manitoba, and thereby has violated the principles of parliamentary freedom, contrary to the concepts of free discussion in a free society.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the honourable member leave to proceed?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Minister of Mines & Natural Resources)(Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, speaking on a point of order, before we get to the substance of my honourable

(Mr. Lyon, Cont'd.) . . . friend's motion I think we must look at it and look at the rules which surround the question of adjournment to debate matters of urgent public importance, and as Your Honour will know quite well, the whole substance lying behind this rule was that the matter -- the debate itself -- the subject matter must be of such urgency that you, Madam Speaker, should enquire of the House as to whether or not the honourable member has leave to proceed, and I suggest that in this case from the face of the motion itself the question is not answered in the affirmative. My honourable friend, if anything, is raising a point of order which he might well discuss upon the particular motion that I believe is now before your Honour having -- I suppose -- having regard to the motion that was raised by the Honourable Member from St. Boniface. If it is something else, why then it is even more out of order. If we are just guessing, Madam Speaker, if we are left to conjecture as to what is in my honourable friend's mind, then of course the whole thing is completely out of order, because

MR. PAULLEY: Not at all, no, not at all.

MR. LYON: That is without any reference to my honourable friend's mind, the order of it; but may I say, Madam Speaker, that this is an administrative or a procedural objection that my honourable friend is taking and if he has any point to elucidate he seems to hide now and say that he is not making reference to the motion of the Honourable Member from St. Boniface. If not that, then what? Because before we know that it is impossible to make any objective finding as to what he is trying to get at, but in any case I suggest that the motion that is before us does not suggest that there is any matter urgently requiring debate, because if my honourable friend wishes to debate something urgently the whole Throne Speech is before us; there is ample opportunity to debate anything -- practically anything in context of the amendments that are before us on the Throne Speech. There are many ways in which my honourable friend can debate this subject which he is cloaking in some cover here, and so I suggest, Madam Speaker, that it is not in order at this time to even enquire of the House as to whether my honourable friend has leave to proceed.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, if I may reply to my honourable friend, may I first of all respectfully say to you I am quite positive and fully convinced that my honourable friend, the former Attorney-General, cannot know what is in my mind, but I suggest to you, Madam Speaker, that until such time as I have been heard as to why this motion is presented for the consideration of this House, he or no-one else will know what I have in my mind, and that the suggestion of my honourable friend that I should not be heard, simply because of the fact that he does not know, is not ample contention that the subject matter that I asked of the adjournment of this House should be ruled out of order. May I suggest respectfully, Madam Speaker, to you and to all members of this House, that the subject matter contained in this resolution is of such vital and prime importance to the process of democracy, that rather than the suggestion of my honourable friend, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that rather than curtail my rights to say in this House as to why I think the process of democracy is being violated, and he replying that I should be deprived of this simply because of the fact that he doesn't know what is in my mind, should be similarly rejected by you, Madam Speaker, not for any other reason than that suggested by my honourable friend. I respectfully suggest to you, Madam Speaker, that in proposing this resolution for the consideration of this House, the only thing that you should rest any decision on is as to whether or not I have support for the introduction of this motion. Surely, surely in this House or any democratic legislature, the proposer of a motion does not have to first of all satisfy any Minister of the Crown as to the reasons of proposing such a motion. So, I respectfully suggest to you, Your Honour, that the point raised by my honourable friend is without foundation, that I should be allowed, with your consent, to proceed with the motion, for which I may assure you, Madam Speaker, that I have the support of the requisite number of three in this House.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier & Provincial Treasurer)(Wolseley): Madam Speaker, I rise to calm the troubled waters, if that should be possible, because I feel in a sense that -- I feel in a sense that I may be responsible for my honourable friend's indignation in one particular, because yesterday I made some comments about his motion that was about to be offered with respect to the voting age. Well, if it makes my honourable friend feel any better, I want to assure him that having considered that matter, I personally feel that his resolution is in order. But I want to deal basically with the point that he raises, because we always have a discussion

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . as to the nature of urgency in these matters which are in the House, and I must admit that it is not an easy question to decide, and I also must make it clear that we should not, by deciding in the negative in any instance, abridge or infringe upon the right of a member to speak in what he considers to be an important matter. I believe that my honourable friend does think it is an important matter and that he does maintain that there has -- I can only assume from the wording of his motion as to what he has in mind. I must admit he has no necessity or no need to worry about satisfying ministers of the Crown as to what he has to think. It's entirely a matter that is at the discretion of Madam Speaker. But the question is, is the matter urgent?

Now, it has to be urgent in a particular way, and we have had many discussions in the past as to what the nature of urgency is, and in fact we once amended the rules to make quite clear that we understood what "urgency" meant. So I'm going to take the position that, while my honourable friend may have a very important point, I do not think that it comes within the meaning of urgency that has to be considered in connection with adjourning the House on this point. I think that if one looks at the rules, one first has to look at the rules of our own House with respect to urgency, and the question of a matter of urgent public importance is dealt with in these rules, and it is a question for Madam Speaker to decide, not for ministers of the Crown, but we do not assume any responsibility in that connection. The question of urgency is defined in our own rules and it's also defined in Beauchesne, and I refer members to Paragraph 100 of Beauchesne, where they will find the definition of urgency. "A definite" -- I'm quoting now from Subsection 2 of Section 100 when it defines "a definite matter of urgent public importance for the discussion of which an adjournment of the House may be moved" (under their standing order, same as ours), "must be so pressing that the public's interest will suffer if it is not given immediate attention." Now, that's important, because we have the Throne Speech debate before us, and we have many other opportunities to consider the wisdom or unwisdom of the way in which the government records its views in the Throne Speech, and it does not seem to me that the question of my honourable friend is such a matter of such urgent and immediate attention that it must be dealt with at the present time. In a motion that was offered in this respect that Your Honour can read in the portion that I'm referring to, the Speaker ruled that the motion should not be allowed because he did not think the matter mentioned in the member's statement was of recent occurrence or so urgent that the proceedings of the House should be halted so that it should be discussed. There must be a prima facie case of urgency. Again, on the following page under Subsection 3: "Urgency within this rule does not apply to the matter itself." Now that's extremely important. "Urgency within this rule does not apply to the matter itself" -- on which we may all have our opinion. But it is the urgencies of debate when the ordinary opportunities provided by the rules of the House do not permit the subject to be discussed or to be brought on early enough, and the public interest demands that discussion take place immediately.

MR. PAULLEY: That's perfectly correct.

MR. ROBLIN: So the point that's before us -- Thank you. So that the point that is before you, Madam Speaker, is whether the point that my honourable friend makes is of such urgency. In the first place, as far as he personally is concerned, no-one has denied him, up to the present time, the right to introduce any motion whatsoever. He has not been denied the right to introduce any motion. You have and that has been ruled on by Madam Speaker, and I think properly, on grounds of anticipation. Now, as far as the present case is concerned, there has been no denial of my honourable friend's rights. He may fear there will be, but it hasn't happened yet, and I have a sneaking hunch that it won't happen, because I'm sufficiently impressed with my honourable friend's skill and knowledge in the technique of debate to know that he's going to have his say regardless of what I may be saying on this side of the House, and I salute him for it! There is no-one

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, if my honourable friend will allow me to say, it is on a sneaky hunch that I proposed the motion that is before you this afternoon, a sneaky hunch of the activities and actions of my friends opposite.

MR. ROBLIN: Oh, you know, I thought my honourable friend had a higher opinion of us than that!

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, no

MR. ROBLIN: I know that he doesn't think we're much as a government, that he really would like to see us go out, but I didn't think he thought we were sneaky. I want to tell him, our motives were very clear and above board and our attitude plain, but to get back to the point, Madam Speaker, and I apologize for diverting from it, the question that is before you is whether this comes within the nature of urgency of debate as set out in Beauchesne and in our own rules, and I think there will be plenty of opportunities in the regular course for my honourable friend to say what he thinks about our activities on the Throne Speech. He has not up to the present time had any motion of his ruled on with respect to anticipation, and I think that he should wait until that happens. If he finds out that something that he has proposed is ruled out because of grounds of anticipation that he wants to give us. . . for it, then we'll have to take our lumps when that time comes. But I suggest that it is not a matter of urgency within the rules as stated in our own book and in Beauchesne.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I hesitate to get into what seems to be a private fight here, but in order to get the work of the House in process this afternoon, I'd like to refer the House to Page 13 in our own Rule Book, Rule 27, Sub-rule 3, and I submit, Madam Speaker, that you have ruled on this motion by the member of the NDP because the rule is very clear. It says, "The member shall then hand the written statement on the matter proposed to be discussed to Mr. Speaker, who, if he thinks it is in order and is of urgent public importance, shall read it out and ask whether the member has the leave of the House to proceed." Madam Speaker, you have read the motion to the House, and you have presented to the House the question, "has the member the right to proceed?" In so doing, you automatically, according to our rules, ruled that it was in order and was of urgent public importance. There can be no other interpretation of this rule. From the moment that you read the motion and put the motion to the House, then you have settled that in your opinion it's in order and of urgent public importance. The next step, of course, does not prevent honourable members opposite from raising an objection, but having raised their objection, the following step again is very clear -- Madam Speaker has no alternative. It says: "Mr. Speaker shall request those members who support the motion to rise in their places, and if three members rise accordingly, Madam Speaker shall call upon the member who has asked for leave." So I submit that when my honourable friends are through with their objections, the matter having advanced to this point and your having ruled under Subsection 3 that the matter is in order and is urgent, then let's have three members rise and my honourable friend can proceed.

MR. ROBLIN: I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that having considered the views of the members of the House that you advise us as to whether you think the motion is in order or not. As far as we are concerned we will abide by whatever decision you render.

MR. MOLGAT: But Madam Speaker, you have already ruled that the matter is in order by taking the action that you did. Read the rule.

MADAM SPEAKER: Would the members who support the motion please rise. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, may I first of all thank those who took part in this very interesting discussion on rules of procedure. It seems to me that as a result of the discussion it's all the more important that the subject matter that I propose for consideration this afternoon should be considered by this House. That is, as to whether or not our democratic system of government and society that we so vigorously defend in the western world should prevail here in the Legislature of Manitoba. My honourable friend, the First Minister of the province, and also aided and abetted as he was by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, prejudged without any previous indication of what I was going to say. My honourable friend the First Minister says that if the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party wants to stand before this House and criticize him, because yesterday when my colleague from Seven Oaks rose to introduce a motion concerning the voting age being lowered, then I could do it at the time that the matter was formally presented to the House. I want to say to my honourable friend the First Minister it was because of his action and his attitude yesterday, Madam Speaker, that led me to propose this motion today. I'm sure that I don't have to say to my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition or the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that when a matter of this nature is before the House for the consideration of Madam Speaker, that once the decision of Madam Speaker is ruled then there is no debate and the only alternative that the

(Mr. Paulley, Cont'd.) . . . Opposition has is to challenge the ruling of Her Honour. This is the way we operate in a democracy. But, Madam Speaker, I suggest that by the very attitude of the Honourable the First Minister yesterday in response to the resolution standing on the Order Paper of my colleague from Seven Oaks, that there were going to be attempts in this Legislature of depriving the Opposition, or indeed any member of this House, from suggesting proposals for the consideration of this Legislature which are for the well-being of the people, the citizens of the Province of Manitoba.

Let's take for instance, Madam Speaker, and I'm not going to discuss the merits or otherwise as to the resolution dealing with the extension of votes to those of eighteen years of age. But the principle involved is of prime importance, and it is urgent, because if this Legislature were to follow the suggestion of my honourable friend that the matter could not be discussed simply because it was referred to by inference in the Speech from the Throne that a special Select Committee of this House will be asked to consider or to review The Election Act, then I say that there is the possibility of an injustice to the citizens of the Province of Manitoba in this manner, Madam Speaker. We have at the present time, or even today the Honourable the Minister of Education proposed to this House the names of members of a list of committees, who will in this session deal with matters referred to on an immediate basis, as they arose. The inference in the Throne Speech of a Special Committee to review elections indicates to me at least -- and here I may be anticipating government action as they attempted to anticipate what I was going to say this afternoon -- but it anticipates at least to me, Madam Speaker, that the review of The Election Act will not take place by this Special Committee until after this House is prorogued, and the recommendations, if any, of that Committee, would come before the Legislature of Manitoba at its next ensuing session. And I respectfully suggest, Madam Speaker, that in the interim, knowing the type of fluctuating minds of the members opposite, that -- yes, flexible -- that the Government opposite could call an election tomorrow. In this way, the subject matter of the resolution as proposed would not have been considered.

We well know, we know well who sit in opposition to that Government, that they don't know from day to day what course of action that they will take, and I suggest that it is incumbent enough in Opposition to make proposals for the consideration of this Legislature that will extend to as many citizens of Manitoba the privilege of passing judgment on their activities as possible, so while I am referring indirectly to the resolution of my Honourable Colleague from Seven Oaks, I do it merely as being an illustration of how far and how ridiculous it can be if the author and editor of the document that we are considering at the present time, namely the Throne Speech, can merely stand up in his place and say, "Madam, because I mentioned it in the Throne Speech, it's out of order." I suggest, Madam Speaker, that the honourable gentleman, the First Minister, when he was appearing on TV about a week or so ago -- I believe the Wednesday before this session started -- but with a different opinion, of a different mind than he is this afternoon, because at that time in answer to a question by Mr. Peter McLintock of the Free Press, when Mr. McLintock says to my honourable friend, "Now, Mr. Premier," -- I may not have the exact words, but I am sure my honourable friend will agree that I am not taking them out of context -- when Mr. McLintock said to my honourable friend, "Now, Mr. Premier, when you have compiled and edited the Throne Speech, does this of necessity mean that everything that you say in the Throne Speech will be enacted upon by the Government?" and what was the answer of my honourable friend, Madam Speaker? No. It was not necessary for the Government to introduce a subject matter simply because it was mentioned in the Throne Speech. And I suggest that that is what my honourable friend attempted to do yesterday. So I say it is of vital concern to this House that he is not given this opportunity in this House.

May I refer to another matter without debating the subject matter or the contents? I suggest that the Honourable the Minister of Labour was the author of a part of the Throne Speech dealing with the review of labour legislation. He says that it is going to take a period of three years; the review is going to be undertaken over a period of three years. If he, or the First Minister, applied the same type of judgment as was being attempted yesterday in respect to my colleague's resolution in the field of labour, then no member on this side of the House could introduce any resolution or any bill pertaining to the field of labour legislation. How ridiculous a situation this would be, Madam Speaker, but again, am I not correct in presuming

(Mr. Paulley, Cont'd.) . . . that this would follow the logic of my honourable friend, the First Minister? Would this not, as I suggest in my resolution, be depriving the Opposition, and even members of government, from fulfilling their duties and their obligations as members, as I say, in a free society.

I want to say, Madam Speaker, that in the other House at Ottawa, I have been informed and have observed that on many occasions, albeit reference has been made in the Throne Speech to certain proposed legislation, that it is recognized in that House that until the Government's intentions have been known in a concrete manner by a resolution or a bill being placed on the Order Paper, then the Opposition has the right in the other House to introduce a bill or to introduce a resolution dealing with the subject matter that was contained in the Throne Speech. I respectfully suggest to my honourable friend, the First Minister, that he look at past precedence in the House of Commons at Ottawa, and he will find, Madam Speaker, that what I have just said is right, that until the government indicates -- I think I can say it -- sincerity of purpose, by having placed on the Order Paper for the consideration of the House its intention, then members in Opposition have their democratic rights to propose similar legislation. Then, after that, Madam Speaker, there does come the question from time to time, that after this having been done, which shall take precedence over the other. And it has been done in the other House, where members in Opposition or private members have withdrawn their resolution in favour of that of the Government, realizing that the Government-proposed resolution normally has more chance of success and adoption.

So I say, Madam Speaker, I was deeply concerned yesterday when my honourable friend rose on what appeared at that particular time, although it actually wasn't, to be a point of order, to say that the subject matter could be considered by the committee or an amendment could be made to a resolution, I was deeply concerned. For while my experience in parliamentary procedure may not be the best that there is in this House, I respectfully submit, Madam Speaker, that it is in the interest of the Province of Manitoba, it is in the interest of this House and indeed in the interest of our democracy that we cherish so widely, that there should be no infringement on the rights of opposition, that until such time as the Government show by its action by the introduction of resolutions in the concrete form on the Order Paper, that there should be no attempt whatsoever by the Government of the day to use, as I said to my honourable friend yesterday, the mere verbiage in the Speech from the Throne to deprive we on this side of the House our rights to make propositions that we feel will be in the best interest of all of the people of our province.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I think that my honourable friend deserves a comment from me on his presentation and I take advantage of the opportunity to give it. As I listened to him talk that famous quotation from MacBeth flashed into my mind that begins, "full of sound and fury, signifying" -- well, I leave what it signifies to the judgment of the members of the Assembly. But let me say that there are really two points, perhaps, that should be made in answer to what my honourable friend has said, and the first is that it seems to me that he is uncertain in his mind as to the rule of anticipation. Now we have a rule in our books that says that a motion shall not anticipate a matter which has previously been appointed for consideration by the House or with reference to which a Notice of Motion has previously been given and not withdrawn. And I think that on consideration none of us would really like to do away with this rule about anticipation. That is, if the Government announces that it intends to bring in a measure with respect to a certain matter, then it is not desirable that other members should raise the same point until the Government's proposal has been dealt with. That is a long-standing rule of parliamentary assemblies that has been developed over the years as being necessary to expedite the business, and it is a rule which I think my honourable friend really approves of in principle -- I don't think that he would deny that -- and that it is a necessary rule with respect to the procedures of the House.

He says, however, that the government are going to use this rule -- and this is the second point -- the government are going to use this rule in an attempt unlawfully and improperly to stifle members of the opposition or to prevent them from having their say on matters. Well of course there are a number of ways of approaching this particular problem because even if the government were successful or intended this course of events, the best they could do would be to postpone the discussion, because as soon as their own resolution is before the House it

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . would be in order for men who disagreed to amend it or to debate it in that particular way, and I submit that even with the worst intentions in the world no government could get away with it.

But that is not the point that I want to make in this connection. What I want to say is that my honourable friend raised a number of assumptions and presuppositions which developed a case which is entirely theoretical and which may never exist with respect to one particular point, this question of the resolution at 18 years. It is perfectly true that I got up the other day and made some comments with respect to it, but I considered what my honourable friend had said and I came to the conclusion in my own mind that he was right and I made up my mind that when the matter came up again it would certainly not be opposed by me on grounds of order. But then he says we have a Throne Speech here which is so all-inclusive and which uses subjects of such broad description and terms, such as the labour matter that he mentioned or this reference to The Electoral Act, that the government could get up and say: "Oh, the rule of anticipation prevents you from doing this, that and the other thing" -- and anyway you may never bring it in -- and he quotes the interesting talk I had with Mr. Peter McLintock on the subject of Throne Speeches.

Well I think that if a government stands in its place -- or any member of the Executive Council stands in his place and says that a certain matter mentioned in the Throne Speech will be brought in, then that certainly is pretty good evidence that that is going to happen; and I think that if any member has any question on that point and wants to enquire of the government whether it intends to introduce the measures in the Throne Speech, then I think that that course can be followed. I don't recall many instances, if any, where we have not proceeded with matters that were mentioned in the Throne Speech, but theoretically it is possible to drop them.

But all that is really beside the main point, and the main point is this, that my honourable friend does not have to depend upon the goodwill or the wishes or the intentions of the men on this side of the House for his rights. His rights in this Legislature do not depend on what a majority may happen to think about what he's got to say at a particular time, and thank God for it. We have established a protection for the rights of members and if the government were so foolish, and I say foolish, to get up for example on this question of labour legislation and state that because we have intimated we are going to study this matter for three years that no member could bring in any resolution to talk about labour for three years -- if we were so foolish as to try and do that, or if we were so foolish as to try and extend the true intent and meaning of the doctrine of anticipation in a way that would unfairly block the rights of members, they have a protectoress in this House and a protector. The protector is the rules of the Legislature and the protectoress is Madam Speaker, and if you want an example of the kind of protection that is offered for the rights of members you need only go no farther back than the ruling made by Madam Speaker just a few minutes ago.

Now I expressed my opinion at that time that I didn't think it was in order, but Madam Speaker thought otherwise, so those of us who are the majority in this House accepted the ruling of Madam Speaker and my honourable friend had his opportunity to speak and that is as it should be -- that is as it should be. We have no monopoly on either virtue or accuracy on this side of the House. Our judgment is at fault at times and if Madam Speaker decides in her wisdom that the matter should be proceeded with, it really doesn't matter what the First Minister thinks or other members on this side of the House, we're going to accept the ruling of Madam Speaker.

Now, I suggest, Madam Speaker, that if members think that the government is overstepping its rights, if they think that the government is not correct according to the rules of the Legislature, they have you to decide on these matters, and I think that the obvious example that we just had a minute or two ago indicates the way in which you exercise your powers as the protectoress of the rights of this House, and that's the right of every single member in it. So if the government were trying to do the nefarious things which are spoken of in this motion for the adjournment, we would never get away with it because you are going to interpret the rules as they ought to be interpreted; with due respect to the rights of every member of this House and with due respect to the rules under which we operate.

We had a motion the other day with respect to private schools and you ruled on that occasion that this was a case of anticipation, and I think rightly so, because a statement had been made by a Minister in his place that a resolution would be introduced. The general terms

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . of the resolution were indicated so you had a clear opportunity to judge whether or not the government intended to proceed with this matter in the proper way and in conformity with the fair interpretation of the rules of anticipation. I think that while there may have been some objections in the mind of the honourable member who proposed the resolution, he stated them at the time -- I don't disagree with his right to state his objections -- nevertheless I think your ruling on that occasion was correct. But you were the one that ruled Madam. You were the one who made the decision. We can advance any arguments we like on this side of the House, you will rule according to your good judgment and you will rule with a full regard to the rights of each single member of this House. If we on this side were so foolish as to try to word a Throne Speech as to prevent discussion, why the very concept in itself is ludicrous because the purpose of a Throne Speech is to get the discussion of the various items under question; but if we tried to stretch those rules in our opinion so as to block legitimate rights on the parts of members opposite we would never be able to get away with it, and I say thank God for it.

MR. PAULLEY: That's why I proposed this resolution.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, that's why my honourable friend proposed it. In that case we don't disagree because we are not intending to use any unworthy method to prevent a discussion of the issues that are before the House, and you Madam are in your Chair to see that government and opposition alike obey the rules with the utmost degree of fairness to all.

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): I won't have 35 applauding after, but I'd like to give my views on this. Madam Speaker, I wish to say that I am certainly in accord with the Leader of the NDP. I certainly believe that there should be a rule as far as anticipation, but the word "anticipation" is certainly stretched quite a bit by this government. Let us study what has been done in the very short week that we have been here so far. Let's look in the Throne Speech and I quote here: "A special committee of the Legislature will be proposed to review The Election Act." Very straight -- to review The Election Act -- anything that has anything to do with The Election Act. Now there was a motion brought in yesterday and the Premier said that he wasn't too sure about it, but today everything is fine. It's clear that this could be discussed at the time. Of course he had a very good reason. He felt that it didn't matter what he was going to do, that the Leader of the NDP was too smart for him so he'd have his say anyway. But apparently I'm not quite smart enough to get away with this so he ruled mine out of order.

MR. ROBLIN: No, Madam Speaker, I must correct my honourable friend. He knows that I did not rule his motion out of order. In fact, I very kindly

MR. DESJARDINS: Could I ask a question?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, please. I have given my ruling on your motion and there is no debate on it.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, this motion re-opens, as far as we can see, anything about the Throne Speech. Well just a minute, Madam Speaker, why did the Premier stand up and talk about it? That's different, is it?

MADAM SPEAKER: I have given my ruling on yours and it is not debatable. You may carry on.

MR. DESJARDINS: May I explain? This motion here states that we are -- the Leader of the NDP is accusing the government of writing the Throne Speech in a way to protect themselves and to prevent members from bringing in any motion. Can't I discuss this, as the Premier did when he discussed mine? Can I have a ruling on this now, Madam Speaker, please?

MADAM SPEAKER: You are permitted to speak on this motion given to me by the Leader of the New Democratic Party, but I have ruled on yours.

MR. DESJARDINS: Why was the Premier allowed to speak on mine, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: I believe that there was a reference but there was no speech.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well are you anticipating? I haven't made any speech yet. Well, let me ask this question, Madam Speaker. Was this question of my motion, either if it was in order or not, ever discussed in caucus that you attended -- in Conservative caucus that you attended?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order!

MR. DESJARDINS: I think I have the right to know that.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, I might as well have the steamroller all the way through. Can I speak or can't I speak, Madam Speaker, on this question?

MADAM SPEAKER: You are permitted to speak on the motion of the Honourable

MR. DESJARDINS: Thank you. I'm not referring to any motion. I'm referring to something in the Throne Speech. The Throne Speech says: "My ministers also inform me they will present a statement dealing with the relationship between the public school system and the private schools and the principles which, in their view, underlie sound educational policy in Manitoba." A statement will be made -- fine -- the statement that followed a few days later. The First Minister stood up and said that it was decided, first, second and third -- three principles -- those were swept under the carpet and then

MADAM SPEAKER: Order! I must remind the honourable member that I have ruled on

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, I'm not discussing my motion. Madam Speaker, I'm discussing something about the Throne Speech. If this motion of the Leader of the NDP is in order I think that I should be allowed to speak. I haven't mentioned my motion once. I haven't talked anything about

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, on a point of order, just to try to help out. It seems to me that your ruling made with regard to the motion made by the Member for St. Boniface can not now be challenged by him and he is not doing so. All he is doing is referring to it in a narrative or descriptive manner and certainly he can continue to do so during the course of his remarks here this afternoon because he is referring to the motion that is now before us, and as long as he doesn't directly challenge a ruling made previously I don't see how he can be called to order.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, can I continue without being out of order or

MR. ROBLIN: Let me appeal to my honourable friend to use his best judgment. None of us wish to quarrel with the Speaker and we on this side accept her rulings. I know that my honourable friend now understands he is not going to talk about the Speaker's ruling the other day on his motion, but I urge him to do his best to comply with the direction that he receives.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thanks very much. This is acceptable. This is what I was trying to do, Madam Speaker. I say then that -- I've read in the Throne Speech that "my ministers also inform me that they will present a statement dealing with the relationship between the public school system and the private schools and the principles which, in their view, underlie sound educational policy in Manitoba." And then this statement -- as I was saying in the statement of the Premier, he enumerated three principles that he felt, well as far as I am concerned this is accepted, we will sweep this under the carpet, we won't talk about it. And the motion, this would be anticipating. Now that we know what the motion will be we must facilitate this process -- we are now preparing a motion providing for the appointment of a special committee of the House to consider the advisability of a program of shared services for private school children within the public school system. What the Government will do is very clear. It will name a committee to discuss shared services, and -- well I can't say anything more but I think that you have got the point, Madam Speaker. Thanks very much.

MR. PAULLEY: May I have the indulgence of the House -- if no one else wishes -- to withdraw the motion?

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the honourable member leave of the House to withdraw his motion? -- Agreed.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone, that the House do now adjourn for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance; namely, the urgency of ending the prolonged truancy of 21 St. Vital school children.

MR. LYON: Your Honour is no doubt aware of the rule in this respect. Rule 27, subsection (6): The right to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose mentioned in sub rule (1) is subject to the following restrictions: (a) Not more than one such motion may be made at the same sitting.

MR. DESJARDINS: I will withdraw my motion then, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Inkster.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, will the House permit that this request be left on the Order Paper for another session.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed.

HON. GEO. HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville) presented Bill No. 21, an Act to amend The Agricultural Credit Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the Motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, could the Minister explain the

MR. HUTTON: I will just read the explanatory note in the bill itself. This amendment gives priority to a mortgage in favour of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation over a landlord's right to distrain for rent with respect to the goods and chattels comprised in the mortgage.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the First Minister and I want to make it clear that this is a question, not a -- I don't want to be ruled out of speaking because it will depend on his answer. Does this place the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation in a different position than a normal holder of a chattel mortgage.

MR. HUTTON: Yes.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Madam Speaker, in that case, and this is what I was afraid the answer would be, I rise to object to this bill on the basis of the very principle involved. I can see no reason whatever why the Crown or the State should be placed in a different position in its business transactions, as is the case here of the Credit Corporation, than should a private individual. Why is it that the Crown in this case should, merely by taking advantage of the rights that it has, place itself in a preferred position where another individual is unable to do the same. It seems to me that this is against the very principles that we should be upholding here. The State certainly has rights, but when it goes, as it does in this case into a business operation in competition with other business activities, then I think it is unfair to give it rights that are of a purely business nature not accorded to others. I think this brings up a number of other questions as well. What will be the situation if there were rents due on a certain piece of property? What would be the situation if there was past rent due on a piece of property? Where would the government stand then? Would it take priority or would it not? This leads to, I think, the opportunity for the government to take advantage of situations where individuals may not be aware, may not know that the government has this prior claim, and I don't believe it is good legislation.

MR. PAULLEY: There are, Madam Speaker, some occasions at least in this House where the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the New Democratic Party see eye to eye, and I think this is one of the occasions on which we can. I agree with him most heartily, particularly seeing as the Minister of Agriculture replied in the affirmative as to whether or not this placed the Agricultural Credit Corporation in a more favourable position than other landlords. Now it seems to me, Madam Speaker, that the Manitoba Credit Corporation with its investigations of individuals before credit is granted is in a pretty good position to see as to whether or not the individual concerned can meet his obligations. Now it seems to me as I read, and I must confess that I am just a layman insofar as law is concerned, but it does appear to me that by this legislation that a landlord, being an ordinary individual, can be placed in a far more unfavourable condition than an agency -- or a situation than an agency of the Crown, and I certainly cannot support this contention. We had a bit of a debate this afternoon with the rights of the individual in a democracy and I think that it might be applicable to some degree at least in this legislation that is being suggested by the Honourable the Minister. I respectfully suggest to him that the matter be given further consideration by his department and that he be prepared not to proceed with the second reading of this bill, or to give us assurance that the matter will be looked into more fully. It seems to me, Madam Speaker, quite frankly, that this is a piece of legislation that may have inadvertently slipped through my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture's hand without full scrutiny, because I don't think, knowing the honourable gentleman, that this is the type of legislation that he actually would propose if he was fully aware of all the significance and consequence of it.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I think both honourable gentlemen have raised a very significant point. However, the only reason that this was introduced was not to protect the government or the taxpayers money primarily, but to allow a freer administration and to guard

(Mr. Hutton, Cont'd.) . . . against what might be an over-cautious administration of the monies designated to be loaned for the improvement and increase of the cattle population in Manitoba. As you well know, Manitoba is a pioneer in Canada in the field of intermediate loan capital for cattle, and although cattle on a short-term basis are very good security, when you get into the long periods in the case where you are dealing with tenants -- leaseholders -- it was felt that the policy could be administered to greater advantage to the people who would be making use of it if this amendment were proposed and passed by the Legislature. However, in view of the very strong opposition that has been voiced here by the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the NDP, I would suggest that you allow it second reading and have it referred to committee for further study by the Agricultural Committee. I think that this would be the best approach and I would recommend it on that basis, fully understanding that you will have serious reservations about the outcome.

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The motion before the House is the second reading of Bill No. 21, an Act to amend The Agricultural Credit Act.

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

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

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Sherchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure, and Wright.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 35; Nays, 18.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

Continued on next page.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Dufferin and the proposed amendment of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and the proposed amendment to the amendment of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, first of all I would like to pass on congratulations to you on the manner and the way that you conduct the business of the House in your capacity as Speaker. Certainly I wish you every success in this Twenty-seventh Legislature. Then I would also like to congratulate the mover, the Honourable Member for Dufferin, and the seconder to the Reply to the Speech from the Throne. The Honourable Member for Dufferin represents a constituency neighbouring to the one I represent. In fact, some of his electors live in my hometown area and the Town of Winkler. Certainly I concur in many aspects of the fine community that he represents and that he spoke so highly of, the leadership given in this area on the many matters, and the bright prospects for the future in such matters as expansion of industry. The possibilities are certainly there and it is up to us to explore and to develop them. Irrigation was mentioned in the Throne Speech and also in his talk; likewise water control and conservation. These are very important to the area both that he and I represent, and I often feel that we are too slow in developing this area. Many acres of land are being ruined because of erosion by water and otherwise. I appreciate the work done on the Hespeller Floodway by the present government. The job made -- and I feel that the program should be stepped up, for at the present rate it will take years before it's finished. The need for it is now. The same holds true for the Marais where corrections are needed. Some of the work done seems to me, and also to the council, as fundamentally wrong, and I for one would certainly like to see some of the matters corrected. There are new programs mentioned in the Throne Speech and I do hope that the requirements will be met as far as drainage and water control measures are concerned.

I also wish to congratulate the new Minister, the Provincial Secretary. I notice he's not in his seat at the moment. He is also the Minister of Utilities. I had the pleasure of witnessing the opening or cut-over to the new dial system of Manitoba Telephones at Winkler in January of this year, to which the Honourable Member for Dufferin also referred. It is a big improvement mechanically and in many other respects, although it will create unemployment for some people locally for the time being because of the centralization of the service perhaps having been moved to Morden. The new system will cut down the number of phones on a party line. Having been subjected to a party line service up until now, and still am, I am in a position to state the improvement is well appreciated. However, it is rather amusing, and at the same time ironic, to note that a person could have six telephones installed on one line -- that is the number presently being served in many instances -- to his home or business in a rural area which would give the person in essence a private line. As a result of this, several persons have applied for this type of service, and the cost of such a service where you would have the numerous lines wouldn't cost much less than to have one private telephone installed. This state of affairs seems to be ridiculous and more private lines are needed, especially in the densely populated districts south of Winkler where you have a dozen or so villages or smaller communities with populations of some 100 to 400 people. These communities have business establishments that should be served with private lines when desired, without having to pay the exorbitant price of \$1,000 or more plus the monthly service charges. Certainly this matter should have been looked into before construction started in order that a thicker cable with more strands be laid to provide the wider scope for hook-ups.

I understand that in a similar situation in Grunthal east of the Red River a sub-station was set up to service the people of that area. I would ask the Honourable Minister to seriously look into this matter and provide us with a similar or comparable service. It stands to reason, and it is only common logic that it will cost less in the long run to service one phone than to set up six party lines in the same establishment and service them. Presently this is being done at less cost to the applicant or user, according to the schedule of fees. No doubt this will be corrected and I hope that the Telephone System's policy in this connection will be revised to meet the desired changes. Nevertheless, I wish the new Minister well and would like to say that since he has lived in the area at one time I consider him a personal friend.

Also, mention is made in the Throne Speech that certain sums of money will be

(Mr. Froese, cont'd)... required for both the Hydro and Telephone System utilities. I hope that this will be sufficient to correct the situation back home. Then also, mention is made that legislation will be brought forward to make the Utility Boards more directly accountable to the Legislature. This is very welcome indeed and essential. I also wish to congratulate the Honourable Ministers that have changed portfolios and thus have taken on new duties. It seems that just at the time when our differences on school matters in respect to the Department of Education have more or less eased off because of recent developments the Honourable Minister has changed portfolio thereby making it necessary for me to take issue with him on other matters of concern to me and to my constituents.

Last month, many farmers in the southern Manitoba area were charged with over-delivery of flax. They presumably delivered over the quota in effect in the area. Charges were laid under Section 16-1(e) of The Canadian Wheat Board Act, dealing with the quantity of grain delivered. Farmers were summoned by the RCMP to appear in court in various centres with the result that fines and penalties were handed out. While most farmers paid the fine, there is a very strong resentment to this action. Since flax is not under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board, people were of the opinion that this was nothing but a minor infraction and not as serious as it was deemed to be. Might I say, to clarify the point, we here might all have parked our auto at a parking meter, and as a result of overparking received a ticket for so doing. Naturally, we all know that the overparking ticket fine can be paid at the police station in Winnipeg or at some other point. It is only when we refuse to take this step that we are subjected to the summons treatment, court action, and the rest. In the name of justice and freedom could not this procedure have been followed, thus enabling honourable citizens, all as honourable as a lot of us here today, to discharge of their penalty without shame or sham? When you think of a farmer simply delivering his own farm products to his own grain elevator, be it Pool or Co-op, and storing it there, only to find that he is being charged like a criminal for what could be the most honest action, you wonder what is happening. In many cases the flax was sold to the Pool or other private elevator companies, but in no case was the flax sold to the Canadian Wheat Board. Why does the Board wield such powers? Such wide and autocratic powers? In effect, we would expect this of Communist Russia, or any Communist nation, but not in Canada. I urge the Honourable Attorney-General to attend to this matter and see that the proper measures are taken to have this thing cease.

There is no doubt that the Canadian Wheat Board had powers conferred to it through a declaration contained in Section 45 of the Act, and I would like to read the section, which is as follows: "For greater certainty but not so as to restrict the generality of any declaration in the Canada Grain Act that any elevator is a work for the general advantage of Canada, it is hereby declared that all flour mills, feed mills, feed warehouses, and feed cleaning mills, whether heretofore constructed or hereafter to be constructed, are, and in each of them is hereby declared to be, works or a work for the general advantage of Canada, and without limiting the generality of the foregoing, each and every mill or warehouse mentioned or described in the schedule is a work for the general advantage of Canada."

Madam Speaker, to have a law on the statutes giving the Wheat Board, a Crown agency monopoly, these powers, and in the name-- and I quote -- "of a work for the general advantage of Canada" is to say the least absurd. The powers of the Board should be curbed. Some people might have over-delivered intentionally, others were innocent in this matter and did not even know until summoned. Yet they were treated alike because of the way in which the charges were laid. There was ample space in the elevators, no congestion problem, and flax was moving freely. It seems as though quota increases were purposely withheld, whether for this reason or to get in wheat deliveries for shipment to Russia I do not know. However, that in itself would include another form of compulsion. I feel that an investigation should be made into the Board's operation in connection with this matter. On the other hand, the Board has power to withhold increases in quotas and can thereby regulate the farmers' sales of grain, and regulate the farmers' income therefore and thus keep the farmer in a borrowing position most of the year. We also have enabling legislation passed in Manitoba supporting or pledging co-operation in marketing legislation of this type. I feel this should not have happened in the first place, but certainly because of the compulsion should be repealed to make it a voluntary Board to which all farmers could subscribe.

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

The section dealing with this legislation is found in Chapter 179 of the Revised Statutes. I feel that this matter should be taken in hand. I feel that the Honourable the Attorney-General should take this matter in hand and do something about it. Certainly we live in a free country and yet to be subjected to this type of compulsion is not good. I am sure that if our retailers were told that they couldn't sell more than such and such in the way of goods they would scream to high heaven. Yet we as producers in Manitoba and in Western Canada can only deliver so much, as the Wheat Board, a Crown monopoly, tells us or allows us to. I think this is absurd and it should be corrected.

When I look through the Throne Speech, look at the many items of legislation that are supposed to come forward, there are some things that I do welcome, and very much indeed. I am certainly looking forward to legislation that will assist in the prevention, detection, treatment, and rehabilitation of mental illness. This indeed is commendable, as more and more people fall prey to this illness, and the sooner and faster we can bring about more help and assistance in this direction, the better.

I also note that dental health proposals are to be placed before us, and I hope that it is something we can support. Ordinary folk cannot afford dental services today because of the high cost involved. As a result, things are left in abeyance until a set of dentures have to be secured. Many people in Manitoba are in the low income group and therefore request and strongly urge that denturists be allowed to operate legally and in their own right. These are people that are offering their services at low cost, and have rendered a good service in the past.

I also note that there are measures such as the Regional Development Association, Irrigation and Ground Water Exploration, and new program for drainage and water control, that I am awaiting with anticipation. The other day we heard the First Minister give a statement on education in connection with shared services policy. I am, for one, certainly interested in the extension of services of this public school system to other groups to put it to better advantage. Certainly there is nothing alarming about this measure, as it will not disturb the school system as it is presently in effect. To me, it is only an extension and sharing of the services presently available. No doubt some problems will arise and areas of operations will have to be defined. I can envisage a private school adjoining or in close proximity of a public school, having facilities such as a gym, commercial classes fully equipped, music or vocal instruction available but not put to full use, to be shared and to be put to better advantage than we presently do. Affiliation will have to be defined and I see no problem where you have one district divisions, where both elementary and high school instruction come under the authority of one board. Not so in the rural areas and in smaller centres, where division board is in charge of secondary education only, and a separate board administers the elementary education. There should be no trouble with private high schools affiliating with the divisions. After all, they are being charged with very similar duties, and as long as they are not subjected to any infringements of their autonomy I think there will be no difficulty in this regard. There may be very few private elementary schools outside the urban area of Greater Winnipeg, so that affiliation of private elementary schools might not pose a large problem. However, I think we should avoid any further centralization of power or authority in the division boards, other than in the one district divisions presently constituted that have greater responsibilities already. The program holds promise for high school and vocational school students in large centres that have these services available. I do have further remarks on education, on the Education Department of this Province, but I will reserve those till such time as we will be dealing with the estimates of that department.

I now come, and I would like to speak a few words in connection with Natural Resources, and here I note that the Minister is not in his seat. However, I wish to congratulate the new Minister of Natural Resources and I wish him, of course, the greatest success. Since the Minister is such an able debater, a most admirable quality -- I believe he should put his persuasive power to good use, and with all his usual energy embark on a vigorous program that will make the department he is heading a paying proposition. All of our natural resources can be made to produce greater government revenue to provide the capital and funds to pay for government expenditures, thus reducing our provincial taxes and provincial debts which are

(Mr. Froese, cont'd)... sky-rocketing. No doubt he will be anxious to learn, for in spite of the impression he leaves sometimes that he knows everything, there are two renowned authorities that he would do well to look up. I would recommend that the Government pay the Honourable Minister an all expense trip to the two most prosperous provinces of Western Canada, British Columbia and Alberta, to gather some know-how. I know they are ready to give sound advice with experience to back up a program, and that can be applied anywhere, any day. Certainly there is room for further Hydro development in our province, and if it could be financed on a proposition similar to that of the development of the Columbia, where without creating a debt for the province Premier Bennett's Social Credit government has given a tremendous boost to the province's economy, a boost which will carry well beyond the nine to ten years that it is anticipated the construction will take. Let us make use of our natural resources while it is still economical to do so, and before they become obsolete. Let us not allow our natural resources to go to waste. There are many things the B. C. government has to offer, and in which I feel we are certainly lacking and certainly not holding pace by comparison. The B. C. government is actively supporting by becoming a minority shareholder on behalf of its citizens in a new federally chartered bank that will make B. C. and Vancouver a centre of Canadian finance. No doubt this bank will have a western flavour, have greater confidence in and therefore do more for Western Canada. Likewise, we are advised that a charter will be sought to bring about another bank by Mr. Coyne and his associates here in Manitoba, but on a smaller scale, with a head office in Winnipeg. I think this is good. I for one welcomed it to come about. On the other hand, Mr. Coyne, having been in the banking business as head of the Bank of Canada, will know where the gravy is and know that he cannot go wrong in this venture.

However, what I wanted to point out, where B. C. through its investment into projects, receiving large amounts of capital through the Columbia deal, will be on the active side of the ledger whereas we in Manitoba will either be borrowing, or if we do invest, probably will be getting our funds from New York, will be borrowing whatever we do invest, and rightfully appear on the liability side of the ledger. That's a marked difference.

Should he go there, to B. C., he would also be adding to the B. C. tourist influx where they have enjoyed a 40% increase when over a million Canadians visited B. C. last year -- another area where greater emphasis should be placed on in this province to receive in tourist spending. While there, he would also realize that the citizens of that province were enjoying much larger pensions than Manitoba, and that when the federal government increased the old age pensions, he would have seen to it that these were passed on to those people receiving social allowances as well, and thus not necessitating the liberal opposition to base their non-confidence motion on this item.

While on his way to B. C. he might also drop in and take advantage and see the Alberta government in connection with the extension of the Treasury branches. These too are providing a very useful purpose and complementing the Credit Unions to operate at less cost and there would be therefore less cost to the members. This is something worth looking into as well.

All in all, I feel that we are way behind time and certainly lacking in development of our natural resources. Something should be done to set up the right policies that will bring about development for the good of our citizens.

I would also briefly like to refer to the amendment that is before us submitted by the NDP Group of this House, where they endorse a comprehensive public health program. This morning I read the Free Press and came across an article, and I would like to read part of this into the record. It comes from Montreal and it reads this way: "The Alberta government's new health plan meets many insurance industry wishes and the Sun Life Assurance Company of Canada intends to underwrite others elsewhere in North America, the President of the Company said Tuesday. Allistair M. Campbell was addressing the annual meeting of the Sun Life participants in the Alberta plan. Mr. Campbell said the Alberta plan included many of the insurance industries' recommendations in its brief to the Royal Commission on Health Services. Other plans would not have to conform exactly to the Alberta plan to qualify underwriting by the company." And further on in the same article it goes to say: "Sun Life spokesman emphasized on President Campbell's remarks that the Alberta government's health plan meets

(Mr. Froese, cont'd)... many industry wishes. In their brief to the Royal Commission on Health Services, the insurance companies said a health plan should allow them to provide health insurance at premiums no greater than a legal maximum. This is incorporated in the Alberta plan. The Alberta plan's availability to all regardless of health, age, occupation or place of residence was also recommended by the insurance industry. The company's brief recommended that the plan be voluntary and that the government provide subsidies to pay the premiums of persons unable to pay themselves, both of which are in the Alberta plan."

I feel the Alberta plan has a lot of merit. People are free to subscribe to the company, to the plan that they desire and the provincial government is subsidizing them in getting their insurance. I have a schedule of the rates that are in force there, but I don't think it's necessary to read them at the present time. They feel that they have a possible 400,000 people in the province which will be eligible. Presently, some 230,000 people are already covered, and the insurance plan has just been in operation for a few months. Presently, 47 insurance companies are availing themselves of this legislation and are providing insurance. In addition to that there is the provincial M. S. I. as they commonly call it. It's a prepaid service, a private prepaid service operating in the Province of Alberta. The rates are very economical and the contributions that the province makes run about half the cost, so that here, I think, is a plan that we in Manitoba could well adopt; that we could subscribe to. Certainly we want to leave the people in the way where they can decide for themselves whether they want it or not, and what type of insurance they want.

Madam Speaker, I had some other items that I thought I should bring in today but I haven't got my material completed on them, so I will be discussing them when the estimates are brought forward. One of them that is uppermost in my mind has to do with our own Crown agency, the Manitoba Development Fund. Probably members will know that action was taken under a security held by the Fund, which was exercised and therefore the corporation has gone into receivership and the people of that community are losing every cent they invested in the organization. I for one feel that the Development Fund is over-conscious and they are taking too much security when it is not needed. Actually, I...

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to remind the Honourable Member that he has five minutes left.

MR. FROESE: Thank you. The company has gone to receivership and the Development Fund has no doubt realized the money that they invested, but other agencies that also extended credit to this organization will be losing out and, as a result, they will be very hesitant in future to invest in a company — in an organization where the Development Fund has first charge on the assets of that company. I think I also feel that this Fund should provide some counselling, some consultative service for these businesses so that they wouldn't develop that far that they would have to go into bankruptcy. Surely if this had been taken into account and had been attended to at an earlier stage, I think the organization could have been saved, but as it is now, it is too late. I feel very strongly on this point and something should be done in connection with this matter, especially in revising the policies of the Manitoba Development Fund, which is a Crown agency. I think that is all I have to say at the present time. I will have some further remarks later on. Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak in this debate I would like to move the adjournment, but I'm more than willing to let anyone speak before I do.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I believe it's the fourth day and this amendment must be disposed of. If the Honourable House Leader has an idea of letting us go home early I agree with him on that, but insofar as the amendment it must be voted on today in accordance with our rules.

MR. EVANS: Oh, I see. I was mistaken. I had in mind that it would be voted on tomorrow.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Madam Speaker, I wish to extend my congratulations to you on again being chosen as Speaker of the House. It was a pleasure to listen to you speak French. I am bilingual myself but I am sure no one in this House would understand if I spoke my mother tongue. It was spoken in the United Kingdom two thousand years ago and out of

(Mr. Harris, cont'd) . . . all the different peoples and languages came one tongue, English. I think that we as people in Canada should take a big lesson from that, for this reason, that from all them people that come into that country, we should do the same here, and when they say an Englishman -- I can rightly say I'm an Englishman as well as any man that comes from that place although a lot of people say, "Oh, the Englishman, he comes from England itself." What is England? It's the United Kingdom the same way, and I would say there's a lesson to us here, that we should take stock of what has gone on through the years. That language -- I don't know whether I'd be out of order by saying this word, but I say -- pardon me for saying it -- it's a bastard language. Now when I say that, there's no race can claim that, no race, so therefore I say we should take it to heart here and make ourselves Canadian. Surely, I can go and I can cultivate my own language at home. I agree with that. And the custom -- I agree with that too. But I say if we are to become Canadians, let's become Canadians and not anything else.

I wish to congratulate the mover and seconder of the reply to the Speech from the Throne. They did a very excellent job. Also, to the new Minister, the Provincial Secretary, the Member for River Heights, the very best in his endeavours. I know that with his experience and knowledge of business that he cannot help but come out right for Manitoba.

I wish to congratulate the new Attorney-General, also the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, the Minister of Health, and to the Minister of Education -- congratulations. I would say you have a tremendous job ahead of you as the subject of education is the one that is of paramount importance in my estimation. I would like to express a few of my own views on this subject.

In the Speech from the Throne mention was made of the relation between education and employment and the power of knowledge as the determinant of growth. No mention was made, however, of how sufficient employment would be made available to the thousands of students who will either complete their public school education or drop out before Grade 12 in this coming year. Much is being made of the building of two Technical Vocational Schools and a Junior College, but it must be remembered that schools are more than the bricks and mortar that build them. The real achievement lies in the quality of education imparted in them and the intrinsic worth in the world of industry and commerce of the students who graduate from them.

The building of the schools is no more than token recognition of the sore need for diversified education in Manitoba. The new schools to be built must be operated on a different basis from the Winnipeg Technical Vocational School where only 40% of the students are taking trade education while the remaining 60% are taking commercial high school training that can be more economically taught in regular high schools. This particular school has never operated at its full capacity of 1,800 students, and has a yearly drop-out rate of over 25% of the student body.

In view of this, it is hard to understand why all the wood-working machines were taken out some years ago, or why the teaching of the needle trades has been discontinued, especially when the Department of Industry and Commerce has recently announced their intention of encouraging the expansion of the garment industry in Manitoba. In Technical Vocational Schools in Ontario and the United States, the wood-working trades are regarded as the basis for many allied trades and are rated as highly important in the teaching of basic skills. Thousands of dollars worth of wood-working machinery was installed in the Winnipeg Technical Vocational School when it opened, but it has now disappeared and with it the skills that could have attracted and supplied students there with a good grounding in manual arts.

Our Technical Vocational School in Winnipeg has become the dumping ground for all the misfits from the academic courses. Is this what is going to happen in the new schools that are being built and will they also be filled by the catch-as-catch-can method used in the Winnipeg schools? Or will a serious attempt be made to staff the new schools with excellent teachers and to attract students who sincerely wish to take technical or vocational training with a view to working in industry? There will have to be much more publicity on the advantages of taking a good technological course as opposed to an academic course, and parents, as well as students, will have to be convinced of the necessity for taking such a course if they are not of academic calibre.

At present, children are sent to the Technical Vocational School as a last resort. This

(Mr. Harris, cont'd)... is not what these schools were intended for. They were built to provide future workers with the necessary skills to ensure they would be able to get out and hold a job, secure in the knowledge that they were making a valuable contribution to the province's economy, as well as enjoying the status of qualified tradesmen. Unless we get back to this original idea and stop using our Technical and Vocational schools as educational stop-gaps, it will not matter if we build three new Technical Schools or thirty, the results will be the same.

There will be the same number of drop-outs, perhaps more, and this is a very serious problem in Manitoba, as in all other provinces. For instance, of the 3,453 students who started Grade 1 in Winnipeg schools in 1950, there remained only 1,431 of these students in Grade 12 in 1962, indicating a drop-out of well over 50%, or 2,022 students over the twelve-year period. Of the original 3,453 students, 305 or 10% went on to University, and of these, 125, or less than half graduated. This is where our present educational system is leading us, to a point where more than half the students drop out before finishing their education and where a mere 3 1/2 % graduate from University.

The report of the Department of Industry and Commerce showed that 44,000 Manitobans were employed in industry in 1962, and that there was no increase in this figure from 1961, and also that this indicated an increase of only 260 in the last eleven years. Where do our 2,022 drop-outs and 1,431 graduates fit into this picture, and fit in they must since these eleven years take in practically all their formal education. Are they gainfully employed, or are they statistics in the provincial unemployment tables. Manitoba's stagnation in industrial employment came at a time when Canada's gross national product increased by 8%. How much worse off will we be if the gross national product decreases, and what will happen to the youth of Manitoba then?

Building schools is not enough. What is most important is that our young people be properly equipped through their education to meet and overcome the challenges that will face them in an age of automation.

Now, Madam, I am going to speak a little on pensions. I see there was a mention made of pensions there. I have paid into a pension since 1950 and I am paying right now \$4.80 a week. About two years ago I went and asked, what would I get if something were to happen to me today? What would I get? What does my pension qualify me for? At that particular time I was told it would give me \$39.00 a month. Now, I thought to myself, how would I live on \$39.00 a month? It's pretty hard to live on \$39.00 a month. Now there's mention made of pensions. I'm glad to see there is some mention made. I don't know what is coming. It might be good. I hope it is. With these portable pensions and pay-as-you-go it gives the older people that are coming up — not the ones that are old now, the aged — but the people that are coming up, it gives them a little security.

The way it is right today the people that have pensions, that have paid through the years, they have nothing, for one reason. I will quote from this, Madam Chairman. "Appearing before a special Senate Committee investigating the problems facing the aged, John S. Morgan, Professor of Social Work at the University of Toronto, estimated that about half of Canada's aged persons lived close to a poverty level. The group the committee was discussing was persons over 65 years of age. Professor Morgan estimates that based on studies conducted in Britain and the United States, in these countries anywhere from 44% to somewhere close to 50% of the older citizens were said to live at the poverty level. This results from inadequate income for a large percentage in the older citizens age group. These observations bring us to the subject of inflation and a look at living costs in Canada point up the problem and aggravates it. Undoubtedly many in the age group referred to bought annuities or contributed to pension funds, more to permit comfortable retirement with the approach of later years. Money in these days was not easy to come by and in the intervening years inflation has drastically depreciated the value of the dollar. Living costs in Canada are roughly 34% higher than they were 14 years ago, and what cost \$100 then now requires \$134. The people in the older group, regardless of how carefully they provided in their earning years are finding the value and buying power of their dollars diminishing steadily with each increase in living costs. It is little wonder that Professor Morgan estimates that about half of the aged persons in Canada are living in near poverty level. This problem facing elder citizens is far more

(Mr. Harris, cont'd)... serious than a great number of Canadians realize."

So you see, Madam Speaker, there is something that we have to do, but it seems that here each province is trying to do what they think is the best. But I sometimes wonder if we as Canadians are really taking this thing seriously, because it's not everybody has the same opportunity. One man, he makes it the easy way, but 99 of them have a hard tussle to go around, and I say if we follow what is taught us, if we go the way that is taught us properly, we would turn around and help our fellow man, and if you don't help your fellow man you're going to say to yourself, am I going to be the next man? I say that we've got to do something on this pension plan, regardless which way it will go. I thank you.

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the proposed amendment to the amendment by the leader of the New Democratic Party that the amendment be amended by adding after the word "Manitoba" in the second line thereof the following: "has failed to take the necessary steps to foster economic development in this Province...."

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Cherniack, Desjardins, Guttormson, Harris, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

NAYS: Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 16; Nays, 34.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member from St. James.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I wonder if the item before the House is not now the Throne Debate as amended.

MADAM SPEAKER: Oh yes, excuse me. The question before the House is the proposed amendment of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. McLEAN: I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for St. James. The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, may I ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks. The Honourable the Member for St. Vital.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): Madam Speaker, I would like the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand, but I have no objection if any other member wishes to speak at this time.

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

MR. WRIGHT: I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand, please.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Carillon. The Honourable the Member for Fisher.

MR. EMIL MOELLER (Fisher): Madam Speaker, may I ask the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Emerson. The Honourable the Member for Turtle Mountain.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that the House do now adjourn.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Friday afternoon.

STANDING COMMITTEES

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS:

Hon. Messrs. Lyon, McLean, Smellie, Weir, Messrs. Campbell, Cherniack, Cowan, Groves, McKellar, Molgat, Paulley, Strickland and Tanchak.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS:

Hon. Messrs. Roblin, Hutton, Lyon, McLean, Smellie, Weir, Messrs. Alexander, Beard, Bjornson, Campbell, Cherniack, Froese, Gray, Hamilton, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Klym, McDonald, McGregor, Mills, Moeller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Schreyer, Smerchanski, Strickland, and Watt.

PUBLIC UTILITIES AND NATURAL RESOURCES:

Hon. Messrs. Roblin, Carroll, Lyon, McLean, Steinkopf, Witney, Messrs. Bilton, Campbell, Groves, Guttormson, Hryhorczuk, Jeannotte, McDonald, McKellar, Mills, Moeller, Molgat, Paulley, Schreyer, Seaborn, Smerchanski, Stanes, Watt and Wright.

AGRICULTURE AND CONSERVATION:

Hon. Messrs. Roblin, Harrison, Hutton, McLean, Weir, Messrs. Alexander, Campbell, Froese, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harris, Jeannotte, Klym, McDonald, McKellar, Mrs. Morrison, Messrs. Schreyer, Shewman, Shoemaker, Strickland, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Watt, Wright.

MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS:

Hon. Messrs. Harrison, Johnson, Snellie, Witney, Messrs. Barkman, Cowan, Froese, Gray, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, McDonald, McGregor, Mills, Mrs. Morrison, Messrs. Peters, Seaborn, Shewman, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Watt and Wright.

LAW AMENDMENTS:

Hon. Messrs. Roblin, Baizley, Carroll, Evans, Harrison, Hutton, Johnson, Lyon, McLean, Smellie, Steinkopf, Weir, Messrs. Barkman, Bilton, Bjornson, Campbell, Cherniack, Cowan, Desjardins, Froese, Gray, Groves, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Jeannotte, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, McGregor, McKellar, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Molgat, Mrs. Morrison, Messrs. Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Seaborn, Shewman, Smerchanski, Shoemaker, Stanes, Tanchak and Vielfaure.

PRIVATE BILLS, STANDING ORDERS, PRINTING AND LIBRARY:

Hon. Messrs. Carroll, Hutton, Johnson, Messrs. Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Campbell, Cherniack, Cowan, Gray, Groves, Harris, Jeannotte, Lissaman, McGregor, Mills, Mrs. Morrison, Messrs. Patrick, Shoemaker and Vielfaure.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS:

Hon. Messrs. Baizley, Carroll, Evans, Harrison, Hutton, Johnson, Witney, Messrs. Barkman, Beard, Bjornson, Desjardins, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Lissaman, Martin, Paulley, Peters, Seaborn, Smerchanski, Stanes and Tanchak.

STATUTORY REGULATIONS AND ORDERS:

Hon. Messrs. Lyon, McLean, Smellie, Steinkopf, Messrs. Campbell, Cowan, Groves, Hillhouse, Schreyer and Wright.