

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, March 5th, 1965

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the report of the Special Committee on Highway Safety and Highway Traffic Administration.

MR. CLERK: Your Special Committee ...

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, due to the length of this report, may I suggest that as it will be printed in the Votes and Proceedings and in Hansard, may we dispense with the reading.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, is it the intention to move concurrence or for the Minister to indicate when.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, that the report be received, and that we will give notice for concurrence.

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

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON HIGHWAY SAFETY
AND HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ADMINISTRATION

Your Special Committee of the House, appointed on Thursday, the 9th day of April, 1964, at the Second Session of the 27th Legislature, and reconstituted on Monday, the 17th day of August, 1964, at the Third Session of the 27th Legislature, to examine, investigate, inquire into, study and report on all matters relating to highway safety and highway traffic administration and control, beg to submit their first Report.

The Honourable Maitland B. Steinkopf was elected chairman of the Committee, and the Committee set its quorum at five. Your Committee met on Monday, October 19, 1964; on Thursday and Friday, November 6th and 7th, 1964; and on Thursday, January 21, 1965, and on the 22nd day of February, 1965.

Public notices appeared in the newspaper with respect to public hearings held on November 6th and 7th, 1964, for the purpose of inviting and hearing public representations with respect to matters relating to highway safety and highway traffic administration and control.

Presentations were made by the following persons or organizations:

Mr. C. Leatherdale on behalf of the Winnipeg Funeral Directors Association,

Mr. G. B. Huehn on behalf of The Automotive Trades Association (Manitoba)

Mr. A. B. Stovel as a private citizen,

Mr. Phil Haffner on behalf of The Winnipeg Safety Council,

Mr. R. J. Montgomery, former inspector of the traffic division of the City of Winnipeg,

Rev. W. Potoroka on behalf of the Alcohol Education Service (Manitoba),

Dr. W. D. Penner, pathologist,

Dr. Rankin Hay, Chairman of the Special Committee of the Manitoba Medical Association,

Mr. S. Leipsic, an insurance agent, appeared in a personal capacity,

Mr. C. N. Kushner, Q. C., Executive Director, on behalf of the Manitoba Urban Association,

Mr. J. Keefe, representing the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing of Canada Ltd.,

Mr. John MacLean, Q. C., Chairman of the Suspension Appeal Board,

Mr. J. Galonsky, on behalf of the Manitoba Farmers Union,

Mrs. Bruce Eadie, on behalf of the Dugald Branch of the Manitoba Women's Institute,

Mr. R. J. Hansell, representing H. C. Paul Limited,

Chief R. W. Alcock, Chief of Police of the Town of Tuxedo, as a law enforcement officer,

Mr. W. G. Eidt, representing the Central Scientific Company of Canada Limited.

The Committee discussed at length the ten points referred to in the terms of reference of the resolution reconstituting the Committee and to which the Committee is to report relating to highway safety and highway traffic.

With respect to these points your Committee recommends:

1. That driver education and training at the high school level is desirable and necessary

on a contributory basis. In order to achieve this purpose, courses should be given after regular school hours, on Saturdays and during holidays. In addition to the training course for driving and traffic rules, a further course on the effect that alcohol, drugs and special equipment have on safe driving, should be an integral part of the course.

2. That compulsory mechanical inspection of motor vehicles be established in the first instance in the Metropolitan Winnipeg area. To establish the necessary facilities an initial capital grant would be required, but adequate fees should be set to ensure that the project would ultimately be self-supporting. A fee of \$1.25 per inspection is suggested; the vehicle to be inspected every six months.

3. That the demerit system while working well should be given more publicity to its method of operation and its aims and objectives, thereby increasing its deterrent value as a means of cutting down accidents. The technical people involved should keep abreast of the latest developments in this field and advise of any administrative needs.

4. That the matter of reviewing the existing penalties for driving infractions under The Highway Traffic Act be held in abeyance pending the revision of the Act.

5. That reflectorized license plates be used for motor vehicles.

6. That 1967 models of cars and trucks, and subsequent models, be equipped with two safety seat belts in the front seats of motor vehicles.

7. That the use of breathalyzers as a new technique, and equipment related to the apprehension and conviction of drivers under the influence of alcohol be given further study.

8. That the establishment of a Provincial Highway Safety Council could not be entertained unless adequate funds are provided to carry the work of the Council. That the Committee appear as a complete unit at the forthcoming annual meeting of the Canadian Highway Safety Council which will be held in Winnipeg in May of this year.

9. That provision be made in The Highway Traffic Act for adequate and uniform marking of pedestrian crosswalks in Manitoba, and that a campaign to educate both drivers and pedestrians be intensified by means of the press, radio and television, and the matter of enforcement be given further study at a later date.

10. That the Committee be reconstituted at the forthcoming Session of the Legislature to pursue its deliberations, and that study of the revision of The Highway Traffic Act be added to the terms of reference of the Committee.

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell) introduced Bill No. 11, an Act to amend The Lord's Day (Manitoba) Act.

MR. SMELLIE introduced Bill No. 38, an Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act (1).

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 59, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Education, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the resolution standing on the Order Paper in my name.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider the proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Attorney-General, with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution recommends it to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The resolution to be considered by the Committee is: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Public Libraries Act by providing, among other matters, that the resident administrator of the Local Government District of Churchill may establish a municipal public library within the local government district, as a result of which further grants may be paid from and out of the Consolidated Fund for the purposes of the library.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, members will recall that last year amendments were presented and approved to The Public Libraries Act which would allow the establishment of municipal public libraries in certain local government districts named in that bill. This, as

(MR. McLEAN cont'd) indicated in this resolution, will add the Local Government District of Churchill to the list and it is for that reason that this resolution is presented at this time.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate the process by which the local government district requests this. Does he act here on the basis of petitions? If other local government districts want to do the same thing, will the same privilege be given to them, and on what basis?

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, whatever the basis are, I wish to commend highly the government of establishing a library in Churchill.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, in answering the question of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, the procedure is by way of a petition of the resident electors. That petition, after certain checking, is approved and it is then submitted to a vote of the resident electors and comes into operation if the vote is a favourable one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has adopted a certain resolution and has asked me to report the same.

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

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

IN SESSION

MR. McLEAN introduced Bill No. 57, an Act to amend The Public Libraries Act.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to draw your attention to the gallery where there are some 150 Transcona Collegiate Grade 11 students under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Kendrick, Mr. Fiorentino, Mr. Huebert. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. Also in the Speaker's Gallery, there are some 12 ladies from the Women's Institute of Hadashville. These ladies come from the constituency of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye. On behalf of all members of this House, I welcome you.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, before you proceed with the Orders of the Day, I would like to invite all members of the House to attend the Manitoba Export Corporation's Export Achievement Day at the Royal Alexandra Hotel. Letters will be distributed to the Honourable Members today -- oh, they have been distributed, I'm glad to see that -- so that without then repeating the text of the letter I issue my warmest invitation to join the Corporation on that occasion. Transportation will be provided to and from the building and we will return here in time for the session.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (Ste. George): Madam Speaker, the invitation that we have just received from the Minister of Industry and Commerce conflicts with arrangements that have been made with the School Trustees to meet at all three caucuses that same day.

MR. EVANS: I can only regret that the Achievement Day has been planned now for a considerable period, as my friend can understand, and it will be a great regret to me that he and others will not be able to be there.

MR. GUTTORMSON: to his caucus as well.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. I would like to ask the Honourable the Minister if he would take under advisement and inform the House at his earliest convenience as to whether the Text Book Bureau will place in stock a text known as "Reading with Phonics." I ask him this question, Madam Speaker, because my information is that this text, which is considered to be very good for use in instructing in articulated phonics, is not available through the Text Book Bureau now, and I'm informed that a great many people are anxious to get it.

MR. GRAY: Madam Chairman, may I direct a question to the First Minister or the Provincial Treasurer, whether the government has any definite commitments to the Pan American Games which are being discussed and will be held here in 1967?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): I thank my honourable friend, Madam Speaker, for having given me notice. The government has informed the City of Winnipeg and the federal administration that it would recommend the support on the part of the province to three quarters of a million dollars -- \$750,000 or matching the municipal contribution, whichever is the greater sum, so that is our commitment at the present time with respect to the Pan American Games

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd) . . . and an item is in the estimates to cover this.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, a subsequent question. If the Metropolitan Government of Greater Winnipeg were to decide to make a grant, would this be considered a matching grant for municipal purposes?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, we will take the gross municipal grant.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, is the provincial commitment contingent on the federal commitment?

MR. ROBLIN: No, it stands on its own feet.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, in this connection I wonder if I may be permitted a question. Representations have been made, I understand, to Metro Corporation as to possible participation. I wonder if the Honourable the First Minister or the Attorney-General or the Minister of Municipal Affairs might inform the House as to the legality of Metropolitan Corporation making a contribution to the Pan Am Games?

MR. ROBLIN: I think, Madam Speaker, we would await the action of the Metropolitan Corporation before making any comment on that.

MR. PAULLEY: In other words, I presume then, Madam Speaker, that there may be negotiations and discussions that may or may not be legal, and it's only after these negotiations that the government will rule.

MR. ROBLIN: I think the position is that we'll find out what they are intending to do, then we'll know what attitude we ought to take toward it.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. I understand the government recently appointed a Dr. Nona Doupe as a police magistrate. Could you tell us where this appointment has taken place or I mean what part of the province?

MR. McLEAN: What was the name?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Nona Doupe.

MR. McLEAN: I am not aware of any such appointment.

MR. GUTTORMSON: . . . of the House, it says to be a police magistrate in and for the Province of Manitoba effective on and after January 29th, 1965, Dr. Nona Doupe of Winnipeg -- (Interjection) -- The Manitoba Gazette.

MR. McLEAN: That's one of the folks we appoint at the request of the Department of Health arrayed for the psychiatric services.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Is this the first time that a woman has been appointed a magistrate, a police magistrate? We've had women judges and women J. P's but . . .

MR. McLEAN: I don't know whether it's the first time or not, Madam Speaker.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to lay on the table of the House the Annual Report for the fiscal year 1963-64 of the Department of Welfare.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I think it was the other day when my honourable friend from Rhineland asked for copies of the table from which I was quoting concerning export rail rates, comparing those from Montreal and those from Churchill. I'd like to lay these copies on the table.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table of the House a number of reports. The first is the report of the Comptroller-General setting out the statement of assets and liabilities of the Liquor Control Commission for the year ended 31st of March 1964. The second is a memorandum showing the general administrative and prosecution expenses of the Liquor Control Commission for the Liquor Law Enforcement for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1964. The third is the report covering the operation and enforcement of the Liquor laws in Manitoba for the calendar year ending December 31, 1964. The next is a "Nil" return under The Contravened Elections Act for the calendar year 1964 from the Court of Queen's Bench and the Court of Appeal, and I wish to inform the members that no rules were made by the judges under the Act; a "Nil" return under The Trade Practices Enquiry Act for the year ending 31st of December 1964; the Annual Report of Jails for the calendar year ending December 31, 1964; a report of the proceedings of the 45th Annual Meeting of the Conference of Commissioners on Uniformity of Legislation in Canada for the year 1963 -- this particular report, Madam Speaker, should have been tabled last year except for the fact that it had not been received prior to the time that that session terminated; and the same report, that is the proceedings of the 46th meeting of the Conference of Commissioners on Uniformity of Legislation in Canada for the year 1964.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, on Tuesday of this week I asked the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources whether he could indicate to me when the Pitblado-Hoskins firm had been retained by the government to act for them in the matter of the Bain estate. The Minister replied, "I'll take that question as notice". I wonder if he has an answer for me yet.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, I thank the Honourable Member for reminding me. The date, I am informed, was August 7, 1963.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, I ask for leave to have the matter stand.

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

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks: Resolved that this Legislative Assembly recommends to the Government of Canada that it take steps to introduce amendments to the laws governing dissolution of marriage by divorce, to provide the following as reasons for dissolution of a contract of marriage, any one of which may be applicable: (1) Adultery; (2) Desertion for more than two years; (3) Persistent physical or mental cruelty; (4) Insanity, continuous or recurrent; (5) Imprisonment for two or more years; (6) Legal separation for more than two years.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, the resolution speaks for itself. It was debated in this House for many times, and I felt the justification of this change is so strong that it should be introduced again. I shall be very brief in my remarks, except reading to you some supports of men in this world who have made a study of it. The library, this library and others, have much material in support of it which I am not going to read, but I have just taken out some of the most important items.

In 1886, the Parliament of Canada enacted a law stating that, and I quote: "To remove all doubts, all laws of the United Kingdom after July 15, 1870 are to be regarded as being in force in the Northwest Territories unless Parliament repeal or alter them." These Territories are later Manitoba - the United Kingdom's divorce law, with adultery the only admissible cause for divorce. This act has not been revised and it means, Madam Speaker, the people of Manitoba are subject to divorce laws which are 107 years old.

In that 107 years attitudes towards divorce have changed so radically that I can say without fear of contradiction that all religious institutions, with probably the single significant exception of the Roman Catholic Church and its communicants, will accept liberalized divorce laws. Indeed, even the Roman church is currently reviewing its stand on divorce as we have noticed in the press during the last few years. Does the state have the right to legislate for morality? Does the state have the right to impose the standards of conduct, for example, of every citizen regardless of his or her faith or lack of faith? I believe the answer of these questions to be known, and I believe that all the honourable members, upon reflection, will agree with me.

To return to the existing situation, what have our rigid divorce laws accomplished? Undoubtedly they have prevented a large number of divorces. They have also, however, done much to increase the cruel practice of desertion, the incidence of couples living apart, separated without the opportunity to attempt to build a proper home for their children with another mate. They have sustained and extended the practice of common law marriages, in which children who may be the product of such alliances have no right to their father's name. Moreover, it has not been demonstrated that unhappy marriages, which by virtue of the divorce laws have been forced to continue, provide a better home environment for the children than do homes created by remarriage. What sort of companionship and understanding exists in a home where the husband hates the wife; or where the wife is incurably insane, living in our mental institutions; or where the man is an habitual criminal of low character. There are shared experiences in such homes to be sure, but few of them can be pleasant. Few of them can have a healthy influence on children.

Our present divorce laws have also forced many of our citizens into acts of collusion and

(MR. GRAY cont'd) . . . perjury in order to gain relief from a marriage which has become intolerable for both parties. No one will ever convince me that a man or a woman bent on meeting his mistress or her lover secretly will leave the doors unlocked so that detectives are able to barge in and take pictures.

A divorce law authority, Mr. Power, has written -- and I have his book right here -- "Undoubtedly there are matrimonial offenses such as actual cruelty and desertion which are often more serious insofar as they render life intolerable than an isolated act of adultery is, and it offends the idea of justice that a young man and woman whose fate is to be married to a partner who has become incurably insane should be unable under the law to obtain release from that tragic reality."

We will not allow people to obtain release from this sort of tragic reality unless they first prostitute themselves, make a vulgar display of themselves in front of paid strangers. The whole process disgusts everyone with a concern for the dignity of man. In allowing divorce on the grounds of adultery, we have made divorce in some circumstances, a regrettable necessity. Let us now ensure that we establish an idealistic set of circumstances in which divorce is possible. I'm definitely certain, on reading most of the material I have in front of me, that people could live happier if they had other opportunities or other reasons to start a new life.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, in rising to support this resolution I do so in respect of the principle embodied therein, but unfortunately I cannot support the specific grounds which the Honourable Member for Inkster has included as grounds for divorce. I feel therefore that this resolution should be amended, and the amendment which I intend to move will be in conformity with the grounds for divorce that prevail in the United Kingdom.

In supporting this resolution, Madam, I do so with a full knowledge that it is not going to solve or in any way assist our grave social problem of marriage break-ups. In my opinion, that is about the gravest social problem with which we are confronted today. But I do feel, Madam, that where a marriage has broken up, where it is beyond repair, that it is foolish to allow that marriage to persist. I think that these people who have tried to make a go of marriage, who have failed, should be given an opportunity and a chance to start afresh. Divorce, Madam, is not what ends a marriage, it is simply the legal recognition that a marriage has failed and humanly speaking is beyond repair.

It is true that in Canada today adultery is the only ground for divorce, but speaking as a lawyer, the adultery alleged in a divorce petition, although constituting the legal grounds for granting the divorce, is in my opinion in very few cases the actual cause of the people going to court and seeking a divorce. In my opinion, that marriage was broken up before these people came into court. It is my opinion, Madam, that there are as many causes of marriage failure in this province as there are human frailties, and I think the time has come for us to recognize these other causes of marriage failure and include them in grounds for divorce.

We in Canada today, in spite of the fact that we recognize that marriages are in most instances broken up before people come to court, we still persist in making a petitioner in a divorce action to allege and prove adultery. Now to me, I think that's absolutely absurd, because all we are doing is forcing these people in some instances to commit an act which is abhorrent to them or in other instances, to set up a set of circumstances from which a court could legally presume that adultery had taken place.

I think the day has come when we must face up to this problem squarely and we must do something to bring it more in line with modern thinking. I think that we must today, Madam, recognize some of the other causes which result in a marriage break-up, and I think too that we should recommend to the Government of Canada that the grounds for divorce in those provinces wishing to enact complementary legislation to that enacted by the Dominion of Canada should be brought into line with the grounds for divorce prevailing in the United Kingdom.

For those reasons therefore, Madam, I support this resolution in principle, but I feel that it should be amended to bring the grounds for divorce in line with those prevailing in the United Kingdom. I therefore wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, that the resolution be amended by deleting all words and figures after the word "Canada" as it appears in the second line thereof and substituting therefor the following: The dissolution of marriage may be claimed by either husband or wife on the grounds that the respondent: (1) Has since the celebration of the marriage committed adultery; or (2) Has deserted the petitioner without cause for a period of at least three years immediately preceding the presentation of the petition; or (3) Has since the celebration of the marriage treated the petitioner with cruelty; or (4) Is incurably of unsound mind and has been continuously under care and treatment for a

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd) . . . period of at least five years immediately preceding the presentation of the petition; (5) That dissolution of marriage be granted on the petition of a wife on the grounds that her husband has since the celebration thereof been guilty of rape, sodomy or bestiality; and (6) That any married person who alleges that reasonable grounds exist for supposing that the spouse is dead may present a petition to the court to have it presumed that the said spouse is dead and to have the marriage dissolved, for such proceedings the fact that for a period of seven years or upwards the other party to the marriage has been continuously absent from the petitioner and the petitioner has no reason to believe that the other party has been living within that time shall be evidence that he or she is dead until the contrary is proved.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that the debate be adjourned.

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

The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Inkster. The Honourable the Member for St. Matthews.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Madam Speaker, I beg leave to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, may I have the leave of the House to have this matter stand please.

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

MR. WILLIAM H. HAMILTON (Dufferin): Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I believe you were going to give a ruling on that.

MADAM SPEAKER: Yes, I have considered the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert and if he wishes to proceed, he may do so.

MR. GUTTORMSON: May I have leave to have this matter stand please.

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

MR. GUTTORMSON: May I have this matter stand please.

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

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House and ask that this matter be allowed to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. I have had this resolution under consideration and you will recall that I have given my ruling with respect to this proposed resolution on March 2nd. At that time the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party requested me to consider the terms "consumer credit" and "consumer affairs" as used in the proposed resolution and in the Throne Speech. After due consideration, I must inform the honourable member that my ruling stands.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, it is with deep regret that I must appeal your ruling.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is: Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

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, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Viel-faure and Wright.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 34; Nays, 18.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I ask permission of the House to withdraw this resolution.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I don't rise to disagree but just to make a point because of the precedents that we sometimes establish here. It is my understanding that until a resolution has actually been moved by a member that he does not really need the permission of the House to do so, and I only rise so that in the future this rule be clearly understood. Beauchesne certainly, I think, supports that point of view, that until the motion is actually moved by the member it is not before the House and therefore there is no need for the permission of the House to withdraw it. It is simply a question of he standing in his seat and saying he does not propose to proceed with it.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Lakeside. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, apparently we do have a resolution that we can debate -- or I can debate this afternoon, and my remarks will not be overly long in connection with this matter. May I say at the outset that I am prepared to accept the contention of the former leader of the Liberal Party, the Member for Lakeside, that he did not direct this resolution at myself particularly, although I must say on the other hand, judging by the events in the House this year at the special session and the last two or three sessions of this House, I could well imagine the desire of the Liberal Party to curtail the efforts of what some people call the effective opposition to the Conservatives here in this House. -- (Interjection)-- The Honourable Member for Lakeside says, "Never", and I could suggest that such is the case, that when members of my group rise to speak in criticism to the government we attempt to offer to them constructive criticisms based on policy. I respectfully suggest, Madam Speaker, that more and more people are indicating to me as Leader of this group that such is the case, and I am personally proud to receive such comments.

However, Madam Speaker, again I say that I accept what the Honourable Member for Lakeside has said in his remarks the other day insofar as this particular resolution is concerned. Also, Madam Speaker, because it is so obvious, I can not help but accept his contention, as listed in the resolution there has been established by the record that what he says in the preamble is correct, and I find myself in a position, that while I will differ in substance, I can not differ with him in the facts as he has presented them to this House.

But, Madam Speaker, I want to say to this Assembly that I too was a member of the Committee on Rules, Orders and Regulations of the Proceedings of this House that dealt with this matter among others, and in the course of the remarks the other day the Honourable Member for Lakeside acknowledged that I raised the question during the deliberations of that committee which, as he said, had my way prevailed the committee report would have contained a recommendation similar to what is printed in the rule book as of today.

Now, Madam Speaker, I don't know what happened. My honourable friend in his remarks the other day said that my representations were to of no avail and the committee did not agree to my contention that the political scene in Manitoba, indeed in Canada, had developed away from the two party system in government and that recognition must be given to the third, and in some cases the fourth party or fifth as well. But I recall, Madam Speaker, at the hearings of that committee -- or deliberations should I say of that committee, that after at least one of the sittings when I was so disgusted, as I am so often disgusted at what happens in this Assembly and its committees because I didn't think that right was prevailing, that I threatened to leave, and as a matter of fact did rise from my chair to leave the committee, whereupon I was cajoled or asked, whichever the case may be, to resume my seat with the committee which I did.

I think one of the changes that has been adopted as the result of my endeavours on that committee was the fact that we now have a time limit of 65 hours, prior to the exhaustion of which we close at eleven o'clock in the evening. And this was done, many may remember, only after a lot of bargaining on the committee itself. But I think it is most vital to consider this point in this Assembly now, Madam Speaker: is the recognition of my efforts and those of the present Member for Parliament for Winnipeg North, David Orlikow, to have due recognition given to the New Democratic Party, or as we were in 1960, the CCF Party, to give due recognition to them in the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba which had been the case since the Honourable Member for Lakeside pointed out back in the forties.

While I accept, as I say, the point raised by my friend the Member for Lakeside today, and while I read the copy of the report that was concurred in in 1960, I think that he, like I and others who were on that committee, should have raised this point when the present book of Rules, Orders and Proceedings of this Legislature were laid before us. I'm not attempting to raise this point to establish that the Honourable Member for Lakeside is wrong, but merely to point out,

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) Madam Speaker, that for at least four years, and possibly six sessions of this House, the present rule as contained within the Rule Book has guided this House. And it has established, as the Honourable Member for Brokenhead interjects and says, a precedent. But I must confess however, that notwithstanding whether a precedent has been established, Madam Speaker, it is still a written rule of this House and we must also consider the report that was brought forward from the committee in 1960.

Another point raised by my honourable friend in his address the other day, with which I concur most heartily, Madam Speaker, is that he -- and I agree with this most sincerely -- lays no blame on any of the staff of this House, or indeed -- and I'm happy at the mellowness of my honourable friend in this instance after hearing him in other regards -- he does not even lay any blame whatsoever on the government. So I guess the member for Lakeside and myself in this particular instance are at one and the same because we do not lay any blame, Madam Speaker, on the staff of the House or on the government. If indeed I suggest to my honourable friend from Lakeside, and he may agree with me on this, that if any blame is forthcoming as to why it is 1965 that we're dealing with this, it lays equally with the Member for Lakeside and possibly with myself as well.

But, Madam Speaker, I think that we here have an opportunity of dealing with this situation in a different manner as that suggested by my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside, for if we were to adopt the resolution as proposed by my honourable friend we would turn the clock backwards to what the rule was as contained in the little red book, which was adopted back in 1951 if memory serves me correctly. I suggest, Madam Speaker, that we should not turn the clock back in regards to, what my honourable friend says, the liberties and protection of opposition groups in this House and elsewhere.

And I suggest on another angle, or another aspect of representation and rights of the opposition, that we of the New Democratic Party here in the Province of Manitoba and its leader, and when I speak of leader, Madam Speaker, let me assure this House I'm not talking of Russ Paulley, but we are being placed at the present time at a distinct disadvantage to our influence on the voter and electorate of the Province of Manitoba, in that we are not being granted any contribution from public funds to more fully serve our destiny in this province, that all of the advantages are being awarded to the Official Opposition, the Liberal Party of Manitoba. And while I would agree, Madam Speaker, with this contention if you were only looking on the two party system in this province and Canada, that this might be well and it's o.k. But, Madam Speaker, we've got in this year of 1965, I suggest, to look at this in a different light.

However, Madam Speaker, I only interject this to show that in our opinion, and I'm sure in the opinion of many, that we're at a disadvantage as the third group in this House over the members of the Liberal Party, and this same disadvantage prevailed, Madam Speaker, at the time that there was only a difference of one member between the New Democratic Party group and that of the official Liberal and of course I refer back prior to the election in 1962.

I also draw to the attention of the House that in other jurisdictions across Canada, indeed, Madam Speaker, in the House of Commons at Ottawa, due recognition is given by way of assistance to the leaders of the New Democratic Party and the two Social Credit groups as well. While I appreciate the fact that a resolution was proposed last year on this particular subject and debated, I raise it merely to illustrate that there are sufficient restrictions on the third party or fourth party here in the Province of Manitoba at the present time without continuing the restrictions that formerly prevailed.

So, Madam Speaker, when I say to my honourable friend the member for Lakeside I appreciate and I accept the points that he raised insofar as the documents are concerned, but I him in one part of his address when he says that "he is not trying to curtail the opportunity of his friend" -- as he said it and I believe he was sincere in this -- "the Leader of the New Democratic Party," or again quoting my honourable friend, "or even the Leader of the Social Credit Party." As a matter of fact, he was quite flattering in his remarks, I think Hansard will reveal that he said "he even enjoys listening to us." And I concur -- (Interjection) -- Yes it is, Madam Speaker, and I appreciate this from my honourable friend because we cross so often -- (Interjection) -- That's right and I appreciate the fact that the Honourable the Member for Lakeside is a mixed-up individual, but I forgive him for this, Madam Speaker, for if I was in his position I think I'd be mixed up as well.

But apart from that -- but apart from that, Madam Speaker, this was his contention and I agree with him. We're agreed then on the evidence that he produced. We're agreed that neither the officials of this House or the government interfered at all. We don't really know what

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . happened. We don't know why the rule is as it is at the present time only I would suggest that maybe I was more influential than the member for Lakeside gives me credit for in the committee and that this was the impression that came out of it. But notwithstanding that, Madam Speaker, we still have the record before us.

So in that there is no disagreement except, Madam Speaker, I think that there is a disagreement as to what we should do now, and because of this difference, Madam Speaker, I want to offer to this House a different approach to the problem, if indeed it is a problem, that this House is confronted with. Therefore, Madam Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the motion be amended by deleting all the words in the last four lines thereof and adding the following: whereas enquiries failed to reveal how the difference in language and principle as between the report concurred in on March 26th, 1960 and the present Rule Book came about; and whereas this House is confident that such differences in language and principle are not the result of any intent by those responsible for producing our Rule Book so as to influence procedure in this House; and whereas Rule 33 as at present printed in our Rule Book reflects accepted precedents of recognition of a leader of a recognized party; and whereas Rule 29 of our present printed Rule Book recognizes this fact; therefore be it resolved that this House accept Rule 33 that now appears in the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, it is not my intention to speak on this matter, I'm just rising to raise a point of order, and I would ask you at your convenience if you would consider whether this amendment, as far as its main principle is concerned -- I recognize there is a considerable difference in verbiage -- but as far as its main principle is concerned, is anything other than a direct negative to the . . .

MR. PAULLEY: On a point of order, Madam Speaker, I must say that I gave this matter consideration at home. It is not the direct negative I would suggest that you consider, but that it is an alternative proposal dealing with the same matter which, in my opinion on perusing Beauchesne and other authorities, is quite in order. However, if Madam Speaker would like to take the point into consideration raised by the Honourable Member for Lakeside I think this would be proper.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, on the point of order, I realized that likely my honourable friend had taken this matter into consideration I wasn't asking his opinion, I was asking yours.

MR. PAULLEY: All that I stood up for was in order to put my honourable friend straight once again, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: I have not had time to study the resolution so I will take it under consideration. The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, since the Minister of Health has indicated some action is being taken in this regard, I am willing to withdraw my resolution at this time.

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

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John, the following resolution: Whereas automation has and will affect the employment opportunities of every Manitoban, now and in the future; and whereas the problem is beyond the ability of any one group of society to solve; therefore be it resolved that the Provincial Government give consideration to the advisability of establishing a committee comprising representatives of government, management, labour and agriculture to consider the effects of automation and recommend such measures which will enhance the moral, economic and sociological well-being of Manitoba in relation to the effects of automation.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HARRIS: Madam Speaker, in speaking to this resolution, I will first quote from this book I have here, "Automation - Implications for the Future". "The capabilities of this society and the need for ever-increasing productivity engender forces which seem to undermine the foundations of the system. These explosive forces find their most telling manifestations in automation. Automation threatens to render possible the reversing of relationship between free time and working time on which the established civilization rests. The possibility of working time becoming marginal and free time becoming full time, the result would be a radical transvaluation of values."

(MR. HARRIS cont'd)

Madam Speaker, the average worker in Canada and the USA is worried that through automation he will lose his job and that soon a machine will be doing his work or that his plant will be closed and replaced with a modern plant where machines do all or most of the work. The statistics on automation prove that his fears are justified.

In Canada, between 1949 and 1959, motor vehicle production went up by 50 percent, but employment went up by only 11 percent. Household appliances production rose by 54 percent, and employment rose by only 19 percent. Electrical apparatus and supplies, production went up by 82 percent and employment rose by only 42 percent. In all manufacturing industries between 1957 and 1962, production rose by 44 percent, while the volume of employment actually dropped. It is estimated that 800,000 jobs have vanished in Canada in the last 15 years -- more than 50,000 jobs per year.

The Computing and Data Processing Society of Canada, in its first complete census said there were 538 computer installations in Canada at the end of March 1964. The society said 393 of the computers had been installed since January 1, 1962, replacing out-of-date computers. According to the Federal Department of Labour, Canada had only 89 computers in January 1960, and 303 in January 1962.

The Federal Department of Health in Ottawa processes three million Family Allowance cheques a month in 286 man hours, where formerly it took 15,000 man hours. A staff of two clerks is now used, instead of 120.

To provide some indication of the effect that automation will have on graduation from our high school system, we can be guided by some of the research by Lord Halesbury of Great Britain. He says that one computer equals 100 clerks working for one year, and every \$5,000 of equipment replaces one clerk. Our children are thus being deprived of jobs before they even have a chance to enter the labour force. The United States census used 50 statisticians in 1960, compared with 4,100 in 1950.

In the field of communication, terrific strides are being taken to replace humans by machines. The American Telephone and Telegraph Company estimates that revenue from long distance calls placed by machines will be larger in 1970 than telephone calls placed by humans. In our own province of Manitoba, after the installation of DDD, the number of long distance calls increased by 75 percent in the first few days of the new system. The Radio Corporation of America has a computer under design to take voice translation, and type it with such accuracy that it will jeopardize the jobs of one million and a half secretaries.

When the Maple Leaf Milling Plant in Port Arthur burned down, a new ultra modern plant was built. Our Packinghouse Workers Union had 240 members there before the fire. Now 72 people produce more flour than before. New automatic equipment invented in France is reported to be able to bone a whole carcass of beef in the incredibly short time of six minutes. And so it goes, with countless examples.

The foregoing are examples of the technological changes that we can expect in the near future in our production and service industries in Canada. This is the situation that our children will have to face when they leave school, whatever type of education they have had. This phase of the industrial revolution may force us to change our whole ideas of training, of education and of life itself, insofar as work is concerned. It is almost certain that we will have more time to spend on leisure, in fact, it may be that those people in our society of the past who formed the great mass of the working population, and this means most of us, may become the leisure class.

One short-term answer to the problems of automation as it concerns the working force lies in collective bargaining in such things as shorter hours, longer vacations, an earlier retiring age on an adequate pension and the right to transfer when a plant is closed down. This will help soften the blow and at the same time protect the members of unions, but it will be of little comfort to the non-union workers and to the young people trying without success to get their first job. Last year there were 200,000 new entrants in Canada into the labour force, with 50,000 less jobs available, as was previously mentioned, and we can expect more and more job-seekers each year for the next few years as the young adults of the post-war baby boom flood the labour market, with less and less jobs available.

The long term answer to automation is political control. The advances of science belong to everyone. We should not be afraid of automation, because properly controlled it can be a blessing that could usher in a golden age such as has never before been seen by man or equalled in history. Think of it, man freed from the burden of exchanging labour for subsistence and

(MR. HARRIS cont'd) . . . able to put all his mental, spiritual and physical capacities into re-shaping a new civilization where fear and want are unknown.

Now that is the thing, Madam Speaker, we all think of it as a Utopia, but it seemed to me today we talk of pensions, we talk of this and we talk of that, but are we going to be forced by this thing that is coming up on us. It reminds me of the flood of the Red River that was years ago here. The thing crept on you regardless. There was no river or anything beside you, but this thing crept right into your home, filled your basement up and you could do nothing at all about it. So this is a thing that I would say we should go now and do something about it. Because if we don't do this then we are lost.

What we should be concerned about is our government and what it is doing about automation. Governments must start planning now for the needs of the people, not for motives of profit. We must realize also that automation will affect every member of our society, not only the blue collar and the white collar worker will be affected by it, but also the professional people such as engineers, lawyers, accountants, and the managerial staff, whose careers are already being threatened by the all-powerful machine that can calculate and supply information at an incredible speed with amazing accuracy. As the number of automatic "Brains" increase, so will the number of human brains required decrease, regardless of their excellence or ability.

Automation has already nullified the beneficial effect of good working contracts and agreements. Although these contracts may give protection and a certain amount of security to workers at the present time, by the time their sons and daughters are ready to take their place in the world of work the jobs held by their parents will have vanished.

The right of unions to strike is also being violated by the installation of bigger and better machines to replace workers involved in legitimate strikes. An example of this is the printers' strike in Toronto, where the striking workers have been out for several months and have been replaced by machines operated by women whose rate of pay has not been made public. Therefore, the worker has less redress for justified grievances on the one hand, and diminishing opportunities for employment on the other.

Although we have not yet felt the full impact of automation, it is becoming increasingly obvious that the problem of unemployment is the major factor in this technological revolution that has yet to run its course. What will happen to our people when it is no longer feasible to train them for jobs that no longer exist, or to retrain them on job skills that will be obsolete by the time their retraining is finished? Who will feed, clothe, and house them or us, because we will all be involved in this tremendous social upheaval. Who will buy the products of an automated society when that society can no longer exchange labour for goods and services? Who will govern and police this huge aimless society that has nothing to do, nowhere to go and nothing to hope for?

If we are to avoid these evils inherent in an economy automated for profit alone, we must forsake the profit motive and start planning now. Since we are all directly involved in this electronic revolution called automation, representatives from every sphere of society will be needed to work out a formula that will provide a place, a program, and a part for everyone. This is a challenge we must all meet and overcome so that automation can be the salvation and not the ruin of our society. I thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Rupertsland, that the debate be adjourned.

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

The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): May I ask the indulgence of the House to let this stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 45. The Honourable the Member for St. James.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James) presented Bill No. 45, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Convalescent Hospital of Winnipeg, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. STANES: Madam Speaker, in short, this is changing the name from Convalescent Hospital to Convalescent Home. However, I think I would be remiss if I didn't give a brief explanation to the history, which is very interesting, of this very fine establishment run by a board of ladies who give very generously of their time and their efforts.

(MR. STANES cont'd)

The hospital idea has been known officially for a number of years was an outcome of the first women's organization in Winnipeg which was formed in 1883. It started off as a hospital aid society and was the first. To give just a thumbnail sketch, Madam Speaker, of the work of the ladies over the years, it developed into a home which they built on McDermot Avenue. At a later date in 1913 they built their present home.

During the course of the history of this organization they have done many things, including treating alcoholics, and hence the name hospital. The situation at present is that this old house that they are using, because of its age has very high maintenance costs, is no longer suitable; it's a fire hazard and so on; and they are in the process of rebuilding. In making their financial arrangements with the CMHC it was discovered that they are known officially as a hospital, although in practical terms over many years they have been known as a Home, therefore it became necessary to have this amendment.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, I suppose that if the institution receives the usual grants that it will not be changed in this respect by the changing of the name, all will remain as is in this regard.

MR. STANES: Madam Speaker, that is correct. It is only a change in name, an official change. In fact it has been known as a home for many years.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The second reading of Bill No. 46. The Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 46, an Act to incorporate Manitoba Museum of Man and Nature, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, this is an Act to incorporate what was formerly known and what is now known as the Manitoba Museum Association. The Manitoba Museum Association is a non-incorporated organization which has been in charge of the Manitoba Museum in its very inadequate facilities in the Civic Auditorium. The association now hopes to expand its work and have a new building in the new Manitoba Arts Centre, and the public-spirited men and women that belong to the organization desire to be incorporated so that they may better carry on their work in the future.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The second reading of Bill No. 9. The Honourable the Member for St. James.

MR. STANES presented Bill No. 9, an Act to authorize the City of St. James to issue Certain Debentures, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. STANES: Madam Speaker, members will recall that some of the original arrangements between the City of St. James and Grace Hospital was that there will be a grant of the sizable sum of \$980,000 to be given to the Salvation Army for that hospital. After that decision was made and the necessary by-laws passed by council it was put to the people, the ratepayers, who passed and sanctioned the actions of the council. Because the money was not required and has not been required until fairly recently, the provision of The Municipal Act, Section 530 (b), which states that the debentures must be issued within two years was overlooked. This was brought to the City of St. James attention by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and this act purely complies with this oversight which I think in this case was excusable.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The second reading of Bill No. 10. The Honourable Member for Ethelbert.

MR. MOLGAT in the absence of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert, presented Bill No. 10, an Act to authorize the Rural Municipality of Mossey River and the Village of Winnipegosis to make grants to the Sisters of the Order of St. Benedict, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I suspected that someone would be asking for this. On behalf of my deskmate and also my neighbouring constituency, the situation here is that the hospital in Winnipegosis is a very old hospital. It was established in the very early days of the community and served the community extremely well and also served a very wide area, because to the north and to the -- both north, northeast and northwest there are no other facilities nearby and there are substantial population figures in there, and settlements like

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) Camperville and Duck Bay, as well as the other direction in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland and the waterhead area. This is the normal location for these people to go to because this is really their only outlet.

The hospital is now old and out-dated and it is impossible to put into it any modern facilities to accommodate the equipment necessary or the patients, so the intention is to build a new hospital. The bill will simply permit the two municipalities concerned to put in a mill rate in addition to what they are allowed now, that is in excess of the one mill allowed by The Municipal Act. This will permit them to make a larger levy. It is not intended that the municipalities will assist in the operating of the hospital. This will be done by the Order who will control and own the hospital. This is merely a capital grant. So the two municipalities request this so that the construction can proceed. They have no further liability there. Their only engagement is in the provision of capital for the building.

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

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, that this House doth concur in the final report of the Standing Committee of the House on Privileges and Elections appointed to study and review the provisions of The Election Act with a view to making such recommendations respecting amendments thereto or improvements in the law relating to elections of members of the House, received by the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba on Tuesday, the 23rd day of February, 1965.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, members will find the full report set out in No. 2 of the Votes and Proceedings of this Legislature that was printed for Tuesday, the 23rd of February, 1965, beginning at page 2 and continuing through to page 7. I think, Madam Speaker, that the only thing that I should say is that the committee was established as the result of a resolution of the House a year ago; that the meetings of the committee were held between sessions as indicated in the report itself; and that a thorough consideration and review of the present Elections Act was made section by section; and the report contains a number of the detailed recommendations of the committee as set out in the report. It was a careful review, I think I may say, and I am certain that many useful improvements are available which of course can become effective at such time as they may be brought before this Legislature in the form of a Bill to amend our present Elections Act.

Perhaps Madam Speaker, I might direct the members attention particularly to item 33 as it appears on page 5 of the Votes and Proceedings which relates to the voting hours and to say that in this matter there was a difference of opinion in the committee and I have been advised, and I think perhaps I should advise the House that some members of the committee, as it were, in whatever manner they may wish to do so, have indicated that they wish to reserve their position or their opinions with respect to this matter. I simply direct the members' attention to the fact that there was a difference of opinion in the committee; the recommendation was the majority opinion of the committee at its meeting and there may be those who were members of the committee who would wish so at some proper occasion perhaps express some different opinion from that which appears in the report itself.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, before we move into Supply I might enquire if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would like to proceed with ways and means because if so I would be glad to move

MR. MOLGAT: Well it wasn't my intention to proceed today. I assumed that we would follow the practice that you set last year.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, well the practice was last year that on every day I asked him if he was ready to proceed and finally one day he found he was. Is there any particular day you'd like to stipulate now?

MR. MOLGAT: Well I'm not quite sure at the moment, but I'll be prepared to give notice.

MR. ROBLIN: Well in that case, Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, before you call the vote I think that a few things should be straightened out here in this House. I think that it would be advisable to do so at this time.

So far during the session we have made different statements; we have made certain protests; we've also made certain accusations. We have accused three Ministers of waste and mismanagement in the purchase of certain land. We've accused the Premier of making erroneous and misleading statements on TV, on the radio and then repeated it in this House. We also say that the government is placing cruel taxes on the people of Manitoba. We have accused certain members of trying to influence you, Madam Speaker. We've also stated that the Department of Labour did not properly safeguard the people of Dominion City. We also say that the wording of the Speech from the Throne made it very difficult to bring in certain things that are very vital, very important to the people of Manitoba. We also say that they've -- accused them of reducing the speech debate by one day with their phony definition of the word "resume." We also say, Madam Speaker, that this government has been dictatorial and arrogant.

Now, because we made these accusations, because we made these statements, we in turn have been accused of certain things. We are scaring civil servants. We are showing disrespect for the person of Madam Speaker. We have been accused of trying to cause panic here in Manitoba. We're told that we accuse by innuendoes, rumour mongering; of McCarthyism; of being barren of ideas; of not having any constructive criticism; of refusing to talk about policies and discuss the record of the Roblin government during the by-election in River Heights; and finally of being members, or at least behaving like members of the Mafia.

Well, Madam Speaker, today I say that this arrogant and dictatorial government is running scared. Mr. Roblin has pushed the panic button. Oh, a few short years ago they laughed at this tight-fisted government, former government I should say. They were pretty arrogant in their yelling, "Why didn't you do it then?" They were having a lot of fun. Madam Speaker, now this government cannot stand criticism. It is running scared and it's cowering in the corner. These would be men of action are now crying like a bunch of babies. We have not accused by innuendoes, Madam Speaker, we have come with a direct accusation. We have accused three Ministers of the Crown we have named these people. We have accused them of mismanaging the affairs of Manitoba and wasting the money of Manitobans. This was a direct accusation -- in fact, we've asked for the resignation of these three Ministers. Now besides crying like babies, what have they done? One of these Ministers didn't even stand up -- oh excuse me, he tried to stand up; the Premier wouldn't let him. Then another one, the second one did not defend himself but he cried; he cried until he got real mad and then he cried some more. The third one, he's the dangerous one, because he's a terrific speaker. He spoke for an hour and a half and he said nothing. He brought in all sorts of irrelevant facts. He talked about the value of the property -- this wasn't being denied -- the value of the goose preserve. He was trying to make a point always talking about the goose preserve and this the government of priorities. I think that this is the number one on their hit parade, the goose preserve. And then he gave a description of the property and so on. This was very interesting but it had nothing to do with our accusation at all. And then he did what he had done before. I think it was -- I think he hid then behind Mr. Archie Dewar at one time; now he hid behind the civil servants in this department. Finally his long-awaited defence. There was the bombshell. We had been told that he would be just about ready to resign himself after hearing this.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.)

Well, the defence was based on three points. The government had taken in the Federal Government and this was a big thing; it was a joke because it was a Liberal government. That meant that it was all right to play with the money of the people of Manitoba, spend their money, mismanage, but if you can get somebody else as a partner, more power to you. I imagine that this is what he meant. Then apparently the directors of the company were three people active in the Liberal party -- I understand that they are lawyers and I don't know if they're the real partners, but this was another terrific thing. He had somebody else with him. This was a defence. This proved that there was no waste at all because the directors were three people active in the Liberal party. And finally, he falsely claimed, and this was proven later, that the government had no right of appeal.

Then the Premier, watching the clock, rose at just the opportune moment. He was really going to sink this party. Well, he said that he had very little to say about defending himself, and he said very little. This is what he said according to the paper, the Free Press -- I'm not quoting Hansard: "Mr. Roblin said he was satisfied that the Bain property had been procured by the government for a reasonable price. If the so-called goose preserve was to be sold tomorrow the government would make a considerable profit." What does that mean? What does that prove? We don't deny that at all. It doesn't matter how much it can be sold for now, the people of Manitoba are still \$110,000 short. Then this minister, the First Minister started knocking the pension plan, and he was looking at us and this was our fault. I'm not responsible for the pension plan, I don't know that much about it yet. Now he knocked it and knocked it but he hedged -- he was going to vote for it. He thought it was more cruel than the tax on fuel but he was going to vote for it. Then he gave us a big long speech, which was all the speech that he should have given in front of the premier of different provinces and the people representing the Federal Government. This was his defence.

Madam Speaker, I'd like to point out that when we have accusations against civil servants, we do this directly. We've accused -- I think that we, I shouldn't say necessarily accusation, we mention here that we thought that the sentence imposed by a magistrate on a lawyer that had been found guilty was not adequate. We did this; there was no bones about it. I, myself, was not satisfied with the work of the chairman of the Manitoba Hospital Commission -- I said so. Oh, then I was chastised by the then Minister of Health. I did not have the right to tax somebody, to complain of these people. I didn't have the right -- I say the then Minister of Health, I was told that this was cowardly, that the ministers of the Crown had the responsibility, they accepted this responsibility, and they accepted all the blame. Well, my friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources doesn't believe in this any more.

Now, Madam Speaker, we have been accused of showing disrespect for Madam Speaker. We know that we must accept your decision, Madam Speaker. Mind you, it is difficult enough at times to do so, especially when it seems that we are 99 percent of the time wrong over the years, of the time that I've been here. It is very difficult for a human being to feel that he is wrong so often and that somebody is right so often, but nevertheless, we accept your ruling. But it is difficult enough, and if these people have as much faith and confidence in yourself, Madam Speaker, we ask why don't they leave you alone? Why don't they let you make your decisions by yourself? We also think that you are quite capable of doing this yourself. A few days ago when I spoke, Madam Speaker, you asked me an explanation. You asked me if I was directing any of these remarks to you and I said no. After some discussion I asked if I could proceed and you recognized me. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources stood up and he insisted that he knew what I meant, and he insisted that I was wrong, that I was accusing you. And with your kind permission, Madam Speaker, I would like to read, if I may, the first paragraph of that speech.

I quote, Page 138: "Madam Speaker, with your kind permission, I'll forget about the empty and meaningless words that many members start this debate on the Throne Speech." This is clear so far. "Mind you, I do agree with my colleague from LaVerendrye that you are a very charming lady, and I respect the high office of your position, but I don't think that you would believe me if I wished you to have a long term in this office. What I actually wish is I hope that for once maybe I'll be able to stand up here and not be called out of order. I don't believe, Madam Speaker, that" -- I was interrupted -- "I don't like to start with those empty words, as I said. I don't believe that one should smile before trying to knock somebody else's block off, not more than I like to be patted on the back before somebody thrusts a knife between my shoulder blades. Now I do believe in this direct approach." And then quite properly you

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) . . . wanted me to clarify this -- we didn't have the text in front of us -- and I did, and I believe to your satisfaction, because then I said, "Can I go on, Madam Speaker?" "MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from St. Boniface." But the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources knew better than anyone else.

Now, Madam Speaker, earlier in the day, the First Minister had done the same thing. I want to see what is this respect. I was trying to move a motion that we adjourn the House to discuss a matter of vital importance, that is, the statements by the First Minister we felt were not quite correct, Madam Speaker, after some dogmatic speaker. "In my opinion," and I'm quoting page 107, March 1, 1965 Hansard: "MADAM SPEAKER: In my opinion I believe that there is ample opportunity for discussion of the matter in the ordinary course of events."

"MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, may I ask on what occasion?" Is that any disrespect? "MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker is not obliged to answer these questions." I guess he has to tell you what you're not obliged to do and what you're obliged to do.

Now, the First Minister, on the television and then again on radio and in this House, made an erroneous and misleading statement. He definitely did, and we certainly think that he has some explanation to do -- and I'm not going to quote all the Hansard that I did before. If anybody's interested they can find it or I can let them know exactly what it was. But the fact is that during the special session, the special session that we had in 1961, the First Minister again brought a bill. He wanted to bring something that was unpopular. He wanted us to ratify an agreement that he had made with the great man in Ottawa at the time, the man with the vision, the greatest friend of the people of western Canada. That wasn't popular. He wanted to raise tax. That wasn't popular. So he attached this other rider -- this one per cent was to reduce the hospital premiums. Well, he was asked many times -- and I'll show him on Hansard if he wants -- if this was earmarked for reduction of hospital premiums, and he answered definitely that it was. It was mentioned in the Throne Speech of that session. Now, in front of an audience -- oh, he played around with the words. He tried to be correct. It is true that he had refused to put this in writing in the bill. We had known what was coming. We knew about him, a little more about him, and I think that we didn't trust him too well on this bill, and we tried to bring in an amendment asking, well, if this is what you want to do, put it in writing, and he refused. You can see that we were right in moving this amendment.

Well then he said that since 1958 the premium has been the same -- hospital premium has been the same -- "And do you know why? There's a reason for this," he says, "and the reason is that you are getting a grant from the Government of Manitoba." And he said in the House here, answering one of these questions -- I think it was my leader -- that as far as he was concerned that was never earmarked for premium reduction. But in the 1962 election, when he was on television again -- he has a lot of those appearances on television -- what did he say to the people of Manitoba, lumping this big bill again, trying to mislead the people again. What did he say? "Who voted against the reduction of premiums to the hospital? Messrs. Molgat, Campbell and Desjardins." If this isn't a falsehood, I don't know what a falsehood is; and if this is not misrepresentation, I don't know what it is to misrepresent.

Now yesterday, my colleague from Emerson brought in a point that was very sincere. It was an important point. He didn't try to panic the people of Manitoba, the people of Dominion City. Panic was already in. The people were coming to see him; they were phoning him; and he explained this. The Minister of Labour was very mad, very insulted that he should try to work for the people of his constituency. This was awful. The same people that told us that every single member here -- we were all ombudsmen. They told us that a few years ago. Now he was insulted. Nothing was directed at him personally. It is possible it was being brought to his attention that his department wasn't doing proper work. A group of people from Dominion City were here on Wednesday. They went to see, not the Minister -- nobody was blaming the Minister -- they went to see the Department.

MR. ROBLIN: rise on a point of order. This particular grievance was discussed last night. It is not in order to raise the same grievance again on a subsequent occasion. Our friend is out of order in raising that particular grievance now.

MR. DESJARDINS: Am I out of order, Madam Speaker? On a point of order -- am I out of order in stating that we have been accused, he accused us of rumour mongering, this Minister yesterday. And I just want to say this, if I may, that a group came -- this was not mentioned yesterday -- they came to see the Minister; they weren't satisfied with the -- not

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).....the Minister, the department -- not satisfied with the department. They went to their own Member, and then when they found out that these people were going to the Member, then somebody was sent, and I'm told this was not discussed yesterday, that an inspector from the government, the government sent -- the Department of Labour sent an inspector yesterday. I don't think this is out of order at all. This rumour mongering, this is what you were accusing us. They say that rumour mongering is when we tell them that this is mismanagement -- I think we can prove that -- waste, irresponsibility, false and misleading statements. Is that rumour mongering, Madam Speaker? I think we can prove and we've proved every one of these charges.

Now, the Member for St. Vital also said that we were afraid; that we do not want to bring in any constructive criticism and that we did not want to debate the plans of the government for the Roblin administration. And, Madam Speaker, I would like to read at this time a letter dated September 21, 1964 from the Liberal candidate in the by-election of River Heights addressed to the Conservative candidate at the time: "Dear Mr. Steinkopf" -- and I will table all these for your information, but I would like to read it -- "Dear Mr. Steinkopf: It has come to my attention that you are waiting for a formal notice of my offer to debate with you the issues now before the electors of River Heights. Please accept my letter as such notice. I hereby challenge you to appear with me on television or at a public meeting in order to debate the record of the government for which you are a Cabinet Minister. I have been advised that Channel 7 is prepared to provide us with one half-hour of time for this purpose. The rules for debate could, I am sure, be arranged in a manner suitable for both of us. I wish to make it clear all over that in fairness to the people of River Heights, I believe that the scope of the debate should include the record of your government over the last two years. The record includes the methods of land acquisition followed by the government and includes as well the new tax legislation recently imposed, and the many other matters of vital, immediate concern to all citizens of Manitoba. Nonetheless, if you will not meet me on this basis, I am prepared to limit our debate to the matters connected with the Arts Centre land purchase. I trust that you will find my offer acceptable, and that you will contact me immediately in order that necessary arrangements can be made. Signed, Scott Wright."

Now the answer dated September 23, 1964. "Dear Mr. Wright: I have given consideration to your proposal contained in your letter of September 21st that we should meet in public debate. As long ago as last spring, the leaders of your Party were offered full access to all the facts with respect to the cultural centre transaction, both by the government and the private citizens concerned. These offers they did not accept. Instead, they preferred to make the matter the political issue that it is now and the reason for this by-election. Bona fides of those offers were established in the recent session of the Legislature. In view of this attitude of the Liberal Party, with the basic issues involved, I believe my responsibility is to present my case directly to the electors of River Heights. I find that the electors appreciate the information that I am able to give in my personal canvass of the constituency and at the various gatherings within the constituency. My campaign committee have decided that the public interest will be best served by continuing our present campaign of carrying the issue directly to the people." I will also table this letter.

Now, Mr. Wright, he also had a chance to go on television. He had five minutes on the night of September 25, 1964. And this is what he had to say, "I have tried to fight the election in River Heights on the total record of the Roblin government. I have sought to debate all the issues publicly. I believe that any election is a time when the action and records of the government must be placed before the people and they must be freely and openly discussed. I feel that the Roblin government has failed in this responsibility in this by-election. At the outset of the campaign I challenged my opponent to a public debate on all the issues. He would not debate the government record. I agreed to debate on his terms, namely, the Arts Centre question. Even this offer was refused. To say the least, my opponent's position astonished me. In the first place, for an ex-Cabinet Minister in Mr. Roblin's government to refuse to debate or defend that government's record when the record is under attack in an election campaign, is surely a high level admission that what we Liberals say about the records is absolutely right. But worse, I find it impossible to understand how Mr. Steinkopf can refuse to debate the Arts Centre land purchase question when he himself claims that this issue is the main contributing factor in his resignation from the government and Legislature. The Liberals in the Legislature felt that this matter would be better considered and examined by a judicial enquiry, and I agree. Had this course been followed, all the facts and the questions involved

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). "could have been fairly and impartially considered. In my opinion, an election campaign is not the proper forum in which to resolve a controversy of this nature, but having chosen the arena, my opponent and the government should have met this question head on. Why they are now unwilling to do so and why my opponent is unwilling to defend the Roblin record, these are questions I cannot answer; but if Mr. Steinkopf backs away from the whole Roblin record, I do not want the people of River Heights to feel that I am backing away from any issue in this campaign.

"Now what about the Arts Centre question? To date no satisfactory explanation has been given to justify a profit of \$137,000 on the sale of the Arts Centre land to the government. I cannot agree with Mr. Roblin when he says that the land purchase method used by the government has saved the people of Manitoba money. This profit has been paid by the taxpayers of the province, and it is especially aggravating when considered in the light of the whole new series of taxes now being imposed by Mr. Roblin. Secondly, Mr. Steinkopf had, and still has, personal land interests in the area adjacent to the land recommended for the Arts Centre. In my opinion, on the face of it this represents a conflict of interest. How can it be otherwise when a person charged with responsibility for pinpointing the exact location of the Arts Centre and then recommending the amount to be paid, which of course reflects on land values in the surrounding district, himself has land interest in the adjacent area?

I think it is important to make it clear that because I say a conflict of interest exists I am not thereby attacking the integrity of anyone. I sincerely desire that this be understood. The point that I make is that in the operation of government our representative must bend over backwards to avoid a conflict of interest. Good government must not only be done, it must appear to be done. At the time all this took place my opponent was not an elected member of the government but Duff Roblin was; and more, he was the Leader of the government, and Mr. Roblin has acknowledged that he was aware of Mr. Steinkopf's land interest in the area when he retained him. I say it was unwise, it was inexcusable for Mr. Roblin to retain Mr. Steinkopf in these circumstances, and it is upon Mr. Roblin and his government that I direct my criticism. It would have been simple and sensible to follow the usual practice of obtaining the land required by expropriation. Values would have then been frozen and there would be no opportunity for the kind of controversy we are engaged in now. Why the government does not follow this long-established method is difficult to understand. What I have said this evening is some evidence of disorganization of Mr. Roblin's present administration.

"There is much more, but I must now conclude my remarks. I have entered this by-election to give you the opportunity to protest the way the government is behaving. I ask you to vote for me on September 30th."

I would also like to table this. Now I will not read -- this is another speech -- I will not read all this; I think that we get the general idea; but in this one the Liberal candidate is placing again some of his ideas, some of his plans.

Then it was said that there was only one folder that was tabled by the Member from St. Vital. Well there's another one that I'll table also -- says, "Why, by voting Liberal, you can protest: against the government for imposing new taxes that are deceptive and fully prepared; against the government for its cynical attempt to bribe you with a tax rebate paid out of your own pocket; against the government for its arrogance, steam roller tactics, and pushing through ill-conceived and hastily drawn legislation at an unnecessary special session of the Legislature; against the government which, rather than reply to questions from the Opposition, choked debate and prorogued the House; against the government for the unusual and improper procedures used in the acquisition of land for the Arts Centre; against the government which refused a judicial enquiry and seeks to delude the electorate into believing that this by-election can resolve the issue; against the government which refused to stand on its own record."

And he has some positive points, too. "A provincial Auditor-General to provide an independent audit of provincial government expenditures. A Glassco-type enquiry into the organization and efficiency of provincial government departments. A provincial ombudsman to protect the citizen against arbitrary government decisions. Setting up fair, rational and consistent land acquisition procedures." Maybe I should do like the First Minister and repeat this one so it can sink in. "Increase representation in the Legislature for the City of Winnipeg. An effective program of curriculum revision for our schools. Establishment of a commission for long range planning to meet the needs of higher education. Extension of daylight saving time to conform to other areas." Now would you -- there's 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 different things. I think that this would indicate that maybe we weren't afraid to discuss positive things

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).....and to discuss the Roblin government record.

Now we are told that we are barren of ideas; we have no constructive criticism. Well, I only have 40 minutes; I can't read them all, I can't give them all to you, but I'd like to give you a few -- these different motions that we brought in: Study the possibility to appoint agency to handle all property purchased by government; Glassco-type commission to report on all phases of government efficiency; Department of Health to change the assistance age of victims of the polio epidemic who accepted home attendance care in lieu of remaining in hospital; construction of two additional traffic lanes from Winnipeg west to the junction of No. 1 and No. 4 highways on the way to Portage; equalize Hydro Electric rates throughout Manitoba; establishment of second sugar beet factory in Manitoba; principle of public aid to private schools -- this was not brought in; conduct a study on the corrosive effect of salts; investigate the practice of unfair labour practice by the Department of Labour -- that is, the investigation should be done by the Department of Labour; institute a program for sale of long term leasing of Crown land; more extensive use of TV in education; teaching of French in Grade 1; highway safety programs included in schools on voluntary basis; uniform time; establishment of the Department of Youth and Recreation; adequate precaution be taken to preserve original soil fertility -- that's when there was some work done by Utilities; study practice and program of teaching reading in elementary grades; more protection to public on obscene literature; more adequate grants for construction of school rooms; committee to consider Election Act; too many boards and commissions; permanent Speaker; non-partisan approach in selection of Speaker; no tax on land transfer; no tax on heat -- we'll talk about this at a later time; give chance of public to voice an opinion and to discuss these taxes; this was brought in -- the government -- last year, Madam Speaker, we tried to adjourn the House I think it was to discuss this. We met until 11:00 o'clock at night and then we were told at that time, 11:00, 11:30, that there would be a meeting at 9:00 o'clock. Nobody had a chance to know, but the First Minister said, "I want everybody to know." He said that later on in this.....because somebody got wise to this and there is some people with a little bit of pull -- oh, this was fine. No, he wanted everybody to have a chance to study this, but the poor ordinary fellow that has to pay his tax, what can he do? Bang, the door's closed. Then all of a sudden a bunch of resolutions died on the Order Paper and we can't bring them in because of the wording of the Throne Speech and we are not bringing anything in.

Well there is some more. I'm not going to -- there's a lot more. Things that are difficult, well no they don't come in. I think I remember here something that certainly wasn't going to help me, not politically anyway, when I said that I thought that the title of doctor should come from the University and not from this Legislature, but I don't know what they're going to do with the, I think it's the Hall Report that recommends exactly the same thing.

Now the Provincial Secretary accused us of McCarthyism. I think that he has a lot of nerve. Does he think that the rest of his colleagues are all lily white? Does he think that himself is all lily white? He told me--(Interjection)--well all right, let him listen then. He told me himself that when I was being investigated that it was stupid, my investigation. He was going to do something about it. I haven't heard. I always thought that he was a friend but he seemed to want to carry this business since his re-election outside the House. I tried to recognize him, to talk to him on one occasion, three occasions the same night; he wasn't very co-operative but that's his business. Maybe he thought that I was practicing McCarthyism at the time.

Now there is something that I wasn't going to do but I am going to do it now after being told of McCarthyism. I was investigated not too long ago. I say I wasn't going to do it because I felt that the Attorney-General was very courteous. Mind you, he had a little game to play and this was fine, but he was courteous and he was very correct, as far as I am concerned, and I wasn't too satisfied in bringing something -- embarrassing anybody; but when we are being charged with McCarthyism I think it's time that I say something about that. Early during the River Heights by-election, around the beginning of September, rumours were started that I was being investigated. After receiving a number of calls from reporters and telecasters and after being told by them that the Premier had stated that I was being investigated, I wrote an open letter to Mr. Roblin dated October 23, 1964, protesting his lack of courtesy in not informing me of this and asking for explanations. He replied that the matter was in the hands of the Attorney-General who would soon contact me. As I say, my battle is not with the Attorney-General on this at all. He phoned me a few days later and asked me to meet him in his office, which I did. At this meeting were also present Mr. Gerald S. Rutherford, Q. C.;

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)..... a member of the Attorney-General's Department, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Mind you, I didn't know that they were going to be there but they were there. The Attorney-General admitted quite candidly that this investigation came about because an over-zealous supporter of the Conservative Party, which I suspected was a member of the Conservative caucus.....

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I made no such statement to the Honourable Member.

MR. DESJARDINS: On a point of order, he admitted that to me personally in his office. He said that it was caused by an over-zealous supporter of theirs that came to the government with the public accounts book and saw my name, and this is the fact.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I am not just too sure whether I should ask the member to retract the statement. I say that I did not make that statement to the Honourable Member. I informed him on the occasion in question that the matter had been drawn to my attention.

MR. DESJARDINS: By an over-zealous supporter of the Conservative Party, and I don't care if he is too sure -- it doesn't matter a thing to me. This I heard. And I am entitled to as much faith in my words as the Honourable Minister his.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, may I just say the statement by the Honourable Member is not correct.

MR. DESJARDINS: The statement is correct, and this statement was repeated to different people immediately after this. Now, these people had seen the name Desjardins Funeral Chapel in the public accounts and thought that he might have something on me and approached the Attorney-General with his findings. The Attorney-General told me that there seemed to be a conflict of interest because the Desjardins Funeral Chapel had received payments from the government for the burial of indigents. I explained that a company, Chapels Limited, had bought all assets and name of Desjardins Funeral Chapel in 1954, and that actually the name Desjardins Funeral Chapel did not mean too much as all the banking, etc. was done under the name Chapels Limited.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, please. I would like to remind the Honourable Member that he has three minutes left.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thanks very much. He then informed me that the declaration made by myself indicating that I was the sole owner and proprietor of the firm Desjardins Funeral Chapel had not been cancelled and that Chapels Limited had failed to fill a declaration indicating that they were carrying on business under the name of Desjardins Funeral Chapel. I told them that if this was the case that that could be an oversight on the part of our solicitor who had been instructed to prepare all necessary papers. Nevertheless, I felt that if there was blame, the blame was Chapels Limited under the Companies Act, it had nothing to do with me personally or with The Legislative Assembly Act. He informed me that I might be wrong and that the government was ready to introduce a bill to validate my election to allow me to keep my seat in this House. You can understand, Madam Speaker, that this surprised me and shocked me. I, as well as my colleagues in the Liberal Party, had refused to vote on such a bill in the case of the Honourable Member from River Heights, and I was asked to support a bill in my own case. I told the Attorney-General that if I felt that this was not the proper procedure in the Steinkopf case, it wasn't proper procedure in my case. I was then informed the Attorney-General might have no alternative but to withhold my indemnity. I answered that this was up to him and that I did not consider myself guilty of any wrong.

I then contacted my solicitor who took over the matter. Sometime in November he wrote a letter to the Attorney-General explaining his views and offered to co-operate. In fact he included a photostatic copy of the agreement of December 31st, 1954, where Chapels Limited acquired from me the business, goodwill and exclusive rights to use the name Desjardins Funeral Chapel. The next time I heard from the Attorney-General was on Thursday, the 11th of February, a few days before the opening of this session, when he phoned me and asked me to call at his office on that day or at the latest on the following day. I phoned him back to advise him that I would call on him on Friday accompanied by my solicitor. At this meeting he handed me a signed letter informing me that after consideration of the facts, the office of the Attorney-General had decided to close their file on this case. I think that it would be unfair -- I think that in all fairness I must -- I never brought this investigation. This is for something that the company is doing at a cost. I think it is only fair for my family, for myself and for the members of my Party to bring this in. I think that the government was very remiss in taking all this time to investigate me. If I had worried, if my family had worried, it would

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)..... have been very difficult, but let me reassure them, I didn't worry a darn bit, my conscience was clear and I didn't lose any sleep.

And finally, we're accused of being members of the Mafia. Well I've got good news for the members of the government. They can stop shaking. Most of the boys met — Sneaky Gramps I think was there, Punky and the Chief, all of us I think, all of the members of the Mafia, and we all agreed that although it was quite a temptation, we won't do away with any of the members of the government and although it might help a bit to have narcotics at times to deaden the blow of having to listen to them and to see them cry, we won't start trafficking in narcotics right now. So I hope that the Cosa Nostra of the Liberal Party will not be investigated.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre please take the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution.....

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, when we rose last night, I undertook to find out for the Member from Lakeside some facts about Hansard which I have before me, and I'll read them so they'll appear on the record and he can be informed. Free copies of Hansard distributed as follows: Premier's office, five; Executive Council, six; MLA's of the House, 70; Press Gallery, 10; Party Rooms, five; Members of Parliament, Ottawa, 14; Ministers and department heads, 39; Federal Government departments, five; newspapers and radio stations, 75; city press and dignitaries, 31; total free copies, 260; paid copies — country, 83; city, 103; total paid copies, 186.

MR. MOLGAT: The Member for Lakeside, who asked about this, is out getting his copy of estimates and will be in shortly. I'm sure he'll be interested in the figures.

I wonder if the Minister could explain to us -- there's a very slight increase in supplies, expenses, renewals and operation of recording equipment. Does it indicate any new equipment, or is it simply an increase in the costs of the normal operating?

MR. ROBLIN: There's a couple of new dual recorders being obtained and a new transcriber that makes up the extra cost.

MR. MOLGAT: I'd just like to say before we leave the item of Hansard, how much I think the staff should be congratulated for the work that they do. I recall when the system was first instituted there were at times some delays in the obtaining of the Hansard copies but I find that in the past two sessions we have the Hansards on our desk the day following the debate here in the House and I think this is a rather remarkable operation. I think the total cost of the Hansard is in line, particularly when you consider the speed and accuracy of the service. I realize that it isn't like the Ottawa system where there is some editing. There is no editing here. It may lead to difficulties at times because I don't think that all the members read what has been said the day before to see if there are any errors but I can say that there are very few errors and I think that in this regard I would extend the compliments to Mr. Sly who looks after the recording and the staff who do the transcribing and the typing of this. The service is very well handled and I think is performing a useful function for the House.

MR. CAMPBELL: I want to thank whatever Minister is responsible for providing the figures. I take it that these figures say "free" to the Premier.

MR. ROBLIN: I'll give my honourable friend the totals if he likes, he was out of the House at the time. Total free copies, 260; total paid copies, 186.

MR. CAMPBELL: We're now down below 200, I think that's a drop since last year. I don't suppose my honourable friend has the figure handy of last year, but the subscription list is on the decrease. I don't wonder very greatly when I think about it.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, we're on 2, are we, other assembly expenditures now? Resolution 1. I don't suppose that there is a member in this House but that has had to pay some additional income tax for last year by reason of the fact that the \$600.00 living allowance has been found to be taxable. Now, Mr. Chairman, I should correct myself, because it would only be those members who are forced to live away from home that would be affected, that would in fact receive the \$600.00 and that probably only would affect 50 per cent of the members. But, I find that in 1964 that the federal income tax authorities went back to the time that this was first implemented, some four or five years ago and collected the back taxes on the \$600.00. If we received it for four years, we paid income tax on \$2,400 last year. At

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd). least I did. I hope that I'm not the only one here that got stuck--(Interjection)--I didn't get away with it. I was one that didn't get away with it, Mr. Chairman. It cost me about \$800.00 extra. Now the point is this, apparently that under federal legislation one-third of the member's indemnity is not taxable, or it's recognized that it is not taxable. But by receiving this \$600.00 additional money, then it is over and above our indemnity and it immediately becomes taxable. Now my auditors took this up with the federal authorities here and spent some time with them and apparently they argued there was nothing that could be done because this was the way the Act was established many years ago for all of the provinces, that one-third of your indemnity is not taxable. This is over and above that, so it's taxable.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the whole purpose of this \$600.00 is to pay the members that are obligated to live away from home for their out-of-pocket expenses. That's the purpose of it and surely it never was the intention of the First Minister or the front benches opposite, that this should be taxable. And I wonder if there is some way of revising the wording so that if in effect we receive the forty-eight plus six that a third of that would be considered not taxable. Perhaps there's just a technical point here that can be ironed out. I don't object to paying income tax. I've always maintained that if you receive it you should be more or less happy to pay it. But in this case the \$600.00 was intended to pay us for our out-of-pocket expenses and I hope that something might be done in this regard.

MR. ROBLIN: I regret to tell my honourable friend I don't think anything can be done. This is a regulation of the federal administration over which we have no control. The only solution, of course, would be to increase the indemnity so that the indemnity would be increased and therefore the expense allowance would be compensated for in that way and I don't believe we propose to do that at the moment.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I can understand that that could hardly be done because the \$600.00 as you know, Mr. Chairman, is only payable to those members that are supposed to have an additional expense, and they certainly do have an additional expense by virtue of the fact that they're living away from home, so if you increase the indemnity of all members well then, of course, it wouldn't take care of those members that are obligated to stay away from home.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) passed, (b) passed, (c) passed, (d) passed, (e) passed, Resolution No. 1 passed. Resolution No. 2, 3(a) passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I understand that the First Minister has promised us that the -- he's not only promised us but we have received the Civil Service Report on Salaries and we've received the numbers of employees, but there is one other thing that has been furnished each year. I still hold to the view that it should show in the estimates themselves but inasmuch as it doesn't then it's been the custom recently to furnish a salary schedule for senior employees, and by senior employees I mean deputy ministers and I am not sure whether branch heads were included, and I think that has not been done yet. Can we expect that soon, and in the meantime I would like to have the salary of the Comptroller-General.

MR. ROBLIN:that information, Mr. Chairman, the salary of the Comptroller-General is \$15,500 and I'll get the tabulation for my honourable friend.

MR. CAMPBELL: It is shown here as fifteen, five. I presume that must be the top for that position now, the top of his range because he has been there for some time and I think that the item of the salary increase vote at the back mentions that the total annual salary increments are included in these estimates so that any place that the annual increments have accrued they will show in these.

MR. ROBLIN: That is correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3(a) passed, (b) passed, Resolution No. 2 passed. Resolution 3, 4, passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, when we are on the Premier's salary, if the Premier would prefer I could defer this question until Treasury is reached. I don't suppose it matters when it's taken up.

I wanted to raise a question with regard to one of the tables in the -- following the budget speech, I refer to the table and I have the copy that was made available yesterday. I think it is the second last page that carries the table on it, actually the second last table. We have a table there of the Manitoba's Agricultural Production and it is mentioned that these data have been revised to accord with new reporting sequences. And then we have the note that the difference between aggregate production and net production is an allowance made for seed and

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd).....feed grain used on the farm, and then we have the further note that the 1964 figures are estimates. Now all of those are clear to me but what is not clear to me, Mr. Chairman, is that if you look at the difference between the aggregate production and the net production, which is that same figure with an allowance made for seed and feed grain used on the farm, you find a great variation between the years. If my computations, subtractions are correct it varies all the way from \$103 million per year to \$38 million a year. Now I know that there can be changes in acreage, and I know that there can be changes in price and I realize that there would likely be some variations but I wouldn't think that either one of those would account for anything like that variation, so I was wondering what is the explanation for the very wide variation between the years. I do not guarantee my arithmetic but as I have worked them out quickly it looks to me as they go all the way from \$103 million one year down to 38 in another, of 41 in one case, 56, 55, 57, but then we go also to 91, 99 and 90. How would there be so much variation in that feed and seed item?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I will ask my colleague the Minister of Agriculture who supplies this information to be prepared to answer it when his estimates are reached.

MR. CAMPBELL:if the Minister would have it now?

MR. ROBLIN: We should wait until his estimates are here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh but it's my honourable friend the First Minister that supplied the document, not my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. ROBLIN: I can't answer it right now, I'm afraid.

MR. CAMPBELL: Pardon?

MR. ROBLIN: I can't answer the question at the moment.

MR. CAMPBELL: But maybe the Minister can.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville):guess here but I would think that there's inventory, changes in inventory that are reflected here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh, would my honourable friend check and if it is then that should be indicated, shouldn't it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 3, passed. Resolution No. 4, 1(a) passed, (b) passed, 2 passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, we're working here on the basis of what? The resolution number on the right or the appropriation number on the left.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 4, then we went 1(a) and (b), passed.

MR. MOLGAT: All right, so. Next is.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are now on 4. Grants and Miscellaneous. Then Resolution No. 4.

MR. MOLGAT: I just wondered if -- there is no item on Federal-Provincial Conference. There seems to be many more Federal-Provincial conferences on all sorts of subject rather than the major one which we normally consider as being the fiscal one. Are these now covered by departments and what about the conferences for example such as, I think, the Ministers of Finance and their deputies which the First Minister referred to the other day, how are they covered and where?

MR. ROBLIN: It has been decided that it is rather pointless to show this item here as a separate item. That is best included -- items that covers these expenditures are included in the various departments under the supplies and other expense items.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 4 passed.

MR. MOLGAT: From now on all conferences then will -- for example, in this case would come under Item B.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes.

MR. MOLGAT: Expenditures last year for the conference that was held with the Ministers of Finance would be under B.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes.

MR. MOLGAT: Fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 4 passed. Resolution No.

MR. ROBLIN: No, ... Mr. Chairman. Under 4, Mr. Chairman, I would like to give some information here because there's an increase from the previous period and I think the various institutions concerned would like to know what proposals are being made respecting grants and I give this list to the committee. I will give the last year's grant and the present year's grant so they may compare them as follows. I'll give the name of the institution, what they got last year and what is proposed for this year. Manitoba Drama League, \$1,000 and \$1,000; Manitoba Theatre Centre, \$14,000 to \$25,000; The Circle Moliere, \$500.00 to \$1,000;

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd). . . . Manitoba Museum Association, \$12,000 to \$12,000; Historic Sites Advisory Board, \$1,000, \$1,000; Winnipeg Art Gallery Association, \$17,000 to \$20,000; Men's Musical Club of Winnipeg, \$2,000 to \$2,000; Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra Limited, \$25,000 to \$25,000; Royal Winnipeg Ballet of Canada, \$17,000 to \$25,000; Brandon Arts Council, \$3,000 to \$4,000; Frontier College, \$500.00, \$500.00; Winnipeg Summer Theatre Association, \$4,000 to \$5,000; Manitoba Arts Council, nothing last year, \$7,500 proposed; Manitoba and Northwestern Ontario Music and Speech Festival, nothing last year, proposed \$2,500.00.

Then moving on to other types of grants -- I'll only record a change where a change is necessary or stated. Manitoba League for the Blind, \$100.00; Last Post Fund, \$250.00; Boy Scouts Association, \$2,500; Girl Guide Association, \$2,000; Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, from \$2,500 to \$3,000; Area Association for the Commonwealth Parliamentary people, \$600.00; The Canadian Highway Safety Council, \$1,200; Royal Canadian Humane Association, \$100.00; Canadian Olympic Association, \$3,000. And that's the grant schedule for this coming year.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Premier if the decision as to how much is to be granted to the various organizations is based on judgment or whether there is some kind of formula that relates to either the number of activities or the number of players engaged or some such basis.

MR. ROBLIN: We consult with the people concerned and use a considerable degree of discretion but this year for the first time we received a proposed distribution from the Manitoba Arts Council and while we did not agree with everything they recommended, that is the basis on which these grants are allotted and, generally speaking, I think we're pretty close to what they suggested.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could have the indulgence to hark back to an item which seems to have passed and has to do with the Dominion-Provincial conferences. The Premier tells us that the costs for these conferences are shown in the various departments as they are needed but there is, I take it, such a thing as a Dominion-Provincial conference of premiers, and inter-provincial premiers conference. Now I take it that if anywhere that would show up in this particular -- in the Executive Council, and I'm wondering is any expense incurred by the Province of Manitoba for this specific kind of conference and if so where does it show up?

MR. ROBLIN: It shows up as I stated under the Item - Supplies, Expenses, simply as travelling expenses.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, the First Minister indicated that he would only mention those items where there was a change from last year but I'm wondering, the grant -- I suppose that the grant for the Agriculture Museum at Austin still remains the same--(Interjection)--It isn't under this item.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, what relationship is there between the grants that are made here and those made by Canada Council? In the decision to make these grants, does the government take into account the decisions of Canada Council and the grants that they have made and is there consultation between our own Arts Council here and the Canada Council?

MR. ROBLIN: I can't speak for the Arts Council; we take into consideration what the Canada Council does because we receive the proposed budgets of the various groups and we are able to see what the relationship is there. There is no rule of thumb, however, that connects the two systems of grants. We've been guided this year, as I say, by the recommendations of the Manitoba Arts Council to a very considerable extent. All the bodies concerned are represented on that Council and this represents, as far as I'm aware, the consensus of their opinions.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, the item for Manitoba Arts Council of \$7,500, could the Honourable Minister give us some idea as to the program undertaken for this coming year and whether their budget includes income from other sources, and if so, the nature of the source and approximately the budget total?

MR. ROBLIN: I can just give a very sketchy reply here for the reason that this sum is put in for notional purposes. This is the one body where we have not had a thorough discussion with them about expenditure for the reason that they have been -- I must be careful of my language here -- not entirely inactive but they have not been as active in the past as they hope to be in the future, and it is because they hope to reorganize their approach to the cultural area that they're asking for some support in the form of a stenographer and an office from the

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd)..... Provincial Treasury, and in effect what this money is going to provide is a stenographer and an office for them, plus a few operating expenses so that they may get started, because we have felt that if the other cultural bodies agree -- and this is a matter that has yet to be resolved, I'm expecting to see the Arts Council to discuss this in a matter of a few days -- but provided that there is general agreement among people interested in the cultural area, we are hoping that the Manitoba Arts Council may take a more active role than they have in the past, in co-ordinating the work of the various groups and in acting as a clearing house and central place for all the cultural activities in the province.

Now, as I say, I mustn't go beyond my brief here because we're not certain that this will come to pass. It's proposed by the Arts Council for themselves and we expect to talk to them about it, as I say, in a few days' time; it's not possible to meet before. And one of the points that we'll wish to discuss is the reaction of other people in the cultural area to this proposal, and if we do get favourable indications that indicate we should proceed, then this money will be made available, but it is rather tentative at the moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 5 passed.

MR. MOLGAT:I notice a slight increase in the column of parliamentary grants. Is there expected to be more activity in this field, or is the next year.....

MR. ROBLIN: They just assess us and we meet the assessment.

MR. MOLGAT: Straight assessment. I think we might have a report on what has happened in this..... Was there a conference this year outside of the country and who attended? When is the next conference outside of Canada expected?

MR. ROBLIN: I wonder if -- my colleague the Minister of Industry and Commerce represented Manitoba at the Conference in Jamaica this year and he's been looking forward to making a report on it. He isn't ready to make it right now; he wants to make it on his estimates, and if that will be agreeable, I would suggest that we could do it then.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the Member for Gladstone, the Minister said that the grant to the Austin Museum would be under a separate item. I presume it will be under Agriculture, would it?

MR. HUTTON: Administration and Agriculture.

MR. MOLGAT: I see. I wonder if it would be possible to get all these grants into one location so that we could make an assessment of their relative values. It's very difficult for members of the House to be able to determine whether or not they feel that the grants are adequate, or too much, when they're broken down into all sorts of departments. Will we find in many other locations through the estimates separate grants of this nature?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, it has been the custom for many years to have the grants dealt with on a departmental basis. For example, in the Department of Health there are a number of grants there and they are managed by the Department of Health. Most of them have to do with Federal Government co-operation. They've got nothing to do -- they're specialized. So that any department may have some specialized grants within them and it's thought better administrative practice to leave them there. I can say that this is the case in -- well, what are you going to do with your school grants? Where are you going to put them? They've got to go under the departmental grant. The same with Health, the same with Agriculture, and the same with tourists, so that there will be grants and usually they are indicated in the text that there's a grant. In some few cases they're not, but they can be asked about. The grants that are included here are those which are of a general nature and which don't really fit in to any departmental structure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 5 passed.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, under Provincial Library I would like to say a few words. In the course of the past two years, three years, I have had occasion to use the library here, not just during sessions but between sessions. I want to say that I'm sure that we have in the library staff a very fine and competent group of people. I also notice what I think to be a marked increase in the use of the library facility here, not just by people within the building but from the university and from outside generally. In fact, I think that the library is being used so much more these days that as a member of the Legislature I have been hesitant to ask for assistance as much as I may have wanted to at times. The point that I want to make is that I get the impression, and it's only an impression, that members of the executive branch here are using the library staff, which is their perfect right to do so, but in view of the fact that they do have large staffs to assist them and aid them as it is, I'm wondering if they are not sort of freezing out the members of the Legislature a bit.

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd).....

The second point I wanted to make is that there seems to have been a change of policy in the library, or at least some directive was issued apparently by someone in the Cabinet, whoever is responsible, to the effect that henceforth if a member wants to receive photostatic copies of any material he has to now pay for it. I've never really used this service very much but I have used it on some occasions, and just recently I find that I'm being billed for it. Oh, it's not very much but it's the idea. I'm not sure that this is a directive that was well advised, if in fact such a directive was issued--(interjection)-- Well I asked to be billed so that I could have it on record. Perhaps it's been a long-standing policy, in which case I've been getting away with something. But the amount has been small I can assure you.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to put to the responsible Minister that it has been suggested to me that in Ottawa in the National Archives, the National Archives Commission has co-operated with the public, the outside public, to the extent that men and women who want to work and make use of the Archives after work, after 5:00 p.m., can come there and work, well 11:00 p.m., close to midnight, and someone is there on duty during this time. It has been suggested to me that perhaps the government could be persuaded to provide for either a key system or else to provide estimates to have one librarian on duty until 11:00 p.m. in the evening, or at night, so that people, the public, school teachers after work and anyone could come in and make more use of the library, so I would merely ask, is it a reasonable request? It seems to me it is, and if the Minister thinks so, would he undertake to pursue this?

MR. GRAY: A hungry man or hungry person always appreciates food. I think that a public library here, and I have stated it for years, is being administered the finest way possible. I have not yet met more pleasant people and more staff that know about a library and help out those who are unfortunate like myself, ignorant in many subjects, to help me out in getting the information. The staff under the librarian is wonderful, including the librarian. I think that there is no reason for any member of this House to discuss anything not knowing what he is talking about, with the help of the public library. I want to commend the librarian; I want to commend the Minister in charge and his staff on their wonderful work in helping those who need so badly a little more help in education.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I am glad to accept the kind words of the Honourable Member for Inkster on behalf of the staff, who do render very fine service. With regard to the photostatic copies, the machine that makes the copies is a machine belonging to the Queen's Printer and it is their regulation under which the charge is made. The charge is for the paper only. This is, however, a Queen's printer and I would refer you to my colleague in it, the Provincial Secretary who has in charge the Queen's Printer. The suggestion of using the Archives after hours is an interesting one. I think it would involve additional staff. I'm not too certain how much it would be used. We would certainly be glad to look at that idea, however, in the light of our responsibilities.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I hope the Minister would not regard it as an impertinent question if I asked him if Cabinet Ministers have to pay for photostatic copies that they receive if they receive any from the library.

MR. McLEAN: I can't really answer. I haven't made any canvass of the Cabinet Ministers and can't say whether I ever get any copies myself, so I don't remember paying for anything. I presume that we all follow the same rule and if we don't we ought to.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I can assure the Member for Brokenhead that the Leader of the Opposition, in any case, does. I'm intrigued with the fact that he has a credit service there, however, and the fact that the Member for Lakeside doesn't. It's obvious that after my friend, if he stays around as long as the Member for Lakeside, they'll find out the truth about his credit position as they have about my colleague.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to add my comments regarding the service provided by the library. I never cease to marvel at the amount of information that is available and the speed at which it is obtainable from the library services here. I'm sure that a lot of the members are not aware of what can be done and what can be obtained from the library. It seems that it really doesn't matter too much what it is that you are looking for, they are able to get it for you, and this is most appreciated. It's an item of research which is provided to the members of the Legislature here regardless of what party they belong to, which I think is important in our democratic system, and I want to record my particular appreciation for the work that is done there by the staff and the service that is provided.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I always like to take the opportunity of availing myself of free legal advice, and I have a very high opinion of the capacity and capabilities that my honourable friend the Attorney-General, and I want to be sure that when I part reluctantly with my six cents per sheet of photostated material that I'm not thereby entering into a contract as defined by the Legislative Assembly Act. This is a point that has grieved me almost as much as the parting with the six cents and so I just want to be assured by my honourable friend that he won't find out that I've paid over that money with a great deal of pain, and then on top of that, presumably because of some infraction of the Legislative Assembly Act. I think we're entitled to that assurance from the Attorney-General himself as a chief law officer of the Crown, in addition to being the Minister responsible who has imposed this what my honourable friend from St. George would no doubt designate as a cruel tax upon us.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, the thing that is offensive under the Assembly Act is the member receiving money, not paying it. Paying it is quite legal. It's to receive money that would be quite improper. And may I just quickly give an answer to the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead. A note has come down from on high which tells me that the research for research students who asked for material before closing hours, the material at the present time is placed in a locked corral or study room and they are then enabled to use it after hours. That is the policy which is provided at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is now 5:30 and I'm leaving the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.