

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Thursday, February 24, 1966

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 21 passed. Resolution No. 22 passed.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Chairman, this disagreement that we read about in the papers between The Liquor Control Act and the proprietors of the Playgreen Inn at Norway House - it's my understanding that \$40,000 worth of liquor is involved in this situation. I'm wondering will the government absorb the loss of the \$40,000, because I am told that beer ages or goes no good after about five months and it's my understanding that this beer is not going to be of any value after a certain length of time. Who is going to absorb the loss of this beer? I am told the breweries will not take it back.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Chairman, I just have one question to ask the Attorney-General. Last summer the Council of the City of Winnipeg passed a resolution urging the Winnipeg Board of Police Commissioners to establish a youth squad for the purpose of dealing more efficiently with juvenile offenders and the prevention of juvenile crime. I understand that they passed this resolution on to the Attorney-General and asked him for financial assistance. I think this is an area, Mr. Chairman, where the government would be well advised to spend some money. The Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains in his opening remarks on the Attorney-General's estimates stated that prevention was the cure, not incarceration. I wonder if the Attorney-General can tell us if he has given any consideration to granting or setting up or helping the City of Winnipeg to set up the youth squad?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the question asked by the Honourable the Member for St. George, I would assume that if there is a loss - and I answer this without having discussed it with the Liquor Commission - on the beer, because of aging, that that would be a loss that would be absorbed by the Liquor Commission. I think however that there is not that quantity of beer there, if I recall the press reports correctly. This is a matter which has been a dispute between the Liquor Commission and the proprietor of the Playgreen Inn, but it would be my impression that the Commission would have to absorb any loss.

With respect to the youth squad, we did receive this request and the acknowledgement that I made was that we would, as requested, take it under consideration, although I did not believe that perhaps the possibilities were too strong, of financial assistance from the Province. And as of the present time, no decision has been made to give financial assistance toward the establishment of a youth squad. While a youth squad would be for the purpose of dealing with a particular aspect of criminal or illegal conduct, namely juveniles, in my opinion it is part of the policing function, it's a special part of policing function, and I would tend to question whether it would be advisable for the province to contribute financially for that particular aspect of the policing function any more than we might contribute toward say the women police who are primarily engaged in policing activities as it affects, perhaps women offenders, or perhaps, say a special squad that might be involved in liquor enforcement or narcotics enforcement. I am of the opinion that if we were going in this general area of financial assistance as it applies to law enforcement and the administration of justice, that there are perhaps other more appropriate ways in which assistance might be made available by the province to the city, rather than a contribution toward the policing function. This, however, is not to say that any firm or irrevocable statement has been made in the matter. Up to this time we have not agreed or decided to make any contribution.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Attorney-General should give serious consideration to this because this is not a function of police duty in the normal sense of the word when you refer to narcotics, liquor and women police. This is where you get young people, and if you have the proper facilities to deal with them, you will do an awful lot to prevent repeaters; and if you don't give serious consideration to this then we're just not taking a forward look.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, the Attorney-General indicated that he thought that the Liquor Control Commission would absorb the loss. It is my understanding that there is \$40,000 worth of liquor at this Playgreen Inn. The Minister indicates he thinks it might be less than that. Can he give us the figure of the liquor that is there, the amount?

MR. McLEAN: I can't at this time. I would have to get that figure.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I don't know, maybe I am confused but it seems to me that my idea of a youth squad is entirely different to the ideas that have been expressed in this House. My idea of a youth squad was something similar to the youth squad they have down

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd.) in United States, particularly in the City of New York, which they use for the specific purpose of controlling youth. In other words, to prevent gang warfare and that kind of stuff. I would like to have some explanation. If that is what the city council meant - if they wanted to have a special squad to patrol these community clubs and these other places where youth gather, to prevent breaches of the peace. Because if that's what they want, I don't think that's what we need. We want to prevent juvenile delinquency from occurring.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, it's quite evident that my honourable friend does not intend to answer any questions in respect to the Totogan Farms Limited Commission but surely he could answer the other one in regard to the amount of money paid to Arpin and Company. You know as well as I do, we could get the information, I suppose, by putting in an Order for Return. But does my honourable friend not know the sum that has been paid to Arpin since 1958 or would he prefer that we put in an Order for Return?

MR. McLEAN: First of all, I didn't know that I had been asked the question. I was under the impression that the Honourable Member for Lakeside has said that he knew the amount and that it was in excess of what had been received by the Premier and myself and perhaps some others. So I didn't realize that I had been asked the question. I can get the amount if it's of any interest.

I think in fairness to Mr. Arpin, I should point out that in either 1958 or 1959 he acted in an expropriation in which monies were paid to his firm and by him disbursed out to people to whom the money was payable, a large number of people, the sum was something in excess of \$100,000, and certainly I hope no one is suggesting that that was paid either to Mr. Arpin personally or to his firm. It was a business transaction in which he received the money from the province and proceeded to disburse it to the people that were entitled to it. I have no doubt he has earned some fees for work done for the province and I'm sure that that has been included in the returns that have been made annually each year, asked for by the Honourable the Member for Logan; and again this year he has asked for the same information and if it is really urgent or I shouldn't say that - if it's important, I can find out the amount of fees paid to Mr. Arpin. I say, I didn't know that I had been asked to find that figure. I thought the members opposite already knew it.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well isn't it a fact, Mr. Chairman, that the Public Accounts surely wouldn't show the amount that Arpin and Company received and then disbursed, would it?

MR. McLEAN: Yes, it does.

MR. SHOEMAKER: It would. Well then, I wonder if my honourable friend the Attorney-General would assure the Assembly that at some day in the near future, he will let the Assembly know the net amount of legal fees paid to Arpin and Company since 1958. And if not, then we can put an Order for Return in.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, in accordance with time honoured custom, the word has come down from above and I have the figure here, the total amounts - now remember this includes -- the amount involved in that transaction is \$157,611.05. Now that includes the years 1958 to 1965 and I would judge from this that approximately \$130 - now I may be not quite right on this, it looks to me as if \$133,000 of that - \$133,594.12 was involved in this transaction - I know that it was an expropriation but I don't know the name of it. If those figures are correct, then it would leave approximately \$20,000 paid to the firm of Arpin, Rich and something-or-other in the years 1958 to 1965. Not all of that would be in respect of Mr. Arpin personally, because I do remember that Mr. Houston acted for the Province of Manitoba in a prosecution relating to Brown Steel Tank, so at least one other member of the firm had a rather extensive and long extended case in that connection - for the province.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, surely if monies were paid on behalf of someone else in an expropriation case or something of that kind, that should be indicated in the Public Accounts, shouldn't it? Because it gives a wrong impression, for the figure that my honourable friend mentions there of \$133,000-odd is shown as having been paid to that firm in one year. I think it was the year ending March 31, 1962 and I think it would be only proper and fair to the general situation to show that some of that was paid on behalf of monies in trust or something of that kind. And I notice that that procedure is followed in the most of cases - for instance I can recall two or three where it shows quite clearly that money that was paid to a certain individual was paid in trust or on account of someone else or an estate or something of this kind. Surely that should have been done in that case because I was interested in that very large amount of fee which appeared to go directly to the company with no further explanation. Then the other thing would be, that I guess that my honourable friend couldn't deduct the whole \$133,000 odd

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) from that, because if I know lawyers at all, there'd be a pretty healthy slice taken out of an amount of that size. Wouldn't my honourable friend agree with that?

MR. McLEAN: We always hope to get a certain fee out of it, yes.

MR. PETERS: just so the members of the Committee would understand what the City of Winnipeg Council wanted by the resolution was - (1) To establish a youth squad for the purpose of dealing more effectively with juvenile offenders and the prevention of juvenile crime. (2) To expand the educational program for police constables to include lectures in psychology and sociology in co-operation with the Extension Department of the University of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 21 passed.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that there's been a recommendation that all the police departments - or the major ones across the country - set up a telecommunications system aside from that employed by the RCMP. Does the Attorney-General support this move and will the government be sharing in the costs of this system?

MR. McLEAN: No, that is, yes and no. We support the idea of telex system if the police forces wish to instal it. One of the plans of the RCMP is to expand very greatly their telex system and as I understand it that will be of such a nature that it can be tied into other police forces, for example the Quebec Provincial Police, Ontario Provincial Police, and individual municipal police forces. We will be sharing in the cost of the extension of the RCMP telex system because that will become part of the cost of our RCMP contract between the province and the RCMP, and that is the only extent to which I anticipate that we will be sharing there. But if the systems are co-ordinated, it will of course, without really any cost, in a sense, to the municipal forces who wish to join it, it will enlarge their area of communications.

MR. GUTTORMSON: At the present time is it not correct that the provincial government pays the cost of telegrams and the cost of bringing a prisoner back from another jurisdiction.

MR. McLEAN: That is correct, yes.

MR. GUTTORMSON: It is my understanding as well that the present telex system employed by the RCMP is so busy at the present time that the police departments find it very difficult to use because it is overworked now.

MR. McLEAN: and the RCMP have plans to extend their telex communications systems.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I understand a year ago the provincial government received a brief urging the provincial government to implement legislation for liquor advertising. I understand they said in this brief that 60 percent of the people of Manitoba were already receiving liquor advertising from outside the province, radio stations and T.V. What is the intention of the government in connection with liquor advertising? Do they intend to implement the recommendations of this group?

MR. McLEAN: At the present time there is no intention to present legislation respecting liquor advertising.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I notice in the statement of policy in the resolution presented to the government by the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce, that this was one of the resolutions on which they spoke in favour of. Now I am not committing myself on this one but there's three or four other recommendations that the Chambers of Commerce as a body made to my honourable friend, and one was in respect to sweepstakes and it seems to me that I recall reading newspaper stories in which it indicated that the Attorney-General of this province was highly in favour of sweepstakes.

Another recommendation that this august body made to my honourable friend was in respect to penal reform, Resolution No. 50; and another one, Resolution No. 51 on Police protection to smaller towns, and it points out that the small towns, that's the verbiage they use, have no police protection and they are asking -- "the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce in convention assembled, request the Provincial Government to contribute to small towns for police protection where these towns are not under the supervision of RCMP."

And then there is the subject too, of extending longer hours for liquor stores and there's a resolution on that that points out that several of the towns in the province are only open five days a week or four and a half days a week and so on. I wonder if my honourable friend has assured the Chamber of Commerce that -- well, I'm certain he has assured the Chamber that all of the resolutions would receive consideration -- but has he suggested to them that he was

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) . . . going to implement any of the recommendations?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Gladstone-Neepawa was not with us last Friday night when I made my comment about sweepstakes. I think, while I don't just recall the exact wording of the resolution by the Chambers of Commerce, I tried to make my position with regard to sweepstakes fairly clear - (a) that I was not advocating the legalization of sweepstakes; (b) that I was certainly not advocating state lotteries or sweepstakes as a means of raising money for public purposes because I consider that to be a complete delusion -- and I'm now expressing my personal opinion, since we have not considered it from the standpoint of government policy -- but that I was concerned about the matter of the proper and just administration of the present lottery laws and present conditions and indicated that I had discussed the matter at the Conference of Attorneys-General and the Minister of Justice at Ottawa in January of this year and am rather anxious that some rational approach should be made to the law enforcement aspect of it. The members will know that the Minister of Justice has recently indicated that he intends to give this matter some serious consideration.

The matter of police protection for smaller towns is a very real problem and we've been quite concerned and it is possible - now I must underline the word possible - if we are able to negotiate a satisfactory contract with the RCMP that some solution may be found to this problem. I emphasize the word "may" because it would be too early to say that it will be done. I am however alive to the problem, the problem as pointed out by the Chambers of Commerce is a very difficult one and we are hopeful that we will arrive at a solution that will be satisfactory to all concerned and within the financial means of all those who are affected. Members may be aware that we have already - or I shouldn't say we - the Liquor Commission, as a result of some discussions we had last summer, have extended the hours of a number of liquor stores throughout the province and certainly in the larger centres they are now remaining open until 8:00 o'clock at night. I believe there are still some who would like them to be open longer but at the moment I'm not aware of any consideration having been given to having them open longer than 8:00 o'clock at night.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, as a matter of interest what is the position of people within our province who continually buy Irish Sweepstake tickets? I must confess that I have bought several in the past, and no doubt there are the odd member present tonight who has also bought them, and probably if they dug into their purse at the moment they'd find one or two there. But what is our position if we buy one, in respect to the law?

MR. McLEAN: Technically, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member could be charged with an offence for buying it, but it has never been customary to take any action against the purchaser. Where action has been taken it has been taken against those who sell the Irish Sweepstakes tickets.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 21

MR. SHEWMAN: Mr. Chairman, for a matter of clarification, is this federal or provincial law, controlling the sweepstakes?

MR. McLEAN: The law respecting lotteries is a federal law of the Parliament of Canada although it is administered by the Attorney-General of the province concerned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 21 passed; No. 22 Passed; 23 passed; 24 passed; 25 passed;

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I have a question to ask on one of these items - I think - are we now at Law Enforcement and Police Services?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 25

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, that covers all of the - Mr. Chairman, in connection with the administration of or rather the Law Enforcement and Police Services, the Honourable the Attorney-General may have answered this one already. If he did he can just say so and I won't press the question, but I listened with interest to the discussion regarding the salaries of Crown attorneys and if the question has not been asked or answered yet, I would like to know how many Crown attorneys have we in total and how do they rate as between the different categories that he mentioned of one, two and three? Is this the proper item under which to ask it or should it come under the next one?

MR. McLEAN: We have, Mr. Chairman, seven departmental solicitors and these people will all be within the service here and they will be graded departmental solicitor one, two and three in the same arrangement as in the case of the Crown attorneys. We have nine Crown attorneys working in Winnipeg and in the Eastern judicial district which means all of the people that are located here, and five Crown attorneys in other judicial districts. Some of the five are

(MR. McLEAN cont'd.) part-time Crown attorneys, although two of them are full-time Crown attorneys.

Now as to the distribution between which category they come in, that is one, two or three, I do not have those figures at this moment. My guess would be that the bulk in each category is in the Crown attorney II classification; but I would not wish just at this moment to give the figure. I would really want to get some further information on that.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, it's only the full-time ones that I'm interested in and I would like to get the breakdown as to the numbers that are in the different categories, of the full-time Crown attorneys or departmental solicitors, and particularly -- there would be some I suppose in category three.

MR. McLEAN: Yes, yes there are.

MR. CAMPBELL: Then the other question that I have Mr. Chairman, and it's one that I have been having some difficulty to restrain myself from asking it while the discussion was going on on the Ministers salary, but I thought the proper place was under either Law Enforcement or Magistrates Courts -- and this is this difficult question, difficult I'm sure for the Attorney-General, regarding the stays of proceedings. I have been concerned about one or two cases that I have heard of, or three, where the Attorney-Generals department has stayed the proceedings in what seemed to me to be quite serious cases. I do not want to bring up some of them, certainly not by name, because if the offenders in these cases are now on the way to rehabilitation or if the feeling is that they are definitely being rehabilitated, then perhaps -- well certainly they should be encouraged in that rather than things made more difficult for them. But I would like to hear my honourable friend give what might be termed the philosophy of the Attorney-General with regard to the whole question of stay of proceedings which seems to me to place a great responsibility on the Attorney-General himself and something that I think should be exercised with the very greatest of caution and consideration, and any time it is exercised that the Attorney-General should be prepared to make a good defence of it. He will not have to make the defence of the two particular cases because I don't want for the sake of the individuals involved to bring them before the public if there is an honest, sincere and apparently successful attempt being made towards rehabilitation; but I would like a word on the point of view of the Attorney-General with regard to stay of proceedings in general. I would like to have his assurance that that action is taken by the Attorney-General's department only when the case seems to be completely meritorious.

Then the other point that I wanted to mention, Mr. Chairman, was that I understood the Honourable the Attorney-General to say last week at the beginning of his estimates -- and I haven't the Hansard before me but I think I could substantiate this. I understood him to say that no prosecutions with regard to lotteries had taken place in Manitoba during the time that he was Attorney-General. That happened to be, not because I was particularly interested in the subject of lotteries -- to a very great extent I share the point of view that he has already put before the committee with regard to lotteries in general -- but I also have the conviction that the honourable gentleman's opinion and my opinion do not matter. Where the law says that a certain thing shall be done, then it's the duty of the Honourable the Attorney-General to do that thing if it is the responsibility of his official position, whether he thinks that law is right or not. If the law isn't right then he should use his influence to get it changed; but as long as that is the law, I think that it's his responsibility to see that it's enforced.

I am aware of cases of lotteries that have been prosecuted during the time that my honourable friend was Attorney-General. Now, I'm not blaming him for that, I'm not blaming him; in fact if I were inclined to blame my honourable friend at all the the thing I would blame him for would be that one of those cases was stayed; and I would like the differentiation to be explained to me as to why one of them was stayed while several others were proceeded with to the extent of a substantial fine.

MR. WRIGHT: would the Honourable the Attorney-General care to answer this. I have some questions about jurors. Would you like my questions at the same time on jurors and juries. Mr. Chairman, if the Attorney-General would wish me to state them now. Every year since 1962 I have shown an interest in some law abiding citizens of this province in our jurors. I have repeatedly asked for an increase in pay -- it went from I believe, \$9, 00 -- it was increased, and at the last session we had legislation put forward which enabled a juror who felt that he was being hurt financially to make application to the court for an extra amount of money. Now I would like to have the Attorney-General tell us just how many people have applied, how many know about it and how many have applied for this, because I have pointed

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd.) out and I keep pointing out every year that a mechanic can earn \$2.50 an hour and if he has a mortgage on the home and a few children to feed, it's little consolation to him to know that he's doing a service to his province under this sort of a handicap. I think that perhaps the Attorney-General can tell us of some improvement along these lines.

I criticized the conditions at the law courts in 1963. I read a letter from one of my constituents where he pointed out that he had been called to serve on two consecutive murder trials. The Tribune ran quite a story on it, and Val Werrier, one of their ace reporters, wrote a two column report on it, saying that, he verified everything that I had said and said that it was now time for jury reform. Now, I don't want to be sensational about this, but as I said before, we're talking about people who are law abiding citizens, people who have to work for a living, and people who are entitled to consideration when they serve on these juries to at least the same comforts that they have at home.

I notice that the Attorney-General's Department have printed a booklet now and I want to commend them for it, it's called "Laws of Interest to Women" and there has been quite a demand for this. But in this book it mentions the fact that women in Manitoba are now eligible for jury duty, but prior to 1952 this wasn't the case. I would like to ask the Attorney-General how many women have been called for jury duty. Believing in the equality of the sexes I am in favour of turning the whole mess over to them sometimes; but I said before that one of the reasons why we did not see fit to call women for jury duty in Manitoba was because of the fact that we couldn't adequately house them. Now I hope that this has been changed. I have waited patiently for this item to come up rather than mention it under the Minister's Salary, and I'm hoping that we can hope to see something in the way of progress in this matter of handling our people who are called for jury duty. Now I know that -- I'm not unmindful of the fact that there have been improvements, because I see on the legislative grounds now signs marked "Jury Parking." I imagine before this time that these people had a very great difficulty trying to find a place to park, so there probably is some sign.

Now I want to make a suggestion to the Attorney-General. This comes under Law Enforcement. It has to do with minor breaches of the law and I'll refer to one case. I went hunting with my boy some years ago and we came back to the car and we drank some hot chocolate and it steamed up the inside of the car and just about when we were ready to pull off and go home, we noticed that the back frost shield had fallen off the back window. We only went about 100 yards and the mounties came along and pulled us over to the side and very politely gave us a warning notice. I thought this was the right thing but I had to report, after the frost shield was applied, I had to report to the Mountie Barracks in St. James, and I lived in West Kildonan some nearly 10 miles. Well, my wife was using the car so she had to drive these 10 miles out to St. James to report that this had been re-applied. Now, in speaking to our Chief of Police, I find out that it's quite in order now for the local police to verify by phoning the mounted police that this frost shield had been applied. Now I wonder how many people really know this, and if this is the policy would it not be a good idea when the mountie issues the warning to have a headlight or a frost shield applied, to let the person know, because I'm much impressed by the courtesy that they use when they do these sort of things, but would it not be carrying it a little farther to have them inform the person that they could have this defect corrected, report to their local police, who in turn would be quite willing to call the Mounted Police. This would make for a lot of good will between the -- because after all there are far too many people who look upon our law enforcement officer as just somebody that's on the road to make life miserable for them. I don't go along with this idea at all, so I'm offering that as a suggestion. I think that this would save many people a lot of concern, because when we're dealing with people who have little trouble with the law, it does give them, even these minor things give them some concern, and this might be a good idea when they issue these warning tickets to suggest that they apply to their nearest police force.

I don't think that I have anything further than that on the jury but I would hope that the Honourable the Attorney-General might bring us up-to-date as to what has happened since the Tribune called for "time for jury reform" in an editorial of March '63, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, before the Honourable Minister gets up to answer the questions that have been asked, could he tell us how many permanent police magistrates we have in Manitoba, where they're located; how many part-time magistrates and where they're located; and whether he has appointed a permanent magistrate for the judicial district of Dauphin?

In the Dauphin area, we have five police detachments and during the past few months we've had to draw on police magistrates from outside the Dauphin area to obtain the services of a

(MR. HRYHORCZUK cont'd.) magistrate. I'd like to know whether he has any hope of appointing a permanent magistrate for the Town of Dauphin to serve the surrounding district; and at the same time what are the difficulties that he is finding in obtaining full-time magistrates, because in a lot of these areas a part-time magistrate cannot carry out the functions that are allotted to him. I do believe our magistrates should be full-time magistrates, do nothing else but that type of work, especially since they are asked to go on circuit. I would like to know what the difficulty is having qualified men take these positions.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the question raised by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside about stay of proceedings and related to that the matter of lotteries, on the basis of what he has told me I obviously answered the question wrongly then because I was not aware that there had been any prosecutions for lotteries and if there have been I have to offer my apology for having made an incorrect statement.

Stay of proceedings is not perhaps as serious a matter as sometimes is made out. Generally speaking, my policy is to leave that matter to the good judgment of the Crown Attorneys and the director -- now we call him Director of Criminal Prosecutions. I would think that there are a number of occasions when a stay of proceedings is entered. The vast majority of those will be when reviewing the evidence available in relation to the charge the Crown Attorney or the Director of Criminal Prosecutions or the Deputy Attorney-General comes to the conclusion that the evidence does not warrant the charge and therefore a stay is entered. That's a matter of judgment in which -- we don't as a rule proceed with cases which we do not think are well founded on the basis of the evidence that is available. I think that in the most cases stays of proceedings that are entered are entered under those circumstances.

Now, I can't answer specifically the -- he has in mind two cases. Of course, I can't really answer them without knowing them - and I appreciate he doesn't want to - because I would have to say that at this moment I can't bring to my mind any particular two cases, nor could I give any explanation. I would think that there are some cases where, not because the evidence is not satisfactory, but for what one might call humanitarian grounds, that a stay is entered, and if the honourable member is interested in my philosophy, if there is an instance where perhaps through some indiscretion, a person has committed an offence, it seems to be the better part of judgment to enter a stay, I would certainly be in favour of that being done. In fact, I am inclined to think, Mr. Chairman, that we don't enter a stay of proceedings often enough. I'm always rather intrigued by the fact that we bring the whole force of the law to bear to get a conviction against somebody and then we put everything into reverse gear and bring another branch of our services to look after them, and I would have to confess that I think lots of times if we used our heads we'd save a lot of time and trouble right at the start. That is, however, an opinion which is not shared, generally speaking, by Crown attorneys and those who have more experience than I have in the administration of justice, but if one is interested in my approach I suppose that's about as good an indication as I can give you.

Now I recognize that one's judgment in matters of that kind might be defective and perhaps there could be difficulty, when I say that I leave the matter of stay really to the Crown Attorneys and the people concerned, and I would think that in most cases we would find that it's because they don't feel that there's a satisfactory case to proceed.

Now on the matter of lotteries, well I've said that I obviously was in error, and I think that a stay of proceedings with regard to the lotteries - and there was one particular case in which reference was made in the press - is really -- there's no philosophy behind that it's because of the troubled mind I have about this matter of enforcement of the Lotteries Law, and I would be the first to acknowledge that if the law says it's illegal, one really ought to be prosecuting. I couldn't argue with that theory at all. On the other hand, if you prosecute one then I assume we would have to prosecute everyone, and whether it's this sort of problem between doing what the law says you should do and what is practically possible where the difficulty arises. That doesn't really answer the question, but simply say that the matter of a stay of proceedings in the ordinarily accepted sense in the case of a person who may have perhaps committed a criminal offence, or an offence under The Liquor Act, is quite a different thing in my opinion from the matter of the lotteries which I tend to regard as standing in a separate problem.

With respect to the jurors, I can't quickly give some of the information to the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that is, as to how many jurors applied for the increase in pay. I can't tell him that. I can tell him, however, that we are asking for an additional sum, that is, a sum more than last year, an increased amount of \$3,000 for jurors' fees and expenses for the

(MR. McLEAN cont'd.) . . . coming year, from which I assume that we are anticipating that there will be such applications, and I noticed that 700 jury summons were issued in the past year as compared to 500 issued in 1958-59. Now that means that there were 700 people summoned to appear for jury duty. Not all of those, of course, would actually sit on a jury because they may or may not be selected to sit on a jury, but 700 people had to spend some time because they were called for jury duty during the past year - an increase of 200. We are budgeting, as I have indicated, for an additional sum of money.

On the number of women called for jury duty, again I would have to reserve the answer. I don't think that I have that information handy here and I would have to get it for the honourable member.

Adequate Housing: We made some small improvements in the accommodations at the Law Courts Building, but as members have already heard, it's rather crowded over there. One of the things we hope to do as a result of this Magistrates Court building and being able to move some of the folks out of the Law Courts Building is to improve the jury facilities at the Winnipeg Law Courts Building. I think there's not really a problem in the other courthouses in the province in that regard.

The matter of replying to the nearest police force is a good suggestion, and I would certainly be glad to do whatever I can to encourage that that be done.

The number of magistrates and where they are located. I should have come prepared with that because I might well have known that someone would have asked me. We have full-time magistrates in Winnipeg, and all of the other magistrates in the province, they are located at Brandon, Minnedosa, The Pas, Flin Flon, Portage la Prairie. I'm in error - there's a full-time magistrate at Selkirk and three full-time magistrates in the Winnipeg area, and a full-time magistrate at Selkirk. All of the other magistrates are part-time magistrates. The position of the magistrate at Portage la Prairie has always been somewhat in doubt. It was our understanding that he was engaged as a full-time magistrate. This was during the time of my predecessor. He tells that the magistrate says to me that that isn't the case, and I am unable to prove otherwise, so I am now taking his word for it that he's not a full-time magistrate, but as I've indicated they're all part-time magistrates.

Let me be clear. I'm not suggesting that this is a satisfactory arrangement. There are some problems associated, as I've said before, in changing the system, but I would not for one moment suggest that the system ought not to be changed.

Now he speaks of the Dauphin Judicial District and that touches a very responsive cord, and I would have to confess that I have been having some difficulty. I would be glad to have an application from a very estimable member of the Legislature who may have close associations with the Dauphin Judicial District and be glad to hear from him at any time, but at the moment we are continuing, and I'm hopeful that we will be able to look after the situation, but I have been anxiously watching to ensure that there has been the minimum dislocation. My information is that, at the moment, the cases are being looked after as expeditiously, if not more expeditiously, than they were previously, and certainly those are the standing instructions, that no effort is to be spared simply because the magistrate is not actually there, but I would have to acknowledge that it is not a very satisfactory situation and I am hopeful that we will be able to resolve the problem reasonably soon.

If I may give the information to the Honourable Member for Lakeside regarding the Crown Attorneys, I may now give him this information. In the civil side we have a Director of Civil Litigation. We have two departmental Solicitors III, we have two departmental Solicitors II, and we have one departmental Solicitor -- I'm sorry, we have two departmental Solicitor I, but there is one of this group that is just about ready to be promoted to departmental Solicitor II, in which case we would have three II's and one in the I category.

Under the Crown, in the Crown Attorney side, in the Crown side, we have a Director of Prosecutions, we have one Crown Attorney III, three Crown Attorney II, and four occupying the Crown Attorney I position, and they, when they have put in a certain length of time, will be eligible for Crown Attorney II. Now we're a little heavy there on the Crown Attorney I, but it is in this area where we have recently lost two of our men, and a little before that another one, so that we are heavy there on the I.

In the Western Judicial District we have a Crown Attorney II who is a full-time, and then of course we have a part-time Crown Attorney. In the Dauphin Judicial District the Crown Attorney, who is a full-time Crown Attorney is a Crown Attorney II, and the other Crown Attorneys are part-time Crown Attorneys. In addition, there is in the St. Boniface, Mr. Thomas, who is

(MR. McLEAN cont'd.) in a rather special position in the hearts of all of us. He is not actually classified as a Crown Attorney in our pay classification, but is paid a monthly fee which is equivalent to -- they haven't given me the figure here but I would assume that it's one of the more senior positions.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, since the Honourable Minister was so kind, if I understood him right, as to ask me for assistance to find a magistrate for the Dauphin area, I would only be too glad to help him in any way I can, but before I approach anybody I would like to know what the qualifications are and what the salary is.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I was disappointed in the reply of the Honourable the Attorney-General in replying to my questions. There hasn't been a day since the Session opened that we haven't heard the term 'dragging behind' or something like this, and I would suggest that this too applies to jury reform when the Honourable the Attorney-General said that some small changes have been made in regard to the housing facilities of women jurors, and I am suggesting to him that there haven't been any women jurors in Manitoba. And surely, when they put out the book 'Law is of Interest to Women' surely it would be of interest to women to know what progress has been made in regard to this modern trend, and I'm not at all satisfied.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, speaking as bargaining agent for my honourable friend from Ethelbert Plains, I think I could induce him to take on that magistrate's job, if the Attorney-General would only guarantee security of tenure, \$16,000 a year, and a nice pension.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to delay passage of the Estimates, but I would just like to ask the Honourable the Attorney-General if he would check these cases that I have been mentioning, and either confirm or set me right as to whether there were actually something in the neighbourhood of six prosecutions with regard to lotteries during his term of office, and that one of them at least was stayed, and would he give me the reason, give the House, the Committee the reasons, of what differentiated that case from the others that were proceeded to trial and in some cases a fine was levied?

MR. McLEAN: Is the honourable member referring to the case last -- what was it, September or October, that there was reference to in the Press. Oh, Well, I think I did mention this, that I felt that the particular lottery in question was one that was being conducted by a group of citizens who had been for a number of years devoting the proceeds from it to public purposes, and the persons charged were two private citizens who happened to be the President and Secretary, if I recall correctly, of the association, and I would have to say simply that I felt that under the circumstances, all things considered, we ought not to proceed. Now I can only give that explanation with regard to that. Now I don't know about the others -- the others didn't come to my attention and I assume they must, in that case, have been just dealt with in the regular way. This one was brought to my attention by a number of the people who were concerned and -- that is concerned in the possible prosecution or in the prosecution. So, that's not too satisfactory an answer, but I couldn't answer as to what might have been done in the other cases where they were proceeded with, if they had been brought to my attention. It might well have been that the same considerations would have applied.

MR. CAMPBELL: Then, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my honourable friend as a good lawyer, which I recognize him to be, does he say that the Federal Act gives him the authority to make that decision? Does he have the authority under the Federal Act to decide that these are good citizens and that they are engaged in a worthwhile work and because of that the Federal Act does not apply?

MR. McLEAN: I think what the Act says, it doesn't say that I may decide whether they are good citizens or not, but does say that the Attorney-General, if I understand it correctly, that the decision as to whether or not the prosecution is to be proceeded with, is a decision for the Attorney-General. Now that is a decision that he may not always be making himself personally but that is my understanding of the legal position.

MR. SHEWMAN: Mr. Chairman, for a matter of clarification on this question of lotteries, I have listened to this discussion - and I hope I'm wrong, and I'll bear correction if I am wrong - - but from the debate that the Honourable Member from Lakeside has put up here tonight I had these thoughts that he's opposed to lotteries. But when we think back a few years and when we think of the lotteries that have been gone on in the past and the good that they've done and the people that have conducted these lotteries, it's hard for me to believe that the Honourable Member from Lakeside is opposed to these lotteries. I am thinking of one lottery that was conducted on a Red River derby. The money raised from that lottery went to the Crippled Childrens' Hospital in Winnipeg here. There was a good many thousand dollars raised for that hospital. And when one stops and thinks of the efforts that the Legion is putting in to raise money through bingo games, lotteries and such like, they are doing a lot of good. And then we have the Legion and other organizations having bingo games and lotteries to help furnish our senior citizens homes in Manitoba. And we have agricultural societies that have lotteries, such as car raffles and whatever you might have; curling clubs have these lotteries that cost a person all the way from .25 cents to a \$1.00. And we think of our - - (Interjection) - - I'm not speaking to you now, I'll talk to you later. And we have our curling clubs who are raising money for good causes. I don't want to leave this Chamber tonight with the thought in mind that the Honourable Member from Lakeside who has been Premier of the Province, a senior member in this House, having the thought in my mind that he's been opposed to these lotteries all the time and never done anything about it. Now I'd like him to clarify for my own thoughts whether it's right or wrong.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I'm delighted to accommodate my honourable friend because I have become completely convinced in the last eight years that practically everything that was done previously to that time was done wrongly. And what I was wanting to know was, why was there one area in the recent years where things weren't completely perfect. And it was just to get the distinction that I was questioning my honourable friend.

Now I find that my honourable friend the Attorney-General and my honourable friend from Morris differ in regard to their opinions on lotteries and I wouldn't for worlds take part in a difference of opinion between two such good friends. I'd suggest to them that they settle their differences by themselves. But inasmuch as the Honourable the Attorney-General is the one who has the administration of the law in his hands and holding the opinions that he did, I would warn my honourable friend from Morris that he's better be pretty careful about the lotteries that he encourages from now on.

MR. SHEWMAN: Mr. Chairman, it comes back to what I said before, it was through the associations I have had over this number of years with the Honourable Member from Lakeside that makes me form these opinions and ask these questions. Now I just asked a question, I'm glad he answered. He is still opposed to lotteries as far as I am concerned. For these beneficial causes where my 25 cents, and I doubt if he ever put 25 cents into a lottery, but it's my 25 cents and the other fellow's 25 cents that does some good as far as mankind is concerned.

MR. CAMPBELL: I think Mr. Chairman we've probably found out now from whence has come the pressure to ease off on these lotteries.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I was eagerly awaiting my honourable friend the Member for Morris to suggest that a Commission be set up to look into the possibilities of establishing - - and Harry and I could go to all the Casinos in the Mediterranean and all up and down the country, because we really did enjoy ourselves on the only commission that we were together on: Maybe it isn't too late yet for him to bring forward a resolution in this regard.

Now Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon the Honourable Member for Selkirk discussed, or talked about the qualifications of Magistrates and Judges and so on. Last year I asked about the qualifications of the JP's and wondered whether my Honourable friend would supply me with a copy of the application and the examination papers that they are required to fill out before receiving their appointment. I think I even said that the number one qualification of course was that they must have been actively working as a poll captain for the conservative party or some other position, but there must be other qualifications. And I wonder if my honourable friend is completely satisfied with the qualifications of all of the JP's in the province or does he really think there is some improvements that could be made in this regard? I think that the Honourable Member for Selkirk suggested that some of them were just simply cash registers. I think that's what he said. Now I believe that this is true in

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd)... certain instances, that in certain places in the province the Secretary-Treasurers are in fact JP's, and they are collecting fines, the receipts of which go directly into the corporation for which they are paid -- and it seems to be that this is a little departure from justice. So I agree with the Honourable Member for Selkirk that perhaps we should take a new look at some of these things.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know for my own satisfaction if no one else whether or not it is a criminal offence or an offence punishable by fine or imprisonment to operate a motor vehicle at any time during a registration year without insurance coverage if the additional sum of \$25.00 has not been paid.

Now when you receive your application for the renewal of your car insurance there is a little slip like this that goes with every application, and what I have just read is a paragraph from that "Important Notice", that goes with the application. I have been told by the local police that it is not a criminal offence to drive without insurance or not having paid the \$25.00 -- or under the Highway Traffic Act.

When you make application for your licence -- and incidentally, Mr. Chairman, I have filled out literally hundreds of applications for people. They've come into the office and said would you kindly complete the back of this application, have I insurance, the necessary insurance, the name of the Company, the policy number and the expiry date. Now as my honourable friend the Attorney-General knows that if you go in tomorrow and make application for your car registration, and if you say, yes you have insurance with such and such a company and that it expires on March the 2nd, 1966, you can purchase your license without paying the \$25.00. But there is no assurance under the sun that the policy will be renewed after it has expired on March 2nd. None whatever! And I suppose that the intention here is that the motorist is to be left with the impression that if he fails to renew the policy that he's subject to an offence that is punishable by fine or imprisonment. And yet the police say no that is not so. Well who's right?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, the member that has just spoken asked for the qualifications for JP's and I would briefly like to come back to the local town police. What is being done to upgrade the qualifications of these people? Is there any program going and provided by the government whereby these people come in and get some briefing, get some training as to their work?

Then I also notice under the resolution that we are discussing that there is provided \$1,685,000 for Law Enforcement and Police Services. Does this apply purely to the RCMP or are there any other police included in this particular item. The Honourable Member for Gladstone mentioned the matter of the \$20.00 or \$25.00 that you have to pay if you do not purchase insurance. What do you get in a case like that when someone has an accident and the party that is also involved has paid the \$25.00. Can the person that has damages, can he collect in full? Or what is the situation and where does he collect from? Does he collect from this insurance fund where everyone is contributing to in the matter of the fifty cent payment; or what is the case in this respect?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I don't think I'll be any more successful this year than I was last year in explaining to the Honourable Member for Gladstone-Neepawa the qualifications of a Justice of the Peace. If it is a fact that poll captains are made Justices of the Peace, he'll be happy to know that the vast majority of our present Justices of the Peace were appointed prior to 1958, so I presume that they're full qualifications will be satisfactory.

A Justice of the Peace is a person of good character and sound common sense who is thought to be satisfactory to perform certain limited responsibilities in relation to law enforcement. There are those, among whom I count myself, who feel that their function should be restricted pretty well to the issuing of legal documents, summons or perhaps granting bail or something of that sort; but they do under our system and do more than that. We do not favour, and I do not favour, the appointment of the Secretary-Treasurer of a municipal corporation as a Justice of the Peace, but I would have to acknowledge that there are a number of Justices of the Peace appointed in that category and some of whom have been appointed since I became the Attorney-General. It's a nice question. Sometimes it is in a particular situation perhaps the only person or maybe the person that is considered to have the best qualifications, but one must balance that off against this other rather difficult situation if possible; and so as a matter of policy wherever we can we try to avoid the appointment of Secretary-Treasurers as Justices of the Peace.

The matter of the offence of an operation of a motor vehicle, the Attorney-General

(MR. McLEAN cont'd). . . . does not have the administration of The Highway Traffic Act, but -- and he said is it a criminal offence. Well, of course, it is not a criminal offence. I would say that, without having looked at the Act specifically that it is an offence to be operating a motor vehicle without having either an existing policy of insurance in force, or alternatively, having paid the \$25.00 to the Motor Vehicle Branch. In the illustration which he gives, I would be of the opinion that if the insurance was in force on the day that the license was purchased but that it expired after that date then the obligation is on the operator to either get a continuation of the insurance or to then proceed and pay the \$25.00 to the Motor Vehicle Branch. That would be my interpretation of the law. However, inasmuch as The Highway Traffic Act will be before the members for detailed consideration, undoubtedly this matter will receive careful consideration.

And just while on this point and dealing with the last point made by the Member for Rhineland, the \$25.00 is paid into the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund by a person who does not have a policy of car insurance or insurance on his car; and if there is an accident, then the operator of the vehicle is in the first instance responsible for any damages out of his personal assets; he's responsible for the payment of damages. It is only if he is unable, has no funds with which to pay any judgment against him, that the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund pays, and if the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund is called upon to pay, it pays according to the limit set by the Fund which may be less than the judgment that has been recovered. In other words, the \$25.00 is not an insurance policy, it's a payment to the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund and the ordinary rules of law apply.

Local town police - what is being done to upgrade the qualifications of police. We do not have in Manitoba any plan for the training or the upgrading of local police people. I believe that some municipal police forces have been able to avail themselves of the police training which is given by the City of Winnipeg, but that is on a basis that may be arranged -- I'm not really familiar with the arrangements and I doubt if that's used to any great extent. I have under consideration whether or not we should have what might be called a police school or a police training system which would enable local police forces to have their men trained in such a training institution, and we are looking at this now with our colleagues in the Department of Education to see whether or not something can be usefully worked out.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland will be particularly interested in this, that in Alberta some two years ago they made plans for the establishment of a training system and up until a very short time ago had never implemented it because they found that it was going to be quite expensive, and while it's on the statute books of Alberta, I believe it has not in fact been implemented, or wasn't until a short time ago. But I just say that we don't have any facilities at the present time; it is altogether possible that we ought to have such facilities and we are looking at that situation.

The \$1.6 million is a payment to the RCMP and this in respect of the policing services which the RCMP perform for the Province of Manitoba. And we don't pay any part of that money to any other police force.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, at the last session I brought to the attention of the Minister that in my constituency the Magistrate's Court was sitting only once a month. Up till this time no change has been made in this respect. Has the Minister considered making the changes that I asked for last year? And I wonder while I'm on my feet whether he'll make the same, pass the same concession to me that he did to the Member for Ethelbert Plains; would he like me to look for a magistrate for him?

MR. McLEAN: Is that the court at Lundar? I thought we had increased -- you say well -- just once a month?

MR. GUTTORMSON: That is my understanding, unless they have changed it recently.

MR. McLEAN: Now, I'll check on that. My recollection was that as a result of our exchange and our discussion in committee a year ago that we were increasing the number of sittings at Lundar, but I would have to check that.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Perhaps the Minister is right. It was my understanding they hadn't, but I wouldn't dispute that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolutions Nos. 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 passed. Department of Agriculture.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House has considered certain Resolutions and requested leave to sit again.

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.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, by leave of the House, I wonder if permission might be granted to have the debate on the motion regarding the rules which was adjourned by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface on my behalf called as the next Order of business. I know this is unusual, but in order to promote the motion, the Whips and the Member for Rhineland have agreed to this procedure, and I ask for leave of the House to do so.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. PETERS: As far as our group's concerned, Madam Speaker, the honourable member has leave.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed from..?

MR. FROESE: Yes, I'm willing to agree to accommodate them.

MR. EVANS: on this side of the House.

MADAM SPEAKER: This gives unanimous consent of the House then for the honourable member to proceed.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, the one point in the rules that has caused us concern is the matter of the 80-hour limit for the Estimates. However, in view of the statement made by the Premier this afternoon, we on this side are prepared to accept his statement in good faith and prepared to accept the rules on a trial basis as suggested this afternoon.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Will I call the adjourned debate at this time?

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I think there are one or two matters to consider at this point. I take it the adoption of the resolution now adopts those rules, as the rules of the House, and presumably at this moment then we're now operating under the new rules as they have been agreed to and as they have been approved in the resolution just passed. This may well raise one or two additional points in connection with some other matters that have been considered not in the written rules, somewhat say with respect to ringing of the bells while in committee and some other smaller matters. I wonder if Your Honour's had a chance to consider those matters as well.

MADAM SPEAKER: During the debate on concurrence it has been suggested that certain minor corrections be made before the final printing of the rules. I wonder if the House would agree that these corrections should be effected under the supervision of the Speaker? Agreed? Well, now that the rules have been adopted, they shall come into effect at once, and to date, I would ask the Clerk to apprise the House as to how many hours we have spent in Supply. Ten hours and thirty minutes have been spent in Supply and this time will be applied to the 80-hour limitation rule concerning the debate. May I also remind the honourable members of the House that while we were effecting the rules, it had been agreed upon by the Committee that Madam Speaker instruct the Sergeant-at-Arms to ring the bell in cases of Divisions in the Committees of the Whole House, and (2) that the Speaker would not allow more than two supplementary questions in the House. (3) That Chapter 14 be deleted from our Rule Book and that the rules respecting the Library be prepared by the Librarian and approved by the Minister having the responsibility for the Library. (4) That the Speaker would convene a meeting of Whips to give consideration to suggestions regarding decorum and management in the House. (5) That the resolutions from the Committee of Supply dealing with concurrence be prepared by the Clerk with the approval of the Speaker in such a manner as to include in one resolution all the resolutions and the aggregate amount for the departments, that is, only one resolution per department read by the Clerk for concurrence.

Now the rules of the House will be printed in due course, but in the meantime, the honourable members are requested to refer to their own copy of the report.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I just noted one point as you were reading the supplementary matters that were agreed to in the Committee. I noticed that the one with regard to the Library stopped at the point of the Minister having agreed to the rules proposed by the Librarian. I think there was a further clause added that each member of the House was to have a copy or something to that effect. I think there was a further clause added -- is there a copy of these was it not.. yes, -- did you read this part, Madam Speaker? If you did, I didn't catch it. Rule 3, Chapter 14 be deleted and that the rules respecting the

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) . . . Library be prepared by the Librarian and approved by the Minister, having the responsibility for the Library, a copy of the said rules to be supplied to each member of the Assembly.

MADAM SPEAKER: I have not that on my copy here, but I recall that that was in it. Agreed that this will be the case? ..

MR. EVANS: Now, Madam Speaker, I think there's one matter that we should agree upon. These being the new rules would call for the House to meet at 10:30 tomorrow morning. I think this is a matter which could cause a good deal of difficulty and I think it's the general opinion of the House that when we adjourn this evening that we should adjourn to meet at 2:30 tomorrow afternoon instead of 10:30 tomorrow morning. I wonder if honourable members would care to express an opinion on that?

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, the first point that I have, I think the time was 10:00 rather than 10:30. 10:00 to 12:30, I think.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, this meets with our approval.

MR. PETERS: My understanding is that we'll meet at 2:30 and adjourn at 5:30 and not have a night sitting tomorrow. Is that correct?

MR. EVANS: That is correct. I wonder if the Honourable Member for Rhineland has any comment?

MR. FROESE: I would agree; however, I would like to have the previous vote recorded on division. That was the one on adopting the Rules.

MR. EVANS: The honourable member is not voicing an objection that we propose to adjourn until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. Therefore, Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable the Attorney-General that the House do now adjourn.

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