

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, April 3, 1968

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present the First Report of the Standing Committee of Public Utilities and Natural Resources.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources beg leave to present the following as their First Report:

Your Committee met on Tuesday, March 26, Tuesday, April 2, and Wednesday, April 3, 1968 and appointed Honourable Mr. McLean as Chairman. Your Committee agreed that, for the present session, the Quorum of this Committee shall consist of nine (9) members.

Your Committee has examined The Annual Report of the Manitoba Telephone System for the Fiscal Year ending March 31, 1967, as published.

Your Committee received all information desired by any member of the Committee from the officials of The Manitoba Telephone System and their staffs with respect to matters pertaining to the Report and the Business of The Manitoba Telephone System. The fullest opportunity was accorded to all members of the Committee to seek any information desired.

Mrs. Prefontaine, on behalf of the Committee for the residents of Headingley, submitted a brief requesting that a group of 170 families be put on the Winnipeg Exchange of the Manitoba Telephone System.

Your Committee has considered Bills:

(No. 22) - An Act to amend The Manitoba Hydro Act

(No. 38) - An Act to amend The Manitoba Telephone Act

And has agreed to report the same without amendment. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that the Report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress) introduced Bill No. 49, an Act to amend The Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation Act.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, under the new rules, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of this bill, recommends it to the House.

MR. LYON then introduced Bill No. 34, an Act to amend an Act respecting Soldiers' Estates.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville) introduced Bill No. 40, an Act to amend The Dairy Act.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 55, an Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956, and to validate By-laws Nos. 19389, 19466 and 19494; and Bill No. 58, an Act to amend The Pharmaceutical Act.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's) introduced Bill No. 57, an Act to amend The Child Welfare Act.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon) introduced Bill No. 51, an Act to amend The Brandon Charter and to amend an Act respecting the City of Brandon and to Validate By-law No. 3930 of The City of Brandon.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone), in the absence of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, introduced Bill No. 59, an Act to amend The St. Boniface Charter, 1953.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct the attention of the honourable members of the gallery where we have 21 students of Grade 9 standing, from the St. Norbert Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. McDonald. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Attorney-General.

We also have with us today 38 students of Grade 9 standing, from the J. B. Mitchell School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Lysecki and Mr. Jamault. This

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

We also have with us 16 members of the Manitou Farm Business Group, who are under the direction of Mr. Wiebe. They hail from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Pembina.

There are also 15 students of Grade 9 Mixed Standing, of Marymount School for Girls. These students are under the direction of Mrs. L. Russell. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable the Provincial Treasurer.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, may I announce that I expect to bring down the budget next Monday at 8:00 o'clock.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of N.D.P.) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, we're glad to receive the announcement of our honourable friend and we trust it will be acceptable on this side of the House as well as on that.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, before the Order are called, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Is it true that the Honourable Minister cancelled the move of the Information Branch to its proposed new quarters?

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Minister of Industry & Commerce): Yes, Mr. Speaker, but only temporarily.

MR. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister giving consideration to a cut-back in the Information Branch budget?

MR. SPIVAK: No, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer a question that was directed to me by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party, and I apologize for not answering yesterday when I was answering other questions. Your question directed to me concerned the rise in the NHA interest rate and our attitude towards that. Now we are all concerned all over Manitoba at a rise in this rate, and I'm really concerned because it reflects very high interest rates not only to every individual but it's to every firm and every government who acquire needed financing, and I'm also concerned because NHA rates seem to be sort of a mortgage rate indicator. Although the Federal Government, I know, Mr. Speaker, will argue that the NHA rate only reflects the existing interest rates, I'm afraid that it has the effect of encouraging the whole cycle of mortgage interest rates to move just a step higher.

There would appear to us to be three choices open to the Federal Government. Probably one of these might be to free the interest rate, another might be to establish an NHA mortgage rate at less than the current market interest rates, and the third might be to establish subsidized interest rates. But all three of these would have to be considered in some depth, because if you free the interest rate the mortgage market would then have to find its own level and the interest rate would continue to rise so long as the demand for capital funds was high, and indeed so long as international interest rates are high. Freeing the interest rate, however, would remove the danger we think that the Canadian rate would continue to rise, and we are giving thought to it and having discussions with the federal people in this area.

Now, if you establish an NHA rate that would be less than the current market rate, all the funds for NHA mortgages would then have to be provided through CMHC and we would have to recognize here, Mr. Speaker, that those mortgages now provided through the approved lenders would simply disappear and they would go to attractive investments elsewhere, and so CMHC would have to provide all the housing mortgages for the country, and if they did, this year they may be called upon to provide some \$3 billion worth of mortgages and this, of course, would have to be considered in the light of other government requirements.

Now if you go to a subsidized interest rate, Mr. Speaker, this system again presents many difficulties because you would have to consider many things such as the selection of income, the selection of homes, the family size, and the value of homes; many things would have to be considered and it has many pitfalls. We are looking at a plan that Sweden has, a subsidy program, and in here too we must recognize that this plan, although it's worthy of consideration, we wonder whether you're really subsidizing the home purchaser or are you

(MRS. FORBES cont'd.) subsidizing the money lender, so it does take a great deal of consideration.

But I would like to tell the House that at present we are having consultations with the federal people, and at present I have one of my senior officials, who is in Toronto, attending the Building Standards Conference which I think has quite a bearing on NHA loans, and next week he, along with the Chairman of our Housing Corporation and our Director of Planning, will be attending the Housing Conference, and I want to tell you that Manitoba will be presenting a very determined pitch to the Federal Government that we would like them to recognize the regional differences and not gear everything to the economy and the resources and the demands that are made by the Province of Ontario. And I can assure the members of the House that discussions will continue with the federal people in an attempt to provide some solution.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I thank the Honourable the Minister for her detailed explanation. I just have one or two supplementary questions. First of all: Have you made any direct representation to Ottawa as to Manitoba's choice of one or more of the three proposals that you have suggested? Secondly, I wonder if -- my honourable friend mentioned, I believe, some of her staff that are presenting or will be presenting a brief in relation to this; I wonder if copies of that brief may be available as to the representations. And the Minister indicated, it seemed to me, that this is a matter that's being given ever more consideration and I would like to know if the Minister can indicate when we might be able to obtain from the government a more detailed statement as to the result of their deliberations.

MRS. FORBES: Well, in answer to your first question, we have advocated, I should say, the freeing of the interest rate. In the answer to your other question, I will obtain copies of the brief and make them available for you; and to the third one, I will have to hold that until we have something further to present to the members of the House.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, in the light of the questions that were answered by the Honourable Minister, might I direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce as to what is the current range of interest rates being charged by the Manitoba Development Fund, and is consideration being given to any of the three proposals that are being considered by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, including the apparent recommendation that the freeing of the interest rates would be the solution? I realize that he may not have the answer at hand, but on the other hand he may.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well then may I, Mr. Speaker, ask a question of the Provincial Treasurer as to what is the situation in regard to the Manitoba bonds that are still out at, I think, five percent, whether there is any substantial application for redemption of same before the due date at this time, in view of the interest rate problem.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, there has been no sharp upswing in the regular redemptions of the Savings Bonds - I think my honourable friend's referring to the Manitoba Savings Bonds which have been issued at various rates, not all at five percent. There has been no undue increase in redemptions. They have been going on month by month at a fairly steady rate and I'm not aware of any special movement at the present time.

MR. CHERNIACK: May I ask, Mr. Speaker: these are the bonds that are redeemable at par at any time?

MR. EVANS: Yes.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Have there been any recent developments, or are there any changes re the Horse Racing Commission, or are they still at deadlock with the other parties?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Speaker, there has been no change in that situation on the part of the government.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, in relation to the reply given by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, I wish to present this question dealing with the matter of easing the interest burden on the people of Manitoba: Does the Manitoba Government support the position taken by the Canadian Federation of Mayors in the resolution that it passed, calling upon the Federal Government for some measure of relief income-tax-wise for interest on mortgages and real property tax?

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take his question as notice.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture concerning a problem of poultry products. Is it true the Department of Agriculture is discouraging the reporting of egg prices in daily papers just about a month ago?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not just sure as to the area of jurisdiction that my department may have in what the press or papers choose to report or not to report. I would have to take the honourable member's question as further notice and check in to see just what activity is being done by members of my department in this regard.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Are there any difficulties connected with integrating Sacred Heart Parochial School in the public school system?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Well, not that I'm aware of, Mr. Speaker. Usually the school board enters into negotiations under shared services with a private school and then send a proposed -- I have to sign the agreement. In this case I have nothing before me at the moment.

MR. DOERN: A supplementary question. Is this a shared services agreement that is being proposed or is this a complete integration in the system?

MR. JOHNSON: I have no precise information at the moment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: Perhaps, with leave, I could make a short statement about business of the House this afternoon for the honourable members' information. It would be our proposal, subject to agreement which I understand will be forthcoming, for the Provincial Secretary to proceed, by leave, with the committee and third reading stages of the two bills that were reported out of Public Utilities Committee this morning, and subsequently His Honour would be asked to give the Royal Assent to those bills. We would then move into the Committee of Supply - and I would just point out that we have now spent 15 hours on the dot in that Committee - with some hope or anticipation that we might possibly finish the current department that is before the Committee. If we were successful in that venture, I can assure honourable members that it would not be the proposal of the government to call a new department today, but rather we would rise out of the Committee of Supply and come back to second readings with the ultimate goal in mind of adjourning at 5:00 o'clock tonight to accommodate an important segment of the House who have an important piece of business to transact. I thought that information might be -- (Interjections) -- I hope that information will be of some help to the members.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection of the procedure but I think the Attorney-General would be getting off too easy if we let him have his estimates passed today.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Urban and Municipal Affairs. The other day, my colleague the Member for Assiniboia directed a question to the Minister with respect to a business applying for a building permit, and the question was, and I repeat it: Has Metro the power to withhold a building permit providing the zoning regulations are met by the person applying?

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, I have not the answer today.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, this is rather important to a certain person in Winnipeg and I would ask the Honourable Minister to please get the information as soon as possible.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order; I'm afraid that what my honourable friend is asking for is a legal question, which is really not related to the jurisdiction of this House. He might better direct his question to the solicitor for Metropolitan Winnipeg Corporation.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, a supplemental question. Is it not true that Metro is set up by this jurisdiction, the Legislature, and has not this Legislature the right to direct Metro if they are breaking the law?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, my only point was that it seemed to me that my honourable friend's question was asking for a legal opinion, which is not properly given on Orders of the Day, and it's a legal opinion over which the government would not have direct knowledge.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs took the question as notice and I look forward to the answer.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs gave three alternatives before as to the source of funds that could be provided for National Housing mortgages. My question would be: have they also considered the Bank of Canada, which has the machinery whereby funds could be made available?

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, in answer, they have considered many things; we just suggested three choices that might be available to the Federal Government.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe it's in order now to call the Provincial Secretary.

MR. McLEAN: I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that by leave Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider and report on the following bills: Bill No. 22, an Act to amend The Manitoba Hydro Act; Bill No. 38, an Act to amend The Manitoba Telephone Act.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee proceed. Bill No. 22, Section 1 -- passed. 31, Section 131--passed. The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, this particular section here gives the Hydro the power to borrow \$50 million on a short term basis. While I would not object to passing this bill, I think there should be one proviso with it in that the members of this House should, at a regular session, receive some indication as to what the program is and what the temporary borrowings would be used for, because this is a large amount, and if we approve this bill now they will have this authority to borrow many millions of dollars without ever having an especially approved sanction from this House. Therefore, I think we should have a program at a regular session indicating what they're contemplating so that we would have notice ahead of time as to what any moneys of this type would be used for.

MR. McLEAN: I could concur in what the honourable member has said and point out, of course, that that is the purpose of the annual appearance of Manitoba Hydro Board before the Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources, first to give a report of what projects they are carrying out, projects contemplated, and a full report respecting their financial position, which of course would involve full information to the members concerning any sums of money that were in effect borrowed and owing under the provisions of this bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Bill 22, and Bill 38, were read section by section and passed.) Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has passed Bills Nos. 38 and 22 without amendment and has asked me to report same.

IN SESSION

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that the report of the Committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. BILLS NOS. 22 and 38, by leave, were each read a third time and passed.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, we're just going to endeavour to see if His Honour is available to consider the Royal Assent.

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

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly, at its present session, passed the following bills:

No. 22 - an Act to amend The Manitoba Hydro Act.

No. 38 - an Act to amend The Manitoba Telephone Act.

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

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee proceed. Department IV Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, there were a few questions that I was in the course of answering last night that perhaps I can proceed with now. The Member for Hamiota asked some questions about the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund - what assurance that a driver's insurance has not lapsed mid-term on his registration without him being required to pay the fee. This really comes under Public Utilities, but in cases where the driver has demonstrated irresponsibility he is required, of course, to file a certificate proving financial responsibility. This certificate requires his insurance company to notify the Motor Vehicle Branch ten days in advance of the cancellation of insurance coverage, otherwise there is no check. He also asks that if the \$25.00 fee in lieu of insurance was not paid, was it impossible for the fund to be sued, and the answer to that very briefly is that the \$25.00 penalty charged by that department, Public Utilities, there is no relationship to the right of a citizen to sue the fund. This is merely a penalty charged to the individual motor vehicle owner and designed to encourage him to take out insurance, and if he doesn't take it out then he must pay the \$25.00, but it has no relationship to the right to go after the fund for legitimate claims against that fund in the event of an accident occurring.

He also asked about the fund, whether or not it has become depleted through excessive claims and what use was made of the fund. I think my honourable friend was a little bit high in his estimate of what the fund used to be. He mentioned the figure of \$5 million. Actually, the highest that the fund has ever been in recent years was \$607,591 as of July 31, 1967. As of the end of February of this year, the balance in the fund was \$447,451.86. Until 1967 the size of the fund was limited by statute to a \$500,000 maximum. The funds are held in trust and they are invested by the Provincial Treasurer; the interest earnings are credited to the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. I hope that cleans up the questions that he had in that regard.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood asked some questions on the Minister's salary item about the Liquor Control Commission. Are the Order Forms necessary? One can fall on either side of this question but generally speaking they do serve this purpose, that the written order achieves much greater speed in serving the customer and it does have a tendency to cut administrative costs. The customer signing, while it's a nuisance to obvious adults, does serve as some deterrent to minors but, as he quite properly points out, there are other alternative means of achieving the same end. The Commission, as he knows, has designed some new forms and I am advised that they are looking at this matter because other provinces recently have been making changes and the Commission is quite prepared to consider anything reasonable that will be of benefit to the public.

Why are the pencils, to use his words, so crummy? There were some hard lead pencils ordered in there but these have been replaced, so I am sure my honourable friend will be able to either use a ballpoint pen or use the new pencils that are available now in the Liquor Commission.

Stand-up bars. They are not permitted by statute in Manitoba. Limits for capacity of licensed premises are set at the number of seats. There are some safety measures that are perhaps better controlled by the lack of stand-up bars, but this again is a question of changing social attitudes. The time may well come when consideration can be given to this again.

Saturday midnight closing --

MR. DOERN: How about the Concert Hall?

MR. LYON: -- concert hall? This is for an occasional permit, though. It's not a licensed premises. Under occasional permits, weddings, whatever the occasion, you can go to the bar and receive your drinks. The stand-up requirement - I'm going only from memory, so I shouldn't be held to this - the stand-up requirement, I believe is statutory with respect to licensed premises.

MR. CHERNIACK: You mean the Centennial Concert Hall was just temporary?

MR. LYON: The Centennial Concert Hall, according to my information, is operating on occasional permit. There are no restaurant facilities open as yet in the premises. Ultimately, when they open restaurant facilities, they may well apply then for the regular licensed premises.

Saturday midnight closing. There may well be a case for this practice. We are certainly prepared to look at it. There doesn't seem to be any great pressure from public or licensees at the present time.

(MR. LYON cont'd.)

He asked what was the general feed back on Bill No. 38? Hardly any feed back whatsoever on advertising or on the change in hours. Anything that I have heard has been, generally speaking, favourable.

MR. DOERN: Could I ask the Minister a question there? On the midnight restriction, the Saturday midnight closing for cabarets and cocktail lounges, does the Lord's Day Act prohibit us from extending the hours or is this our own prerogative?

MR. LYON: I don't believe it's the Lord's Day, I think it's our own Liquor Control Act because we have gone beyond that. He mentioned the New Year's Eve problem that was accommodated to some extent by the Commission giving consideration to the extension of dining room licenses into cabaret areas and this was accommodated in that way beyond the hour, although this was on a Sunday night going into Monday. My honourable friend is talking about a Saturday night going into Sunday. I'm really not clear on that point.

The Honourable Member from Rhineland asked a question about the consolidation of statutes. I believe I mentioned in my opening remarks that we will be asking the House to approve the formation of a Committee of the House this year to approve of the new revised statutes. We'll start feeding them into this Committee this summer. Hopefully the Legislature next year will be able to give approval to them and the printing will take place after that.

The administration of justice. The Honourable Member from Rhineland asked about the John Howard-Elizabeth Fry Society grant. That is still contained in our Estimates. If he will look at Page 3 of the Corrections Report he will see some evaluation of the work of that organization. We think that it performs a useful function and we are continuing our grant to them.

We can deal with the Juvenile and Family Court items when we come to them, although there were two quick questions by my honourable friend from St. George. What will the new Detention Home cost? I presume he is referring to the renovations. It's a guesstimate at this stage but they are estimating that the renovations to Vaughan Street will cost in the area of \$45,000.00. We are hopeful that those premises will be ready for occupation sometime this spring, spring of this year. -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes. The work is presently underway on the Fort Osborne site to make it ready to receive the Administrative Branch, and immediately the Administrative Branch move out then the renovations will start within a matter of weeks on Vaughan Street itself. They are underway on Fort Osborne.

He also asked a question about a detoxication center at Old Grace Hospital. There was some discussion at one stage of using the Grace Hospital for this purpose, but this will not likely be done. This is not within our departmental responsibility; this is within the responsibility of the Hospital Commission. We are proceeding, however, with further discussions of such a facility, not necessarily at that site, and hope to be in a better position to give honourable members a detailed plan of it, hopefully by next year at the latest.

Now I think that covers most of the points, Mr. Speaker, of which I have record at this time, and if there are any others perhaps we could raise them as we come to the individual items in the Estimates.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Chairman, I have an item I'd like to discuss, and perhaps the Minister could indicate to me where -- if I should discuss it at this time or at the time when we get to it. It's a card that one of the local Finance Companies uses to send to their clients, and I don't intend to mention this firm's name but I certainly think that they should be rapped over the knuckles, or worse, for the attitudes or for the things they are doing. They had a client who came to me, who lived in my constituency, and I'll read this to you. It's a printed card and it says: "Notice to appear. You are to appear on" -- and then it gives such and such a date, and such and such a time -- "sharp," implying that it's a court order almost. Now it isn't a court order. It's not signed by anybody but anyone who isn't familiar could easily misinterpret this card to believe that this is an order that he just had to abide by. And I really think that the Attorney-General should take steps, or maybe perhaps through an agent in his office, to say something to this firm, because I certainly think it's improper and that they shouldn't be allowed to send out this type of card. Now, strictly speaking, I don't think there's anything illegal, but as I say it certainly created an impression. I'll send the card over to him so he can see it. Naturally I wouldn't want the name of the party who is on the card involved but I think that the company should certainly

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd.) be rapped and told to stop this type of practice because it certainly is not proper.

MR. LYON: I thank the honourable member for letting us have the card. We will give it to the Law Officers of the Crown - and we'll give it back to my honourable friend - and have them review it in the light of what he has said.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, two or three years ago - in fact it may be four years ago - we dealt with the Act that provided for relief from certain unconscionable transactions, and I think there was provision in that Act for a person to make application for his money back if he did so within 48 hours or 72 hours after he had signed a contract. There were several incidents in the Gladstone constituency where people came to me after they had signed a contract. I think all of them were in connection with steel buildings. The province seemed to be overrun with salesmen out selling steel buildings to farmers, not only in Manitoba but in Saskatchewan and Alberta, in all of the prairie provinces. And three or four of them made application, within the required time, for their money back, and I wrote to my honourable friend's department and got a letter back on one or two occasions in which they suggested that there was some weakness in the present legislation that made it impossible for them to get their money back. So I was wondering if my honourable friend could enlighten the House on the legislation that we have.

In the one instance, the sale was made, or the contract signed for the sale of this steel building in the morning, the farmer came in to see me about 1:00 o'clock in the afternoon, so I immediately sent him up to the lawyer. In the interval, the three - or four-hour interval, the salesman had cashed the cheque and he never did get his deposit back. The deposit in that case was \$100.00; the deposit in another case was \$1,200.00, and both of them lost their money. Now, I understand in Saskatchewan that from out -- well I don't know whether it was from out of a particular fund but I have a report before me that they had -- here we are here. This refers to Saskatchewan: "Money returned to buyers from door to door sales." And it says, "Door to door sales firms in Saskatchewan have had to refund over \$43,000 to buyers since the province's new Direct Sellers Act went into effect on July 1st. The complaints came from 69 purchasers and involved 19 different companies." And so it appears that in Saskatchewan their Act is working very efficiently, and it also appears that in Manitoba it is not working very efficiently. So I was wondering if my honourable friend could enlighten the House on that particular subject.

Another matter that was touched on last night by my honourable colleague, the Member for St. Boniface, was this: He was saying, if I interpreted his remarks correctly, that the laws of the province seemed to be designed to encourage people to plead guilty rather than become involved in court cases, and I have found this to be true on many, many occasions. And on Monday of this week a J. P. came to see me, not from my constituency, and he said, "I understand that you haven't much respect for fellows in my category." And I said, "I wouldn't say that." I said, "All I said in the House was, or all I asked on several occasions: what was the qualifications of a J.P. outside of having been a defeated Tory candidate or something like that." And I said, "I have yet to know what the qualifications are of a J.P. We have some in the province, or did have, that were about 85 years old, and all they were doing was acting as cash registers." And I said, "I'm not saying this about you because I do believe that you're making a fair job." And incidentally this particular J. P. has been a J.P. for 20 years, I guess. But he told me that he was underpaid in this day and age, that he had to get up in the middle of the night on several occasions because he was called by the RCMP, and I said, "How much do they pay you for that kind of thing?" And he said, "A dollar." I think he said a dollar. Well if this is a fact, he is underpaid. My guess is that he is the exception to the rule. My guess is he's an exceptionally good J.P. and a conscientious one that's really doing his job. He does not live in my constituency. -- (Interjection) -- Maybe in Dauphin. But he does not live in my constituency. But so many cases come before the J.P.s, and this fellow told me, he said, "I don't take money from anybody if they plead not guilty. I can't handle their case at all." "Well," I said, "All you are then is a cash register really." You say if you want to plead guilty and he looks up the fine and it's \$15.00 and he puts it in the till.

But I have also had several people come to me, particularly because I'm involved in the automobile insurance business to quite an extent, who have had charges laid against them under the Highway Traffic Act and The Criminal Code, and they have had their car licence

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) suspended or their vehicle impounded, or both in some cases, and they say, "Now what can I do about it?" And I will say, "Well, what did you do about it when they asked you if you wanted to plead guilty?" And they said, "Oh well, they said it would be better for me if I pleaded guilty and so I pleaded guilty." "Well," I said, "Were you guilty? Why should you plead guilty to something for which you may not be guilty?" But then they will come to me and say, "Well, will you appeal or make arrangements for me to appeal to the Appeal Board?"

Well in many cases I have made arrangements for them to appeal, but it strikes me as being kind of odd to plead guilty today and then go to the Appeal Board and say, "Well listen. Sure I pleaded guilty yesterday but today I've kind of changed my mind and I'm appealing to you to give me back my licence." Well I understand that about 80 or 85 percent of the appeals are granted. I don't know whether I'm correct in that regard but I think somewhere in that neighbourhood. -- (Interjection) -- It's Public Utilities. But the principle seems to be wrong somehow and I wonder if my honourable friend could make some comment about that.

I was talking on the province, the province is being overrun by these door to door salesmen, and I do recall that the Farmers Union told us, if not this year last year, that they estimated that the farmers in this province had lost about three-quarters of a million dollars in one year by door to door salesmen of all one kind or another. The Department of Agriculture, my honourable friend the Minister over there - I see he is in his seat as usual - but he sent out a release - or if it wasn't he, yes it was he I guess - on the 25th of September last year, warning: Watch your contracts. My honourable friend read this, I suppose: "For immediate release. Watch your contracts. A number of Manitoba farmers have encountered contract difficulties this summer when arranging for construction of new farm building." They have, indeed - not only this summer but for some summers in the past; and it warns the farmers to beware of these fly-by-night characters. And this proves the point that I have been making. Not only are we fellows making statements of this kind but here is my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture really concerned over it. So I hope that this Unconscionable Transactions Act, if it did have some flaws in it, we can get rid of the flaws and put some teeth to replace the flaws. I think that is what should be done.

Two or three years ago in this House we passed legal aid legislation, and I don't know whether it went into effect or whether it is in this proposed draft that is before the Committee now. But I have here somewhere before me this booklet that was put out, a real good one too, on laws affecting women, and it points out the various legislation that has been passed recently in respect to women. It has been said, Mr. Chairman, that if marriage licences cost \$10,000 and divorces cost \$3.00 there'd be a lot less divorces, and my guess is that there would be. But in this province and in most provinces the reverse is true. But this legislation did promise legal aid for divorces. I wonder if my honourable friend could tell us to what extent that this legislation is presently in effect, or is it in the proposed legislation?

Mr. Chairman, I, like the Honourable Member for Burrows, would like to express some concern over the fact that we just got this report, I think, when my honourable friend made his first comment on the department, and it's very difficult to read all of the things that come before us, particularly if they don't get to our desk until the Minister gets up on his feet. But the very opening paragraph, the very opening paragraph in the Report on Corrections in Manitoba says, "Total admissions in all provincial adult institutions were somewhat higher, but the daily average population was slightly lower, indicating shorter sentences." And when you go through the report - and if I can interpret it correctly, that opening paragraph is an understatement if ever there was one - on - let's see, the pages are not numbered in this book so it's difficult to tell my honourable friend on which page to find anything. There isn't a number on any of the pages. But it's on Page 2 of the blue section, on Page 2 of the blue section: "The most frequent delinquencies referred are as follows:" And under Summary of Tables, (2) 4. Sexual Immorality and other vice, and an asterisk after it. But it jumped from 66 in 1966 to 252 in 1967, or an increase of something like 400 percent. Now the asterisk says: "includes Glue Sniffing." Well, is it a fact then, that as a result of glue sniffing that this particular charge is up 400 percent?

And then you can go right through the book. On about the fourth or fifth page thereafter, Table 6, and that gives a whole series of the "Nature of delinquency by disposition" and the

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) total, the total cases 3,495 in 1966, 4,233 in 1967, up -- what, 30 percent? On the next page, Table 7, "Nature of delinquency by age and sex," from 2,590 in 1966 to 3,335 in 1967, up - what? 35 percent? On the next page, Table 8, "Highway Traffic Act and Bylaw referrals by age and sex and by disposition." Not so bad, but up from 1,522 to 1,750. And all the way through the whole report.

On Table 18, "Children referred by delinquency, age and sex, Manitoba Juvenile Courts," from 2,903, in 1966 to 3,588 in 1967, an increase of 20 - 25 percent.

Table 19, "Children referred by delinquency, Manitoba Juvenile Courts (Winnipeg Juvenile Court Excluded)" from 3,236 in 1966 to 4,066 in 1967, an increase of 30 percent, or nearly. And all the way through the whole report, a substantial increase; and I wonder if my honourable friend has an explanation for this because our population has not been growing to that same extent at all. And so, Mr. Chairman, perhaps my honourable friend will comment on that before we get past the Minister's salary.

I do notice incidentally, Mr. Chairman, in the opening report on Page 3 of the yellow section there's a report on the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry Societies, and I'm not familiar with that but I do know that Steve Juba got into a bit of a row with this society and refused to -- did he not refuse to give them any financial support this year? Or they shouldn't get it -- he said they shouldn't get it. I don't know whether he did condescend and finally give them some or not. Maybe my honourable friend could enlighten us on that.

Then the Salvation Army -- there's a very small report there, and gee whiz, this is something that deserves more commendation than is given to it in the report. One day last week - in fact I think it was a week ago today - I got an invitation from Major Miller of the Harbour Light Centre to go over and have lunch at that wonderful institution and I took two of my colleagues along with me. It was the first time I ever visited the place in my life and I would recommend that every member of this House go over and have a look at the work that they are doing over there.

I was simply amazed at what they are able to do with a small budget. Well, it's only made possible by virtue of the fact that nearly everybody is working for nothing, and I think the Major told me that the highest paid man there got \$265.00 a month -- or \$65.00 a week - \$65.00 a week, the highest paid one, and there were nine, I think, on staff that looked after the whole centre. I made the statement, or one of the colleagues did, that they bet that if the government had to operate this centre it would cost them a half a million dollars, and they're able to do it for -- well, the report says \$110,000, but then they do make a note here that much of that is gratis. So there is certainly a centre and a project that deserves our wholehearted support and we should encourage the expansion of this type of facility.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to just briefly take a moment of the Committee's time. I would ask the Minister - I've written him a letter before and I've talked on the phone to one of his Executive Assistants - I would ask the Minister to visit the Boys' Home at Portage la Prairie. I don't know whether or not he's been there recently or not, and I hesitate at this time to publicly discuss the problems that I've been informed about by friends of the Home, former employees of the Home and others like that, but there is presently a very poor feeling, morale-wise, amongst both the boys who are in there, amongst the members of the staff, and I would hope sincerely that the Minister will some time in the near future pay a visit out there and talk to members of the staff. There seems to be no communication between the Minister's office and some of these institutions such as the Boys' Home at Portage la Prairie.

In the past year there has been a change in the superintendent, for Mr. Bruce Jones has retired and Mr. Ray Atkinson is now the superintendent out there. So without me saying any more, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that the Minister go out and visit that Home and talk to members of the staff.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether this item should be discussed in the Attorney-General's estimates or not and he can advise me, but it applies to the general release of all demands with respect -- it's a paper which the government requests people to sign when they're accepting payment for damages from the government. Now, I'll give you an example. This applies to the Department of Agriculture and they were making some payments for damages and they had -- it was a document that the farmer in question had to sign before he could receive the cheque, and I'd like to raise the matter of this document somewhere in the estimates. Now is this a matter that should be raised in -- would

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd.) this be drafted by the Attorney-General's Department? It's certainly drafted by lawyers and I think it should be raised somewhere. Now, would this be a matter that would be discussed in your estimates or the Department of Agriculture?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, very probably my honourable friend is quite correct in saying it would be drawn by our department for the utilization of other departments of government. If he has any particular points, perhaps he could raise them under the item of Administration of Justice where we deal with the civil side and I'd be glad to take it up with him at that time.

While I'm on my feet, I'll be glad to deal with the questions raised by the Honourable Member from Gladstone, which he has just spoken of, under the various items under which I have a note of them appearing, and I thank the Honourable Member for Portage who is not - well, I see him coming back into the House - for his comments. We're aware of the situation that arises I think because of the change of supervision at the top, and I thank him for his comments and can assure him we'll be giving it attention.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolutions 19 and 20 were passed.)

MR. HANUSCHUK: There are two points that I'd like to draw to the attention of the Honourable Minister. The first one deals with bequests to charitable institutions and the role that the Surrogate Court plays in this matter. I notice, Mr. Chairman, there is a procedure laid down in Ontario under The Charities Accounting Act which makes it mandatory for an officer in Ontario known as the Public Trustee - now here we have no comparable officer, I do not believe - but it is mandatory to inform the Public Trustee of the bequests to charities and then, in turn, the Public Trustee notifies the charity that it may be entitled to some benefit from that particular estate. Now I have not heard of any charity in Manitoba being short-changed by the executors, being overlooked by the executors of an estate, but it would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that this would be a valuable precaution to take to prevent the occurrence of such a situation.

Now the Honourable Minister may be aware of this piece of legislation in existence in Ontario, and if he is, and in view of the fact that we do not have similar legislation in Manitoba, I would appreciate hearing his comment on that matter.

The other matter -- or perhaps I will defer my comments on the other matter. It's going to deal with magistrates and magistrates courts and I suppose I could deal with that under Resolution 23, so on this point this is the only comment I wish to make.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I'm vaguely aware of the legislation in Ontario. I'm not aware of any abuses, that is directly, as I stand on my feet. I could enquire from the department as to whether or not they have knowledge of any complaints that would justify the introduction of any such legislation. I understand that there have been no complaints but we could keep the suggestion in mind. I thank him for raising it.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, just on the last point. I would like the Honourable the Attorney-General to consider that what could happen is that there would be no complaints because the charity would not know. I think the point that my honourable friend is making is that an individual could leave a bequest to a charity and the executor would not pay the bequest, and certainly he's not going to give you a specific case and I'm not going to give you a specific case. I would hope that there were no cases, but I couldn't be sure. Now, the executor could then possibly never pass accounts, as my honourable friend would know that this could quite likely happen, and it never occurred to me that what is being done in Ontario is being done. All they do is have the Surrogate Court, or somebody who has access to those records, write a letter to the charity indicating that there was a bequest in this Will that they should know about. It's not likely you would have a complaint from a charity that didn't get a bequest because it's likely that that particular charity would not even know of the bequest.

As a matter of fact, it appears to me - and I don't know whether they do this in Ontario - that it would be a good idea to send every beneficiary a letter that there is a bequest in a particular Will. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, if it's convenient - and I don't think that there should be anything onerous or any proof of service required, but as a matter of practice I think the proposal has a great deal of merit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Resolution 21 was passed.) Resolution 22 - (a)--passed; (b)--passed; Resolution 22--passed.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): ... item (c) there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I beg your pardon, I'm in error. (c)--

MR. CAMPBELL: With regard to the revision, I listened with interest to the report that the Honourable the Minister gave regarding the computerizing of the statutes. When does he expect the revision to be complete to the extent that we will have a set of the Revised Statutes? Maybe he's already mentioned this, but I missed it if he did.

MR. LYON: I mentioned it just briefly, Mr. Chairman, and I'm glad to repeat it. The work of the revision has been proceeding under the direction of the former Legislative Counsel, Mr. Rutherford, and he has advised us that he has practically finished all of the statutes now. At this Session we will be establishing the committee that is called for under the statute to review the work of the revisionists and, hopefully, that committee will be reporting for work after prorogation, during recess this year, and will report back to the next session of the Legislature approval or amendment or whatever of the Revised Statutes and the printing can then take place following the approval given by the Session of 1969.

So we're now within sight of it. It's been a long, harrowing road, but my honourable friend from Lakeside, who's been through a number of these, will appreciate the amount of work that goes in by the draftsmen, and the new format of looseleaf statutes and the pilot project on computerization are not holding things up at all; they are just new ideas that are being implemented.

We're hopeful that the computerization will prove to be feasible on a total basis because the possibilities of that for information retrieval for members of the House, for members of the public, municipal officers, lawyers, is almost beyond comprehension, the speed with which this can be done. All of this is melding together in a very happy way for us because our statutes are maturing to the point where we can deal with them. The computerization idea is possible now with the government computer and the one at the university, with the purchase of a bit of additional equipment, so we're looking forward to the actual printed statutes coming out sometime subsequent to the next session of the Legislature, sometime in '69 or '70.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, is it likely, Mr. Chairman, that this edition of the Revised Statutes will carry the date 1969?

MR. LYON: Yes, depending on how well we do our work this summer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Balance of Resolution 22 was passed.) Resolution 23 - (a) (1)--

MR. LYON: There were a couple of items mentioned here, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Gladstone enquired about the steel building complaints. We had a number of complaints in the department, but above and beyond that the RCMP on their own initiative investigated altogether some 265 cases. Of those, about 60 warranted further review by the staff, and of these there were approximately a dozen where at the very outside a prosecution could have been considered. The staff are giving consideration to some of these at the present time. The majority of these, as I mentioned, did not arise from complaints but as a result of police investigation and enquiries on their own because of associated work that they were doing with other police forces. I am not able to report on the success or otherwise of any prosecutions. The bulk of them did not fall within the category of being offences that could be taken to court for criminal prosecution.

Now, he also asked about legal aid and I made a brief comment on it last evening. The item for additional legal aid appears in this estimate of Administration of Justice. We're anticipating, pursuant to the recommendation of the Statutory Orders Committee, bringing a brief amending section before the House this session which will authorize the department to enter into an agreement with the Law Society with respect to legal aid for indigent persons - I underline the word indigent - for indictable criminal offences - nothing on the civil side at the present time - and for this we have voted the amount, or are asking you to vote the amount of \$40,000 in this item.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my honourable friend for the answers he has given, but in respect to the 265 complaints that he received -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. LYON: ... 265 cases. We received a much smaller number of complaints.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, under the existing law, what can a farmer, or anyone else do, as far as that's concerned, if he wants to cancel a contract within the cooling-off period?

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) What steps does he take?

MR. LYON: If he was within time, that is after The Unconscionable Transactions Relief Act came into force and effect, then he can utilize that Act. I'm not personally familiar with the correspondence that my honourable friend speaks of that he had with the department, but I know one or two cases that were brought to my attention where the contracts were signed prior to the coming into force of The Unconscionable Transactions Act and therefore were not within the ambit of that legislation. That Act is administered by the Provincial Secretary, not by this department, although we do provide legal advice to the Provincial Secretary for that purpose. Our main involvement was with respect to potential charges under the Criminal Code rather than the Unconscionable Transactions Relief Act.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, what item are we on at this moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are on Resolution 23, (a) (1).

MR. SHOEMAKER: On another point, and I don't know what should be done or what can be done, but every year you find people out selling contracts of some kind or other that are a little on the shady side to say the least, and the most recent one that was brought to my attention was a character that is out selling a contract that is similar in nature - well, to a small degree - as one issued by the Manitoba Motor League. In consideration of something like \$35 a year they simply guarantee, or they agree to pay certain legal fees if you are involved in an accident -- you know and all this kind of stuff. So I went upstairs to the -- (Interjection) -- No, the officer up here that has to do with the Companies Act, to check up, and they said, "Well this outfit" - and I think there are only two in it, named in it - "they have yet to file their first report." They have never filed a report. So I wrote to the company; I've got no reply. I didn't get my letter back so my guess is they got their letter. I don't know to what extent they are carrying on business but I know they were working in the western part of the province. And they are always working on people who -- older people who will part with \$35 to get rid of the characters.

Now what do you do with people like this? Their contract is worthless; it's really of no value at all. They are licensed by the government to carry on a business. I don't know what can be done, but it seems to me that they are taking advantage of a lot of people who are short of money in the first place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)--passed; (2)--

MR. LYON: Just quickly on that one point. If there is evidence of any fraud, that is if they can't deliver as they say they will, then this should be reported to the police immediately, who should investigate it and then report it to the Crown Attorney for his decision as to whether or not criminal charges lie. Otherwise, if it's a civil claim, that is if they pay money for a service that is not received and there is no fraud involved in it, criminal fraud, then they should resort to their own lawyer to determine whether or not they have a good action to recover the money that they may have paid to this company.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, under (2) I have two matters that I would like to raise. I can make them briefly because both of them happen to be ones that I mentioned at the last session. The first one has to deal with coroners, and I recounted last year a case that to me was a very trying one, where a coroner had held up the funeral of a young girl who was killed in an automobile accident under very sad circumstances, and the funeral was held up by action of the coroner for five days, what seemed to me to be an unnecessary delay and which added greatly to the suffering of the parents and the family and the inconvenience of school children who were planning to attend the funeral and all such.

Now the Honourable the Attorney-General promised me that he would look into it. I raise it again only to again point up the fact that it seems to me that there should be an understanding that the coroners in these cases should do everything consistent with the proper discharge of their duties to see that the wishes of the family of the deceased are met with insofar as possible. If the Honourable the Attorney-General would tell us what has happened in that particular case, if anything, I'd be interested in hearing it.

But the other one, the other side of that case, I was unable to discuss a year ago for the simple reason that the case was before the courts. Now it has been completed before the courts and I am in a position to discuss it. I do not intend to waste much time over it but I would like to give some of the background of it once again.

This was a car accident where a fatality occurred. It occurred in November of 1966; the court case did not take place, or the final disposition of it, until October of 1967. The

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) one who was established, after a considerable amount of difficulty and conflicting evidence in front of the court, the one who was established as the driver was driving a car that had no insurance. He himself was under suspension. These are the facts as they are given to me. He was under suspension. He had a driving record that was very bad, including convictions for impairment, for leaving the scene of an accident, and other convictions in addition to those in this case. I know that it's not the province perhaps of the members of the House here to be critical of the courts, but in this case, where this boy who was 20 years of age when the accident occurred - he would be 22 now I suppose, in that neighborhood - tried to pretend that he wasn't the driver of the car and yet he was found by the courts to be the driver, had been certainly a contributing factor to the accident. A girl had died under tragic circumstances and this boy was acquitted by the court on the charge of causing death by criminal negligence.

Now I would recognize that that is a very stern charge, causing death by criminal negligence, but knowing the facts of the case to the extent that I do, it would seem to me that it was a just charge, but he was acquitted on that charge and found guilty of dangerous driving. Well now, dangerous driving simply does not seem to me to be a severe enough charge for that case, but the court decided that that was the basis on which he was found guilty.

He was sentenced to six months in jail last October. My guess is -- do six months people get shortened time for good conduct? My guess is - my guess is that he is likely out; my guess is that he is likely out of jail now. I don't know; I am only guessing. My guess is that he's likely driving again, and although he was - whatever the proper term is - banned from the road for 18 months, my guess is that he is driving. I think there should be some follow-up someplace by either the Attorney-General's Department or the Public Utilities Department to have some kind of a watch on people with a record such as this. First and foremost, I think that the court charge was not as severe as it should have been; the sentence was not as heavy as it should have been. I would be interested to find out if he is already out of jail, and then I think if he is, that somebody should be watching to see, making a definite check on that particular individual to see if he is driving.

Now some people will say that that's a type of persecution, but I think that a person of that kind needs - if that's persecution - needs persecution. I think the public needs protection, and I reiterate what I have said in the House many times before. I get concerned over the fact that we seem to pay so much attention frequently to talking about the rehabilitation of the people who perpetrate crimes and the fact that we should have understanding and services for them, protect them, that we are inclined to forget the victims of those crimes and the rights of society itself.

So I want to ask my honourable friend a question. Will he find out for me whether that particular boy is out of jail? And then I would like to ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities to find out, if he can, whether he is driving again. He was not supposed to be on the road for 18 months. My guess is he'll be driving as soon as he's out, and I think there ought to be an attempt made to find out and to see that if, as and when he is caught, as he will be, but maybe after another fatality, then that he should - I'm inclined to think he should have already - the next time he should lose his licence for life and probably some other measures as well.

Mr. Chairman, there is a lot more that I could say on this but there is no need of taking the time of the Committee to deal with it any further. I would like to know what can be ascertained about this particular case.

MR. LYON: If my honourable friend would be good enough to give me the names, if he could either tell me or put them on a piece of paper, of the two people, first the coroner's inquest and second the accused, I'll be glad to get the information for him.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well I think in a case of this kind they should all be put right on the public record. The name of the coroner is Dr. Denton Booth; the name of the boy in question is Hugh Woods. The other details of the case can easily be established because he was sentenced some time in the neighborhood of the middle of October, 1967.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I want to follow up somewhat in more detail the remarks that were made by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside with regard to the office of the coroner. I just wonder from the Honourable the Attorney-General as to whether anything is being done to investigate the whole question of coroners' inquests and the function that these have in the administration of justice. I see the Minister is nodding his head, which indicates

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) that the matter is being looked into and I therefore won't go into it at great length, but I do think that sometimes inertia and tradition carry on proceedings which have long since lost any functional value.

In this regard, Mr. Chairman, I may say that I have attended many coroners' inquests and I am completely bewildered as to what is actually happening and as to what rules guide this proceeding which to me is distinct from any other proceeding I have ever attended. I'm not certainly alone in this and I know that there are many lawyers and Crown Prosecutors who would agree with me, Mr. Chairman, because it was said much better than I have just said it. I think that with the indulgence of the Committee I would like to read something that A. P. Herbert said in "Uncommon Law" on this office because I think, although it's exaggerated and A. P. Herbert made a lot of points by humor, I think that the point that he makes is an excellent one. I am reading from "Uncommon Law", an edition that was published in 1935 so it's not something new that I'm talking about, it's something that has been discussed for a very very long time.

At page 261 of that volume, the court is commenting on the office of the coroner, and His Lordship says: "Lord Mildeu remarks in a famous case, the name of which I've forgot, it is the duty of coroners to investigate the death of the deceased and not, as some of them seem to think, the lives of the living. Even an inquest can be too inquisitive. It is a pity that that dictum has never been brought to the attention of Dr. Busy, the Bathburn coroner. The office of coroner is ancient, odd, anomalous and perhaps unnecessary." And Herbert gives a footnote: "He is not found necessary, for example, in Scotland." And I don't know the Scottish practice.

He goes on to say, "The only one man judicial tribunal whose pronouncements are never in practice subjected to a second opinion is the coroner. The high court has power both at common law and by statute to quash a coroner's inquisition and order a new one, but these powers are rarely used and do not cover the whole mischief. There are three dangers: (1) that by reason of the coroner's queer proceedings a person may be wrongly accused of crime; (2) that a person properly accused and tried may be unjustly hampered and endangered by a cloud of inquest-generated prejudice; and (3) that without being tried, wholly innocent persons, witnesses or relatives may be blackened with the coroner's mark."

Now I'm not suggesting that that has happened but I certainly suggest that it can. And then the fictional judge that Herbert has talking gives an example - and this will just take a few minutes and I think the members may find it very interesting - of what he describes as being a typical coroner's inquest.

The Coroner: What time was it when you say you found the body of your father?

George T . . . , aged 22: As I approached the house I heard the clock strike two.

Coroner: Why were you returning home at 2:00 o'clock in the morning?

Witness: What has that got to do with it?

Coroner (sternly): Answer the question, sir. It is my duty to elicit the truth.

Witness: About my father's death, yes sir, but not about my evening out.

Coroner: So you had an evening out? Were you sober?

Witness: Yes, I'd been to supper, dancing. You can't dance drunk.

Coroner: You had been out to supper. With a woman?

Witness: Of course. Do you suppose I should dance with a leopard?

Coroner: No impertinence please. What is the woman's name?

Witness: Mind your own business.

Coroner: At this moment, sir, it is my duty to mind yours, and I must ask you for the woman's name.

Witness: Pratt.

Coroner: Miss or Mrs.?

Witness: Mrs.

(The coroner here ordered Mrs. Pratt to be sent for. He ordered Mrs. Pratt to be sent for.)

Coroner: So you were having an evening out with a married woman. Was her husband aware of this?

Witness: Really, sir, what has all this got to do with . . .

Coroner: Answer the question.

Witness: Probably not.

Coroner: Probably not. Do you mean that you and this woman are deceiving the husband?

Witness: No, I don't. I mean they don't live together anymore.

Coroner: Divorced?

Witness: Practically.

Coroner: Practically divorced. Then the husband has obtained a decree nisi?

Witness: No, you fool. She has.

Coroner: Oh, so you returned home at 2:00 A. M. after dancing with a successful petitioner for divorce whose decree has not been made absolute?

(The coroner here ordered his office to communicate with the King's Proctor.)

Coroner: Is this the Mrs. Pratt who went bankrupt not long ago? -- and so on.

There was in this case no question of murder or manslaughter. The simple question was: did the deceased fall out of the window by accident or on purpose?

Now, Mr. Chairman, Herbert is a great humorist and he makes a point and he makes it well, and I'm not suggesting that our coroners are doing this type of thing, but on the other hand, I ask what are they doing. Is their role really functional? Are they following any type of procedures, because I know that when I go to a coroner's inquest I get a summary of what is going to be said at that inquest and if the witness happens to stray from what is being said the coroner is very much surprised and tries to get him back on the right track. The coroner's verdict means very little, and I, as defence counsel, have often had the dilemma as to whether I have my clients appear before the coroner and make statements or whether I don't, and just what will the attitude be if he doesn't testify, what will the attitude be if he does testify. If we are examining as to how a person met their death, are we stuck with this archaic procedure, which is by the way a costly one. Now there must have been a good rationale for it at one time. Does that rationale still exist or is there a better way, and is the Honourable the Attorney-General investigating it?

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the member would tell us what happened to Mrs. Pratt?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I think I would be delighted to go on and read Herbert to the House but we have other things to do.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I thank my honourable friend for that very interesting excerpt from Sir Allen Herbert's famous "Uncommon Law." I hasten to reiterate what he has already said, that I don't think that that could be written about a coroner's inquest in Manitoba, but if it could, we'll be looking for a new coroner.

By and large, the coroner's procedure, as he's well aware, comes to us by virtue of the Common Law Practice of Great Britain, and there is a famous textbook - I don't know if there is a new one that's supplemented the one that I used to use - "Boyse on Coroners", which would give you the whole procedure of how a coroner's inquest should be conducted. As recently as this morning I was reading the studies of Chief Justice McRuer on human rights in Ontario and he delves into the whole question of coroners' inquests and the procedures that should be adopted for them, and from just a cursory reading of his recommendations I would say that they can be extremely instructive to us. Certainly we will be looking at the whole question of coroners in Manitoba this year because of certain reservations that we have about some of the practices, that is not that they are improper practices, but perhaps some of them are out of date. I have always personally had the view that a coroner's inquest in the case of a charge of murder or a charge of manslaughter where the charge is going to be laid by the Crown, it's really a useless procedure because action is being taken with respect to the death of the deceased person in the court and the coroner's inquest is almost a third leg on the procedure that we customarily take.

On the other hand, I think a case can be made and a good case can be made for compulsory inquests as we attempt to have them for instance for all deaths in government institutions where a suicide takes place in a jail or in a custodial institution, unless it can be shown to be death by natural causes. I think the public interest is served by having an open inquest at which six citizens chosen at random from the public hear the evidence, the sworn testimony before a judicial official, and are able to satisfy not only themselves but are able to satisfy the public that the circumstances of the death are as they finally report it in their verdict, untrammelled by any influence of the Court or by institutional officials or anyone else.

So I wouldn't too quickly throw out the whole concept of coroners because I do think that in those instances they serve the public interest, because we come back to the old cliché - it's

(MR. LYON cont'd.) still a good one however - that justice must not only be done it must appear to be done, and I think that coroners' inquests serve this useful function, particularly in cases where there is little likelihood of any other subsequent legal proceedings, civil or criminal, taking place.

But we are looking at the whole question of coroners' inquests at the present time and I think the McRuer Commission Report will be very instructive to all of the common law provinces of Canada, because one of his recommendations in particular deals with the point raised by my honourable friend from Inkster that there should be statutory rules laid down, some codification of the old common law rules as to what the jurisdiction is of the coroner, who may question the witnesses and so on. This is laid down by common law procedure. It is followed, I would say, very well by our coroners in Manitoba, the large majority of whom are medical practitioners untrained in the law. But my experience, as I am sure the experience of my honourable friend, has been that they do an exceptionally good job with the aid and help from time to time of the Crown Attorneys and the solicitors who are there representing families or representing other related interests. They do an exceptionally good job and they do try, as incisively as possible, to have the evidence adduced as to where, when, how and by what means the deceased came to his death.

I have no criticism of the practices of our coroners' courts, and saying what I have said today I wouldn't want anyone to think that I am criticizing any individual coroner, but rather like the honourable member I think we should be paying attention now to this total concept and to where it can be streamlined to suit the requirements of the twentieth century.

MR. PHILIP PETURRSON (Wellington): Mr. Chairman, I think I would like to direct a question and a couple of remarks to the Attorney-General or whichever other Minister is involved in this particular field. It has to do with coroners' inquests in a way, but specifically with the burial or disposal of bodies for burial or otherwise. Up in the north it would be burial mainly; they have no crematoriums up there. But it has to do with inquests and coroners, so I feel that it fits quite appropriately in here.

As we know, the settlements in the northern part of the province are pretty well scattered. People do not enjoy the same amenities of life as we do here in Winnipeg and the southern part of the province, and I know that things are and can be quite difficult on occasion. I know also that in the event of death and burials, disposal of a dead body, that things of necessity often have to be carried out in rather a rough and ready sort of a manner. I've had some experience of that myself in having been called up into, not too distant northerly points, but on a couple of occasions quite some distance.

But the specific point that I am arriving at is that there was an autopsy or post-mortem - I don't know the distinction between the two - performed on a man. He may have been a derelict type of individual and it was felt that there should be a post-mortem. Is that the word? -- (Interjection) -- Autopsy? -- (Interjection) -- It doesn't matter. The police were in charge of the burial, or of the shipping of the body to the point of burial, and the examinations necessary, or that is that were satisfactory to the police, had been made and the coffin was to be closed. The story, as I had it, was that relatives of this man were present, and before the lid was fastened down on the coffin I believe it was an officer or some other official appeared with a plastic bag and raised the lid and threw it in and said, "Bury the guts with him." These are the exact words that were spoken to me in describing this particular event.

What kind of provision is made up in the north where people are far from settled communities? How are bodies handled and how are they disposed of, and who looks after things if there's not autopsy necessary or needed. I know that the Mounted Police would be closely involved, but are there coroners in the north or are there people who look after these things to see that the disposal of a body is carried out in a manner that would even in a very basic sense be acceptable to survivors of the dead person.

We all know that death when it comes creates a very sensitive situation for many people, and in Winnipeg or in settled communities it's a thing that can be handled quite easily. There are provisions, all kinds of provisions made and bills have been passed. There is such a thing as The Burial Act and things of this sort to which individuals conform. But in the north, what provisions are made? How are they made? How are these things handled? Are they handled to the complete satisfaction, if not complete just partial satisfaction, of individuals concerned and can things be done in such a way as not to show disrespect either to the survivors or to the dead person. I feel that this comes very closely in or is very closely linked in to the whole

(MR. PETURRSON cont'd.) question of coroners and inquests and things that are involved with that office or position.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, there are coroners in most of the major settled areas of northern Manitoba, Thompson, Churchill - I'm not sure - I think we have one as well at Gillam. The problem arises, and this is just my own personal opinion, the allegation that my honourable friend makes there certainly could never be condoned if the police did as my honourable friend suggests or as he was told. That could never be condoned and certainly should not take place.

I think the absence of funeral directors in the north, or the scarcity of them, probably contributes as much in these cases to complaints arising of this nature because of course funeral directors ensure that proper respect is paid to any bodies that are committed to them for burial. The distances involved, however, do result in the odd complaint that has come to the department. I couldn't answer his question though extensively to say that we are satisfied or dissatisfied. The only cases that we would come into contact with of course would be the cases where an autopsy was ordered by a coroner to determine the cause of death. Whether he might then subsequently have an inquest or not have an inquest would of course be up to his judgment subject to review by the department.

But I'll be glad to look into it and ascertain for my honourable friend if the complaints are numerous or whether they are scarce in number. I have heard the odd one myself and that's all I can give him as a personal opinion.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, the item we're discussing I think deals with sanity examinations as well. Could the Honourable Minister tell us how often are these reviewed? Once a commitment is made of a person to an institution, is it very difficult to get him out? From time to time we have articles appearing in various magazines and so on describing situations in some of the institutions and they describe it in terrible terms. Now I would like to know from the Minister: Are these examinations reviewed annually or are they re-examined or what is the situation?

Then yesterday when I spoke under the Minister's salary, I questioned him on the matter of consolidation of regulations and whether we had a revision. Has there ever been a revision made of the regulations, and if so, what year and how far do we go back. Could he give us some information in this general regard in connection with the regulations?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I neglected to comment on my honourable friend's suggestion about consolidation of regulations. We would like to see that done. Until we get the statutes out of the road, however, it is unlikely that it will be done. The regulations are bound annually in a separate volume. Many of them - not many - a number of them have annual effect only and they're of course self-repealing or are repealed the next year by replacement regulations such as the annual regulations put out by the Wildlife Branch on trapping and so on. But there is a need for consolidation and we will be looking into that because his point is very well taken.

With respect to mental health commitments, this more properly comes under the Department of Health. The only area in which our department becomes involved is where a magistrate, pursuant to the provisions of the Criminal Code, can require an accused person before him to be examined before he is dealt with in court, and subsequently if the person is committed to court, it then comes under The Mental Diseases Act which is under the Department of Health. There is provision, however, within that Act for appeal and then the practice, as I'm sure the Minister of Health would tell us, the practice currently of the mental institutions and their directors in Manitoba, to the best of my information, is to ensure that persons who are ready to return to the mainstream of life are released as quickly as possible. In fact that has been the recent practice in most of the institutions with which I am aware, that they try to return persons to the home environment as quickly as they can because of the therapy value of it and other factors. In other words, as I understand it, the treatment basis today is not loaded in favour of commitment so much as it is in favour of release in the usual cases of mental disease. But he can more properly discuss that I think with the Minister of Health.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to raise a question that the Minister may not be able to answer today, that perhaps he could next time we return to his estimates. A matter that's been causing concern in certain quarters is a case where a woman, a mother of four children, was killed on December 24, 1966. Circumstances of this accident, was this woman had been out tobogganing with her family and decided to leave a little bit early, and proceeded to take the bus home. She was waiting for the bus on a sidewalk to go home, when a car went out of control and jumped the curb and killed this woman. Now, it was suggested

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd.) after the accident that the men in the car were fooling around, apparently - it was suggested to me, and I can't substantiate this, but it was suggested to me by more than one person, that the passenger in this car had seen this girl and knew her and got smart and said - "There's a doll, let's pick her up," and he grabbed the wheel I'm told -- I can't substantiate it but I'm told - and jerked it on the driver and as a result the car spun out of control, crossed over the curb and killed this woman on Christmas Eve. Now this accident has caused tremendous stress in the family and subsequently the charges were laid in connection with the accident and then for some reason unknown to me, the charges were dropped. I know the family and other people who are aware of this case are extremely concerned and wonder why this matter never went to court. Now maybe there's a valid reason, I don't know. I can understand if the Minister could not perhaps give me an answer at this time but I would ask him when we resume his estimates, that he might be able to let us know, and maybe provide us with a copy of the Police Report. The name of the woman involved was Verna Stout.

The Minister suggested earlier that I might deal with this matter of the forms sent out by the department. We've heard a lot of discussions on this side of the House about unconscionable transactions and so on and we have a form here which was sent out to farmers to sign. I'll give you the background. There's a number of people up in my constituency flooded by the Fairford River and compensation was sought and the government agreed to pay the compensation and I think it was in February, or this month - last month rather, an agent of the Department of Agriculture took the cheques to these individuals who had applied for damages and before they could get these cheques, insisted that they sign this document. Many of the people did sign the document. They were told to sign it but some questioned it. They phoned me and I interpreted what the document said. I said "Don't sign it" if it says what I think it says.

Mr. Chairman, had this man signed this document which he was told to sign, it would have precluded him from ever applying for damages again in connection with this matter. Now this is flood damage and there is a possibility that these people who were affected, could be affected again this year as a result of the land turning sour on them. And the sentence that's causing me concern says, it's in legal terminology, and had they signed this document they would have no opportunity to claim for damages again. It seems to me that if a government agency, we have enough trust companies and what not getting people to sign documents that they aren't aware of what they're signing, that we shouldn't have a government document doing this. I think people should know the full implications of what they're signing.

Now as I said, in this case the people were flooded and they were paying for damages in 1967; but as most people know, where there's flood damage and the water lays on the land, the land can turn sour and can render the land useless for a second and possibly a third year. Now had they signed this, they would have had no opportunity to claim for damages in '68 on the basis of the damage in 1967. I think it's wrong that the government should take documents like this to people to sign, particularly when they're not aware of what they're signing. These people are not learned in law.

Subsequently I met with the officials in the Department of Agriculture in connection with this matter. They confirmed what I had said that this - they said this was a standard procedure, and they had to do this for the protection of the government. As a result of our discussions I think they have agreed to draft a new document for these people so they will not be precluded from applying for damages. We're not suggesting that they should get damages; we're just leaving the door open that they could apply. I would suggest to the Minister that if he's the one I should make the suggestion to, that anybody representing the government should not take a document to be signed and not fully explain the implications of what the people are signing, because in this particular case there's no question, if they signed the document, they were precluding themselves from applying for damages and they were leaving themselves wide open to not get any damages at any other time and I don't think an agency or a government department should ever do this again. -- (Interjection) -- I'd be happy to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3--passed; (a)--passed; (b)(1)--passed. The Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of discussion in the House and in Committee in regard to the Vaughan Street Jail, and I'm not going to add to it. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon me? I appreciate that. I'm not discussing that at the moment. This is an old institution and was built a long time ago and probably if the Minister had to do it now he would do it differently. However, Mr. Chairman, I had occasion on the weekend to be at Gillam where there is a new Local Government District building. It's a very nice looking

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) building and has all the government facilities in the building, including of course the Magistrate's Court and the place where people would be locked up, awaiting court, and of course it's very clean and it's - as it looks in the building now, it looks like a very decent type of facility. We notice, Mr. Chairman, that the beds in the cells were the entire width - of course they're not beds, they're pieces of metal which are bolted in from wall to wall and there are two of them in each of the cells, and the cells I would say are about 6 x 6 and the entire length of this particular facility which was to be used as a bed was six feet. It looked smaller than that but we had the Member for St. Matthews, who is not here, lay himself out, and he is a short fellow much like myself, and he, Mr. Chairman, barely got himself into this bed lying flat. There might have been two inches at the top of his head which means that any person that has any height at all couldn't possibly fit into that cell comfortably. Now, Mr. Chairman, there's always a danger that when you're asking for a normal place to sleep that someone will say that you're coddling criminals. I would like the Chairman to know immediately that first of all I'm not discussing that; I'm discussing people who are charged with an offence and who are in custody awaiting appearance before a magistrate, and I assume that these cells would be for such people, and if we are not merely paying lip-service to the proposition that a man is innocent until proven guilty, the people who these cells are designed for are people who may be as innocent as any other person walking down the street. I know that it would be impossible to provide them with first class hotel accommodations, but if we are doing it now, Mr. Chairman, we're not talking about a facility that is built in a less enlightened age, we are talking about a facility that is being built in 1968, that it could be something which we would be happy to say, an innocent man is going to spend an evening in. Because we're talking about an innocent person, until he's proven guilty, and therefore I would merely like to know, Mr. Chairman, whether in new facilities, in facilities that are going up, that there's going to be a standard of comfort, not for the purpose of coddling anybody, but for the purpose of making sure that when a person has to be incarcerated, awaiting trial, that that facility will be something that we are prepared to say is reasonable for an innocent person, not a guilty person.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2--passed.

MR. HANUSCHAK: On this item there's just two or three points that I wish to raise. It pleased me to note in the report that we received last night, the Report on Corrections in Manitoba, that the Honourable Minister has instituted a course for the officers dealing with the process of rehabilitation. I'm not quite sure, however, whether this rehabilitation program will - if and when it's instituted, and I do hope that it's instituted soon, I hope that it's instituted within a shorter period of time than the time lapse that's occurred between the first promise of replacement for the Vaughan Street Detention Home and the present date - I do hope, Mr. Chairman, that this program, this rehabilitative program will extend beyond the period for which a person may be confined to a correctional institution, in other words that there will be some follow-through after he leaves.

I've looked through the report to see if there is any provision for it and there is some reference, true enough. There is reference to what is being done by voluntary organizations, by what's being done by the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry Society and I also take it that even the Provincial Chaplain, or Chaplains - I believe there are two, a Protestant one and a Catholic one - the Provincial Chaplains are to some degree responsible for this type of activity. Now, it would seem, Mr. Chairman, that when you spread the responsibility over so wide an area, voluntary organizations, employees of the government and not making one person or one department specifically responsible for this type of program, that the work will not get done - not because of anybody's unwillingness to do it but because of the difficulty in the follow-through program. I note that if the Chaplains were to do an effective job within the walls of our correctional institutions, there are about 4,000 people a year to contact which is physically impossible for two men to do. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister will give us some assurance or some indication of the nature of the rehabilitative program that he envisages coming into being which would put to maximum use for the people of Manitoba the type of training program that he has for his correctional officers and other staff at the present time.

MR. LYON: . . . area is largely the responsibility of the Parole Board, the National Parole Board. The rehabilitation work, the custodial training program is under a Director of Training within the department who looks after all of it for all institutions in the department - one person charged with that sole responsibility. The two Chaplains, while they are the only

(MR. LYON cont'd.) two on staff, they organize the voluntary chaplain work that is done in other areas, other judicial districts in Manitoba by the many members of the different clergy who service the institutions on a part time basis. So they are not responsible for going to all institutions on Sunday, because of course it's physically impossible for them to do so. But they organize within the Catholic faith and the Protestant faith the volunteer ministers who do the services within the jail.

Perhaps if we could pass these items. We're obviously not going to finish. I move the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2--passed.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, on the matter of grants, the matter of John Howard and Elizabeth Fry societies have been mentioned. Do we get reports from these organizations where grants are made to and the grants that we are making what percentage would they constitute of their budgets? Is it a large amount or is it just a minor amount?

MR. LYON: This grant that's shown is to the John Howard - Elizabeth Fry Society - it's a substantial part of their budget. The Federal Government also contributes as do the Greater Winnipeg - the Winnipeg Foundation. This represents a substantial part of their budget. The work, in my estimation, and the estimation of the department that is done by the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry Society is exceedingly good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2--passed; 3--passed; 4--passed; (b)--passed; (c)--passed; -- (Interjection) --

MR. LYON: Well, if there's going to be questions on (c) perhaps we should move that the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

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

IN SESSION

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, because of the early hour of adjournment I'll move adjournment tonight. Before doing so, I'm sure I speak for all members when I wish a certain group in this House a safe trip and a good trip on behalf of Canada.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge my honourable friend's courtesy in wishing some of us a good and safe trip and I'm sure that what we will accomplish will be to the advantage of Canada as a whole.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): . . . happy note, Mr. Speaker, any change would be to the advantage.

MR. CAMPBELL: My honourable friend is speaking of Manitoba.

MR. PAULLEY: Then I'll amend that to read "Canada", Mr. Speaker.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer that the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until Monday afternoon, 2:30 p. m.