

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



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, February 12, 1964.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

MR. CLERK: The petition of Hyman Sokolov and others, praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate Tri-State Mortgage Corporation.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

Notices of Motion.

Introduction of Bills.

MR. J. COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 5, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba Limited.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights) introduced Bill No. 38, an Act to amend The Manitoba Hydro Act.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin) introduced Bill No. 30, an Act to make Uniform the Law respecting Wills; and Bill No. 27, an Act to amend The County Courts Act.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell) introduced Bill No. 7, an Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon) introduced Bill No. 24, an Act to amend The Pharmaceutical Act; and Bill No. 16, an Act to amend The Hospitals Act.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could have the indulgence of the members of the House to move without notice a motion respecting the Chairman of Committees. If I have that consent, perhaps I might have the leave -- your leave, Madam, to make that motion now. I therefore move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that William G. Martin, member for the Electoral Division of St. Matthews be Chairman of the Committees of the House and Deputy Speaker.

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

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions standing in my name and that of the Honourable the Minister of Labour.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions recommends them to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 1. Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Local Government Districts Act by providing, among other matters, that revenue derived from any land transferred to Her Majesty in right of the province under authority granted under subsection (1) of section 9 of that Act be dealt with and disposed of according to such terms and conditions as the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may provide.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, it is proposed to transfer lands belonging to the local government districts to the province, to be looked after by the Lands Branch together with provincial lands for the purposes of leasing. In the ordinary course of things, the lands standing in the name of Her Majesty the Queen, the revenues from those lands will go into the Consolidated Fund. This will just allow us to make a provision that the income from lands that really belong to the local government districts will be paid to those local government districts.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, if I understand correctly then, this will ensure that the local government districts will get more revenue than they are presently receiving, because there is some concern at the present in many of the local government districts with regard to the unconditional grants. That used to be paid directly over to the school board, as I understand it, within the local government districts. This was changed approximately a year ago and is now going, I believe, directly to the local government district, but some people are concerned about the apportionment of these funds over the areas concerned. Could the Minister indicate what would be the procedure here? Would it

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd)... simply go directly to the local government districts as such, to be expended there, or would it be apportioned over the school district within that district, and who will be responsible for deciding on how to spend the money?

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, the income from lands owned by the local government districts will be paid to the local government district as part of the general revenue of the local government district.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert-Plains): Mr. Chairman, would this be a move to take the lands out of private ownership and placed in the name of the government so that they couldn't be privately owned any longer and could only be obtained by way of lease?

MR. SMELLIE: No, this is merely a method of making it convenient to handle all of the lands of the local government districts in the province in the same fashion under the grasslands policy that has been proposed by the Department of Mines and Resources. The local government district lands and the provincial lands will be subject to the same policy.

MR. MOLGAT: The decision then as to who will get a lease or who will not get a lease of local government district lands will now be taken by the province and not by the administrator locally. Is this correct?

MR. SMELLIE: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Adopted? -- Passed. Resolution No. 2. Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting the regulation of wages and hours of work of persons employed in the construction industry and providing, among other matters, (a) for payment, from and out of the Consolidated Fund, of the costs of administration of the Act, including remuneration and out-of-pocket expenses of members of boards established under the Act; and (b) for payment, from and out of the Consolidated Fund, in certain circumstances, of claims for wages made by certain workmen employed by employers contracting with the government, and to deduct the amount of such payment from any monies owing by the government to the employers.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Mr. Chairman, over a year ago a committee was established to study legislation as it related to the construction industry. Rather than attempt numerous amendments to The Fair Wage Act, I find it advisable to recommend new legislation to take care of this area of hours and wages.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the NDP) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, do I understand from the remarks that the Honourable the Minister of Labour has just made that the report of the committee that investigated the construction industry is summarily dismissed and that we're only dealing with the questions contained here respecting wages and hours of work? Now if you recall, Mr. Chairman, last year we had a considerable amount to debate in this House under the provisions of The Fair Wage Act respecting the extension -- or rather the opposite -- respecting the extension of those areas not covered under The Fair Wage Act. If I recall correctly at that particular time, the Minister -- if not the Minister -- individuals on the other side of the House opposite suggested that this matter was going to be reviewed in any case by this committee that was set up to investigate The Fair Wage Act.

Now on this basis, while we still voted against the resolution, we thought at that time that the provisions of the amendment to The Fair Wage Act that was introduced by the Minister last year would be given consideration with the possibility -- if I recall correctly, these words were used opposite -- that we'll let this go for a year until this committee has made its investigations. The result of that legislation, if you recall, Mr. Chairman, was that a number of communities were exempt from The Fair Wage Act, and more important possibly than the community, the workers in those communities were exempt from the provisions of The Fair Wage Act. Now am I to take it from the introduction of this resolution by the Minister today that no consideration is being given in an endeavour to fulfil what I took from the government a year ago as a promise that the legislation -- or the amendment that was proposed last year might be changed as a result of the committee that was investigating into all aspects of The Fair Wage Act.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think I should assure my honourable friend that these are the changes that have been recommended and are desired within The Fair Wage Act area, that the whole province will be covered, and that it will establish separate boards for Zone A and Zone B in the heavy construction industry. It has been a thorough review.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, may I respectfully suggest to the Minister that the wording of the resolution does not indicate this because -- I beg your pardon -- (interjection) -- Yes, but it does -- if my honourable friend will permit me -- as far as my interpretation is concerned, bring in a measure respecting the regulation of wages and hours of work without bringing in the question of areas. Had the word "areas" been included in that paragraph then I would have not made the remarks that I did, Mr. Chairman, but awaited the legislation, which maybe I should have done in any case, but I'm glad to have the assurance from my honourable friend that this matter was considered; and when the legislation is before us we will give it our consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House had adopted certain resolutions, directed me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SMELLIE introduced Bill No. 8, an Act to amend The Local Government Districts Act.

MR. BAIZLEY introduced Bill No. 29, an Act respecting The Wages and Hours of Work of Persons Employed in the Construction Industry.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, yesterday my honourable friend from Emerson raised the question of the Columbia Hardboard Plant at Sprague and asked me for information concerning the situation there. I think my best course would be to read the press release issued by the President of Western Plywoods Company of Vancouver, dated February the third, and I read the press release: "Mr. John Bene, President of Western Plywoods Company Limited, announced today that the company has agreed to purchase Columbia Forest Products Limited, a particle board manufacturing firm with production facilities located at Sprague, Manitoba, Canada. Mr. Bene reported that the Company will be purchased as a going concern with the take-over effective March 14th. Until that date, production and sales will be continued on the present basis. The plant will be shut down for several weeks starting March 15th to undertake a substantial program of capital expenditure to improve product quality and to increase production. The production from the plant will be marketed from coast to coast through the 24 sales branches of an affiliated company, Weldwood Westply Limited. The particle board production facilities will complement the existing Douglas Fir Plywood, hardwood plywood and lumber operations of Western Plywood Company Limited and its affiliated companies." That is the end of the press release.

Officials of my department have been informed by officers of Western Plywood that during the shutdown period it is probable that most employees will be needed in connection with engineering and installation of additional production facilities. The company has also informed us their program of capital expenditure will result in increased production and increased employment in the plant.

MR. J. P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, a subsequent question. I thank the Minister for his explanation but I'd like this answered. Has the Industrial Development Fund recovered all the money it invested in this project?

MR. EVANS: I have no information on that subject.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to ask a question from the Honourable the First Minister. In view of the statements made by him in this House on shared services for children attending private schools; and in view of the fact that he seemed convinced that an injustice is being committed and that parents who pay their full share of taxes should have at least some share or benefits; and in view of the fact that the proposed committee to study this shared services program could not conceivably report before the next session, will the First Minister consider allowing the presentation of a motion, granting textbooks and transportation for the children attending private schools, debated in this House. Would he agree that this is not too complex a question, causing no administration headaches or problems -- something that could be decided in this session -- and therefore correct one of the injustices referred to by the Premier. And would

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd)... he agree that this might be in accord with his wish to begin a solution to the St. Vital truancy problem in a compassionate way?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I would agree that the honourable member asks the most complicated questions that most members ask in this House. I will simply take the question as notice.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I'd like to ask the First Minister a clarification on some statements that were made here in the House, and also on a TV program where both of us appeared last night. He indicated then that the shared program was a new program and that any students presently using it had to pay for this service. It was my impression, and I said so, that I thought that they were using it en bloc without paying. I notice in today's newspaper a statement by the Superintendent of Winnipeg Schools stating that parochial students using the divisions facilities do so without charge; and also a statement by a Winnipeg School Board trustee that there's nothing new about the Premier's proposals as far as Winnipeg is concerned. The parochial students have been sharing their facilities for years. Now there's a contradiction here between the statements of the First Minister and the statements of these people who are concerned.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I'll take the question as notice. My honourable friend may well be right, but I think it has no bearing on the general argument.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Two years ago I brought in a resolution dealing with the inspection of all meat processing plants and food processing manufacturing plants, and the government at that time had promised they'd bring in reports at each session of the Legislature on the progress the government was making. Could the Minister tell us if he will be receiving a report shortly?

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, I'll take the question as notice.

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to table the Annual Report of the Department of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, may I draw your attention to what I think is an error or a slight omission in the Order Paper of today. I refer Your Honour to the sub-amendment which I proposed yesterday to the Speech of His Honour. The word "and" is omitted from the latter part of my sub-amendment. If you recall yesterday I stated that we were including in our general motion of non-confidence that which had originally been proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, and I think in order to make this amply clear the word "and" should be included in the motion proposed by myself.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, may I address a question to the new Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. By way of a bit of explanation to this question -- last year during some debate I had asked the then Minister if there had been a comprehensive study made of the wildlife and waterfowl situation regarding the Delta Marshes, and I was given to understand that such a study had been made. Now in order to ask my question I would like to read a short paragraph here from a letter. It's addressed: "Dear Sir..."

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member should make his question to the Honourable Minister.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well this is in the form of a question, Madam Speaker. All right then, I'll make it brief. Has there been a comprehensive study of the wildlife and the resources of the Delta Marshes and Lake Manitoba area as it will be affected by the diversion? Has this study been made? Is it available?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Mines & Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, I'll be happy to take that question as notice.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to table the Annual Report of the Chairman of the Liquor Control Commission for the fiscal year ending 31st of March, 1963. My predecessor, now the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources, had copies of this report distributed to all the members in November last.

In addition, I should like to place on the table the report of the Comptroller-General, Statement of Assets and Liabilities, Profit and Loss Account of the Liquor Control Commission for the year ended March 31st, 1963. There is a memorandum as well of the general administrative and prosecution expenses by the Liquor Control Commission of Manitoba for

(Mr. McLean, cont'd)... liquor enforcement for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1963. There is a report covering the operation and enforcement of the liquor laws for the calendar year ending March 31, 1963, and the necessary number of copies have been delivered to the clerk for distribution to all of the members.

There is a "nil" return under the controverted Elections Act for the calendar year 1963 both from the Court of Queen's Bench and the Court of Appeal, and I desire to inform the members that no rules were made by the judges under the act during the year.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for return standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. MORRIS A GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the House to permit me to have this resolution stand.

MR. SMELLIE presented Bill No. 3, an Act to amend The Soldiers' Taxation Relief Act for second reading.

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

MR. SMELLIE presented Bill No. 6, an Act to amend The Municipal Boundaries Act for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, may we have some information from the Minister on this one?

MR. SMELLIE: A short time ago when a surveyor went to do a plan of subdivision on the South shore of Rock Lake it was discovered that there was a small parcel of land there on the south shore of the lake that, according to The Municipal Boundaries Act, was in the Municipality of Argyle, all of which is on the north side of said Rock Lake. It was rather difficult to administer this small parcel of land, being separated from the rest of the municipality by the Lake. By agreement between the two municipalities and at their request, we are amending The Municipal Boundaries Act to put this small piece of land in the municipality of Roblin where it can be conveniently looked after.

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

MR. WITNEY presented Bill No. 11, an Act to amend The Alcoholism Foundation Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, the Bill is being amended in order to provide more activity and effectiveness to the Alcoholism Foundation and is being done at the request, in part, of the Alcoholism Foundation itself, and the remainder of the changes that they did not specifically request all have their concurrence. It is one of the moves that the government will be making during the session re the problem of alcoholism and the others will be explained to the House during the consideration of the estimates.

MR. GRAY: Is it the intention of cancelling all of the allocations that this House has granted to different committees on alcoholism and take it over in one department?

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): I realize that it is not usual to discuss on second reading the various clauses of the Bills, but it seems to me that more than one principle is involved in this case and that consequently we would be within our rights in asking for discussion of individual clauses where a principle is contained. I would like to ask the Minister why the provision in this bill for the repeal of the sections that make members of the Medical Advisory Committee and persons who donate \$10.00 to be members of the Foundation. It would seem to me that the wider the membership that we could have in the Foundation, particularly ones who are members of the medical fraternity and also ones who are prepared to contribute \$10.00, would be to the advantage of the Foundation and I am concerned to know why these sections should be repealed.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, we have discussed here in the House previously, under estimates I think, for the past three years at least this matter of the various grants made by the government to I believe three different groups who are interested in the matter of either alcohol education or rehabilitation, and our suggestion all along has been that there should be some overall control and consolidation within one department. I believe at the moment some is in education and some is in health. I understand the government is moving along as this ties in with the proposal. For the proper discussion in the House, however, it seems to me that we would be better to have all of the government proposals in this regard at one time,

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd)... because if we proceed now to take this bill and send it to committee and there are other bills later on the other proposals of the Government, then we will be back in the same situation where we are discussing the situation piecemeal, so if there are other bills to come, I would like to suggest to the Minister that they be held and discussed at the one time in committee where we can have an overall picture of the government's intentions.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I only asked a question before, so I don't think I have spoken on this bill. Will you permit me to say a word on it please? Thank you very much.

This is in my opinion an extremely important bill. It's a bill where we are all trying to prohibit if possible, or curtail if possible, or educate at least our younger generation not to try too hard to create a surplus of great revenue for the government. At the present time -- and I am not predicting the budget -- but I think that the government can figure on \$17 or \$18 million profits for the coming year from liquor which the government of Manitoba has taken over to administer under the slogan of prohibition and under the slogan of regulations. Now we see that nothing has been done in the last years that I have been here in spending any substantial sum of money to try to educate the people, and if they cannot get anywhere with the elders, at least the young people should endeavour to curtail the evil of drinking and particularly of the young generation. They have given \$100 thousand to one organization; \$60 thousand to another organization; and these days -- the organizations have done a good job -- but these days you cannot do anything which is worthwhile with the little money that they are being granted out of the profit of \$16 or \$17 million.

I think the record shows that in Manitoba, of a population much less than one million people, including the babies in cradles and the older ones waiting for their last day, they have spent over \$60 million for liquor. In my humble opinion it is far too high a price to pay, particularly when we know there is so much suffering and starvation in the rest of the world. This bill as I read it -- and if I am wrong I stand corrected -- is a new venture of spending so much money -- I don't know how much -- to take over all the education and the publicity for people not to drink, and educate especially the younger people not to drink, which is too expensive in one way; not good for their health; it's not good for their education; and it's not good for the safety of the people in this province or anywhere else. Nothing is being given right here. I have expected that the Honourable Minister will give us a full and complete program. What does he intend to do by this Bill? After all, it is his Bill. He should tell us what he means by it and give us a full picture, but so far we have not had it. At any rate, I want to urge whoever gives us the explanation and whatever other bills they may have and whatever other legislation they may introduce, let us right now decide on the future -- I wouldn't say prohibition, but the future curtailment of this evil of the young generation who drink against their health, against their wisdom, against their education and at the expense of the household.

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, the honourable member has shown again his interest in this subject very eloquently and I respect the observations that he has made. The measure will, in fact, aid in this problem of combatting alcoholism in the province. It will make it more effective, and in relation to your first question as to whether or not there would be any decrease in the funds and the monies given to this Foundation, there will be no decrease of money.

In relation to the questions that were asked and the observations made by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, during the Law Amendments Committee we will be able to discuss in full the whole program of the government in relationship to alcoholism. There are no new measures being planned apart from this one -- that is in legislative measures at any rate.

In relation to the questions asked by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, the \$10.00 membership clause has been repealed because it has never been used. At the present time I believe that there is only one \$10.00 membership to the Foundation, but that figure could stand correction. At any rate there are not very many. We do still provide though in one section of the Act for the Foundation to receive donations from any source. The medical committee of five doctors which was to have been appointed by the Minister, while we are deleting this we are amending the act so that the foundation will be able to appoint such other

(Mr. Witney, cont'd)... committees as it feels necessary, medical or otherwise, without the Minister having to do so. I believe, Madam Speaker, that that answers most of the comments that were made with respect to this legislation.

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

MR. WITNEY presented Bill No. 12, an Act to amend The Health Services Act, for second reading.

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

MR. McLEAN presented Bill No. 14, an Act to amend The Public Libraries Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I just want to make one or two observations. As I indicated when this matter was before the committee, this will provide that in certain local government districts a municipal library may be established under the provisions of The Public Libraries Act. There are just one or two minor changes that have had to be made in order to make the general plan in principle and policy fit in with the circumstances of a local government district. Once a petition or application were launched, all matters pertaining to the establishment of the library in a local government district, as indicated in the bill, would be exactly the same as in the present provisions of the Act.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I have one question. I note that there is a limitation-- in the bill it refers to a certain number of residents in a local government district -- I believe the number is 200. I would like to ask the Minister whether or not consideration has been given as to whether this is a satisfactory number. Would it be too onerous on some districts to have this number of 200 in the bill because of the fact that some of these districts, as I understand them, the population count is relatively small? I wonder if the Minister could give me any comparison as to percentage. This would be in connection with the other areas in respect of public libraries.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Minister replies to the question, I think all of us have been concerned here for some years over the local government districts taking on possibly more of their own responsibilities and participating in their governing of their area. I note that in this bill, for example, the government proposes to appoint the members of the library committee. I wonder if the Minister should not consider at this time whether this might not be a very good place to start the developments of local control and have the library committee in the local government districts elected locally by the people in the district and control their own libraries. I think this may be a place where we can begin and move forward from there with advisory boards and so on to the time when these areas can be fully self-governing.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I thank the honourable members for very pertinent questions. With respect to the question asked by the Honourable the Leader of the NDP about the number, in The Public Libraries Act the requirement is for a petition of eight percent of the resident electors. Well we don't have a list of resident electors to begin with in the local government districts so we had to substitute some other provision, and in thinking it over we felt that the requirement of 200 was not an onerous one; and in thinking in particular with regard to the local government districts mentioned, that it would be not too difficult to get a petition of 200; and in trying to make a comparison on the basis of what we think will be the smallest of the local government districts, that would be just slightly under eight percent of the number in a comparably sized municipality or corporation. Now I confess that this is just an arbitrary figure and it doesn't have any sanctity of anything or other. I would say this to other comments that we did also feel that unless there was an indication of at least 200 people being interested, it would seem rather unlikely that the whole project would be carried forward unless there were 200 people initially interested. The other thing is that if it were found as a practice that this particular feature proved onerous, I would certainly be in favour of making a reduction if this was holding anything up. I think my view would be that the most positive indications of interest are in the local government district of Mystery Lake which is Thompson, and also in the local government district of Pinawa, which very shortly will have a larger population, and in my opinion they will have no difficulty in getting the petition of 200 that would be required in those places.

(Mr. McLean, cont'd) . . . Now the matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition gave me some concern, because under the provisions of The Public Libraries Act in an ordinary municipal library or regional library, members of the board are appointed by the council or councils and they are required by statute to a certain representation from the council itself and then the balance appointed by the council from among citizens qualified and that sort of approach. Well what would we do in the case of a local government district that didn't have an officially elected body to perform the selection process? Should you give that authority to the local government administrator? It might be not considered too satisfactory and so we came down on the side of saying, "well the local government district -- the administrator will be a member of the board and then the other members will be selected by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. Again I don't offer that view as a necessarily perfect one. I am really of the opinion that perhaps under present circumstances it's maybe as satisfactory as any, because how could you really give to what might be an unofficial group the right to select another group who would be responsible for the operation of the library. As I say, I admit to the non perfection of what we're suggesting here, but I'm a little concerned that any other method would work satisfactorily.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 21.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, I would ask that this matter stand.

MR. McLEAN presented Bill No. 22, an Act to amend The Testators Family Maintenance Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, this is a technical bill, but I think one in which the principle can be perhaps indicated. Some years ago The Testators' Family Maintenance Act was passed, and this is an act which under certain circumstances allows the dependent of a deceased person who has died leaving a will to make an application to the court for a variation in the provisions of the will to provide for the dependent person. That has been an act which has been working, I think, quite satisfactorily. However some years ago -- a few years ago -- there was an action in the court or an action under this statute, the case of Pope versus Stevens, which gave some problems of interpretation and in which the court indicated that they would have liked certain freedom to act and perhaps to make an order which seemed to be proper under all of the circumstances, but which the court felt it couldn't do because of the way in which the statute was at that time and is still. This matter was referred to the Commissioners on Uniformity because the original act was a uniform act. They concurred in the necessity of the change and made suggestions which in effect are incorporated in the bill here before the House at this time.

In addition, my predecessor, now the Minister of Mines and Resources, referred the matter to the Law Reform Committee which is a committee here locally, and they in turn also concurred that there ought to be a change and approved of the change which is presently before you in this bill. Briefly the proposal is simply to give the judge, before whom an application under this Act is heard, a little wider latitude where he has decided to make an order. That is, we assume that he's satisfied that it is a case in which something ought to be done, then this provision as proposed will give the courts the sort of latitude which it is considered essential in order to carry out the principle and the spirit of the act, and as I say, it is approved by the Commissioners on Uniformity and also approved by our own committee, the Law Reform Committee.

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

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

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, I would like to pay the customary respects to you for the way in which you have conducted the responsibilities of your office. I would also like to congratulate you on your bilingual capability which you showed here in this Chamber the other day. I feel that because of the competence which you have shown for your office, I express the hope that you will be one of the factors, one of the causes for us taking another step -- in actuality a first step, toward having a permanent Speaker here in this province. It seems to me that if anyone among members present here today is capable of exercising the duties of such an office, it is you.

But there is one important prerequisite that a permanent Speaker must -- or someone who aspires to a permanent speakership -- there is one important prerequisite that they must show and this is not only that they are non-partisan -- and I'm convinced you are -- but that you must appear to be so. And that's why I was a little disturbed about a month ago to notice that when the Tory Party members were caucusing in this building, I was rather disturbed to see Madam Speaker present on that day. I always assumed -- and perhaps I'm wrong -- that the Speaker of an Assembly such as this would desist from caucusing with the members of the party of which he or she may have been a member of at one time. And I think it is serious enough to warrant mentioning that if we are in the Province of Manitoba to think in terms of a permanent speakership that this arrangement should be clarified somewhat.

Just one other point I would like to make regarding the decorum in this Chamber, Madam Speaker. I noticed in the Free Press of yesterday there was a picture of the First Minister shown photographed delivering the statement on public aid to parochial schools, and upon looking at the picture I conclude that it was photographed by someone in this Chamber, and I assume that there is some sort of a rule that prohibits anyone taking a picture within the Chamber without Madam Speaker's consent. And I'm just curious to know whether such consent was given. Moreover, I'm curious to know who took the picture. It seems as though the former Attorney-General, the Minister of Mines and Resources, must have been making like an amateur photographer the other day.

MR. MOLGAT: He's much too shaky for that.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I looked at that same picture myself and I came to the inescapable conclusion that it must have been taken from the seat of the Honourable Member from Brokenhead. (Interjection) -- I asked myself the same question and I answered myself by saying, "I think that picture was probably taken the day of the opening." Judging from what the First Minister was wearing.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, if I have only served to cause confusion on the point I shall not make any more reference to it. But it did occur to me as being worthy of some analysis and consideration.

I would also like to extend congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. Their task is simply to show just cause why this government should be allowed to continue in office, and in view of the adept way in which this government handles publicity and press releases, it wasn't difficult for these two gentlemen to sound convincing in the course of their speech, since this government does in fact have a favourable image -- I think one cannot deny that. There is a favourable image and all that the two members had to do was stay within the context of that favourable image and to repeat all of the old cliches upon which this government has rested its case over the course of the past few years. Two members succeeded in doing this and they deserve commendation for that effort.

But I want to ask how much of this favourable image which is projected, how much of it is real and how much is the artificial result of careful press staging. One of the real strengths of this government lies in its flexibility, and on occasion, I must admit, its capacity to cut red tape to a minimum in getting certain jobs done -- jobs that require immediate solution. I don't mind giving evidence to this fact. To give you one concrete example, just a month ago when construction was taking place on the north perimeter bridge, over thirty families, a population comparable to a small village, had their water supply tapped away and they woke up one

(Mr. Scbreyer, Cont'd.). . . . morning, lo and behold, absolutely no water! And it looked like this was a situation that was inexplicable and which might last indefinitely. Some quick work revealed that this was a result of the contractor having tapped away the water supply, and within a matter of hours the Department of Public Works had two tank trucks going about in the district supplying water to the large number of families, and within three days actual pumps were replaced with more efficient pumps in order to get at the water that lay at a much much lower level than had been the level previously. And because of this quick and efficient action one could not help but express and show admiration for the way in which the Department of Public Works from the Minister on down through the high-ranking officials and the men in the field for the way in which they took this as a matter of personal concern and went about meeting the problem. The people in the district concerned are grateful, and I think it is incumbent upon me to express on their behalf the sincere gratitude of the people of East St. Paul, at least those who were affected. I mention this because here we have evidence that government can at times show the human touch, can show personal concern; and when this is done it ought to be acknowledged, and they do so.

I think, too, that this government is taking the right steps when it proposes to build a new school for the deaf and handicapped children in this province, and a junior vocational school as well. Both these proposals have been advocated for some time and they have to do with gaps which have existed for a long time in this province. The first can be justified on the grounds of human compassion, if for no other reason. The second, because of the stark requirements of economics. The Member for Inkster has been prodding for years for a school for the deaf children and handicapped children in this province, and since I have been in this House since 1958 I have tried in one way or another to support him in his cause. In fact, last month I was approached by some parents of deaf children to draft a petition which could be circulated among parents of deaf children being sent to Saskatoon, which could be circulated for their signatures for ultimate presentation to the appropriate minister, and I did so, and it was returned and I was just about going to present this petition which had a significant number of names when the Session opened, and for what it may be worth I shall be pleased to deliver that petition to the minister in charge of this program of construction just to let him know that if no one else, at least these people are grateful for this undertaking that has been made.

The building of the junior vocational school is yet another important step and I say it's about time that concern was being shown about, to quote, "the forgotten boy and girl who have just too many obstacles to overcome in obtaining matriculation education." There I am quoting a former Liberal cabinet minister, and I agree completely with the thought of that quotation. However much I might question the credibility of the source, I agree with the context of what's being quoted.

But this new-found concern on the part of this government for the requirements of junior vocational education, I feel that the provision of more adequate vocational facilities should be no cause for comfort, because with modern technology and the sweep of change that it is causing, we really don't know whether a junior vocational school will serve any prolonged useful purpose. I have the feeling that the kind of training that shall be provided in such a school will be of immense benefit in the short run, but in the long run it will only provide a basis for these young people so that they will have at least some basis for being able to take retraining courses and so on and so forth, because it appears that jobs will be lost and new ones will have to be obtained with increasing rapidity or frequency in the years to come. And if our society remains capitalistic, reoriented, the outlook for these young people of non-matriculation education is certainly clouded to some extent.

The time for the construction of a junior vocational school in this province really should have been three or four years ago. Today, and in the last few years, we have had high unemployment, but on the other hand, jobs in the past four years and more have gone begging because of the lack of basic elementary skill. A junior vocational or technical school should have been providing such skills. This kind of situation is sort of paradoxical; it's ridiculous; it's inexcusable.

How long did it take this government to get on to the problem and to act? If you look in the journals of 1961 you will find there a resolution presented by the leader of this group having to do with necessary steps that should be taken in order to combat unemployment and stimulate

economic growth. His resolution was amended by the Premier, and the Premier himself in that resolution, in that amendment rather, put seven paragraphs, seven stipulations, one of which says that there must be an extension of federal aid toward the development of technical education throughout the whole system, especially the junior technical level, and so on and so forth -- page 282, Journals of 1961.

Well I submit that the federal aid was always there, and there to the extent of 75 percent, but it took three years for this government to really grapple with the specific problem insofar as junior vocational education is concerned. That was 1961. In the meantime, the Province of Ontario -- and I think this was mentioned by the Leader of the Liberal Party just the other day, I'm not sure -- in the meantime, however, Ontario has utilized these federal funds to the extent of \$160 million in 1962-63 alone, and the Province of Manitoba has utilized \$4 million, and even if you adjust this on the basis of population, Manitoba has under-utilized this available federal capital to the ratio of 25 to one, Ontario taking 25 times as much in the way of federal grants for vocational education as has the Province of Manitoba. These federal funds were there. They were available without pressure, without undue pressure. They were simply lost by default.

Part of our amendment proposed by the leader of our group refers specifically to this particular problem, and as such I submit it warrants the support of members to my right. But what I have said so far is not all, by any means. I want to refer to the Minister of Agriculture. It seems to me that at times I refer to the Minister of Agriculture too much. I don't know why this is so, but I suppose it has to do with -- it's because of the fact that a floodway is being built and because of the fact that he is Minister of Agriculture which is a field or department which I'm very interested in.

In 1961, again three years ago -- in the journals of 1961 I find a resolution sponsored by myself, to the effect that the construction of the floodway and the expropriation of land for that purpose is going to remove a substantial amount of taxable assessment or taxable properties from certain municipal roles, and as a result of that, municipal taxes on the land remaining would increase and increase rather significantly, and I asked in that resolution that these people -- the municipality, the local school districts -- be compensated; not a subsidy but be compensated for the loss of revenue, for the loss of tax revenue. My resolution was amended; it's true, and I believe it was amended by the Member for Springfield, but nevertheless the substance of it was allowed to remain and this government voted for it. Three years ago, and what is the result today? There has been no kind of acknowledgment that there is government responsibility here. Municipal taxes have increased in the areas concerned. There has been no step taken, no action taken by this government to implement its own resolution, because it did in fact accept that resolution as amended. In one small school district, the school district of Gonor, the taxable assessment has been reduced by \$75,000 -- a relatively small school district -- and because of this the tax load for educational purposes in that particular school district is going to increase. This government undertook in 1961 to do something about it, in order to alleviate such a burden. Three years have passed and this government -- cabinet -- has sat on its hands and, to quote the Duke of Edinburgh, "it's time they took their fingers out."

The floodway has been a very unsettling and disconcerting affair to the people of my area. Almost as much so as the removal of the T.C.A. base is to the people of Winnipeg and the government of this province, on a proportionate scale. I don't mind saying by way of digression that I wish I'd never heard of the floodway, because it has caused a group of people in my area, and outside my area too to some extent, it has forced them to negotiate about their land with the government that has been very difficult and exacting to deal with. Now this is not a criticism necessarily, because the government has a responsibility too, and they understand that and I understand it, but the construction of the floodway has been undertaken to provide a service that is primarily for the people of Greater Winnipeg. It is of no direct benefit -- it's not a local improvement -- for the people out there; it's merely a fact of the situation. In any case, after long and tedious bargaining and many public meetings that dragged on, the government did manage, as I said last year -- and I did mention this last year -- the government did manage by 1963 -- late 1962 -- to make settlements that were on the whole a marked improvement on earlier offers and quite fair, but it doesn't end there, Madam Speaker, because in other aspects of these negotiation proceedings, negotiations were made under circumstances that

(Mr. Schreyer, Cont'd.) . . . were less than candid. Is that a kind way of putting it? It's somewhat the same as saying that they were made under rather false pretenses. Perhaps again -- I'm not suggesting this was deliberately so, but it happened that way and I shall try to show why.

Many people there were promised that if they had any land left on the far side of the flood-way that they would, in some way or another, be provided access to the land on the far side, and the implication, in fact outright statements were made to the effect that the access would be by means of a dry level crossing or a ford of some kind, and some people signed agreements rather hesitantly and unwillingly, but with this stipulation included it seemed enough to swing the balance and they consented to sign the agreement. And that was fine, but then last summer -- oh, June, July of 1963, we had an announcement in the paper to the effect that dry level crossings are not technically feasible, that they're not workable; so now what? Even if I accept the advice of engineering experts -- and I do -- how does that lessen the injustice of what has been done with respect to those farmers there who signed the agreement being assured that these crossings would be provided, and who can I blame? Who can the people blame? Certainly not the engineers. Not even the negotiators, because I presume that the negotiators were told that "dry level crossings were being investigated; they were very likely, so if there are enquiries you can be rather positive about them." Where shall the matter of responsibility be placed here? I don't know, but two things are certain, Madam Speaker. One is that these promises should not have been made at all, in the absence of any hard engineering advice; and the other, the other thing that is certain is that there exists here legal grievance and that redress and justice should be provided. It's not too late.

The way in which the negotiation was conducted in regard to the matter of crossings indicates the flexibility on the part of this government. I said at the beginning that flexibility was one of the sources of strength of this government. It is also in many ways its source of weakness, because there are obviously different kinds of flexibility. Some are admirable, others border on the despicable, because weakness very often is a substitute, or a sign rather, of lack of conviction. There is the kind of flexibility that can paralyze a government and render it incapable of taking any kind of firm action; render it incapable of taking any kind of positive stand on any major issue. The kind of flexibility which prompts a government to be both progressive and conservative at one and the same time on different days of the week, and so on and so forth. The result -- indecision, evasiveness, and, to use one of the Premier's own words, mugwumpery.

What is the stand of this government on some of the major issues in this province today? The flexible stand, but I'm not talking here of the admirable kind of flexibility, I'm talking about the other. Not a very bright picture, and I think that it's time for a little more candor on the part of myself and other members of the Opposition. Let's just take out three departments for analysis. Let's take the Department of Labour as one. And with regard to labour legislation in this province, I contend that this government has been flexible to the point of having no firm posture at all. It is rather flopping about like the mackerel. Specifically, let's look at minimum wage legislation; let's look at employment standards legislation; let's look at the Fair Wage Act; and in these specific instances -- in the case of minimum wage legislation, it is so miserably low that I'm not sure at times whether we shouldn't have any minimum wage law at all, because at the moment the only useful purpose it is serving is to salve the conscience of employers. They think as long as they pay over the minimum wage they are doing the right thing, and if there were no minimum wage law perhaps their sense of ethics would compel them to pay a somewhat more livable wage.

And what about The Fair Wage Act? The Fair Wage Act has been circumvented in so many respects in the past three years that even here in the City of Winnipeg, which is assumed to be Zone A, many construction workers are being paid on the basis, not of Zone A, but lesser rates, on the argument that non-structural construction does not come under the terms of the Fair Wage Act. I don't know what this government is waiting for, but I assume that the reason it is incapable, or has been up to now at least, of acting in this regard, is because it is trying to appear to be both in favour of The Fair Wage Act and its tightening, and on the other hand opposed to it in order to please some employer interests, at one and the same time, and this kind of flexibility we can do without.

(Mr. Schreyer, Cont'd) . . .

Let's look at the Department of Agriculture. Over the past six years in this Chamber, I hope -- well I am sure I have been consistent with regard to the kind of agricultural policy that should be aimed at, in order to preserve the family farm as a basis of this industry. It follows that in order to support and preserve the family farm as a basic unit of the agricultural industry that there will have to be pricing adjustments, in order to protect that size of a farm against the price cutting influence, or effect of large scale farming units, corporate farming units and so on, and I maintained then, and I still do, that it will be necessary to have a measure of support prices at least on all production that is domestically consumed.

The point I'm trying to make, Madam Speaker, is that I am convinced that our farmers are relatively efficient, but despite that they are being pushed off the land slowly but steadily because of the super efficiency of large scale producers. Many of them are corporately employed. Modern technology in all industries including agriculture has resulted in the lowering of the cost of production per unit produced, and according to a Cornell University study, it has been shown, to some substantial degree at least, that savings that result from technological improvements have been used not to lower prices, but to pay higher salaries, dividends, etc., and the man writing this, the economist writing this, says this is true of all industries except agriculture. In agriculture, savings effected by economy of . . . production are not retained within the industry but rather passed on to the consumer, although the consumer doesn't get too much benefit because of middle men.

The point is that the super-efficient farm production units are making it very miserable, and very much impossible, for the smaller family-sized farm. This has been my contention all along and I was pleasantly surprised to see the other day -- not the other day but a few weeks ago -- that the Minister of Agriculture when he was speaking to a Farm Union Convention here in this city, that he made substantially the same points. I don't have the clipping here, but I recall very vividly the Minister making the point that the agricultural industry is very efficient. Secondly, he said that one of the problems in our agricultural industry today is that too many people are leaving the farm. Too many people leaving the farm, and this is precisely -- he has been arguing the opposite in this Assembly for three or four years. His arguments were ones that I could subscribe to completely, and if this is a change of heart on his part, it will appear that there will be not too much exchange of opinion on this matter during this year and the years to come, but its the kind of flexibility which stands one in awe and marvel that such complete convolutions of opinion on a matter can happen.

I recall so vividly the Minister telling me last year, "The trouble with the Member for Brokenhead is that he wants to keep them down on the farm." It would seem that he is prepared to support some sort of idea along that line. It seems to me that we should be serious here about what steps can be used as a starting point to slow down the trend off the farm into reduced social dislocation as a result of technological change on the farm. It seems to me that the first step is that this Government should ask the Federal Government to re-establish -- re-establish I say -- the Bureau of Cost of Production Investigation. I don't know how many members are familiar with this but one of the first acts of the Diefenbaker government when it came to office was to disband a newly-formed office set up by the predecessors, that had the task or were given the task of computing cost of production of various sizes of farms across the Western Provinces, and the Diefenbaker government disbanded it, and one of the men high up in that office can attest to that because he works now for the Winnipeg School Division. Perhaps some day if we have to we can call him to testify at our Agriculture Committee Meeting. The fact of the matter is, the former Federal Government was not interested in cost of production figures, but nevertheless it's important. Let's have something initiated in that regard now.

Secondly, this government should support the concept of producer-controlled marketing boards. What is this government's attitude regarding marketing boards? I ask the members to my right -- do they know what this government's attitude and posture is regarding market boards? It's important that they have one, but I'm not sure that they do. I think that their attitude here is one of flexibility again. Some are for it, some are against. Last year they may have been for it, this year they're not so sure. Is this government really prepared to grapple with the essentials of the problems that face us, or is there lack of any firm commitment on

(Mr. Schreyer, Cont'd.) . . . various issues, really a sign of floundering, rather a vacuous floundering? The signs of indecision on their part may be merely the result of lack of any conviction. Of course, to listen to some arguments advanced on the other side, we must be very careful how we use the power of government or the state as a social instrumentality, because it is very powerful and we mustn't use it, in fact be prepared to not abide by the rule of law if it is not convenient at the time to do so.

I said I wanted to point out the lack of firm conviction and policy decision in three fields. I have done so with regard to labour and agriculture. Let me take a few minutes to talk about the Department of Health and the matter of a public health plan.

What is this government's policy regarding a public health plan? Do they have one? Well, perhaps they do, but in the course of six years here I have never really been able to discover any kind of comprehensive or cohesive plan. I think that I might as well come right out and say that they will adopt any policy as appears most expedient at the time -- at the present time. I suggest that a public health plan is a "must" but it will not come without a determined effort, and in my opinion it is the last major fight remaining in the field of health and welfare legislation. The battle will have to be joined and will have to be won, and it will be. The question is, when? Not likely during this government's time.

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to tell the Honourable Member that he has about four minutes left.

MR. SCHREYER: I do not propose to go into the merits of a comprehensive public health plan as there is in the Province of Saskatchewan. I think that that plan speaks for itself as does a similar plan in the British Isles, and I can say this, that if this government is going to continue with some vague idea about implementing a plan somewhat as they have in Ontario, they might as well forget it because that plan is proving to be unsatisfactory in more ways than one, and even the Board of Evangelism and Social Service of the United Church, which maintains a respective neutrality towards most things political, has come out forthright in opposition to that plan and in favour specifically of a plan such as is found in the Province of Saskatchewan. We propose this in our amendment. Members of the party to my right were able to support a similar motion on the public health plan two years ago and I presume that they will do so again.

I would like, Madam Speaker, if time would permit, to say a few words about the parochial school issue but it's not necessary I do so now. The opportunity will come in a matter of three or four days. Let it suffice for me to say that there is at least one very admirable aspect of the Premier's statement which I think all members here can endorse as a starting point, and that is the very irrefutable logic of the statement that if a child is entitled to the whole, surely he is entitled to the part. Let me say that if we accept that and assume as a second point that the people of Manitoba are capable of showing magnanimity on the part of the majority and equanimity on the part of the Catholic minority and other minorities, then we will settle this problem, despite seventy years of fright of this question.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, if the Honourable Member for Brokenhead would be kind enough to answer a question, I would like him to give me the names of the Government representatives who he charges reached settlement with property owners of the Floodway on the basis of incorrect information for want of a better use. I would very much appreciate it if he would give me the names of those government representatives and the names of the people who he feels were victims of an injustice.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, if I might be permitted, I said that there were negotiators employed by the department, going from farm to farm conducting negotiations, trying to reach a settlement as to price. On the other hand, employed by the same department, we had a group of engineers conducting studies as to what was technically feasible or not feasible with regard to the crossings. The engineers had not completed their study so there was no hard information. On the other hand, the negotiators were probably informed to conduct negotiations as though this was very likely possible, and I suggest that where any responsibility is to be placed is very likely on the Minister himself, because he was responsible for liaison between the two. I don't accuse his employees of conducting negotiations in deliberate bad faith, I suggest that somewhere the liaison got fouled up and they were negotiating on the basis of wishful thinking. It's not too late to make some kind of adjustment.

MR. HUTTON. Madam Speaker, may I ask a further question? All I would like to have is the names of the people to whom this injustice is said to have been done.

MR. SCHREYER: If the Minister likes, I can provide it to him in convenient memo form.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fisher, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, on the point of order raised by my honourable friend, I wonder if any other member of the House wishes to speak on The Throne Speech before we take the adjournment. I rise on his point of order.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is there any other member who would like to speak on the amendment? Any other member who wishes to rise to speak on the amendment?

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

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, I wish to thank the Honourable Member for Lakeside for his suggestion, in which I completely agree, and would ask leave of the House to withdraw my resolution and to re-introduce it at a later date in a similar vein.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed.

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

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that whereas in 1938 Winnipeg was selected as the national headquarters of T.C.A.; and whereas despite the explicit assurances to the contrary, since 1949 to the present time, the Winnipeg T.C.A. overhaul base has suffered a process of gradual dismantling and removal; and whereas the maintenance of the T.C.A. base is one of the vital factors in the industrial structure of the Province of Manitoba; and whereas it is the declared policy of the Government of Canada to promote and sustain balanced regional growth; therefore be it resolved that this House support the brief presented to the Government of Canada by the Manitoba delegation on December 17th, 1963, and urges the Government of Canada to restore the jet overhaul base at Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. STANES: Madam Speaker, I'm sure, Madam, that you and members are fully acquainted with most of the facts which have created this resolution, therefore, I don't intend to be too long but I do hope that brevity will not be misunderstood and taken that this is not a most important subject. It is a most vital subject.

I'd like to give a little brief history as it has happened to me. In 1957 a group of curlers in Deer Lodge Curling Club approached me and asked me if something could be done about the continual removal of the TCA maintenance base in Winnipeg. They were employees of TCA. I arranged meetings with TCA people and with the union at that time, and finished off the main discussions with assurances from TCA that this was a rearranging of personnel and that this was not a dismantling of that base. We know perfectly well that that removal of personnel has continued ever since and is continuing right up to this day -- up to this very week. I felt most discouraged and so took the matter before the St. James Chamber of Commerce. The St. James Chamber of Commerce, together with the St. James Council, prevented this matter from dying and as we all know momentum was gained and the final end of this was that the Provincial Government, together with the Minister of Industry and Commerce's Transport Committee, studied this thing and made several briefs together with delegations. I think we are most grateful for the efforts of various people in St. James, and in particular I would like to mention Mr. Ed. Smith -- he is President of Airlines Lodge 714, the St. James Council, St. James Chamber of Commerce, who, without their efforts at that time we may not have got the attention to this matter which it did get and rightly deserves. I also think we have to thank the various members of this House, too, who took time out at their own expense and went on these delegations, and people outside this House who spent a great deal of their time and money in preparation of these briefs. I think we are most grateful it got to this point. That is the past history, so you will appreciate that I have been associated with this problem for some time. I live amongst TCA personnel; I curl with them; golf with them; know them extremely well.

We came to look upon this thing only as an economic problem and it is an extremely vital economic problem, but it's more than that to the TCA personnel. These families are living, and have been living with the dread of their jobs disappearing, with perhaps a threat that

(Mr. Stanes, Cont'd.) . . . they will get another job probably at a lower salary in another city to which they don't wish to move. Their roots are very deep in the Winnipeg area; they don't wish to move. I know of many who don't know whether they're going to paint the house, or what's going to happen. It's a most unsatisfactory situation to all concerned and I think it's deplorable the thing has gone on so long. The result from government -- and we've had three administrations we've approached in this matter. We start off with promises that it will be looked into. We have finished up -- and I'd like at this stage to read a letter, if I may, which I'm quite prepared to table, which comes from the present Minister of Transport which in part reads as follows: "Apparently the firm commitment by the government that the base will continue in operation until 1973 for some reason was not accepted in Winnipeg, nor was the added statement that the whole matter was still receiving full consideration and attention carrying any weight whatsoever. However notwithstanding this, as indicated to the delegation when it made its submission to the Prime Minister and Members of the Cabinet, we are giving the matter of the submission further and thoroughgoing consideration." That letter is dated January 10th and addressed to myself, and I'm quite prepared to table that letter.

There's another aspect on this thing apart from the continual moving of personnel which we have been promised by Ottawa on many occasions would not occur, and at this very moment I know of four people employed by TCA who are trying to sell their homes because they're being transferred -- and they have been given notice in the last few days. I don't know, there are probably many more, but I also understand that we are informed that we will have a reprieve of sentence for ten years because we understand the Viscounts will be phased out in the Winnipeg area. TCA employees tell me that the Viscounts will be removed to the Atlantic provinces, where they will operate there and be phased out. I cannot understand how an airline company is going to phase out its aircraft operating in the Atlantic Provinces and be maintained in Winnipeg. So we have two contradictions there that I don't understand.

I am convinced, Madam Chairman, for many reasons, emotional, practical, economic, that this maintenance base here should be re-established because it is not the maintenance base that it was. It should be rebuilt on the intention that it should be a major overhaul base, not for necessarily the present aircraft, turbo and pure jet, but the future aircraft which we know at the moment nothing about. I think this is the right place; I think it's the right decision, not just for Canada but for Manitoba and for the TCA personnel themselves.

It is very difficult to word a resolution without the thing getting too wordy, and I think a resolution that gets too wordy loses some of its force. Therefore, I felt that everything in the brief produced by people of various activities in our province covers the whole subject, and I think it covers the intent which I'm sure is unanimously supported by this House.

MR. R. SEABORN (Wellington): Madam Speaker, I certainly support the Honourable Member from St. James in this matter of the TCA base in Winnipeg, as I believe most of us do. In order to make our concern crystal clear and our object equally plain, I would beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre, that the resolution be amended by deleting the last line and supplementing the following: "TCA Overhaul and Maintenance Base in Winnipeg in order to serve all the present and future TCA aircraft."

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. STANES: Madam Speaker, who was the seconder?

MADAM SPEAKER: Was it the Honourable Member for St. James? -- Thank you.

MR. SEABORN: Winnipeg Centre.

MADAM SPEAKER: Winnipeg Centre. Thank you.

Are you ready for the question?

MR. S. PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member from Portage, that the debate be adjourned.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are we on this motion first?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, you put the question on the amendment and it almost got voted on, but I think no one would have any objection if my honourable friend from St. James would like to move the adjournment on the amendment. That's the way I understand the situation at the moment. -- (Interjection) -- No, not the motion as amended, the amendment. -- (Interjection) -- The amendment itself.

MADAM SPEAKER: Would you give me your seconder again please?

MR. PATRICK: The Member from Portage.

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

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

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, the following resolution: Whereas children today spend many hours per week watching television; and whereas this medium of entertainment is constantly subjecting the plastic mind of youth to scenes of banditry, violence, indecency and horror, and whereas many worthy organizations are concerned and the Canadian Association of Police Chiefs has formed a Committee to study the harmful effects such programs are inflicting upon our youth and hopes to discuss the matter with the Federal authorities soon, therefore be it resolved that this House consider the advisability of asking the Board of Broadcast Governors to investigate the timing of programs unsuitable for children.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Speaker, since the dawn of civilization people have expressed the opinion that their younger generation was going to the dogs. Aristotle wrote that young people in his day were becoming bad-mannered and had little respect for their elders. I do not agree that our children are inferior to those of the so-called "good old days." I believe the ideals of youth as ever are high. To declare otherwise would be to admit our failure as parents. But just as a babe watches a mother's face to tell whether the thunder is to be feared or not, so the child learns by the example set by the rest of the family. Children are great little mimics, and most parents enjoy and some are sometimes embarrassed by this built-in skill of their offspring. I compare the modern wonder of television to that of fire. A little will warm, but a little too much will harm, and just as it is a splendid entertainment and teaching medium, it can also, I believe, be influential in giving our youngsters spiced-up notions of life on the great outside. I am not an advocate of censorship, nor do I want to see the good old western horse opera eliminated, because after all, good taste has dictated and the various societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals sees to it that a horse is never shot in the movies, despite all the wild gun battles. What concerns me is the senseless timing of programs unsuitable for children.

One of the finest of the Disney nature films, the stars of which were a little boy and girl, was shown at 11:00 p.m., while during the supper hour was a horror picture showing an invasion from outer space where huge spiders were released to devour all and sundry. Also showing during the early evenings are gangster pictures, where crime is made attractive and sophisticated, and instead of the good old-fashioned fist fight our hero breaks the end off a bottle and goes after his adversary; and while most wrestling shows on television, although amusing, are not taken too seriously by thinking people, to the young mind there appears to be no rules. Anything goes, and the referee may as well go and sit with the audience for all the authority he displays.

Now, the Canadian Association of Police Chiefs is not only a group of pretty solid citizens but an organization of hardened veterans not given to emotionalism, and they are of the opinion that many tragedies and much heartache is traceable to the influence of certain television programs. Madam Speaker, I'd like to take a moment to quote a couple of these. One is from the Free Press of January 9th, 1964. "Canadian Association of Police Chiefs will ask the Justice Department shortly for a crack-down on television films that feature what the Association describes as '25 minutes of brutality and immorality followed by a 20-second moral.' Police Chief Adrian Robert of Montreal, President of the Association, announced Tuesday it has formed a committee to study the problem and hopes to discuss it with federal authorities shortly. He said the Association feels that too many movie and television films are having a disastrous effect on young people by stressing banditry, violence, indecency and sex."

I read again from the Free Press, January '64 -- I've got the date here and I won't bother the House with -- the article has to do with teen-age drinking, but I'll read the portion at the bottom, Madam Speaker. "In Vancouver itself Police Chief Ralph Booth injected yet another note. He said that street fights, many involving juveniles, are getting dirtier in the city and violent television shows could be to blame, particularly rough wrestling shows shown on television. He was supporting a call by the Canadian Association of Police Chiefs for a crack-down

(Mr. Wright, Cont'd.) . . . on violence on television. He said there was hardly a street fight in Vancouver in which the victim is not given the boots when down."

Madam Speaker, young people today are facing a tremendous challenge when they leave school, and they step out into a very complex world. It isn't the same world as when my dad was a little boy, when he came off the family farm and life was more or less stable. The home and the school and the church in helping to mold the character of its future citizens have their responsibilities. Let's make sure the task is not made unnecessarily difficult. Madam Speaker, I sincerely ask this House to give its support to this resolution.

Madam Speaker put the question.

MR. F. GROVES (St. Vital): Madam Speaker, I would beg, seconded by the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. WRIGHT: I ask the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand over.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . whether this is the correct place to enquire about whether or not it's in order. In view of the fact the government has undertaken to arrange for a committee to examine the whole of the Election Act, it would be my thought that this matter could be dealt with in that way and therefore on grounds of anticipation one might question whether this resolution was in fact in order.

MR. WRIGHT: . . . . considered that, but the Speech from the Throne did not make any specific reference to the lowering of the voting age.

MADAM SPEAKER: I wonder would the honourable member reconsider his proposed motion?

MR. ROBLIN: If there is any doubt about it, we are agreeable to have the matter stand, and it can be looked at. I was just raising the point of anticipation, but it could be stood and looked at at your convenience.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I have no objection to it being looked at, and in looking at it I would sincerely suggest and appreciate if you recall the remarks I made yesterday in reference to the verbiage of the speech from His Honour where the government opposite covered the whole waterfront, and I respectfully suggest to you, Madam Speaker, would you take note of that, and it's my humble opinion that simply because of the verbiage it should not preclude the type of resolution which is in the process, I understand, of being put to the House by my colleague, but I have no objections to allowing the matter to stand for the present time.

MR. ROBLIN: I just want to offer the comment, if I may be allowed, that it's not verbiage, it's a clear undertaking.

MADAM SPEAKER: . . . . matter stand?

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . just reply to my honourable friend, it's a clear undertaking to what?

MR. ROBLIN: Well a committee . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: No, it is not.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed to let it stand? The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Carillon.

MR. L. A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member of LaVerendrye, whereas in the last two years there has been a rapid increase in the price of sugar; and whereas this increase is causing great hardship to the consumers of this province; and whereas Canada is dependent on world markets for a large portion of its sugar requirements; and whereas the growing and processing of sugar in Manitoba has provided much needed diversification and financial benefits to agriculture and added to the industrial output of this province; and whereas this industry was given financial assistance by the Government of Manitoba when it was first established many years ago; therefore be it resolved that this House request the Government of Manitoba to give active leadership in the establishment of a second sugar beet factory in the Province of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. BARKMAN: Madam Speaker, although the subject of sugar has been brought up

(Mr. Barkman, Cont'd.) . . . many times before during the last couple of years in both the Federal and Provincial fields, I think a little more discussion of sugar and sugar products might not hurt anybody in this House. If the least it will do, I hope it will sweeten the minds and the atmosphere of some of us in here.

I have been convinced that there would be many advantages to the people of this province if a second sugar beet factory could be established in Manitoba. I realize that a lot of questions may enter your minds as to the feasibility of a statement like this, and I dare say that -- I'll only touch on a few reasons why we should have another sugar factory. I fully realize there are a lot of things in life that would be easier to do than to undertake a project like this, but I ask any responsible minister or member of this Assembly if anything has ever been achieved without a sincere effort and good leadership.

A lot of changes have taken place in the consumption of sugar during the last 25 years, and for the protection of the farmer, the consumer and the industry as a whole, drastic steps will have to be taken. It might interest you to know that 25 years ago seven out of every ten pounds of sugar came into the home as sugar. Today the figure is slightly less than five pounds, or only half. Processed foods and drinks account for more than fifty percent, and though there are indirect consumer purchases, ultimately the money comes largely from the household budget. Canadian manufacturers alone use over 800 million pounds of refined sugar per year. In other words, 100 pounds of sugar are used per person per year. The big industry users are in this order: soft drinks, fruit and vegetable preparations and confectionery, including cocoa and bakers.

Continued on the next page . . . . .

(Mr. Barkman, cont'd)... Under the present conditions in the Canadian market, no one in the food industry really wants to raise retail prices unless absolutely forced to do so. However, if a lower cost ingredient can be found and used as a substitute for sugar, without affecting the quality, too many of these manufacturers will use them. This to me is again a reason for another sugar factory, when we gladly admit the growing and the processing of sugar in Manitoba has provided much-needed diversification and financial benefits to agriculture. It has also added so much to the industrial output of this province that we should and must do everything in our power to try and hold on to our share of this market. What would many of our farmers in the south-east or south central areas of Manitoba have done for a cash crop last year when their grain crops were so poor due to drought and different other conditions, without this much-needed cash source of revenue. But thanks to the one sugar factory, at least 800 growers were able to cash in on a bountiful beet crop. These 800 growers who grew approximately 31,000 acres of beets might know that had another processing plant been available, their return might have been substantially higher. Where at the start of the processing season it looked like a 17 percent sugar content return, they landed up with an approximate 11.2 percent sugar content, mostly because of warm weather conditions and possibly the lack of another plant.

Admittedly, the recent series of increases in sugar prices cannot be explained on the basis of supply and demand. You might say there is no world sugar shortage. However, at the start of 1963 there was a large surplus. At the end of last year there was still a surplus, although a reduced one. Why, then, this great fluctuation of prices? Madam Speaker, a run-down of the relationship between worldwide production and consumption shows that starting in the fifties, supply began to run ahead of demand. By the 1960-61 crop year, surplus sugar reached a peak. The carryover was approximately 19 million tons. Production at a record 57 million tons was more than four million tons ahead of consumption. The next year, the two figures were in balance. Last year, consumption was cutting into the surplus. Reliable estimates for last year indicate that a twelve million ton carryover at the beginning of the 1963-64 season will be cut quite a bit by this year-end. This certainly does not suggest a sugar shortage, but neither does it represent an over-supply or glut. Basic raw sugar prices are revealing. Last year, the price per pound of world raw sugar had risen to 10.80 cents U.S. currency. In 1962 it was 3.18 cents. In 1961, the year of the over-production, it dropped to 2.82 cents within the trade. 3.25 cents per pound, as the sugar growers will know, is considered a break-even point for producers. Below that figure, sugar growing is not considered profitable. Cane or beets for sugar are grown in more than seventy countries. It is obvious that orderly marketing of the resulting multi-million ton annual crops in the form of raw sugar, calls for the buying and selling facilities of recognized commodity exchanges including futures markets.

The volume of futures trading has been sky-rocketing. On the London market the 1963 volume was recently reported at \$11.4 million. For the same period of the year before it was less than one quarter of this total, suggesting that the explanation of price protect... appear, in sugar I should say, is to be found in the market performance. Although I will be accused that here lies the real effect of sky-rocketing sugar prices and not in growing more sugar beets, I do believe a large percentage of these profits could be shared by the farmers, the consumers in the Province of Manitoba. I do not begrudge the farmer an increase in the returns of sugar one bit. I merely suggest if conditions like these exist, we in our Province should, at this time, be awake to the fact that sooner or later we may go back to where the law of supply and demand exists, and perhaps we will be convinced that now is the time, regardless of pressures and resistance from present companies, who at times seem to be operating on a combines set-up. The retail price of sugar has been a topic of a great deal of discussion and public concern in the last year. This is not hard to understand, as sugar is one of the basic items in our diet, and when the price increases by 300 percent it is only right that there should be a great deal of concern expressed by the consuming public.

A number of reasons have been given for the high price of sugar in the past year. We are told that the world supply of sugar dropped very rapidly and this in turn forced the rapid increase in price, and as said before, we are also told there is a great deal of manipulation in world sugar prices, and the giants, you may call them, who play these markets are making a

(Mr. Barkman, cont'd)... fortune at the expense of the consumer. Suggestions have been made that the Government of Canada should control the price of sugar. The Federal Government has indicated that prices are a provincial matter but the province has failed to take action. Rather than wage us all what might be a constitutional crisis in this matter, I suggest that we have within our own province a method whereby we could help to bring the price of sugar to what might be considered a normal price, and at the same time stimulate our own economy in this province.

For a number of years now, the growing and processing of sugar beets has been an important industry in this province, but, like so many other industries that we have, it had difficulty in its early years of operations. In fact, government help was necessary to assist this industry through a very difficult period a few years ago. Not only was the processing of sugar beets given financial assistance at one time, but the Government through the Department of Agriculture has given assistance to the producer of sugar beets by providing the help of specialists who have, in conjunction with the farmer, improved the methods of growing and of harvesting this crop. The production of sugar beets has been a very important factor in developing agriculture diversification in Manitoba and has helped a great number of our farm people to provide a better standard of living for their families.

There is still room for expansion in the production of sugar beets and a number of farmers would like to have the opportunity to share in this type of diversification, but the facts are that the sugar company now has all the acres under contract that they can process in a normal year. This means that on the production side of this industry we have reached our limit, and there is little hope for expansion unless means can be found to expand manufacturing facilities. I am sure the time has come that in an endeavour to assist in a very direct way to bring stability to sugar production in Canada and thereby insure a more reasonable price to the ever-growing needs of the consuming public and to assist in further diversification of agriculture in this province, that the government should endorse this resolution and take action to see that the producer, the processor and the consumer benefit from this very important industry.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. EML MOELLER (Fisher): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dufferin, that this debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from LaVerendrye, that whereas the transportation pattern in Manitoba has changed vastly in the last ten years, and whereas the volume of traffic on secondary highways in Manitoba has increased immensely, and whereas a considerable amount of heavy freight now is being diverted from rail to highway, and whereas the financing of construction and maintenance of secondary highways in Manitoba has become too heavy a burden on the municipal governments, therefore be it resolved that the government consider the advisability of assuming complete responsibility for all secondary highways in Manitoba.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, in these days of high mobility I think that we should consider this resolution of mine. I think it is of the utmost importance. I have been advocating this change for several years. I have spoken about it in the Throne Speeches but this is the first time that I have got it in the form of a resolution. I have seen this need developing for several years. Today I have a feeling that we will have unanimous support of this resolution. I think it should be unanimous. I also have a feeling that the Honourable Minister of Public Works is aware of the necessity of such a policy.

I know that the Honourable Minister since he assumed his office here has been trying very, very hard to get around throughout the Province of Manitoba to get to know all the different corners of Manitoba, all the highways, so he would have a first-hand knowledge of the needs of the people of the Province of Manitoba. In fact I know that several times he has been in my constituency. In the past there were some complaints that there was a certain amount of discrimination. I'm sure that the Minister this year will take this to his heart and

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd)... he'll try to be more fair to the rest of the people. In fact, he will try hard with all the people of Manitoba. In fact when I asked the Minister about the Emerson Constituency, the Minister smiled in his genial way and he tells me -- he doesn't tell me what we may expect, except what I already know, but he says, "There will be some progress made." I accept his word and I hope there will be progress made. I must congratulate the Minister on his ability to grasp his department and I would say that he is doing a better job than certain of his predecessors of this government. I feel that the march of events is forcing the government to take this step and I would say to the Minister that I feel that there is no time like the present time. I must admit that if the government were to accept this policy that this would entail greater expenditure. In other words, we on this side would be advocating more spending. As the Premier likes to say -- and I like to listen to him whenever he comes out with this remark -- "Too much and not enough." I really enjoy watching him, the satisfaction he gets out of uttering this remark, and I have heard him quite often. I hope he keeps it up. But all we're asking here in this resolution, as in others, is not to spend more money -- I agree that this would be more money -- but to spend money that has already been collected from the people of Manitoba more prudently, wisely, and not to waste it on some -- what may I say -- "White Elephants" in the Province of Manitoba. -- (Interjection) -- It could be pink as the Honourable Member says from Morris here.

Now transportation in Manitoba, as the resolution says, has changed vastly in the last decade. It wasn't too many years ago, only about then to fifteen years back, when you think of the times the farmer had to deliver his produce -- probably by small truck, very light vehicles -- his cream, his eggs. Now the times have changed and there is huge heavy trucks using our secondary highways. They come up, pick up the cream, the eggs and other produce from the farmers. They're using our highways, and these trucks and vehicles are much heavier than the former ones were. Therefore, there is a necessity for better roads than we had in the past. And the volume of traffic thus on secondary highways has increased immensely. In many instances the farmer, or the producer, has found it more economical to use highway transportation as compared to the rail transportation. Also, with the abandonment of some branch lines the farmer will be obliged to use the highway to deliver his grain to other centres, therefore he'll be using these secondary highways to a greater extent than they were used in the past -- using heavy vehicles on the roads.

Therefore, in my opinion, I think that the secondary highways are taking a terrific beating and I do not think that our municipal governments are in a position to carry this burden-- the burden of fair share of the maintenance and construction of these highways. The municipal government as we all know has only one source of revenue, and that is direct property tax. I am sure that most of you will agree with me that this tax has reached a breaking point. Maybe the addition of an extra straw may break the farmer's back. I don't think that we can expect the farmer to carry a greater burden today.

On the other hand, the government has recourse to many fields, many sources of revenue, especially in the last few years, we all know and will agree that the government has increased taxes every year. For example, the income tax fees, cigarette tax and many other taxes, income tax. Therefore, the Provincial Government can carry a more fair share of the burden, relieving the municipalities of this. I think that the people of Manitoba at this time really do feel that they are entitled to this extra money collected from them. Therefore, I hope that this resolution will be accepted unanimously.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. P. J. McDONALD (Turtle Mountain): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed motion standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

This proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface dealing with the school system of the province, in my opinion refers to a matter that has been appointed for consideration in the Throne Speech and of which notice has been given also in a statement by the Honourable the First Minister of this province. Our Rule No. 31, provides in part that no member shall anticipate a matter appointed for consideration or of which notice

(Madam Speaker, cont'd) ... has been given. Beauchesne in the Fourth Edition, 1958, Citation 131, states: "In determining whether a discussion is out of order on the ground of anticipation, regards shall be given by Mr. Speaker to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the House within a reasonable time." In the light of our Rule 31, and Citation 131 from Beauchesne, I must rule that the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is out of order.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege, the Speech from the Throne just talked about a statement and this statement came in the House a few days ago. This statement only mentioned that a committee would be formed to study a certain proposal. I'm asking a definite principle that will not be answered if this vote is not allowed, Madam Speaker, and I feel that this is not anticipating at all. I'd like to know on what grounds I'm anticipating. This is something completely different. The Premier made a statement that he wanted to discuss forming a committee to study a proposal, a definite proposal, and I'm dealing strictly with the principle here in Manitoba of State aid to private schools. I can't see where this will be answered and I can't see where I'm anticipating.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, if I may comment on your ruling. I think your ruling is correct but I sympathize with my honourable friend from St. Boniface who wants to obtain a clear-cut decision of the Legislature on a particular proposition which he advances. I think that may be done, because as I read the matter at the present time I feel that it would be impossible for him to amend whatever resolution the government brings in to give expression to the principle which he seeks to have endorsed and that we may have a debate and a vote and discussion at that time. So I think that his purpose can be achieved in that way, while at the same time I think your ruling is correct.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, then I have no alternative but to accept your ruling. I'm not happy with it, but I'll accept it and probably try to prepare some amendment -- I don't know how that can be done -- but if it's out of order now, I guess it won't be out of order because it will be the same thing. If it's good enough now, it'll be good enough then, I imagine.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, as we have come to the end of the Order Paper, I'm prepared to move the adjournment.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister for Industry and Commerce, that the House be now adjourned.

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