

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, February 22, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills

HON. STERLING R. LYON Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry) introduced Bill No. 58, an Act respecting Compensation to Families of Persons Killed by Accident.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN Q.C. (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin) introduced Bill No. 53, an Act to amend The Land Acquisition Act.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress) introduced Bill No. 65, an Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act.

MR. R.O. LISSAMAN (Brandon) introduced Bill No. 66, an Act to amend The Brandon Charter.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. My question is, Mr. Speaker, can the Attorney-General indicate to us whether or not there will be another bill dealing with amendments to The Liquor Act introduced at this section?

MR. LYON: Is my Honourable friend referring to a bill to be introduced by the government side or one - I can't say at this stage, I can't say accurately at this stage. So far as I know, probably not, but I wouldn't want that to be a firm commitment.

MR. PAULLEY: A supplementary question then. Did the Attorney-General or the government receive representations from the Canadian Legion in respect of The Manitoba Liquor Act?

MR. LYON: Yes.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to that. Is the Attorney-General going to take any action on the representation he had made?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, that's a matter falling within the realm of government policy which can't be answered on Orders of the Day. It's under consideration.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Honourable the Minister of Health. Last year and this year again, I asked him if the medical and hospital care would be taken care of for the athletes taking part in the Pan Am Games, and I was assured that all this was taken care of, this was all settled, and according to the newspaper report this is not the case at all. There was a mandate on Ottawa early in February and this has not been accepted. I wonder if the Minister has any alternative plan in case this is refused by Ottawa.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of this newspaper article that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is speaking of. It's my understanding that arrangements had been made with the Pan American Games and particularly with our Manitoba Hospital Commission to provide for whatever is necessary, so I must check with them to see what their reaction is to the newspaper article.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Under the new Foundation Program, is any consideration being given to giving grants for sabbatical leaves for teachers? Is that a part of the program?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): I don't believe so. I'll take the question as notice.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Certain books are required by students in high school and public school to be purchased for the Fall term. Wholesalers and retailers are anxious to know if this list of books will be available now so that people can buy them to avoid the sales tax in the Fall.

MR. JOHNSON: I'll take that as notice, too, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable First Minister. In view of the comprehensive statement made yesterday evening in respect of Air Canada, is it the intention of the First Minister to recall members of the various delegations that went down to Ottawa in respect of the retention of Air Canada here in the Greater Winnipeg area?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): Not at this time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER(Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend, the Minister of Highways, and my honourable friend the Provincial Secretary, inasmuch as a story appeared in both of the papers yesterday that they would likely be leaving our midst. I wonder if they intend to do so before we reach their estimates.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, why does my honourable friend overlook me?

A MEMBER: . . .there's no hope for you.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the Honourable member to wait and see.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the three gentlemen intend to leave, is this in any way connected with the Sales Tax Bill, or are they going to await the passage of the pill.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Carillon.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Urban Renewal and Municipal Affairs. In view of the fact that the single district system referendum will be coming up on March 10th and that the deadline of submitting the municipal budgets is April 15th, is there a possibility that your department might consider extending this April 15th deadline?

MRS. FORBES: We have this under consideration, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to, I believe, the Provincial Secretary. There has been a pre-booking arrangement at certain lakes like Dorothy, West Hawk and Falcon Lake for people who own trailers, and they were able to renew their leases or whatever they were called annually. Could the Honourable Minister tell me whether they will be able to continue this arrangement or will they be lining up now every year?

MR. LYON: I believe that question falls within the responsibility of the Department of Tourism and Recreation. I'll have to take it as notice and get what information I can for my honourable friend.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Provincial Treasurer or the First Minister. In view of the fact that in introducing the budget and on speaking about taxation they referred frequently to the Carter Commission, and the announcement that the report will be tabled on Friday of this week I believe, is it the intention of the government to withhold any further tax measures in the Province of Manitoba until the commission has made its report?

MR. ROBLIN: Unfortunately it is not our intention to do that, because it doesn't seem to us to be a practical course to follow. We were informed by the Minister of Finance it would take at least two years before we could come to grips with any of the recommendations of the Carter Commission, and unfortunately we still have to pay the bills while we're waiting for that two years to go by.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Provincial Secretary. In view of the fact that the Brandon Centennial Auditorium tenders have been called twice now and they're still \$516,000 short, is it the intention of this government to increase the grant to the Brandon Centennial Auditorium fund?

MR. McLEAN:aware of the matter, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Education. Sir, in view of the fact that the members will be sitting on the day of the referendum for schools, will there be an advance poll or will the members be given a day off to cast their ballot?

MR. JOHNSON: I'll have to get the information, Mr. Speaker. I believe there's an advance poll that I would hope would accommodate the honourable members. I'll look into that.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Health. Is he in a better position now to indicate when he may be making the proposal of a medicare scheme for Manitoba to the House?

MR. WITNEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the instructions were given to put the Bill on the Order Paper.

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the invitation issued by the Honourable Mr. Nicholson and myself for a housing conference on March 6th, I would like to tell the members that at the 10 A.M. conference in the morning, Mr. Nicholson has told me that the agenda would be directed towards all of us. We are asking you to stay for the luncheon, but that the House will be in Session at 2:30, therefore all of us will not be able to attend the conference in the afternoon. We hope that some members from each Party will be there if possible. The afternoon session will be directed towards real estate and investment companies and such. However, I think that probably each Party should try to find one or two of their members who might be able to attend, and in the evening at 6 o'clock we'd like you to be back for the reception. Thank you.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Have you received the report of the Commission of Inquiry into The Vegetable Marketing Board?

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I have not as yet.

MR. PAULLEY: A supplemental question to the Minister. Has he any indication as to when the Board or the Commission may be making its report?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I know this is perhaps not acceptable to the Leader of the NDP, but I hope very soon. --(Interjection)-- Within a very short time.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Attorney-General. Sir, can you tell me if the collection agencies are licensed by the province, and the second part of the question is, are the collectors themselves licensed by the province; and the third part of the question, did any of these agencies have their license suspended in 1966?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General and I are trading questions this afternoon. They're not licensed at the present time. If the honourable member will look again at the White Paper on the Citizen's Remedies Code he will find some references to it there.

MR. DAWSON:but I understood that the citizens white paper was to be held over for another year.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Provincial Treasurer. The other day I asked him a question, if the fire equipment, fire trucks, will be taxable and he said to wait until the Bill is tabled. It appears that equipment will be taxable but the question I want to raise now, if the equipment is ordered now and paid for but delivery cannot be taken until after June because the equipment is not available, will it still be taxable?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I think if my honourable friend will repeat his questions at the time of the second reading of the Bill, or that debate, I'll try to answer them then.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day may I direct a question to the Honourable the Provincial Minister of Labour. Have you received the report of the Minimum Wage Board?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour)(Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I have not.

MR. PAULLEY: Can the Minister give any indication as to when the Board will be making its report because if memory serves me right the Minister suggested that there was some reason for haste in this regard.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, I cannot.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer before the Orders of the Day. In view of the full page advertisement that appeared yesterday about the sales tax applying on cleaning and laundering, could the Minister clarify whether it is intended that cleaners and launderers will be required to pay a sales tax on the machinery and the materials that they use in the product.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I think I'll stick to the proposal I made and that is to answer questions during the regular course of the debate. I think my honourable friend will find some guidance in the Bill itself.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE(Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, could the Minister of Education indicate at this time whether the bill covering the Foundation Program will be introduced this week?

MR. JOHNSON: I don't believe so, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): I was going to ask the same question that the Honourable Member for Rhineland asked. I thought it would be useful for us to have that Bill before us.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. There was a report in the newspapers that Bill No. 38 an Act to amend the Liquor Control Act is going to be a free vote. Is the Minister then introducing this not as a government Bill?

MR. LYON: If my honourable friend will wait until second reading comes up this afternoon he will find out.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. What studies in the field of automation has the government undertaken in 1966?

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to take that question as notice.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Second reading of Bills. Bill No. 17. The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. EVANS: Sir, could I have the indulgence of the House to allow this to stand?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a question of the Minister. Is it his intention to move this Bill at this session?

MR. EVANS: Yes. There has been one technical matter that's really being worked out by the technical people and as far as I know it's going ahead at this session.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 24. The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Highways)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate on Bill No. 24, I apologize to the House for having asked the matter to stand as long as I have but I had wanted to check on some very recent correspondence that I thought might have some further bearing on some of the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition in relationship to the Saskatchewan-Nelson study. --(Interjection)-- The Leader of the NDP. Well he's one kind of opposition, I won't go on to describe it. I'm sorry for the slip in my vocabulary, Mr. Speaker. In the discussion that we had on the Bill, Mr. Speaker, while it ranged fairly widely there was quite a bit of extraneous talk, in my opinion, some of it that might have really better not have taken place. However, that's not for me to judge.

The Honourable Leader of the NDP brought up two or three matters, one of which was pollution. The point that I think I would like to make there is that there is already a Sanitary Control Commission which is charged with the responsibility of looking after pollution at the present time reporting through the Minister of Health. I may say that I hope that the membership on the Sanitary Control Commission is not some of the membership that is being questioned by the Member for Lakeside. It's a commission that is made up of civil servants and the liaison between the departments is exceptionally good. There is a representative of the department of the water control branch on the sanitary control commission so that liaison between the various departments does take place. The improvement in pollution in the natural streams and water courses in Manitoba has been really fairly good. While I don't think I would want to go on record as saying that it was perfect in all instances, the improvement has been really quite good in recent years.

The comments that were made in connection with the investigation and the agreement between the prairie provinces and the government of Canada for the study of the Saskatchewan-Nelson basin, I don't think it can really be argued with to any great extent because I too feel that this is quite an important study. The fact is however, that this is not a recent need in my opinion either to Manitoba or to the western provinces or to Canada; this is something that has been discussed since the 1930's. Strange as it may seem, Manitoba has really been the one consistent partner that has agreed with this study all along. Manitoba has gone on record as approving of the terms of reference of the study and accepting - not necessarily approving - but accepting the relative sharing formula that has been worked out. I say accepting because if this was international waters, the government of Canada would be prepared to pick up the entire bill as they did for the Columbia as they did for the St. Lawrence and for other studies. If I was asked for approval, I think I would have to say that there is good reason for the government of Canada accepting the full cost of this study. Notwithstanding this fact, we do accept the fact that a contribution could be made on the same basis as the other provinces for this study. It would have been much better from Manitoba's point of view had the study been carried out some

(MR. WEIR cont'd) considerable period of time ago because of the amount of money that the Province of Manitoba has had to spend in its investigations and the Manitoba Hydro has had to spend in the investigations that have been necessary and that have been shared by Canada, in the development of the Nelson River. It would have been better if this could have been arranged prior to the very healthy commitment that is being made by the Province of Manitoba in the "water area". When I say the water area, I'm talking about the Winnipeg floodway, the ordinary drains, the provincial waterways, the Portage diversion, the Shellmouth Dam and the heavy commitments that the Province of Manitoba is facing in this area at the present time.

I'm still hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that arrangements can be made of a financing nature to allow this work to carry on and to allow Manitoba's participation in it on a reasonable basis at the speeds with which we can participate. I have reason to believe that the study will carry on. There's correspondence going on between the interested parties which I hope will come up with a solution to the study being able to proceed and the financing being able to be carried out.

The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party talked about the administration and the control of water. I think that the Act, Bill 22, that has just recently been passed has been very explicit in this nature, and that is that the control of water, water conservation and control as far as structures and things of that nature are concerned fall solely within the area of the water control branch. There are other areas like the sanitary control commission that fall within the Department of Health but liaison is looked after between the varying departments that I really believe this can be looked after -- and the Minister of Health and myself, or whoever takes my place. --(Interjection)--Well there's been speculation. I'm not prepared to comment at the present time, but the place I'm going and the place some members of the opposition might send me are two different places. Let me put it that way. And whoever takes my place, the liaison is good enough that a study could be called by the Minister in charge of the Water Control Branch, whether it fell into the jurisdiction of one or whether it fell in the jurisdiction of the other.

The prime principle behind the development of this water commission is one to allow for the public discussion of the varying priorities that can be placed on this natural asset that we have. And they change. They change from year to year and they change from priority to priority and are likely to continue to change, and there's going to be interested groups that are going to disagree on how you work out things in this area.

I would remind the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party and the other members of the House that the responsibility within the water commission is still such, still such that it is the government through the Minister that are responsible for any action that is taken under this Act. It is an advisory commission and an advisory commission only.

Now the Honourable Member for Lakeside made some - well I think really they might be described as a shotgun approach to the various boards and commissions that have been established. He indicated that he didn't like to take this approach when I was introducing the Bill. I think it's fair to say that I hesitate to reply when he has made the charge, and I think that I will tone down, tone down many of the things that might be said in reply to it because of the shotgun approach that was taken. Here we are discussing the establishment of a commission which is going to be made up of individuals, almost before we start, before an approach is made to the individuals that are going to be taking part in the development of this commission and in the studies that are going to have to take place, the possible integrity of these people is really being challenged by the motives of the people that may ask them to act. I really find it difficult because of the 56 boards and commissions that the Honourable Member for Lakeside talked there's a good many of those that are made up of civil servants pure and simple, civil servants pure and simple. He accused the government of attempting to undermine the civil service through the back door, in levelling charges of this nature at boards and commissions that many of which, many of which are made up of a civil servants in total. I just wonder, I just wonder who maybe taking the worst steps as far as undermining the civil service in the Province of Manitoba may be concerned.

I ask the honourable member and the members of the House to consider the position of people that accept positions on boards and commissions and in particular, in particular the water commission. I've been around when some of these selections have been made and while it's true that some of these people may have political leanings towards one side or the other, those people have been selected because of capabilities that they may have. Capabilities that they are considered to have. Sometimes those capabilities stand out, on other occasions they don't. Where the capabilities don't stand out it is perfectly possible to challenge the individual.

(MR. WEIR cont'd). . . . that may be a member of a board or commission and it is perfectly reasonable to remove an individual from a board or a commission because of the fact that he is not able -- that he is not able to meet up with what was expected of him.

I think of the representatives that have been named to boards and commissions in the Federal House, some of whom are very well known to members of this legislature. I have had some personal contact with one in particular, and I'm not mentioning any name. I personally might question this man's ability in the position that he has, but I'm not, I'm not. I don't suggest that the Government of Canada selected this man because of his political affiliation. I suggest that notwithstanding his political affiliation he was chosen as a man that could make a contribution to the people of Canada and I really trust that before his term of office expires that this man, regardless of the fact that he's not of the same political persuasion as I am, may well do just that. --(Interjection)-- I didn't say it. I didn't say it, because I still feel that this man may well go on as I think the members of boards and commissions, the various boards and commissions of the Province of Manitoba will go on to make a very significant contribution.

I've read in the Press where the Leader of the Opposition, for instance, has spoken to young groups, and I agree with him, that what we need in Manitoba is a greater interest, greater activity of the public in political life. If the minute that you get that greater political activity you thereby take away from this man the opportunity to serve the people through a board or a commission or some other way which they can, then I just wonder; I just wonder. I wonder if the people that are approached to become members of the Manitoba Water Commission when this Bill is passed, which I hope it will be, whether or not they have political affiliation. I really hope and trust that these people will not feel that there is any stigma to be attached to their acceptance, by the fact that they accept. I would hope that they feel regardless of whether or not there is any political involvement of theirs and on whatever side that there is any stigma attached to their selection. Now, Mr. Speaker, I could go on, I could really discuss this for some time. I've pondered for a period of time just what reaction there should be and I believe that in this area probably the least said the better in relation to the Manitoba Water Commission.

There's just one other point in closing the debate that I would like to make and that is the provision that is made for a member of the Legislature or a member of the Executive Council to sit on the Commission. From one side and another there has been the indication that the member of the Legislative Assembly was really not be furthering the work of the Assembly -- would really not be furthering the work of the Assembly by being represented on the board because he's not charged with reporting back. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this being made available, this appointment being made available, is not for the enhancement that it might be to this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, there is a particular point of view that a member of a Legislative Assembly can hold. There are people that get elected to legislative assemblies that have some particular background of experience and being able to appoint one of those people is in the interest of the better workings of the commission, not necessarily in some improvement to the operation of the Legislative Assembly as such. I would just ask the members of the Legislature if they don't feel that the perspective that is sometimes achieved by an elected member of this Chamber is something that might be of advantage to a group that is in an advisory position that is carrying the reflections of individuals that are elected within this House to the community hearings, the vested interests and the various approaches that are being made to this commission - if this can't be of a significant contribution -- significant contribution to the operations of the commission.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there are some differences of opinion. In sitting down, all I can say is that I encourage all of the members of the House to support the second reading of this Bill.

MR. MOLGAT: May I ask a question of the honourable gentleman who has just spoken?

MR. WEIR: Certainly.

MR. MOLGAT: He referred to a gentleman who is on a certain board and I don't know what board he is talking about. Someone suggested someone whose name started by "S". Would he be referring to one Hank Scott by any chance?

MR. WEIR: No, Mr. Speaker, but I think the same thing applies.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The matter under consideration is the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Highways, Bill No. 24.

A standing vote was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Craik, Doern, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Fox, Green, Hamilton, Hanuschak, Harris, Jeannotte, Johnson, Kawchuk, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Miller, Paulty, Petursson, Roblin, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Uskiw, Watt, Weir, Witney, Mrs. Forbes and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Clement, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Froese, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: YEAS, 41; NAYS, 13.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading Bill No. 32. The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. FORBES presented Bill No. 32, an Act respecting the City of Portage la Prairie and the purchase of certain Lands from the Province of Manitoba, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, the City of Portage la Prairie constructed a lagoon in the Rural Municipality of Portage la Prairie as a part of its sewage and disposal system. The B.C. Pea Growers Limited, owners of land adjacent to the Portage la Prairie Sewage Lagoon, claimed their property was damaged as the result of effluent from the lagoon. The Company instituted action against the City and claimed damages to their property. Ultimately this question reached the Supreme Court of Canada and the City was held liable for creating a nuisance. Damages were awarded to the B.C. Pea Growers Limited and the city was directed to abate the nuisance. The City of Portage la Prairie did not take adequate steps to abate the nuisance as required by the terms of judgment and accordingly the B.C. Pea Growers initiated a motion in the Court of the Queen's Bench to enforce the judgment. Now immediate action was required to provide the city with adequate time to institute action to abate the nuisance. Overtures were made by the City of Portage la Prairie to the B.C. Pea Growers Limited to purchase the land owned by the Company but the city lacked legislative authority and funds to purchase the land.

In an Act passed at the last Session of this Legislature, the City of Portage la Prairie was authorized to spend \$450,000 in order to settle this and other claims arising out of the operation of the lagoon and the construction of the Tupper Street overpass. However, that Act did not permit the City to purchase land in settlement of claim. The city requested the Government of Manitoba to purchase lands on its behalf and to sell the said lands to the city following legislative authority being granted for the city to acquire and hold such land. The province agreed to assist the city and negotiated the purchase of the land with the B.C. Pea Growers Limited for the price of \$100,000, which price included settlement of the judgment and all other claims arising on behalf of the Company out of the operation of the sewage lagoon. The B.C. Pea Growers Limited agreed to sell the land to the province and to furnish the province with a satisfaction piece absolving the city from further liability to the company with respect to the sewage lagoon. At the same time the B.C. Pea Growers Limited agreed that if the province purchased the land the company would terminate its injunction proceedings.

The province purchased the land from the company and they entered into an agreement with the City of Portage la Prairie to sell the land to the city for the amount of \$100,000 payable to the province over a period of five years. The Council of the City of Portage la Prairie by By-law 3968 of the city authorized the city to enter into an agreement to purchase the land from the province for the price and under the terms and conditions set forth in the agreement to the By-law, which agreement is identified in Schedule A to By-law No. 3968.

The bill being considered for a second reading validates the authority of the city to entering into agreement for the purchase of the land from the province and to impose levies to raise the sums required to pay for the purchase price of the said land. The City of Portage la Prairie passed By-law No. 3968 and executed the agreement on the 9th day of June, 1966. Section 4 of this bill therefore contains a retroactive provision granting the power to the city to have enacted By-law No. 3968 and validating the agreement between the city and the province. I recommend this bill to the honourable members of the Legislature.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable the Minister a question? Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable the Minister if the government has in mind any amendment to either the Municipal Act or the Portage la Prairie

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd)...City Charter which would allow the City of Portage la Prairie to buy additional lands that have also been damaged by the lagoon?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I would move, seconded by the Honourable

MR. MOLGAT: I believe there are some other speakers.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to

MR. SPEAKER:asked I think the Minister a question.

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, if there are any other questions, the question given to me from the Honourable Member for Lakeside, I will take it under consideration and get you the answer to that.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my comment is not a question. Mr. Speaker, I came on the Portage Council in 1962, and the lagoon in question had been completed for some time, but in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the engineers who did the soil testing and the subsequent over-seeing of the construction of the lagoon, in my opinion I don't think their soil testing was adequate, and I would like to make the suggestion to the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs that in the future when municipalities in Manitoba are considering the construction of lagoons that your department should require a soil testing report to ensure, or to be doubly sure, that the municipalities in question have the right location insofar as the soil conditions go. It is my opinion that the Portage lagoon, although it was picked from one of five possible sites from the - well from this court action that we're talking about today, a worse location could not have been picked. There was up to 30 feet of sand in this location, and in my opinion the engineers who did the soil testing there were at fault, and while I was on council I sponsored a resolution through the council to sue the engineering firm who had done the soil testing. I have left council and I understand that the action was not pursued, but I feel quite strongly about this, that the citizens of Portage la Prairie are faced with a tremendous bill to pay here and it was through faulty engineering advice in the first place, and had it been caught in time this would not have happened.

I certainly do not cast any reflection on members of the Portage council at the time. They were all laymen, they were going by the advice of a professional engineer and naturally they took the best advice that they had offered to them at the time and they had no means of judging this; but I do make the suggestion that your department in the future should require a soil testing report to be submitted before the permission is given to construct a lagoon.

MR. DOW: I'd like to follow along on the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie's remarks, that I think in addition to soil testing, there is an engineering fact that is required to build these lagoons that I understand that was not complied with in Portage, is the compaction of lagoons so that there is not any percolation through them, and I'm wondering if we've gone far enough with this bill in regards to Portage. If the percolation has not been stopped, how far do we have to go before it's a contamination of effluent throughout the area where this sand base is. This could involve itself into a sum of money that Portage la Prairie might not be able to withstand, and I think, while I agree with the bill in regards to protecting them this far and making the deal, I'm wondering if we couldn't be of more service to Portage to make sure that the effluent and the percolation was stopped so that the detrimental effects would not continue, because this could go on for a terrific length of time and it is a fact that where the lagoon is built it can be made so that there is no percolation.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 38, an Act to amend The Liquor Control Act (1) for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, as is obvious from the reading of the bill, there is no one principle involved in this bill. There are a number of minor amendments which should not require any specific reference, and there are a number of other amendments which some might describe as being more substantive in nature.

I'll attempt to deal with the more substantive amendments in the first instance, and the first of these might be bunched under the heading of "hours and days of sale". The bill proposes, generally speaking, that the hours of sale for all licensed premises be enlarged by one hour; that is, in the specific instances of beer vendor, that the present hours of 11:00 in the morning to 11:30 at night be extended from that period of 11:00 in the morning until 12:30 at

(MR. LYON cont'd)...night. Beer parlors, presently 11:00 in the morning to 11:00 at night, less the 6:30 to 7:30 supper hour closing; the proposal is that the hours be extended by one hour, having them close at midnight, retaining the 6:30 to 7:30 supper hour closing. Restaurants presently operate 12:00 noon to 12:00 midnight six days a week excluding four holidays; the proposal in the bill is that restaurants be allowed to open between 12:00 noon and 1:00 the next morning seven days per week, excluding two holidays, Good Friday and Remembrance Day. Beverage rooms presently operate from 11:00 in the morning until 11:00 at night six days a week; the proposal is that beverage rooms remain open until 12:00 midnight six days a week and that the supper hour closing remain in effect, for beverage rooms. Dining rooms are presently open from 12:00 noon until 12:00 midnight six days a week, excluding the four holidays. The proposal in the bill is that dining rooms be permitted to be open from 12:00 noon until 1:00 a.m. the following day, seven days per week, exclusive of the two holidays I previously mentioned. Cocktail rooms are presently open from 12:00 noon til 12:00 midnight six days a week, exclusive of the four holidays, and supper hour closing, 6:30 to 7:30 p.m. The bill proposes that the cocktail room hours be extended from 12:00 noon till 1:00 in the morning five days per week and to 12:00 midnight on Saturdays and that the supper hour closing be abolished. Cabarets are presently open from 5:00 in the afternoon until 1:00 in the morning five days a week and to 12:00 midnight on Saturdays, exclusive of the four holidays. The proposal in the bill is that cabarets be open from 5 p.m. to 2 a.m. five days per week and until 12 midnight on Saturdays, exclusive of the four holidays.

I think the only other word of explanation or comment that can be made about the hours of sale that are proposed in the bill is this, that it is felt these hours are contemporary and that they are realistic, having regard to the social habits of our people at the present time. The Sunday matter is a matter that I know can be debated at some considerable length by many people holding very legitimate points of views on either side of the question. I think we would do well to remember that in making this proposal to the House, Manitoba - if the bill were to pass in this form - Manitoba would be joining all of the Maritime provinces, the Province of Quebec and the Province of Ontario who presently have similar legislation in effect. Again, within this subject of Sunday drinking, there can be - and let me underline the point - the appellation is given to this of Sunday drinking - it must always be remembered that this applies only to restaurants, licensed restaurants and licensed dining rooms, and the provision in the Act would permit liquor to be had accompanied by meals only, and it would permit liquor to be served with meals in restaurants and dining rooms - in no other licensed premises, other than those in which you can today obtain liquor, with or without meals in Manitoba, and have been able to for a good number of years, and I refer of course to private athletic clubs where liquor is presently available on Sundays with or without meals.

So I say that while there can be some legitimate argument about hours and the length of hours, the bill as presently drafted reflects the position that really no artificial restraint should be placed on dining hours on Sunday any more than would be placed on dining hours on regular days of the week. Some provinces have seen fit, not too many, some have seen fit to restrict the service of liquor to certain hourly periods on a Sunday afternoon. The bill as proposed to the Legislature does not contain that kind of an inhibition because really it attempts - that kind of legislation I suggest, with all deference to those provinces which have it, are attempting to tell people in effect when they can have a meal on Sunday, and if we don't tell them six days of the week, why should we tell them on the seventh day. That is really the rationale behind leaving the Sunday hours in restaurants and dining rooms the same as they would be on regular days of the week.

I think little else of use can be said at this time with respect to the hourly changes, except to reiterate, as I do, that I think they do reflect contemporary thinking and realistic thinking at the present time in the Province of Manitoba, and that they are not too much out of line with the practice that is being followed in other provinces of Canada; in fact, compared to many of the States of the United States, even the new laws would be regarded as being quite blue in colour.

The next substantive matter upon which a word might be said is that of liquor advertising. This too has been a moot subject for many years, debated inside and outside of the Legislature, perhaps more outside than in this Chamber. The proposal that is in the bill is essentially an enabling section which would permit liquor advertising subject to regulations made by the commission and approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. I can tell honourable

(MR. LYON cont'd)...members, because I feel this is a matter they should have in mind when they are considering this section, that if the section were to pass it would be the intention of the government to have regulations which would be modelled very closely on the Ontario code which the Liquor Commissioners of Canada, some number of years ago, adopted as a general model code for advertising right across Canada. From the information that is given to us we understand that the provinces of Alberta, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia in addition to Ontario presently follow this Ontario or National Code as it is now known and it would be the intention, if the section were to receive your approval, to suggest that the same code of advertising be available in Manitoba.

One point that deserves some comment within the regulations, and I realize that we're here talking about matters which depend upon this enabling section being passed, but I think honourable members should know that with respect to television and radio advertisements which relate to beer in particular, the regulations that are adopted in most provinces are those laid down by the Board of Broadcast Commissioners, B.B.G. The Board of Broadcast Governors, I should say. They have laid down a general code which applies across Canada and most provinces which permit advertising have adopted this code of the B.B.G. so that there's some uniformity in the type of radio and TV advertising that is permitted across the country.

Those are two of the main substantive matters that are contained within the Bill. There are a number of other amendments that I will make brief comment upon. There are a number of amendments dealing with the authority granted by brewery licences, distillery licences and winery licences. At the present time these licences authorize the licensee to sell liquor manufactured by himself. The practice is apparently growing up under which a licensee may well sub-contract the actual manufacture of liquor to some other person. When we get into Committee I believe the spokesman from the Liquor Commission can explain this perhaps more satisfactorily than I. The amendments that are being proposed in the Act, however, are an attempt to recognize this practice and to allow the licensee, that is the manufacturing licensee, to sell liquor that might be manufactured by another person, and this should always be read of course as being legally manufactured by another person. This would permit, for instance, to give one example, a subsidiary of a larger brewery - would permit the subsidiary's beer to be manufactured in the parent company's brewery or vice versa depending on what the plant capacity of the different breweries was.

Another amendment deals with clubs and the Act presently provides that a club must not only have operated premises for a year but must be incorporated for a year, legally incorporated. This comes about because of the definition of the club which is being amended in one of the sections of the Bill. The proposal is that it will no longer be necessary for a club to be incorporated for a full year before it gets a licence. It will, however, have to be incorporated before it actually receives a licence and it must satisfy the Commission of course under the amendment that the premises with respect to which the licence is being issued were operated by the same group of persons as presently from the club even though they didn't have legal incorporation. In other words that there was some continuity of existence of this group whether or not they were legally incorporated. This has been an additional requirement that has been in the Act for some time that has caused some inconvenience to legitimate organizations which have carried on social or fraternal clubs for many years but because they lacked the element of legal incorporation for a one year period they were precluded until that condition had been met from even applying for a licence.

There are some provisions in the Bill dealing with new types of packaging and labelling of all types of products that are being developed all of the time. In this field as in all other fields of merchandising there is quite a change taking place in packaging and in labelling of products. The specific provision of the Act requiring certain types of packaging and labelling of liquor is being repealed and authority is given to the Commission to regulate the marking and labelling by regulation. I might also mention that marking and labelling is a matter that comes as well within the jurisdiction of the Food and Drug Act, the Federal Statute, and is felt by the Commission that if they have this residual power of regulation that the public interests will be met in terms of packaging and labelling.

Another provision worthy of mention is that two provisions are being added to the Act to permit, subject to regulation made by the Commission, the possession and the consumption of home made wine and beer lawfully manufactured by resident householders in Manitoba. Honourable members will realize that for a good number of years there has been the rather anachronistic situation in Manitoba where you were permitted federally, under the Excise Act, to

(MR. LYON cont'd)...make your own home made beer if you had a permit or to make home made wine and yet when you came to the Provincial Liquor Act there was a blanket prohibition in that Act against the possession of any liquor other than that purchased from the Commission or lawfully brought in pursuant to the Customs Act from other parts of the world. So this is intended to clean up that anomaly or anachronism because as we know, good numbers of people do manufacture or make -- I shouldn't use the word manufacture, I think make is a better term -- make home made beer for their own use. A growing number of people in Canada do make home made wine for their own use and it's intended by this amendment to recognize what the social practice is and to make it possible within Manitoba.

Now, as my honourable friend from Lakeside said, "Make Whuskey, too", but we're moderate in all things on this side and we draw the line at beer and wine because the Excise Act draws the line at beer and wine too and I'm afraid that anybody in Manitoba who decides he's going to make his own whiskey is going to come up against the Excise Act federally and the Liquor Act provincially and I'm afraid I can't offer any comfort to home distilleries who might feel that there is going to be some relaxation in that respect.

There are a group of sections in the Act which contain a number of provisions prescribing specific fees within the statute itself for licences or permits of various kinds. At the present time, however, the majority of the fees for licences and permits that are issued under the Act are fixed by regulation, and there appears to be no great rhyme or reason why some are fixed by the Act and some by the regulation, and to make the matter consistent the suggestion in the Bill is that all of the fees be now fixed by regulation and specific fees be removed from the Act. These amendments I might mention with respect to fees would not come into effect on royal assent but would come into effect rather on the 1st day of April, '67, to coincide with the beginning of the fiscal year of the Commission.

There are a number of other provisions in the Act which refer to winery licencees. Some of these sections apply to a wine manufacturer whether he is licensed or not and these amendments deal with the question of ownership or interest of wine manufacturers in licensed premises, etcetera, and it's intended merely to make the same definition apply across the board to all of them. The power of the Commission to issue interim licences is expanded. Previously the Commission had power to issue interim licences only for a period pending completion of alterations to premises or during the final consideration of application for licence for the first time. Also in the present Act there is a limitation of sixty days on interim licences and this limitation in the proposal in the Bill would remove this limitation and restriction on the Commission's discretion in this regard.

The Commission is given additional powers in the Bill to shorten the period during which beer parlors and beer depots may be open. We have had for a number of years a section which permitted the Commission to shorten the period of hours usually on the application of the licencee for all other licensed premises except beer parlors and beer depots and really this amendment is more of a housekeeping amendment to permit the Commission to shorten the hours of all licensed premises whether on application or for cause. These amendments will be found in the Act.

There's another section of interest particularly I think to the lawyers which permit Justices of the Peace to hear prosecution for offences which relate to consumption of liquor in public places and intoxication in public places.

There is a minor change in the procedure relating to local option by-laws having to do with the time limit during which publication of a notice must be made. This amendment is suggested by the Commission because it apparently has caused some problems in the past in local option votes.

Then then I believe, Mr. Speaker, are the main points within the Act. I'm sure I haven't covered all of them. If there are further matters upon which members would like elucidation I will be happy to make note of their questions and try to answer most of them at the conclusion of second reading of the Bill or alternatively to answer questions when the Bill gets to Committee and have officials from the Commission present to answer any questions that may arise.

I should mention before taking my seat that when we were discussing amendments, changes in hours I believe it was, to the Liquor Act in 1959, at that time I made the announcement to the House in introducing a Bill with some similar provisions in it that it was the intention of the government at that time to remove the Whip from the voting proceedings with respect to that Bill and it would be the government's intention again to insofar as this side of the House is concerned to suggest that the Whip be off in order to permit members, some of

(MR. LYON cont'd)whom have legitimate opposition to some of these matters as a matter of conscience. These after all are not partisan matters. These are matters that relate to the social habits of the people of Manitoba and we can find I'm sure within this House - regardless of party differences, we can find a spectrum of opinions right across the board as to what is right or what is wrong or what is moderate or immoderate with respect to such matters as hours of sale and days of sale of liquor in Manitoba. So it would be the government's intention to have the Whip off when the votes take place on the successive readings of this Bill through to conclusion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question if I may of the Minister. I gather from his last comment that it is a free vote so it is not then a government bill. Could he explain to me then why this was in the Throne Speech? Did that not make it at that time government policy, and is it not now government policy?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, as I recall, in 1959 we brought in a government bill and permitted a free vote on it at the same time. I see nothing constitutionally wrong with that whatsoever. In fact if my honourable friend will consult the precedent of the House of Commons within the last year I think he will find that a bill was introduced -- a very important Bill was introduced -- having to do with the abolition of Capital Punishment and the Whips of all parties were off. A much more important Bill I suggest than this but for the reason that matters of conscience of this kind really can be decided on the basis of a free vote and I think it's a very satisfactory practice.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, my question really related to the fact that this was announced in the Throne Speech which I take it as government policy. I don't recall that the abolishment of Capital Punishment had been announced as government policy.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak at this time, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I don't know how all of the members of our group intend to speak or vote on this issue. That will be for each of them to decide for themselves. We do not consider this a matter of party policy.

By the same token, Mr. Speaker, I would indicate that I brought in a Bill which I requested to have drawn last November dealing only with the question of the serving of liquor in dining rooms on Sundays, not knowing then -- well not having seen the Speech from the Throne yet nor knowing the policy that was intended. That was done on my own responsibility and not as party policy and I propose that when my Bill comes up for second reading I will ask permission to have it withdrawn.

In general, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the proposals contained in this Bill before us. There are certain specific matters which do not satisfy me completely. I must say that I am of two minds about the question of the discrimination between the beverage rooms, the beer parlors and the cocktail rooms. I cannot accept the distinction in the closing at the dinner hour for one hour in the case of a beverage room where it does not apply to a cocktail room. It seems to indicate a difference between a beer drinker and a cocktail drinker and I would certainly want to look very carefully at that form of discrimination. I'm not using that word in necessarily a bad sense but in the correct sense and I'm looking forward to hearing whatever delegations there will be to deal with that matter. There's some others of course which interest me and I intend to vote in favour of this second reading in order to bring it before the committee.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, there's one particular area in this Bill and a principle which I think is very important and I think that we are continually evading and that is the idea that places like night clubs must close at 12 midnight. Now I notice that the -- on Saturday evening, pardon me on Saturday evening -- I wish to speak mainly on the idea of Saturday night in relation to the closing of bars, etcetera. To me this is not logical. For example -- I know the reasons that are put forward and I intend to comment on them in the course of my remarks -- for example, the new law proposes, and I must say that in general I am in agreement with the changes, I haven't studied each one and pondered each one, but as I've read the report and looked at the bill, I think in general that I personally would approve of them. But now we're going to have an extension of the hours of restaurants and the hours of cabarets into the early hours of the morning - for example cabarets will be open till 2:00 a.m. during the week but Saturday night and Sunday morning they will be closed at midnight. And similarly restaurants will be open later and now will be open till 1:00 a.m. Sunday morning, but that apparently is a horse of another colour.

(MR. DOERN cont'd) . . .

Now I myself go to church and I myself belong to a church and I don't think that the liquor laws determine whether or not I attend. I think that holds for most people as well and I intend to deal with that particular point. People have to decide in the course of their life whether they are going to get up in the morning and go to work or how effectively they are going to perform their proper functions and if the bars are open till 2:00 a.m. I hardly think that the ordinary workman who gets up at 6 o'clock is going to be living it up every night till 2:00 a.m. somewhere down Portage Avenue or down the Main Street of his town and then stagger out of bed at 6 o'clock the next morning. I think most people have fairly good sense. Sure there's alcoholics but I think they're a special category. I think the average person realizes he has something to do the next morning, his work or perhaps in the case of Sunday if he intends to go to church, he can't stay out all night and so on. There seems to be some kind of a cinderella thesis involved here, the idea that at 12 o'clock the chimes chime or whatever they do and then everybody goes home, goes to bed and gets up and goes to church. I don't think it works that way. I regard, like I think most people, the early hours of 1 or 2 a.m. on what might be called Sunday morning as a part of Saturday night. I don't think Saturday night stops at 12 o'clock. It can stop at 12, it does stop at 12 but I think the average person regards the period from somewhere like 7 or 8 o'clock Saturday evening till 12 or 1 or 2 a.m. or later in some cases as a block. I don't think they regard it as a separation. I don't think they think that at 12 o'clock the bell goes and they think of church and they get into their cars, drive home, go to bed and get up and go to church. I don't think it works that way - and it doesn't work that way. I think 99 percent of the people, 99 percent regard the early hours of Sunday morning as a part of Saturday night. I don't think they draw the distinction. I think if they say I'm going out Thursday night and it's 1 o'clock in the morning and it's actually Friday morning, they say gee I'm into Friday. They may think that but I don't think it determines their behaviour.

People spend their evenings in various places. On a Saturday night for example they do not necessarily go to a bar or go to a cabaret. Some of them stay at home, some of them go to movies, some of them participate in sports and a certain percentage - I think it's a relatively small percentage - go to night clubs and bars. I think it's a very small percentage. And also when these places close, so you close a place at 12 o'clock, you close it at midnight. Does that mean everybody goes home? Some do go home, some go home when the place closes but others if they intend to stay out they're going to go to another party or another place; they can drink at home at a y time if they wish to.

So what I'm saying is really this, in regard to the churches and church attendance and I know this is the biggest factor that is brought up against the idea of opening into anytime within the day of Sunday, anytime in the 24 hour period, I say that church attendance is not related to midnight closing of liquor establishments because they're only one part of the entertainment spectrum. I think that church attendance depends on belief and it depends on habit. I don't doubt that the odd good church-goer sometimes misses a Sunday because he stayed out too late, but I don't think that's a normal case; I think that is a case of an exception. And also I think the churches take into account, they take into account the fact that people often stay up Saturday morning. The average church does not hold a service at 6 o'clock Sunday morning, or 8 o'clock; they often hold it at 10 o'clock or 11 o'clock. Now some churches do, I agree --(Interjection)-- Well I don't know. A lot of churches that I notice, when I look at their services they're around 10 or 11 in the morning, they're not at 9 or 8 or 7 or 6. Many are in the evening; they hold Sunday evening services, as well.

So I'm saying that right now the churches take into account the fact that not all of their flock goes home to bed at 10 or 11 o'clock Saturday night to get up early. They're realistic, they take this into account; they're not determined by what the bars do and I say that the churches aren't - they themselves don't depend on the 12 o'clock closing to get a large attendance on a Sunday morning. Some people drink regardless. Alcoholics drink during church services, some people have parties during the time that they should be in church and so on. I don't think there's any necessary connection. --(Interjection)-- Who drinks during church services? An alcohol - I didn't say in the church, I said at the time that a service is held, at the time a service is held, there are people in their own little rooms and their own places and so on who are drinking.

So to conclude, I think that the kind of person who believes in religion and attends church will leave a party or a night club earlier; he won't stay out till all hours of the morning if he intends to get up in the morning and go to church. I think that some people - in other words

(MR. DOERN cont'd)...some people are not religious, or are religious and have no intention of going the next day. Those people will stay out later. And then of course there's the people who are sort of gamblers and they go on the principle of I'll see what time I wake up or I'll see how I feel in the morning, then I'll go to church. They're another distinct group. So what I'm saying is this, I don't think religion is a feeble force but I think it sounds feeble and I think it appears to be feeble when some of its spokesmen act as if the churches will be full - some of them talk as if their churches will be full if you had no liquor served Saturday night. That would be logical. Or if you have some liquor served early in the morning, their churches will be empty. I don't think it works that way.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by my honourable friend the member for St. Boniface, the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. ENNS presented Bill No. 43, The Department of Agriculture Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I made some explanations at the time of the first reading and they're brief and I think fairly self-explanatory, the first one dealing with the deletion of the word "conservation" from the title of the Act and I would want to point out that while this particular reference is of course to do with the water control branch being no longer under the jurisdiction of this department, but I certainly don't want it to imply that agriculture and conservation are no longer hand in hand. We feel that, we imply that modern agriculture and conservation of soil and so forth is hand in hand. So therefore that's the first change that henceforth the department be known as the Department of Agriculture.

The second change is with the signing, and hoped for signing, of new and broader agreements with federal authorities we find ourselves having to go back to some very old statutes to get some of the authority for this - the old land development and land rehabilitation Act of the 30's, 35's. The technicians in the department feel that new authority or specific authority broadening the authority of the province with respect to signing agreements with the federal government on rural development matters should be clearly laid out in the Act. This has particular reference to the coming agreements that we will be signing from time to time in the hoped for near future with the FRED agreement.

Another change that we are asking for in the Act has to do with the authority for charging fees. The department finds itself getting into the position of collecting fees for different services - perhaps the most outstanding one is the soil testing program where staff collect quite a few fees there; the other area is in the farm consultative program which has to do with the farm business groups where farmers through their choice pay as you might for consultative and auditing services at the rate of some \$200 a year. So we're getting into the area of collecting fees and our Act is not clear on this and we're asking for the specific authority to do so.

There is one further section that clearly spells out the authority for land acquisition. Now I'd just like to explain at this time that is not the intention to use this authority in that manner that would be contrary to the Land Acquisition Act that's before us but rather to work with it. My understanding is that it still requires departmental initiation to acquire land either on lease basis or otherwise and this would be done through the Land Acquisition Board that is presently envisaged.

I think under Section 10 we feel that with a growing number of rural development boards and other such like organizations from time to time, the department would like to be in a position to meet the very nominal expenses that these boards incur. It's very difficult to maintain the co-operation of the services of interested farmers and rural people generally to assist the department in advisory capacities without at least being in a position to from time to time pick up some of the expenses that are incurred by this board. This is not to be interpreted in any way as payment for any of these people or so forth. It reflects only what the department would consider to be legitimate expenses of a primary nature that these boards could from time to time incur.

I should perhaps point out one further change, that is the fact that under the old Act the Department of Agriculture was empowered to give out bursaries or agricultural scholarships of some kind to agricultural students who merited them. It has been the practice I understand for the last several years anyway that this has, as in the case of other departments who were similarly empowered has been done, these have all been brought together under the Department

(MR. ENNS cont'd).....of Education and have been administered from that department, and as such it's redundant in this Act; the same bursaries still apply but we feel that rather than have duplicating legislation here that it could be deleted from the Act as it's written.

The sections dealing with the - in Section 4, Staff, these are changes from our old act but are changes that are I'm told being written into all the new acts as they are being re-written and brought up-to-date. They merely provide the authority for Deputy Ministers and other such officers to carry on the affairs of the department under the conditions as laid out. I think, Mr. Speaker, that that encompasses the changes that we envisage in this Act.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Carillon, that the debate be adjourned.

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

.....continued on next page

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 52, an Act to amend The Unsatisfied Judgment Fund Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, there are some groupings within the Bill that bear a little bit of description at the second reading of the Bill. There are a number of sections, I believe five in all, which deal with a new system of charging owners of antique cars a fee under The Unsatisfied Judgment Fund Act. A complementary amendment will be coming forward under The Highway Traffic Act to raise the fee for the antique car registration to \$25.00. Of this \$25.00 fee, \$20.00 will be paid into the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. The registration is a continuing registration and is not subject to expiry the same as other registrations.

In line with this, the use of the antique car would be limited to car rallies and parades and other similar matters. The owner of the antique car would have to give an undertaking not to operate the car on a highway unless he could furnish proof of financial responsibility similar to that required under The Highway Traffic Act. If he does this, he is not required to pay the usual annual fee required under The Unsatisfied Judgment Fund Act.

There is another section in the Bill which repeals the provision under which the payment of special fees may be suspended in certain cases and is required to be suspended in other cases. This means, Mr. Speaker, that the fee for the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund will be payable by the owner of a car at the time of registering at all times, and I need not amplify on that except to say that with the addition of new claims against the fund such as property damage up to a maximum of \$3,000, and with another section in the fund that we'll be referring to having to do with driver education, that the need for maintenance of this Fund at a higher level is necessary, to say nothing of the increased amounts of damages that are payable through judgments awarded by the Court.

There are other sections dealing with the procedure on applications under the Act, which sections will require service of all pleadings in a case to be served on the Attorney-General at the time the applicant gives notice to the Attorney-General. This is an attempt to save time so that matters can be proceeded with more quickly than is presently the case. At the present time where a case is outside of Winnipeg, the Attorney-General's office has to obtain copies of all of the pleadings from the Court offices involved, and this is just a procedural change which we hope will expedite the handling of these applications.

There is a new provision which will allow a person - and this is an important provision - which will allow a person injured in a hit-and-run accident caused by the driver of a stolen car to sue the Attorney-General and recover from the Fund even although he knows the identity of the driver. Now this is a technical matter which arose in a case before our Courts in Manitoba, a case which is still pending and which has been adjourned *finis di* by the judge in question because this matter was pointed out where there was an area which, as I recall, the judge felt should be remedied by the Legislature before any further proceedings were taken in the case. You will notice that in the last section of the Bill, provision is made to make this amendment applicable to pending litigation, and as I understand it, the wording of that section is to confer a benefit rather than to deprive a right upon any litigation that is presently proceeding.

There are further provisions in the Act for payments to be made to the Fund. These include the cost of investigation being made with respect to applications or proceedings under the Act. At the present time only legal costs and collection costs are allowed -- that should read "payments from the Fund". Other new payments will be those made for paying the cost incurred with respect to driver training programs and driver testing programs undertaken by the government. Limits are placed, however, on the amount payable for this purpose to 20 percent of the amount in the Fund, and the Fund shall not be reduced by payments made for this purpose to an amount below the total of the claims paid during the previous year plus 10 percent.

A number of other items appear in the Act which are more or less tidying up or house-keeping items with respect to cross references to provisions of the new Highway Traffic Act and the cleaning up of some other typographical errors.

Now when we were dealing with this Bill, Mr. Speaker, at the money resolution stage prior to first reading, there were some specific questions that were asked by honourable members opposite having to do with the operation of the Fund generally.

Now I understand that the Leader of the Opposition asked the question as to what the maximum payments were under the Fund. The payments are \$35,000 maximum for personal

(MR. LYON cont'd).... injury out of any one accident, and for easier reference I can refer my honourable friend to Section 8, subsection (1) of the Bill - of the Act itself, not of the present Bill. On property damage, limits are \$3,000 exclusive of cost on any one judgment, and that can be found in Section 8, subsection (3). I hope the honourable members will pardon me for referring to specific sections, but these are general questions having to do with the operation of the Fund rather than with this particular bill. The Fund does not pay the first \$200.00 damages in these property damage matters, and that's found in Section 6, subsection (2).

I believe the Leader of the New Democratic Party was asking a question about the amounts that were paid upon registration into the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, and he will remember that the registered owner of a motor vehicle in Manitoba pays a fee that varies from 50 cents to \$1.00 upon registration. In Ontario, when a person gets a driver's licence, he must pay \$1.00 that is applied to the Ontario fund.

Another question was asked with respect to the present status of the Fund, that is the balance in the Fund. At the present time, as of January 31st, the last figure that was given to me was \$464,279.57, so the Fund is just approximately \$35,000 under a half million at the present time.

Up until the end of November of 1966 - another question was asked on this - approximately \$154,000 revenue was received from the \$25.00 fee that is assessed against those persons who do not produce satisfactory evidence of automobile insurance -- (Interjection)-- the figure was \$154,000 revenue. This represents - I think I can read this figure properly - 6,160 vehicles. That is the information that has been given to me with respect to those earlier questions.

I would recommend this Bill to the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a word or two before this Bill goes to committee. To me it is a very important Bill, a Bill I think that, had we a proper insurance scheme in the Province of Manitoba, that it wouldn't be necessary for it to continue on the statute books of the province.

I think that when we hear remarks such as we heard this afternoon from the Honourable Attorney-General in respect to this Bill, it strengthens the argument of those of us in this group who have held that only a compulsory automobile insurance scheme with the government being the insurer is the logical scheme of insurance in the automobile industry for the Province of Manitoba, or indeed right across Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the old question of unsatisfied judgment funds and the operation of automobile insurance is more and more becoming a matter of concern, not only here in Canada but in the United States as well. Almost every day now I receive correspondence from various states in the United States indicating that they too are having the problems similar to what we are having here in Manitoba. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, the statement of the Minister - he made a number of them and I will refer to two or three of them - one of the statements that he made, if I heard him correctly, was to the effect that the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund in Manitoba is now going to be a continuing fund, that those owners and operators of motor vehicles in the Province of Manitoba, irrespective of whether they have private automobile insurance or not, are going to have to pay into the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund on a continuing basis. My honourable friend the Attorney-General nods his head as to the correctness of this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is this fair, is this fair in the Province of Manitoba or anywhere, that because there are a number of operators of motor vehicles within our province who are not properly insured, who are allowed to have their motor vehicles on the road without carrying insurance, are going to be subsidized in effect by those who have automobile insurance. Now it may seem insignificant to my honourable friend the Attorney-General, but to me it is not the case, for my friend in speaking a few moments ago indicated that there were 6,160 motor vehicles that are insured - I don't think you could call it insurance, Mr. Speaker - but there are 6,160 motor vehicles operating today in the Province of Manitoba from whom the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund receives a contribution of \$25.00 in each case. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that here we have just over 6,000 motor vehicles operating, because of the fact that we have this Fund, who are potential lethal weapons for which people will not receive proper compensation; or, on the other hand, the operators of these motor vehicles who are now only paying into the fund the figure of \$25.00, may be financially embarrassed or restricted from normal living for the balance of their lives because of the terms under which the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund operates.

A couple of years or so - or a year or so ago, the government recognized the fact that

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).... the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund was not providing coverage to the degree that the government figured that they should, so the Fund was expanded to take care of some amounts in respect of property damage. So the Fund was extended for that purpose. It was an inching - if I may call it an inching - toward further recognition that adequate coverage is not in effect in Manitoba.

Whereas the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, if I'm correct, originally started out for the purpose of protection of persons who were injured as the result of an accident or died, two years or so ago - or last year was it - the government felt that those of us who are insured should make a contribution into an Unsatisfied Judgment Fund to assist in compensation for injury to property. And now what is the fund going to do, according to this legislation. It's not satisfied with looking after the personal property damage or public liability, now the Fund is going to be further extended into the field of a cost of driver education, highway safety programs, or any other programs undertaken by the government to reduce accidents or improve safety on highways.

I don't think there's any question or doubt, Mr. Speaker, that all of us are concerned with driver education, safety on the highways, but I question very much whether the method now suggested by the government is a proper or a fair one, because I think the question of highway safety, the question of the education of the drivers of motor vehicles are a concern of the whole community, not just those who happen to be drivers of motor vehicles. I think in this instance, Mr. Speaker, it could be charged that the government is failing in its responsibilities to levy on the population as a whole such costs for the protection of the community as a whole.

I frankly confess that insofar as Saskatchewan is concerned, where they have a government-operated insurance scheme, that that fund itself is being used for the purpose of driver education. This is what is being done there, but the contributors there of the whole premium are making their contribution and they're all covered in the Province of Saskatchewan unlike they are here. If memory serves me correct, the Minister of Education has authorized school boards to go into programs of driver education of motor vehicles and I question - I ask the question as to whether or not the payment for those classes in our public schools are going to be derived from the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund here in the Province of Manitoba.

My honourable friend tells us, Mr. Speaker, that there's almost \$500,000 in the Fund and the Act that he is proposing before us indicates that about \$100,000 of that can be used annually, if the Fund stays at the half million dollars, for the purpose I have just mentioned, that of driver training and driver education, and also insofar as the program of highway safety is concerned. Again, and I repeat, that I'm convinced that these programs should be paid for by all of the people of the Province of Manitoba.

But more important than that, Mr. Speaker, I think that the government, now that it's inching its way into coverage of automobile insurance through its Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, should consider the propositions which we have made for complete coverage with the government as the insurer. I'm convinced, Mr. Speaker, that before very long, if the government continues its amending of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, that the costs of operation of that Fund will almost equal those of the operational costs of a properly conducted automobile insurance in the province.

Then I notice another section that the Minister referred to, a section dealing with the question of the clarification of the situation where a hit-and-run accident is caused by the driver of a stolen car. I note here, as is contained in many of our insurance policies, Mr. Speaker, that if the unfortunate victim happens to be a relative of the driver of the stolen car it appears to my reading of the Act here that they are not covered. So there is not compensation irregardless of fault contained or continued in the provisions of the Act.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, it will be interesting when the Bill gets into second reading, and again I implore the government to actively consider this piecemeal approach to automobile insurance in the province and have the fortitude and the courage to introduce into the legislation a proper compulsory automobile insurance scheme with the government as the insurer.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I have several remarks that I'd like to make with regard to this Bill, and I recognize that perhaps I'm going to be dealing a little more carefully with individual sections than is usually permitted on second reading. On the other hand, I recognize the fact that it's sometimes not desirable to have changes made in committee, so what I would like to do is point out some things that I feel should be looked at by the Honourable Minister so that maybe when the committee time comes around that there

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . . will be some answers for them.

Now first of all, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister certainly intends that the Fund shall be used for the purpose of compensating people who are not insured and that the intention and desire of his department is that where a proper application is made under the Fund that the application will be processed in such a way as to enable the applicant to recover his damages, that it's not the desire of his department to defeat an application either through a technicality or through some inadvertence on the part of the applicant in processing his application. Although that's the intention of the Act and I'm sure the intention of the Minister, may I assure him that sometimes his department can take the posture, by virtue of the legislation, that an applicant cannot proceed by virtue of having perhaps not followed the strict procedure as laid down in the Act.

It's in this regard, Mr. Speaker, that I'd like the Minister to have another look at Section 10 of the Act, and he referred to it, that "With the notice served under subsection (1), the plaintiff shall provide to the Attorney-General a copy of all pleadings in the action and the notice shall show the style of cause and number of the action in the Court in which it has been begun." The Minister explained that sometimes when an action is taken out in the country or in a different judicial district that they have to go and get copies of the pleadings and that it would be an easy matter and should be the case, and I agree that the plaintiff should supply these documents. What I'm worried about, Mr. Speaker, is what happens if he doesn't supply these documents. The way the Act is presently worded, at a judicial hearing the judge could, if an objection were raised that with the notice that was served under the subsection the plaintiff provided the pleadings and the other things but didn't put down the style of cause, he could not then proceed with his application because when the original notice was stalled there was a statutory requirement, and nothing is more compelling than a statutory requirement, and the judge would then be unable to proceed with satisfying the applicant.

Well, I'm sure my honourable friend is thinking - well, the Member from Inkster is being technical, no such objection would ever be raised - but I assure him that I speak from experience, and I would suggest that there be some sort of savings provision that if the department has not been prejudiced by a failure to follow one of these requirements, if the material was available or could have been available by request, that the application not be defeated on that basis. I would ask the Minister to look into that because I'm sure that it's his intention that these people recover and yet he can't have supervision over every single lawyer in his department or a position that will be taken, and I know that positions of this kind have been taken and will be taken in the future.

The other point that troubles me, Mr. Speaker, because I think it's a provision which gets we lawyers into trouble and subjects of the criticism from time to time, is that we say things in such a peculiar way, as I pointed out in my first speech we have to say black is white and white is black and Section 12 is a classical example of this type of section. It says, "Where the death or personal injury is occasioned at a time when the motor vehicle is, without the consent of the owner, in the possession of some person other than the owner or a person living with and as a member of his family, it shall be conclusively deemed for the purpose of this Act that the identity of the owner is not and cannot be ascertained."

Now everybody knows who the owner is. The owner is somebody whose car had been taken, but for the purposes of the law it shall be deemed that nobody knows who he is. We create in this way a fiction which I think, Mr. Speaker, is so unnecessary. Why can't we just add to the section where it says, "Where bodily injury to or the death of any person is occasioned in the province by an accident in which a motor vehicle is any manner directly or indirectly involved, if the identity of the owner and of the driver of the motor vehicle cannot be ascertained" - and now I'm not adding the exact words - or if the vehicle was being driven without his consent. Why should we create a fiction when there's no need to do it. We have to say something which we know is so is not so, and I would just like the Minister to look at this section - and I don't think that he would draw it this way if he had it to do - and get the Department to clean that up because --(Interjection)-- Well, I think that the solicitors can do a better job than what's been done and we lawyers shouldn't have to be criticized for trying to make black white and white black when it's not necessary to do so. --(Interjection)-- Exactly - Why do it? I don't think it's necessary to do it, for us to deem something to be so which we know is not so.

So those are the comments that I would like to make. I'd like the Minister to put in some sort of savings provision so that if the spirit of the Act has been complied with, if they have the

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . . information that they want or at least let them get it on request if they didn't get it, that the applicant not be defeated. Secondly, that that unfortunate wording be cleaned up. Thank you.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, QC (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, . . . should be declared a remedial act and should be given a liberal interpretation.

MR. GREEN: I would say that it should be given a New Democratic interpretation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly was amazed at the number of vehicles in Manitoba that do not carry insurance. --(Interjection)-- Well, there's 6,160 people who apparently have elected to not insure their vehicles but pay the \$25.00 in lieu of it, and I'm wondering what the figures were the year before --(Interjection)-- the year before. Oh I see, about 4 percent. Well it's rather small if you look at it in that light, but what I think should happen in all cases, that when a receipt is given for the \$25.00 that a little booklet be given out with the receipt stating specifically that they do not in fact have insurance and that if they are involved in an accident that exceeds \$100.00 - I believe that's the figure - to both vehicles or there are injuries to persons, that their vehicle will in fact be impounded. I think I'm correct on that, because as I interpret the Act, if you do not carry insurance and you're involved in an accident where damages exceed \$100.00 or there is injuries to persons, they impound that vehicle. --(Interjection)-- Well, that's just as bad, and in order to get your -- my honourable friend says they don't impound the vehicle, all they do is take the plates off it and take your driver's licence away. Well that kind of ties you up anyway doesn't it, unless you want to drive the Bennett buggy - use it as a Bennett buggy. But I'll bet you that there are 5,000 of the 6,160 who do not know this to be a fact when they pay their \$25.00. It's surprising how many people think that they do in fact have some kind of insurance for the money that they pay. They do not know that if they are involved in an accident that their licence will be suspended - probably not the vehicle impounded - but their licence suspended and their driving privileges taken away from them. So I think that the least that the department can do is to make certain that the individual who paid his \$25.00 is quite aware of the facts.

The other matter of whether or not the cost of the driver education program that the government intends to introduce and implement should be taken from out of this Fund, I'm not prepared to say, but I do say that we should proceed with haste on a driver education program of some kind. I think that most insurance companies now recognize the fact that anyone who graduates from a training course is a much better operator and much less likely to be involved in an accident. In fact I think the insurance companies recognize this by reducing the premium by something like 50 percent, so it must be of some value.

Now there's another matter that does concern me somewhat, and being in the type of business that I am we see it quite frequently, and that is that a man or woman apparently can plead guilty to a number of offences under The Highway Traffic Act and then register an Appeal, make an application to the Appeal Board on the grounds that it is extreme hardship for he or she to be deprived of their driving privileges and then they will have their driver's licence reinstated, sometimes on a restricted basis but generally they come back with their licence reinstated. I recall a series of articles that appeared in the Free Press last fall listing in some cases I think up to about 36 convictions that a person had had and still driving on their own, and this. . . .

MR. LYON: I'm quite happy to listen to my honourable friend. I wonder if he might better direct his remarks, however, to the Minister of Public Utilities on estimates. We're dealing here I think with the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund and certain amendments to it.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well I can do that at that time but it certainly does concern us. However, perhaps my honourable friend will be prepared at this time to give us some concrete answers to the questions that have been put up to him at this time.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, in making a few comments on the Bill that is before us, I have no objection in general to the Bill, but on this point of using the funds from the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund for the purposes of driver training and so on, I'm not in accord with this. I think any funds that we will use for that purpose should be shown by the estimates and not come from a fund over which we have no jurisdiction and I think this is the case. When we take the funds from this particular fund for that purpose we will not be considering these in our estimates - if I'm wrong, I would certainly like the Minister to correct me on this - and therefore they will be allowed to spend a considerable amount of money. From

(MR. FROESE cont'd). . . . what we were told this afternoon the Fund stood around close to half a million dollars at the year-end and 20 percent of this would naturally come close to \$100,000. I wonder if the Minister could tell us on this point how much is presently being spent on this program by the government. I don't know whether he has the information as to what the school districts or divisions are spending on this particular program. I think it's sponsored in conjunction with the government by the various school divisions. Whether they're paying for the whole amount of it I don't know, and certainly any information that could be passed on to the members at this particular time I think would be helpful so that we would know what the circumstances are. Certainly some of the other provisions in the Bill I think are good, but on this particular aspect I have my reservations.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if this isn't a good time for me to bring one or two things to the attention of the House. The discussion today has prompted me to bring it forward probably a little earlier than I might have, but anyway I would like to remind the honourable members that, on second reading of Bills, discussion be centered around the principle of the Bill. It is accordingly out of order at that stage to enter into discussion of the clauses of the Bill. My reference in this connection is taken from Beauchesne, Citation 381, which reads in part, "Second reading of a Bill is that stage when it is proper to enter into discussion and propose a motion relative to the principle of the measure. On a motion of second reading it is out of order to discuss the clauses of the Bill."

I would at this time earnestly appeal to all members of the House to co-operate with the Chair in endeavouring to handle the business and the well-being of the House's business in this particular direction. I don't think it needs any more elaboration on my part and I'm sure I can count on the co-operation of the House in order that we can deal with matters as they go along. Thank you.

MR. HILLHOUSE: You're not ruling that we're confined to the principle of the actual amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm merely giving an opinion in order that we don't go. . . .

MR. HILLHOUSE: Is it your point that the whole Act itself, the principle of the Act, can be discussed on any amendment to that Act?

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, yes. So you have the floor now. The Honourable Member for Selkirk. I believe you rose when I interrupted you.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for reminding the House of the rule. I would trust however that the rule wouldn't mean that when we have a Bill which has in it a number of different clauses dealing with various principles that we wouldn't be prevented from, while not maybe discussing the clause exactly as such, of dealing with the general principle, because there is here for example the point that the Honourable the Member for Rhineland is speaking about which was originally brought up by my colleague the Member for Selkirk the other day when we were dealing with the Bill in the Committee stage. I think there is here a question of principle, because the government is proposing that this new Bill, or the amendment, is going to put some of the costs at least of driver training under the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund.

Now I would hope that this is something that we can discuss as a principle on second reading, and in that case I would like to endorse what was said by my colleague the Member for Selkirk the other day and which I believe the Member for Rhineland was speaking about today, that this doesn't seem to me to be the proper place in which to proceed with the driver training costs, because the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund was established for one specific purpose and that is the statement of the Bill itself, "To take care of those people who cannot claim from any other source," and as we went along over the years we have attempted to bring the Act into line with the needs of today.

Now the Minister very kindly gave me the information today that I requested from him regarding the personal injury and the property and so on - costs or damages that the Bill covers. I would suggest to the Minister that if he is going to add more costs on to the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund by putting in driver training, that this is not the proper course of action. I believe rather that we should look at the actual coverage that we supply under the Fund, and it seems to me that the time has come where we have to revise in particular the property damage because this is, at \$3,000, a very limited amount. He stated, I believe, that this excludes costs which can be very substantial at this time. Well, with the price of automobiles what it is, it doesn't take very much today to run into a \$3,000 claim and there are other types of property damage which can be included of course.

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd).....

It seems to me that there is no reason why we shouldn't be looking at that end of the Fund to make sure that it is in fact providing the coverage which is required and not adding other costs to it which are not related to accidents. If we need to spend money on driver training, then it seems to me the proper place to get it is from the Motor Vehicle Licensing which is a method of doing it. We are licensing now. Maybe we should look at special licences for training purposes, but surely not by charging it to a fund specifically set up to cover the claims arising out of accidents. This is the basis on which we collect the money and that's the basis on which we should pay it out.

MR. SPEAKER: As far as the remarks of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is concerned, and in fact every member of the House, I would like to assure them that I fully realize that when they rise to speak in matters of this kind in the odd occasion they must come into the clauses in order to make their point. That is not what I was endeavouring to impose upon the House but rather to gain their cooperation to keep it within bounds; within bounds and that is all. So--the Honourable Member for Selkirk. Thank you.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I had intended to adjourn this debate but in view of the remarks of the Honourable Leader of the NDP regarding compulsory insurance from Unsatisfied Judgment Fund I thought it just as well to speak on this matter now while the iron is still hot and while his words are still fresh in the minds of the members of this House. Now it would appear to me that the message that the Honourable Leader of the NDP was trying to get across to us was this, that if you had compulsory insurance you could do away with an Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. Well, the honourable member is very very wrong in that. The State of New York, which has compulsory automobile insurance, has the greatest percentage of uninsured drivers than any other jurisdiction in the North American continent, and even the Province of Saskatchewan which the honourable member refers to is seriously considering, in this session, introducing an Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, because they have found that people are coming into the province from other jurisdictions, they have outside plates, they're allowed to drive these cars so long without taking out insurance in Saskatchewan, they're becoming involved in accidents, and Saskatchewan now finds that it has to have an Unsatisfied Judgment Fund and they are seriously considering introducing it at this session.

Now there's another thing that I'd like to remind the Honourable Leader of the NDP, he seems to think there's something magic in state insurance. I wonder if the honourable member knows how much Saskatchewan is increasing its premiums this year. It's increasing its premiums 11 percent.--(Interjection)-- It isn't lower. It is not. Saskatchewan Government insurance is not lower and if we want to have a debate on that I'm quite prepared to get into it. But the point is this - and the honourable the members of the NDP don't seem to realize it - that Saskatchewan has a \$200.00 deductible clause in respect of all of its coverage. We have no deductible in Manitoba. As a matter of fact, deductibles in Manitoba are prohibited by law excepting in respect of collision, but in Saskatchewan you have a compulsory deductible in respect of all your coverage in the amount of \$200.00. Now several years ago, if you try to relate that to property damage in Saskatchewan, several years ago I investigated the average property loss in the Province of Saskatchewan in respect of automobile accidents, and at that time it ran around about \$134.00, so you can understand how they could make money on a policy of that nature.

Now, another thing Saskatchewan is doing too that we do not do, Saskatchewan increases the premium payable by an accident-prone driver. In addition to that, Saskatchewan's drivers' licence is much higher than it is in Manitoba and the more convictions an individual has in Saskatchewan the higher his driver's licence costs him. As a matter of fact, they have varying degrees of colour to show the type of driver that's using the road. But basically I think Manitoba has the finest law of any province or state in North America. Yes it is. Because after all we are the ones that fix the insurance premiums. Insurance premiums are fixed on the basis of premiums against loss and there's no jurisdiction, even including Saskatchewan, which has state insurance, can escape that fact. --(Interjection)-- That's got nothing to do with it. If my honourable friend would make sensible remarks we'd get on a lot better. It had nothing to do with the colour of the government at all because the insurance premium in Saskatchewan, ever since the inception of this policy, has increased more and in higher percentages ... the insurance premium in Manitoba. And Manitoba should have a higher accident rate than Saskatchewan by reason of the fact that the population is concentrated in about two areas, while Saskatchewan is pretty much a rural province.

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd)

As far as the Bill itself is concerned, my Leader has dealt with my objection to the principle of charging to the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund any of the costs of driver improvement, and I think he's quite right in doing that. I think that driver improvement should not be charged against a fund of this nature; it should be charged against consolidated revenue. As far as the Bill is concerned, I'm going to vote for the Bill on second reading, although there is one thing that I do think that we should keep our thoughts on and that is this, that I don't consider for one moment that the statutory coverage that we have in Manitoba today, including the coverage under the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, is adequate. \$35,000 is not enough. And I think that we should aim our sights towards not only having a statutory coverage of at least \$100,000 but also the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund should be raised to the same amount. It's the only way that we're going to ensure that victims of accidents are going to be properly compensated, because the courts today, if a person is seriously injured \$35,000 doesn't go very far, and considering too the costs that are involved in hospitalization and so on and so forth, there's very little of that \$35,000 left when you pay out your special damages. And I think that we should seriously consider increasing not only the statutory amounts of insurance that have had to be carried under the Highway Traffic Act, but also the amount that's recoverable under the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I was just going to say I would be closing the debate if I spoke now. In case other honourable members wish to make any comment perhaps an adjournment could be taken by somebody else. If not, I'm prepared to adjourn, to look at the questions that have been asked on all sides of the House about the Bill, and then to close the debate by attempting to answer some of them.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LYON: I move then, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Provincial Treasurer, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you'd be good enough now to call the motion for Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for Arthur in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department of Welfare. Committee proceed. Resolution 116, we were on

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, last night I was going to question -- are you on (f) or (g)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f).

MR. SHOEMAKER: You closed (f), did you? Did you call (g)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I hadn't called (g); I'm calling (g) now then.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well it was on (g) that I was going to make a comment because the Honourable Minister did supply us with the information that I requested on (f), but in doing so I noticed that there was an amount there of \$40,000 for bursaries. Now how does it differentiate from the \$1,000 on bursaries for social work under (g)? That is, this \$40,000 on bursaries under (f), \$9,000 for bursaries under (g).

And I note Mr. Chairman, that under (g) it's down \$2,000 from last year. That's rather difficult to comprehend in light of the fact that we have many many more social workers than we had even three or four years ago and no doubt we will require a great number more social workers in the almost immediate future, and it would seem to me that the whole purpose of having social work bursaries - that's the term used here - is to encourage more men and women to enter into this field. Certainly \$9,000 in bursaries doesn't seem to me as if we'll

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd).... go very far in this particular area. I wonder if my honourable friend the Minister would care to comment on this subject.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Yes, Mr. Chairman, the bursary item that's included here is largely for students who have not entered the employment of the Department of Welfare. They're students who have completed their university training and who are prepared to go on to take social work training beyond the graduate level, and the reason it's down is that there haven't been that many people who have been interested in accepting our bursaries to require the additional amount that was provided last year. I would like to say, however, that most of the people who have come into the department as welfare workers - probably graduate students who are wanting to spend a year or two in employment before proceeding on for their further training - most of these people proceed on educational leave, which is an item shown elsewhere in the estimates of the government.

The item that was mentioned earlier is an item that's provided to the various Children's Aid Societies who have employees on their staff who are interested in going back for educational leave in the same way that most of our staff members return for additional training as well.

There were one or two other items that possibly I should mention very quickly because I did undertake to provide additional information. With respect to the question raised by the member for Hamiota with respect to the deficit of the various day nurseries in the metropolitan area. We pay nothing towards these deficits as I indicated last night. Apparently the municipalities don't either. There are some municipalities in the metropolitan area who do pay per diem rates for people who are getting assistance through the various municipal governments. I understand that the deficit, if there is any, is underwritten or assumed by the United Way who support all of these four institutions.

The Member for St. George raised a particular question about a husband on Old Age Security who got the additional \$30.00 supplement, his wife was on Old Age Assistance. Would this Old Age Assistance be cut down; and the answer as I indicated last night was I didn't think she would be. The answer is that she wouldn't be unless, of course, they had some other income which raised their total income for the two beyond \$2,200.00.

I have an answer, too, with respect to the rates for the Jewish Child and Family Service. Prior to 1963 this agency, which is one of the smaller agencies in Manitoba, was getting the average per diem rate that was allocated to the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg, it being a very large society. By way of comparison of actual expenditures of that department, the Jewish Child and Family Service in 1966 had 9,119 days care provided by that agency. In group homes or in institutions they provided 5,058 days care, or 55.47 percent of their days care was in the high cost institutions and these institutions accounted for 77 percent of the total cost of the agency service. In the year 1967, the estimates that are before us, the cost of service to children in group homes and in institutions is 84 percent of their total budget, compared with the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg who provide something like 425,000 days of care in a year, have only 12 percent of their cases in institutions or in group foster homes, and in spite of the fact that it is a very small percentage it still accounts for a very high percentage of the cost in the Children's Aid Society because they're paying approximately 42 percent of the total cost of that agency on behalf of the 12 percent that are in these high cost institutions. So that we have the Jewish Child and Family Service paying twice as much in terms of their total budget percentage-wise as the City of Winnipeg for the more difficult cases that they have, and this accounts for the higher per diem allowance for this particular agency.

I think that covers most of the questions that were raised, Mr. Chairman, that I had undertaken to provide answers for.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, what's the difference between a means and a needs test?

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, in looking at item 2.(g) Social Work Bursaries, in order to consider this I feel that we should know how many social workers there are on staff in the Department of Welfare; and secondly, is the number of social workers employed by the Department adequate?

MR. CARROLL: And again I could -- oh, incidentally, I'm glad you mentioned that because I did provide some information for the Member for Lakeside last night that was inaccurate. He asked how many were on staff in the Department of Welfare Services; I believe I indicated 393. There are actually only 363. I gave the figure that was in the estimates book. However, I found on checking that that was in error. I can't answer the question as to how many fully trained and qualified social workers we have at the moment. I'd be very pleased

(MR. CARROLL cont'd) to get that information for you.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, well could the Honourable Minister give us some indication as to whether the number, whatever it may be, is it or is it not adequate to perform the services that this Department is intended to provide?

MR. CARROLL: Well we're performing the services now. Presumably we're doing it satisfactorily. I'm not saying it couldn't be done better because we're not perfect in this Department of Welfare. We'd like to be and we're aiming at perfection; unfortunately we fall somewhat short on occasions but we are trying to improve the quality of service that we're giving. I understand that we have quite a satisfactory ratio between the professionally trained staff, the fully qualified graduates of the School of Social Work, and the other staff. Incidentally, as you may know we're getting students through the course in Brandon, Welfare Worker's Course, in which they get twelve months' intensive social work training. They won't be as highly qualified as the others but certainly they're going to be well able to take care of more difficult cases than those who have not had this kind of -- any kind of social work training at all. I don't know the exact percentage of social workers but I will get that. I understand it's something like 24 percent, which is a fairly high percentage of fully qualified workers.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Did I understand the Honourable Minister to say that his Department is short of social workers?

MR. CARROLL: Our establishment calls for more social workers, more professional social workers, than we have been able to fill, and I think you'll find most agencies in the same position. So you fill it with someone who isn't quite as well qualified and they do the best job they can and in most cases do a very satisfactory job, but we're still trying to encourage some of those. The Member for Gladstone pointed up one of the -- at least described the situation of an individual who had come on staff on a probationary basis with the understanding that he would eventually go back and take his social work training. When it came time I understand he didn't want to go back for one reason or another. He wasn't asked to leave the Department at all; the position was still open to him. However, he chose to enter some other field of endeavour. We try to get university graduates. We want to give them the grounding in the welfare field. We try to encourage them by educational leave and subsidy to go back to university to become fully qualified.

MR. HANUSCHAK: In the light of that, Mr. Chairman, could the Honourable Minister explain the reason for the reduction in the allowance for social work bursaries from \$11,000 to \$9,000? If there is still a need for more social workers, why the reduction?

MR. CARROLL: This is not -- this isn't reduced because we don't want to be able to give more, it's just that in fact we haven't been able to find more people at the university who want to go into the course in social work. These are bursaries that are granted to students who are not working with our Department but students that we are trying to encourage to go on to the School of Social Work to take this kind of training and bursaries are available to them -- I understand they run around \$350.00 or \$400.00. But this is not the same as the educational leave that is being provided to our present staff to encourage them to go back and take their training, and we'd be glad to increase this amount providing we had the approval of the Treasurer and providing we could get the students to take the training. We voluntarily reduced this in our estimates because frankly we haven't been able to find enough students to take advantage of the money that's presently available.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, what my honourable friend is saying is, while they are short of social workers on the one hand, bursaries have not attracted them into this particular field. Well then, something should be done to upgrade the type of bursary. I mean if there's something wrong -- you recognize on the one hand there is a shortage; you say on the other hand what we're doing is not attracting them in; well let's devise some way of encouraging them to come in. It's an admission that there's something wrong that has not yet been coped with, and it seems to me that the time to attract any group into a particular field is when they're young, when they're leaving high school and considering a vocation, well perhaps not for life but considering a vocation for a period of time, this is the time to attract them into the area.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on that. I would like to say that one way to attract good young people into the profession is to try giving the profession a little better name and not devising in this House to say that social workers are doing a bad job, they're giving money to people who don't know how to spend it, and that these things are being abused. I think one reason why the profession has not had a good name is that there are so

(MR. CARROLL cont'd). . . . many people willing to run down the profession of social work, to run down people who are getting assistance, and the whole thing seems to have a stigma or a dirty name attached to it. I think this is a real good profession and I would think that we should try to look for some of the positive features in it rather than all of the negative features that many in this House seem to try to do.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Can the Honourable Minister think of other ways of attracting graduates into the field of social work, such as in the area of salary?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (g)--passed; (h)--passed. Resolution 116--passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I regret I wasn't here at the opening of the discussion on Resolution 116. I'll be very brief in my comments. I haven't spoken on this Department yet.

I just want to appeal to the Minister again on three points. One of them is the amount that people who are on social allowance are allowed to earn. I've had a number of cases, for example, where widows with children and all they're allowed to earn is \$20.00 over and above the allowance. Now it seems to me that we should have more leeway here. I realize it's difficult to have exceptions to cases but surely the purpose of welfare is to rehabilitate people, and in those areas where they are prepared and want to go to work we should give them every encouragement to do so, and it seems to me that we could work out a program where they would be allowed to keep a larger amount and bit by bit become self-sufficient, because many of them would much rather be completely on their own but they can't simply make that transition. It would mean then a scheduled program whereby they would be encouraged to earn and then conceivably get on their own. Now this would mean, it seems to me, a decision by the Department, which I think should be taken in any case, to decentralize the operations of the Welfare Department. It is extremely difficult in rural Manitoba to proceed with rehabilitation programs and special work with cases when the social workers are concentrated in centers; for example, like Portage la Prairie or Dauphin. They have a large area to cover. It's impossible for the social worker to be working directly with the individual cases and providing that rehabilitation and redevelopment which I think is essential in the proper development of our welfare in the province. So I would urge the Minister to look at the possibility of decentralization of the workers. Let's get the workers down where the welfare work is. Let's get them down at the level where the welfare cases are, and working directly with them.

This then leads me to the third particular point that I would like the Minister to consider, and that is local committees and local participation. I'm not suggesting that we should turn the administration back to the councils or to local committees, but I do think that there should be much better coordination between councils and the Welfare Department. And there are a number of cases - and I think the Minister is aware of them - where municipalities have not been consulted. He has received letters of which I have received copies, complaining that the welfare workers are going in and not consulting at all with the local authorities. I think again that this is a weakness in the program, that for proper rehabilitation and proper control that it would work better working, where there is a council, through the council at least on a consultant basis, and where there is no council in the local government district, considering the possibility of a local committee, not to administer but to consult with.

MR. CARROLL: I think that's a very constructive suggestion. We don't have any formal liaison with council, mayors, etc. We do try to establish local contact with people who happen to know the various cases with which we're working. I've gone a step further in my thinking along this line. I think we should be helping municipalities with their own cases and acting as consultants to the municipalities where they have difficult cases, and this is something that's fairly new and I would hope that we may be able to lend some mutual assistance between our Department and the municipalities, and I hope that we can work much more closely together in the future.

With respect to the incentive programs, all I can say is, please tell your friends in Ottawa to get that section under the Canada Assistance Plan dealing with work activity programs underway, because we've been pressing for a good long time to be able to have this kind of a constructive approach to welfare programs, and of course at the present time it's held up because there are no regulations dealing with this particular matter and I think it has a great many possibilities in it.

Now with respect to further decentralization. One of the problems that arises in going beyond, say, the larger municipalities is that, supposing you were going to establish somebody for instance in the community of Winnipegosis; it's been requested. Well, as you know,

(MR. CARROLL cont'd)... in our Dauphin Office we do have a fairly high turnover of staff, people who change from time to time. It's difficult, to begin with, to get a person to go into a smaller community, particularly if it doesn't have all the facilities. Secondly, when that person leaves, then you've lost contact with those cases within the community and it may take a few months before you can re-establish that contact because you have to get somebody else to fill that position. Where you are operating out of a larger office, for instance the Dauphin office in this case, usually within the Dauphin office, because they do case work, group discussions and things of that kind, the office itself knows a great deal about the cases, for instance within the Winnipegosis area, and if for one reason or another a worker is sick or away or leaves, then somebody else can pick up the case files and continue on and you have more continuity than you would have if the other system were tried. Now we've tried the other and it hasn't worked satisfactorily. We're only an hour out of the community of Winnipegosis, for instance, so we're trying to keep close local contact with people, and I hope that we're being successful in most cases. I would like to thank the Leader of the Opposition for some constructive comments on our departmental activities.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to extend the debate, but I'd say to the Minister insofar as his saying Ottawa hasn't moved, that doesn't prevent him from moving in the area where he has responsibilities. Let's not blame Ottawa for what we can do ourselves.

Secondly, on the decentralization, I recognize the problem that the Minister has in this, but, Mr. Chairman, unless we move in this direction, I fear - and I can speak here from an area which I know very well - that we are not in fact going to have rehabilitation; we are going to have a persistent welfare problem which is not desirable insofar as the individuals themselves are concerned and I would like to see us moving to get these people back into the stream of life. The Community Development Services were designed for that purpose; these were designed specifically for Indian and Metis people.

The same approach I think is necessary in other areas as well, but it cannot be done, Mr. Chairman, by someone who lives 60 or 100 miles away and then he comes into the community, has a heavy caseload to begin with, is harried and pushed back and forth, it's just impossible to have rehabilitation on that basis. I think it must be done on the local basis. I would think that maybe we can have local groups, whether they be service clubs or church groups, who would undertake to work with this on a rehabilitation program, but it must be decentralized.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I would give support to what the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition has said. I too believe in centralization and that if we don't do this our costs will just continue to rise and there will be no control over this --(Interjection)-- Yes, it's the same thing - sure, centralization costs more - centralization costs more, there's no doubt about this.

The other point is what type of liaison is the department carrying on with the municipalities. Are they informed of the cases that are receiving assistance in their municipalities?

MR. CARROLL: No, Mr. Chairman, we respect the confidentiality of our contacts with people. We certainly do consult with local people with respect to cases where we want advice, where we have to seek advice for various reasons. I think we've gone a long way towards centralization -- or decentralization. I think we're going to go a little bit further before we're finished, particularly in under-developed areas. I think this is where our concentration will have to be, in those areas where the need is the greatest. Unfortunately, we aren't going to be able to service every little community in Manitoba, but we have gone a very long way toward meeting the local needs at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 116--passed; Resolution 117--passed; Resolution No. 118-5 (a)--

MR. MOLGAT: On this item, I wonder if I might just speak very briefly on the question of housing in the areas covered by the Community Development Services. There's been a housing survey undertaken by the group that produced this Newsletter and which have a conference every year here - The Annual Indian and Metis Conference. They've asked the various areas in the province to have a local survey as to the problems in the area. I'm sure the Minister has seen them - I'm not going to run over all of them. There's one case, for example, the area of Amaranth near the Sandy Bay Reserve where the survey there showed seven homes with 51 people, an average of seven per home, all log, the largest one is three rooms, none of them have indoor facilities of any kind. This goes on and on at every one of the points pretty well.

Now some years ago the government embarked on a program at MacGregor, and I

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd), . . . understood then from the Minister that he was prepared to proceed with this program in other areas of the province. Last year I spoke on this subject regarding the federal program that had been developed as a pilot project in Saskatchewan. I understand that the Federal Government have now indicated they are prepared - some time ago in fact - to proceed with similar projects in Manitoba. What does the government have in mind regarding this particular program?

MR. CARROLL: Well, we are certainly very much aware of the need and there have been some discussions with Ottawa. I believe that I might at this stage possibly refer to my colleague the Minister of Urban Development who will be handling this sort of thing in the future. I understand that there will be a housing act coming before the House to make this kind of thing possible in the future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 118--passed; Resolution 119--(a)--passed; (b)--passed; (c)--

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, under (c), the grants of \$763,000. Could we have a more itemized statement on this?

MR. CARROLL: Do you want to know the projects that are contemplated for the year ahead or a report on what happened last year? The projects that are under consideration for the coming year are Birtle, Brandon Legion, Carberry, Gladstone, Grandview, Hartney, Lundar, Melita, St. Pierre, Steinbach, Transcona Kiwanis, Brandon Fairview --(Interjection)-- I want to thank my honourable friend but part of the cost of that is in next year's estimates because of the way in which we are paying out our grants now on an annual interest and principal basis - Brandon Fairview, Carman, Dauphin, Convalescent Home, Salvation Army, Park Manor, YWCA; and others here, these are in stages of negotiation, not all of them have been approved - Dominion City, Emerson, Hamiota, Wawanesa, St. Vital Kinsmen, Neepawa Osborne House, Portage la Prairie Rotary, St. George, First Mennonite Church, Legion Gardens, Morden, Middlechurch Holy Family Home, Hospice Tache, Jewish Old Folks Home and Gimli. These are some of the ones that are under active negotiation at the present time and there are probably others in addition to this that may have been missed, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 119--passed; Department of Welfare--passed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, before the committee rises, might I get the confirmation from the Honourable the Leader of the House where we go from here - again?

MR. LYON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The proposal as we announced some days ago is that we move next to the Department of Tourism & Recreation and there's a small vote for Northern Affairs for the Northern Commissioner, and then after that the Department of Highways. I presume that honourable members don't want me to start on Tourism and Recreation right now, so I'll move the committee rise. Tourism and Recreation next.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker.

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

IN SESSION

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30. The House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30.