

DAILY INDEX

Tuesday, March 22, 1960, 2:30 P.M.

<u>Introduction of Bills: No. 129, re Treasury Act (Mr. Roblin)</u>	1819
<u>Committee Report: Private Bills (Mr. Smellie)</u>	1819
Municipal Affairs (Mr. Christianson)	1819
<u>Resolutions: re Fuel Tax (Mr. Roblin)</u>	1819
Re Superannuation (Mr. Evans)	1820
Re Hospital Borrowing (Mr. Roblin)	1821
<u>Second Readings: Bills 24, 25, 111, 115</u>	1822
<u>Bill 117 re Municipal Act (Mr. Ridley): Mr. Reid</u>	1822
Mr. Prefontaine, Mr. Ridley	1823
<u>Bills 101, 109, 85, re Denturists (Mr. Groves): Ruling by Mr. Speaker</u>	1823
Mr. Stanes	1824
Mr. Paulley, Mr. Johnson (Gimli)	1825
Mr. Paulley	1826
Mr. Johnson (Assiniboia)	1830
Mr. Seaborn, Mr. Gray	1831
Mr. Scarth	1832
Mr. Desjardins	1834
Mr. Orlikow	1835
Mrs. Forbes, Mr. Shewman, Mr. Molgat	1836
Mr. Froese, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Johnson (Gimli)	1837
Mr. Prefontaine, Mr. Lyon	1839
Mr. Hawryluk	1840
Mr. Groves	1841
Mr. Hutton	1844
Mr. Tanchak	1845

Separate Sitting, Tuesday, March 22, 8:00 P.M.

<u>Introduction of Bills: No. 134, re Workmens Compensation (Mr. Carroll)</u>	1847
<u>Third Reading of Bills: Nos. 26, 11, 54, 55, 63, 88, 90, 93, 95, 97, 10, 71, 72, 73</u>	1849
<u>Bill 79 re 45th Battalion: Mr. Cowan, Mr. Lissaman</u>	1849
Mr. Hillhouse, Mr. Scarth, Mr. Smellie, Mr. Hryhorczuk	1850
Mr. Corbett, Mr. Lissaman	1851
<u>Bills 84, 86, 87, 91, 92, 22, 23, 24, 25</u>	1851
<u>Second Reading: Bill 85, re Denturists (Mr. Groves): Mr. Campbell</u>	1852
Mr. Martin	1855
Division on Amendment, Division on 2nd Reading	1856
<u>Adjourned Debate re Rules of House (Mr. Lyon): Mr. Roberts</u>	1858
Mr. Orlikow	1860
Discussion re Adjournment	1861
<u>Committee of Supply: Budget: Mr. Paulley</u>	1863
Mr. Scarth, Mr. Alexander	1866
<u>Resolution re Brandon College (Mr. Lissaman)</u>	1867

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, March 22nd, 1960.

Opening prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees

Notice of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Committee of the Whole House.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Public Utilities)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Minister of Health and Public Welfare that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution; resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act by providing for an increase in the compensation that may be paid to, or in respect of, a dependent mother of a deceased workman.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole House.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member for St. Matthews please take the Chair?

MR. CARROLL: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution recommends it to the House.

Mr. Chairman presented the motion.

MR. CARROLL: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is a matter which has been brought to the attention of the government on several occasions by some of the labour groups. The last one that I recall was the Manitoba Federation of Labour that asked for this particular amendment to be included among changes in Workmen's Compensation Act and we feel that it's one that will provide for those cases where a wholly dependent mother is left as a result of an accident. She would then be able to receive compensation from the Board. At the present time compensation is not payable under these circumstances.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted?

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF)(Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I just want to say we welcome this on behalf of the government. I'd just like to ask the Minister whether he can give us any information at this time as to how this will apply. Now it's my understanding that insofar as compensation is concerned, that on the statutes at the present time there is some provision with, I believe, a maximum of \$30 a month, in some cases where a dependent has become deceased as a result of an industrial accident. I'm wondering whether or not if the Minister can tell us or whether he would prefer to answer this when the Bill is introduced, whether the compensation will be based on the earnings of the individual who is the deceased or whether or not this will simply be a stated amount as is listed in some of the rules of the Compensation Board?

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Chairman, there are two questions I'd like to ask the Minister. First of all, is this all that is in the Act? And secondly, I've heard the expression before from the Minister that the labour groups have pointed this out and requested it, that since the Workmen's Compensation Board are literally in the position of trustees of employers' funds, I would like to know were employers consulted on this.

MR. CARROLL: If there are no further questions, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the amount to which is to be paid to wholly dependent mothers is the same as the allowance which would be paid to a widow. I believe that's in my understanding of it, which is a fixed amount and not dependent upon the workman's earnings. Yes, this has been discussed with some of the employer groups at least. I can't say that they were all consulted but I know that it has been mentioned to representatives of the Canadian Manufacturers Association and I believe also to certain representatives of the Chamber of Commerce. I don't know whether the Builders Exchange--I don't know whether it was discussed with that group or not. However, at least two of the employer groups were aware of this particular amendment.

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

(Mr. Chairman, cont'd.) . . Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House has adopted a certain resolution and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

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

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and following a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. CARROLL introduced Bill No. 134, an Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act for first reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Minister of Education)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct your attention and the attention of the House to a group of 25 Scouts who are in the gallery to your immediate left. The Scouts are members of the 54th Scout Troup; they are here tonight under the leadership of their Scout Master, Mr. A. W. Garbutt. I'm certain that we would like to express to them, Mr. Speaker, our welcome and appreciation of them coming to witness our proceedings and to hope that they will enjoy their stay with us.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, as one of those who in his earlier days had the honour and the privilege of being a Boy Scout, and to learn the true significance of the three fingers extended to the skies, may I join in the welcome to these shiny faced young citizens of Manitoba. And may I express the hope that in the years to come, that some of the representatives of that great organization in the Province of Manitoba will have the opportunity such as I have tonight of sitting in this Chamber. Because I am sure that the members of the House will agree that the training that a Boy Scout receives fits him well to be a member of this august Assembly.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition)(Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, as one who did not have the opportunity of receiving instruction from the fine courses that the Boy Scouts receive, I too, would like to pay tribute to that fine organization. I got a good bit of the instruction second-hand though, Mr. Speaker, because my three sons belonged to it, and I heartily endorse the things that my honourable friend the Leader of the CCF has said regarding the excellent training. But as well as that, I'd like to say this, young folks get a lot of their training because they have to get it. The people who are in charge of the Boy Scout work, the leader who is up there tonight, the ones who work at this throughout the year, in season and out of season, they sure deserve a big hand too. I don't know of a more dedicated group of people than those who continue to carry on that splendid work. And while I would like to endorse what the honourable Leader of the CCF has said about hoping that some of these boys will some day come to sit in this Chamber, I hope that they won't follow in his tradition and talk as often and as long as he does, because I hope he didn't get that training there.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to inform the House, this afternoon a beautiful box was delivered to me by some unknown friend, and in it contained a most beautiful white rat and at the present I am looking for a home for adoption for this rat and I was wondering if the Leader of the CCF would care to adopt this rat for the next four years? I also heard this afternoon that in this Chamber we had two beautiful cats. It's too bad that I didn't know at the time that I had the rat here that the cats were in the Chamber, because I don't think it would have been much worse than the debate that we had this afternoon.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I say to my honourable friend that it's true that we did have some cats in here and let me assure my honourable friend, although it's only figuratively speaking, the cats on this side will eventually swallow up the rats.

MR. SPEAKER: If animals were in the Chamber no one informed the Speaker who should have--

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table of the House the report of the Minimum Wage Board.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Committee of the Whole House.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the following Bills as listed on the Order Paper.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member for St. Matthews please take the Chair?

Bills Nos. 26, 11, 54, 55, 63, 88, 90, 93, 95, 97, 10, 71, 72, were read section by section and passed; Bill No. 73, sections 1 to 14, were read.

MR. M. A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, under Section 11--a corporation may operate any industry. Does it mean the gardens around the sanatorium? Or perhaps it means that they could open up a mill industry and have the patients work. Can I get an explanation of 11? Who is the sponsor of the Bill?--(interjection)--

Bill No. 73, was read section by section and passed; Bill No. 79, sections 1 to 2 (d) were read.

MR. JAMES COWAN (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Chairman, in section 3 of Bill No. 79, we are being asked to validate all acts which have been done by the trustees. Now, Mr. Chairman, we do not know what the trustees have done. When you go to court usually, and get a release, you get a release for trustees, quite often from the court. Well the judge examines the accounts and he asks questions of the trustees and he goes over them with notice given to parties concerned and so on. And when he gives a release to the trustees he knows what he is doing. He knows what the trustees have done and he can justify the release. But here we are being asked to validate all the acts of the trustees and we don't know what they've done. It is true that there are two precedents for this. Two bills have been passed by this House before with similar sections, but just because two bills have had this section in them before doesn't make it right. Wrong is wrong though all the world be wrong. And so I think that we should look at this very carefully. Now the member for Brandon, the Honourable Member for Brandon has said that if we pass this Act the money will be paid out and the trustees won't have any money on hand to make good any deficiency that might have taken place. But if the deficiency has taken place through the fault of the trustees they couldn't use that money anyway for the purpose of making good a deficiency that has occurred through their fault. They couldn't use that money for that purpose anyway. If the trustees have done everything that they should have done, and I am quite sure they have, but I don't know for sure because there had been no accounting to this House, if they have done everything that's right they have nothing to fear. But, if by some chance, some trustee has put \$1,000 in his pocket or done something wrong which ordinarily is a crime in this country, we are, by passing this section, we are saying it is perfectly OK; we're saying it's perfectly all right for that trustee to have done it, because by passing this section we validate all the acts of the trustees. Now there is no need for this section being in here and we are being asked to do something of which we don't know the background of it and we have no reason, no reason to be including this particular section in this Act. And I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital that section 3 be deleted and that the present section 4 be renumbered as section 3.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre that section 3 be deleted and that the present section 4 be renumbered as section 3.

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Chairman, I must protest the amendment to remove this. As I pointed out to the House and to committee, and also I should like to tell the members of committee here, that the vote in committee this morning was overwhelming to leave the clause in. Precedence has been established in the past and I think it's a gesture of goodwill to men who have been entrusted with funds over the years, who have met every audit and every condition required of them. This fund if left could go on 'till all have died and passed away. I may be wrong but it seems to occur to me that when the Red River Relief Fund monies were turned over some such clause as this was given to assure the trustees that they would be free of any obligation that might have been felt to exist. I think it's just a good decent gesture, and I might say, if you look back in the Act, if you care to read the Act, pointing out on line 31 starting: "The trustees from time to time thereunder to be the sole and absolute judges as to whether or not a case is deserving of consideration or assistance, trustees being empowered in their absolute discretion to make such portion of the trust funds as they might think from time to time for the general benefits of all non-commissioned officers and men". And then further down, "and to submit their books of accounts to the inspection of any qualified person or persons to be appointed by the senior surviving officer of the 45th Battalion or a committee of not less than 20 of its members". Now, Mr. Chairman, every possible means has been taken all the way through in trying to come to an understanding of what to do to dispose of these funds, and this I might say, in my opinion, is a very worthy means of disposing of these funds. The funds

(Mr. Lissaman, cont'd)... are to be divided evenly among The Manitoba Heart Foundation, The Shriners Hospital for Crippled Children, Canadian Arthritic and Rheumatic Society and The Canadian Cancer Society. This section has been included in Acts before by this Legislature. I would urge that it be left in here. Personally if I were in the position of a trustee and especially since there were earlier trustees who have died and passed on, I would like to feel that having managed these funds to the best of my ability then those who took upon themselves to give me the authority to dispose of funds, I would like to see them give me some good gesture of goodwill such as included in section 3 of this Act, Mr. Chairman, and I would urge--especially in view of the committee this morning being overwhelmingly in favour of leaving section 3 in the Act--I would strongly urge that this committee support the recommendations of the committee this morning.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Honourable Member for Brandon in his submission. I think that this would be a very poor way of showing gratitude to men for work which they have done on a voluntary basis. And I would ask the members to look at page three of the Bill, particularly the last section and the preamble which recites: "And whereas at a meeting of the members of the 45th Battalion held at the City of Brandon in Manitoba on the 19th day of September 1959, it was resolved that the trustees be empowered to seek legislation to change the terms of the Trust Agreement and to provide that after all current obligations and expenses including legal expenses have been paid, the balance of the trust fund be divided among," and it goes on to state. Now my submission is this, Mr. Chairman. At that meeting an opportunity must have been given to the members of that association to look into the standing of the Trust Accounts and if they were satisfied that nothing out of the way had been done, why should this Legislature now challenge the very men for whose benefit that trust was created?

Now another point which I would like to raise is this: That these men who are now trustees of this fund, the only way that they can get a discharge--they can't get one through the courts; it would be too cumbersome; it would be too lengthy and it would cost too much money. The same procedure was followed by the trustee of the Red River Valley Flood Fund and that was the reason why they came to this Legislature and they were given the same release as these gentlemen are asking for in this bill. But there is one thing that I'd like to point out to the members of the committee and that is this, that if that release is not given to these men by this bill it will be impossible to wind up their estates at any time because there will be an outstanding covenant against that estate. And the only people who can give a discharge of that covenant is this Legislature and I submit that the position of the Honourable Member for Brandon is well taken and he should be given support in it.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member tell us what covenant would be outstanding, because they're holding money in trust under a trust agreement?

MR. W. B. SCARTH, Q. C. (River Heights): Mr. Chairman, I heartily agree with both the Honourable Member for Brandon and for Selkirk. The survivors of the First War are fast diminishing and the very fact that they had \$900 as of some time last year indicates a fairly well run canteen fund and I submit that we pass this without question.

MR. R. G. SMELLIE (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Chairman, we are asked to give a discharge as members of this Legislature to the trustees, and surely the Honourable Member for Selkirk or the Honourable Member for River Heights will agree that if any court was asked to give a discharge the court would insist first upon the opportunity to examine the books of accounts. And they suggest that surely an opportunity has been given to the S. . . . Trust to Examine the books of the trustee; but there is no evidence whatsoever before this Legislature that the books have been audited, or that they have been examined, or that the opportunity has been given, and I would suggest, Sir, that before I will be a party to a discharge such as is required here that that opportunity and the opportunity to examine those books or at least evidence of some nature that the conditions of the trust have been maintained and lived up to by the trustees must be before this Legislature. And I would heartily support the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in his amendment.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Chairman, just a word. I was in committee this morning and I was opposed to the deletion of section 3 and still am. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell just said that we should have some evidence to give us

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd.) . . assurance that the funds are in shape in order that there is nothing that could have happened, that should not have happened, and I would only say this, Mr. Chairman, that since the members of this organization as was told us this morning--and I didn't hear whether the Honourable Member for Brandon repeated it tonight or not--that every effort was made to have every member of this organization gather in the meeting and decide as to what to do with the remaining funds in this organization. And I think the best evidence you can have is the fact that the members unanimously agreed to the disposal of the funds in this manner. If there was any doubt as to what had gone on previously or as to the behaviour of past trustees or the present trustees, then certainly that membership would not have asked for this particular type of bill. Technically, the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre may be right, but it has been pointed out quite plainly that unless we give these gentlemen the release they ask for, then it is in all likelihood there will be no release granted to them; that these men to whom these funds belong will not be in a position to dispose of them as they see fit or as they wish. And I really don't see too much in the objections that have been raised and I'll certainly oppose the amendment.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, insofar as the balance of this trust fund is concerned, section 2 of this bill will authorize the disposition in the manner requested by the survivors of the 45th Battalion, and a discharge will be given to the trustees insofar as that portion of this canteen fund is concerned; but we are asked by this section to ratify all the acts of the trustees prior to this time. Now the Honourable Member for Selkirk has mentioned that the trustees of this fund have an outstanding covenant which we know nothing of in this Bill. It is not mentioned here. No mention is made in the bill of the prior trustees. What of their estates and where did they get their discharge? This covers only the present trustees, and I am not suggesting, Sir, that these men have done anything wrong. I wouldn't like anyone to think that I would make such a suggestion; but we are asked without any evidence before us to give them a blanket discharge and I don't think it's right in principle.

MR. A. H. CORBETT (Swan River): I'm very presumptuous to get tangled up with a bunch of these legal gentlemen, but I happen to know quite a large number of the members of the 45th Battalion and that fund was brought back to Canada I guess about 1919, and it's been handled and administered for the welfare and help that they could give to the various members of the 45th Battalion and I am quite sure, I'm definitely sure--though I can't produce evidence which, when I'm dealing with these legal gentlemen I should have two or three witnesses at my side--but I'm quite sure that those accounts were audited every year by competent men to the satisfaction of the men involved, and I'm quite sure if there had been any defaultations or such like they would have occurred long before this period and if it's a matter of just disposing of these funds and getting rid of them, whether it's legal or not, I'd say forget the legality of it as far as that is concerned and consider the humanity of the thing. The trustees wish to be relieved of an obligation as they are getting to be old men now and they want to be rid of it and they're devoting it to a good cause. I think all these legal technicalities are a bunch of "bosh".

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Clerk has just handed me an affidavit in the matter of the 45th Battalion Trust Fund. "I, Thomas B. Lane of the City of Brandon," so on and so on,"(16), that I have checked over the records of the said trust fund and in my opinion all receipts and expenditures for the said fund are in order and are as indicated in the said records and the balance of the said trust fund found at the present time consists thereof; cash in the bank--\$936.93; Dominion of Canada Bonds at par value--\$3,500, Sworn before me in the City of Brandon in the Province of Manitoba this 8th day of January," and so on. Now the Honourable Member for Selkirk pointed out to you this clause which gives the authority for this action, the disposal of these funds, and I would submit to this committee that at the time this authority was given to the trustees by the remainder of the battalion that should right there be proof enough for anyone in this House that everything was in a proper state of affairs, and I'll read again the words the Honourable Member for Selkirk read: "And whereas at a meeting of the members of the 45th Battalion held at the City of Brandon, Manitoba on the 19th day of September 1959, it was resolved that the trustees be empowered to seek legislation to change the terms of the Trust Agreement and to provide that after all current obligations and expenses, including legal expenses, have been paid the balance of the trust fund to be divided among the" and then it goes on to name the four charities. Personally, Mr. Chairman, this is good enough for me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ready for the question? The motion, moved by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre that section 3 be deleted, that the present section 4 be renumbered as section 3. Those in favour--

MR. COWAN: Mr. Chairman, just one thing I wanted to point out, that the statement read that everything was correct was by Thomas B. Lane who is one of the trustees. It certainly didn't say that, and it pointed out that there's no discharge here being given to previous trustees, and if these trustees have done nothing wrong, as I'm sure is the case, they have nothing to worry about. But we shouldn't be asked to say that everything they've done is validated; everything they've done is all right.

Mr. Chairman presented the motion and following a voice vote declared the motion lost.

Bill No. 79, section 3 and 4 were read and passed; Bills Nos. 84, 86, 87, 91, 92, 22, 23, 24 and 25, were read section by section and passed.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bills Nos. 26, 11, 54, 55, 63, 88, 90, 93, 95, 97, 10, 71, 72, 73, 74, 79, 84, 86, 87, 91, 92, 22, 23, 24 and 25 and directed me to report the same without amendments and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre the report of the Committee be received.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and following a voice vote declared the motion carried.

Bills Nos. 26, 11, 54, 55, 63, 88, 90, 93, 95, 97, 10, 71, 72, 73, 74, 79, 84, 86, 87, 91, 92, 22, 23, 24 and 25 were read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Vital and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Selkirk. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, it's a pretty usual way for honourable members of this Assembly to begin their speeches by saying, "I did not intend to speak on this Bill except for", etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. Well, I can be even worse than that on this occasion, because I can say quite honestly, Mr. Speaker, that I had determined not to speak on this Bill, because in the several times that a similar one has been before the House my views have become so well known that I had firmly decided that I would spare the House the penalty of listening to me expound them once again. But I simply couldn't resist the temptation as the debate waxed louder and longer this afternoon to decide to, once again, say a few words on this important subject. I was tempted to use the cliché this afternoon that we seem to be getting a good bit of bite into this matter of discussing the teeth. For a while the debate got, I think, a bit too acrimonious. I don't think there is any need of it becoming so acrimonious, because this is just one of the many public subjects that we are called upon in this House to make a decision on in what we believe to be the interests of the people of Manitoba. And there is no use--of course we shall argue about it--but there is no use and no need of us challenging one another's motives. I'm as willing to concede the honestly held opinions of the people who are on the other side of this question to what I am as I would want them to concede the honesty of my views on the matter. And as you can see already, Mr. Speaker, and as will appear more definitely when the vote is taken, our own group is by no means unanimous. We're not unanimous; we haven't been through the years. And yet that's no cause for great concern. I am sure that all of us in this group and I believe all of us in every group in the House, no matter how divergent our views, we still are honestly seeking for the same thing. We have different ways of going about it, but we are all looking for the same thing and that's what's in the interests of the people of Manitoba in the long run. So I don't think we need to have this challenging of one another's motives and that sort of thing. Why even the Honourable Member for Carillon, Mr. Speaker, was most gracious in being anxious to second my adjournment even though he holds views somewhat different to my own. And under the circumstances and after the years that we have debated this question both publicly and privately--I'm not speaking because I have any hope of changing his mind, or of those of any other members of the Assembly who hold the other view. What I am really speaking for is not with the hope of changing minds at this stage but of placing on record once again, as I have done some times before, the position that I have felt I should take on this matter.

Now it would be another kind of a corny expression if I said that: "mid technicians and

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) .. denturists there is no teeth like your own". But that would be the text that I would adopt for this discussion because I think that's the thing that we should keep most clearly in mind. There are no teeth, with all due respect to all the many people who can render a service, and I admit that all of them do, there are no teeth like the ones that nature equipped us with. And it's the job of the dentist to look after those teeth. He is the man who is in the position to do that, particularly with the young people, and that's needed more and more as the time goes on. And that's not to deny the beneficial work that the technicians and the denturists and others may perform; they all have their place. But I'm one that holds to the view that because the dentists are the really key-people in this situation, and because we have too few of them, and have had too few for many years, and will have too few for quite a few years yet--because of that, I hold to the view that they are the ones that we should give major consideration to, not in their personal interest--and not because of them as individuals, but because of the contribution that they are able to make to the people of this province. And because of that I also hold to the view that we should, and I don't use the word protection; I don't mean to say that we should protect them; I say though that we should protect the public by seeing to it that these other people who can give excellent and desirable and needed service, that they should work in close co-operation--yes, and under the supervision of the dentists.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, if we agree, and I think we do, that we need more dentists--and goodness knows we do need them, particularly in the rural parts of Manitoba--if we agree that we need them, then how are we going to get them? And if we agree that the prices that the dentists are charging are very high--and they are high--how are we going to get those costs down unless we get more dentists? The only way to get them down the same as with doctors or lawyers or anybody else is to have more of them and then you can get those charges down to some extent. And so if we're going to get more of them who are needed, the same time we're going to get their costs reduced somewhat. If that's possible, we need more dentists. And, Mr. Speaker, that's why we have recently opened a Dental College in the City of Winnipeg. And that's why the government of two or three or four years back, I don't remember the date, that's why the government of that day decided that it would pledge a good bit of the taxpayers' money--I forget how much--and I have no doubt that it overran the expenditure. My experience was that nearly all these proposals overran the expenditures that was planned for them. But that's why we agreed at that time to establish a Dental College in the Province of Manitoba. And now we've got the dental college and I think it can make a great contribution by getting us these dentists that we need.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am also convinced, and I don't mind people disagreeing with me on this, but I am convinced that we will not enable that dental college to make its full contribution to the Province of Manitoba if we establish in partial competition with its graduates, people who have comparatively little training and qualifications compared with its graduates. It's just not fair to them to set up largely unqualified people, compared to them, in partial opposition to them, in my opinion. But apart from the unfairness, we want to get the dentists, and I don't think we will get the students to go in there unless we show from the legislative point of view that we mean what we say about the qualifications of people that can perform these services. And so, not for the protection of the dentists; they don't need any protection as far as they are concerned personally; they are doing fine, thank you; but for the protection of the public in the long run so that we get more dentists which we badly need, I think that we should not allow legislation of this kind to be put on the statute books.

And then, the only other thing that I have to say, Mr. Speaker, is to say that I regret the suggestions that have been made of the motives that are actuating the dentists. I don't think that there is any need for us to question the motives of any of these various bodies that are concerned here. I do not question the motives of any of the technicians or the denturists. They can perform a useful work. They are trained people--not trained in the way the dentists are, but they are trained people and they can perform a useful work in the right manner. And I don't think we should question the position of the dentists either. Because, Mr. Speaker, I had a great deal to do at the time that both members of this House and members of the dental profession were pressing the government of that day to establish a Dental College; I had a lot of meetings with the representatives of the dental fraternity. And, Mr. Speaker, if we were going to accept the suggestion that these dental representatives are actuated only by their own personal

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.)..... and financial motives then why would they be wanting a dental college set up in Manitoba. Why would they want to help to train more dentists to enter into competition with them if they were thinking only of their personal position? Why wouldn't they want to remain in the extremely favourable position they are in now? But in spite of that, just the same as members of this House urged the government of the day to establish a dental college here, no one spoke more frequently and with greater force than the dentists themselves pointing out the need, pointing out the fact that their age group was such that there just was going to be a shortage of dentists. And I, characteristically some will say, was hesitant about establishing a dental college here. No one will question that I suppose. I was hesitant about it because I said several times to those folks, "look, I don't think under these circumstances that we can staff a dental college here adequately and I think it's better to have good dental colleges in other parts of Manitoba where they are already established and have good ones there fully manned with highly trained instructors rather than setting up a dental college here that might be not top-flight." And do you know what changed me from that position? Mainly of course the great need for dentists; but in addition to that the thing that really influenced me was the dedication of the local dental people here, the local dentists here and the urgency with which they pressed upon the government of the day the need for a dental college here. And then the final straw as far as I was concerned was their undertaking that they would see to it that it was staffed, that they would see to it that it did not lack for first class personnel to carry on the training, because I had had that fear and had expressed it. And, Mr. Speaker, I think it's worth recording that there are some of the top-flight dentists of this province today, perhaps a dozen of them, certainly eight or nine or ten of them, giving freely of their time over there at the dental college at an honorarium that is only a tithe, if it's that, of what they could make engaging in the practice of their own profession. Mr. Speaker, there is just no point in challenging the motives of people of that kind.

And another thing, the three men who were because of their position on the executive, because of the position they held, three men -- three dentists that I came to know particularly well during that time, one of them is considerably older than I -- and most of the members know how old I am I guess-- one of them is considerably senior to me, and the other two are not much junior to that, and every one of the three of them, if I gave you their names you'll realize that, every one of the three of them is so well equipped with this world's goods that he doesn't have to work another day. No one of the three of them has to work another day, and yet they all are working just to carry on the profession that's so badly needed now. What interest have those men in protecting their profession in order to make more money? It isn't that. If it was that why would they be wanting to set up a college to bring more dentists in here. Of course it's not that. I make a bit of fun myself once in a while of the lawyers and the doctors and the engineers and the other professions. It is all clean fun to make a little fun of them, but they all, as I have come to know them, they all have pretty high ethics as professions when it comes down. Yes and the farmers have too. And some of the politicians have, particularly in one corner of the House. I won't be any more specific than that. But, Mr. Speaker, let's not, when we're debating a subject like this, let's not malign the members of any one of these groups. Every one of them is trying to do what it thinks to be right in the best way that it can. And I'd like to be able, in some way or another, for the House to be able to express its appreciation to every one of them. But I don't think that we should do that with any one group unless we honestly believe that it's for the good, the long-term good of the Province of Manitoba, of the people of Manitoba. And I cannot convince myself that it's to the advantage of the situation that we face in this province and will face for a long time yet, to pass this Bill. Because what we would be doing would be setting up in partial competition, a group of people who do not have the qualifications that they should have in order to work directly with the public. And so I come back to the principle that's been mentioned and debated many times in this House. I don't think that there is any point in sending a Bill to the Committee for further discussion for those of us who hold that view. It's in no antagonism whatever toward any group at all; it's with malice towards none that I say that I think this Bill should not be advanced.

But the amendment? I think the amendment offers some sensible alternatives. I think that these people with the training and the benefit of the training that they have got now, that

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.)....if they would take some further training according to qualifications set up by the university that is the appropriate body to set up such qualifications, then I think they could work in as a useful, very useful arm of this profession, but I would say again in close co-operation with -- yes, and I think under the supervision of the fully trained people. And so, Mr. Speaker, I hope that I never have to speak on this Bill again. I've spoken on it too often already perhaps but I didn't want, after the things that were said in the House this afternoon, I didn't want at that time to see a final decision made so far as the House was concerned on this Bill without once again re-stating my position on this matter, and I hope that an arrangement can be made so that all of these people can contribute their full share to a profession that is badly in need of all the personnel that we can get. I do not agree with the sponsor of the Bill when he says that if this Bill fails of passage that there would not be a place found for the people who are mainly interested in it. These folks that we're talking about, their feelings perhaps run a little higher at times as matters like this are under discussion, just as they do at times in the House here. We get a bit steamed up at times too, but when the dust settles, as Dean Atchison used to say, when the occasion has passed I think that the industry will settle down to a harmonious future; but I don't think it will settle down and I don't think the best interests will be served if we pass this Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I feel that I would like to make my position clear and plain on this question. Like all the other members, I have received many letters dealing with this subject and asking my support for the Denturists' Bill, and I wouldn't like to be misunderstood by anyone in any action that I might take tonight. There is the economic aspects of this Bill because we're living in a day when we're paying high prices for the necessities of life, and not only for the product of the dentist, but in anything that you want to purchase you have to pay very very much more than you paid a few years ago. When people come to you and say that they were able to get very satisfactory dentures, they've given no trouble; and it only cost them so much money and so forth; you can understand their position if they haven't too much money to use for any particular thing. That's the economic aspect of it, Mr. Speaker, but that's not the only side of it. In this thing we are dealing with the health of the people and the health of the people is something that you cannot fairly evaluate in terms of dollars and cents. Things have been said in the debate here and arguments have been presented that would lead one to believe, and perhaps we know from contacts that we've made with many many people, that while they have saved some dollars and cents in the question of the price they have paid for their dentures, but the unsatisfactory aspect of the work sometimes has more than matched what they have saved in money. It's a very very important thing when you're dealing with the living tissues.

Now this amendment is not in opposition to Dental Technicians, as such. What it recognizes, and I recognize the place that they have, it recognizes the need of adequate training for men who are going to serve the public as the denturists seeks to serve the public. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that you can have too much training and too much equipment in the art of dental technicians as in other professional arts. I am happy that there is a suggestion made that these men, who are in this field, should have thorough training. Reference has been made to the Dental College. It's very true that we haven't enough dentists here in the province to deal with our rapidly increasing population. We not only want more dentists but we want the best possible dentists, and if we're going to get the best possible dentists, well we know that that's going to mean years of training and equipment; and the Dental College, which has recently been opened in our city and province, will do much in this regard. But I like to think, Mr. Speaker, also, that the Dental College in its future program can do very much by way of training fully equipped Dental Technicians, because after all, the technician is the dentist's right-hand man and I can't see any reason why men who are attracted to this art and who are following this profession are in any way opposed to any suggestion, that in order to practice the art, they should have proper training and qualifications. If they did so it would give them better status; there would be no taint such as we hear sometime of illicit work, or even that ugly word "bootlegging" has been used. It will be better for all concerned and it will enable the Dental Technician for whom I have a very high respect, to make a finer contribution to the health of the community. And so, Mr. Speaker, it's because of these things that I cannot see any real

(Mr. Martin, cont'd.)....purpose served in sending this forward to the committee in the light of the suggestion that is made here in the amendment.

When I vote for this, I vote from the standpoint of principle. I'm looking and taking it in the light of what is in the best interests of the public and health of the people, and we know that we cannot afford to take chances in that regard. But all the suggestion is, that these men who want to follow this course of business and this career shall not be adverse to thorough and adequate training, which is the very suggestion of the amendment, and with that training and with that equipment they will be able to go out and serve the public. They will find it very lucrative, and if they are members of an association closely identified with the Dental Technicians that are co-operate with the dentists, they will find that it's a business that brings in a very generous return to them and they will have a place in the community which no one could criticize and no one would deny; and perhaps with this training, there will be even more people going to these men now trained as dental technicians and will be able to serve them at a price that will be well within the purse of the average citizen.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion defeated.

MR. GROVES: The yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

Yeas: Messrs. Alexander, Campbell, Carroll, Christianson, Corbett, Desjardins, Dow, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Hutton, Johnson (Gimli), Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Roberts, Scarth, Smellie, Strickland, Thompson, Weir.

Nays: Messrs. Bjornson, Cowan, Mrs. Forbes, Messrs. Froese, Gray, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harris, Ingebrigtsen, Johnson (Assiniboia), Klym, Molgat, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Prefontaine, Reid, Schreyer, Shewman, Shoemaker, Stanes, Tanchak, Wagner, Watt, Wright.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 22; Nays 26.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion defeated.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of this vote I was paired with the Honourable Member for Wellington. Had I been voting I would have voted in favour of the amendment, and I doubt if the honourable member would have been in harmony with me.

MR. HAWRYLUK:with the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce but had I voted, I'd have voted against it.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Is it possible to pair on the same side of the House?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe so. Yes. The question before the House, the motion of the Honourable Member for St. Vital for second reading of Bill No. 85, an Act to incorporate the Association of Dental Technicians in Manitoba. Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. LYON: The yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

Yeas: Messrs. Bjornson, Cowan, Mrs. Forbes, Messrs. Gray, Groves, Froese, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harris, Ingebrigtsen, Johnson (Assiniboia), Klym, Molgat, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Prefontaine, Reid, Schreyer, Shewman, Shoemaker, Stanes, Tanchak, Wagner, Watt, Wright.

Nays: Messrs. Alexander, Campbell, Carroll, Christianson, Corbett, Desjardins, Dow, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Hutton, Johnson (Gimli), Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Roberts, Scarth, Smellie, Strickland, Thompson, Weir.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 26; Nays 22.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Speaker, I think that as usual there was some skulduggery in the ranks of the opposition. Perhaps we should demand a recount.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, if I may on a point, I should like to direct the attention of the House, and particularly those representing the news services, that Law Amendments Committee is called to meet tomorrow morning at 10:00 o'clock in Room 200. Bill No. 75, being an Act respecting Dental Technicians; and No. 82, an Act to amend the Dental Association

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.)....Act, are to come before that committee, and now Bill No. 85 will also be considered by the committee commencing at 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. HAWRYLUK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention that I was again paired up with the Honourable Minister, and if I had voted I'd have voted for second reading.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, I too was again paired with the Honourable Member for Wellington, and had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

.....continued on next page.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Attorney-General. The Honourable the Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. S. ROBERTS (LaVerendrye): Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendments to our Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding, I think require some further comment. But before doing so I would like to remark on three general rules of the House which we have in our Rule Book and for which no proposed change is made in this list of amendments, but general rules to which we do not abide too closely. I'm referring particularly to Rule 29 re the reading of previously prepared speeches; Rule 30, re speaking to a specific question, amendment or motion; and the general rules concerning Second Reading of Bills. On the first one, Rule 29, which states quite clearly that no member should speak from a previously prepared speech, I think that here is a rule that we have not made any arrangements to amend, yet which is being regularly ignored in the House. I think that it's a fairly serious offense. I don't think that anyone would want to stop new members, who have just come to the House, from reading perhaps their first speeches or from anyone naturally wishing to deliver a particularly special statement as the Ministers of the Crown often do; but in a general debate of the House, I think that it is pretty important that we should abide by this rule of not reading our speeches. I think the main reason why this rule is in the Book is quite obvious.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Is the honourable member reading his speech?

MR. ROBERTS: I am not, Sir. Would you care -- that I would look up? The first reason, which is pretty obvious, is that it is the elected member speaking himself and not reading a previously prepared speech by someone else. It is with a great deal of disappointment, Mr. Speaker, that I note that the orator of the House, the Honourable Member from St. Matthews, reads his speeches. It is with a great deal of disappointment that the...

MR. MARTIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I don't read my speeches and I'm such a terrible handwriter that even if I look down too much I'm confused with the scribble on the paper.

MR. ROBERTS: I accept the correction, Mr. Speaker. I was of the opinion, and I would say that circumstantial evidence indicates that the honourable member was reading his speeches. I don't think that there is any doubt in the members of this House's mind that the Honourable Member from Wellington, when he delivers his great orations against sin and against Socialists and sometimes sin and Socialists combined, that he reads his speeches. And I think that it isn't right that they should. I think that for the speeding up of debate and for the honesty of debate, that members should confine themselves to perhaps preparing notes, but not of the reading of the speeches.

We have other examples, Mr. Speaker, that I think that you would have noticed from time to time in how much more interesting the debate is if the speakers do not read their speeches. You will notice that the Honourable Member from Gimli, when he is the Minister of Health and Welfare and reads a statement, you will find that it is sometimes difficult to follow. It is not nearly as interesting as though someone from this side of the House should pass nasty remarks about his "needs" program, and when he suddenly becomes the Honourable Minister of "Wealth and Helfare" and delivers an oration on his great program. Or, for instance, if someone on this side of the House should make some remarks about the fish industry and then the Honourable Member for Gimli suddenly becomes the Honourable Minister of Fish and delivers an interesting speech on fish. And so these are examples of speeches that are delivered, sometimes read and sometimes not read, and are usually far more interesting when they are not read.

The other members of the House, I think that the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, who is one of the better speakers in the House, and the Honourable the First Minister himself who is an excellent speaker, both deliver speeches from notes that they have prepared in advance and in these cases deliver good speeches because their notes have been thought out. The Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party has the happy ability of being able to speak endlessly without notes. I am sorry he is not in his seat at the present time but we had a beautiful example of this this afternoon when he spoke, with your assistance I might say, Mr. Speaker, for some 60 minutes on a subject, without any notes.

ONE OF THE MEMBERS: Without saying anything.

MR. ROBERTS: Without saying too much. The Honourable First Minister, as I said before, speaks without a full speech, at least does now as we used to, a year or two back,

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) . . . criticize him occasionally for reading his speeches; but apparently now he speaks with previously prepared notes. But I recall an instance in the Law Amendments Committee a week ago when the Honourable the First Minister was making a sort of decided attempt to be on both sides of the Hutterite question at the same time and spoke without notes, probably a previously unprepared bit, and so confused everyone in the committee and particularly the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce that we ended up, particularly with the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, not even sure at the end on which side he had voted. And so that is all I would like to say about Rule 29, Mr. Speaker. I think that we should give it serious consideration. I think that as members of this House that we should take active steps to discourage the reading of speeches. I think for more realistic, interesting, effective debate, that this rule should be enforced.

There is the subject of second reading of bill, Mr. Speaker, and this is a case which has arisen particularly in the last week or two on three specific things that I am thinking of, three bills in particular. I have as examples the Hutterite Bill; the Sunday Sports Bill, I think as it's called; and the Denturist's Bill which we just completed a few minutes ago. Mr. Speaker, regularly you remind us that on second reading we should be discussing the principle of the bill; and yet speaker after speaker on the Hutterite Bill, on the Sunday Sports Bill, or today on the Denturist's Bill as it's called, spoke saying I am against the principle of this Bill but if we can get it to Law Amendments and fix it up in Law Amendments so that it suits me better, I am in favour of it. I think we are breaking the rules of the House by voting on that principle. I think, first of all of course which is more important, that we are evading our own responsibilities. I think we are evading the responsibility for which we were placed here, and that is of judging by our conscience whether we feel that a Bill, as printed, is right or it's wrong, and should be right in principle and sent on to second reading. If it is right in principle as it reads, it should be sent to second reading, in my opinion; and if it's wrong, regardless of what amendments might be coming up in Law Amendments Committee or in Committee, I think we should vote against the Bill. I think that this is one of the cases where we are breaking the established rules of the House and rules for which we propose no amendments.

Now with particular respect to Rule 34, Mr. Speaker, this rule affects the Throne Speech Debate, and for which we have a proposed amendment at the present time. A short time ago the Honourable Member for Carillon spoke very effectively on why he felt that this amendment, or proposed amendment to rule 34, would limit the debate on the Throne Speech unnecessarily. I agree with the Honourable Member from Carillon. I do think that the Throne Speech Debate is our most effective debate. I think that it is traditional and it's a debate on all subjects. It has a great value in giving opportunity for every member of the House to speak out on subjects on which he wishes to be heard. I think that it has great value in presenting ideas to the members of this Assembly. I think that limiting debate on the Throne Speech is, in reality, limiting free speech in the House. This year we took 11 days, 11 actual sitting days in resuming the Throne Speech Debate, and counting the first motion, it was 12 full days of Throne Speech Debate. The proposed amendment calls for limiting this now to 7 days with only one of those days actually on the Throne Speech Debate itself and the other 6 discussing amendments thereto. The amendment, as it is proposed, does not specify days on which we discuss the Throne Speech as such. It just calls them "sitting days" and there is a possibility, of course, that we might sit on a certain day with a matter of urgent public importance coming up and we do not discuss the Throne Speech as such, and it would be called a day towards the debating of the Throne Speech. And then of course there is the part of the rule which says that 30 minutes before the ordinary time of daily adjournment, Mr. Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and forthwith put the question on the said amendment, sub-amendment or main motion. And I feel of course that this might be the falling of the guillotine right in the middle of someone's pet peeve, and I really don't quite think that that is necessary.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment which I would like to propose to ensure that even though we do not debate the Throne Speech on any given days, that that day will not be counted as one of the days allocated to this debate. Further, that more time will be allowed to the actual discussion of the more versatile, and the broader aspects of the Throne Speech itself rather than one of the amendments to it. And it will remove, I hope, the possibility that by having to stop the debate exactly 30 minutes before quitting time, that the guillotine will fall

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) . . . right in the middle of someone's, as I said, pet peeve.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon, the following amendment: That the report of the Committee be not concurred in with respect to Rule No. 34; that all of the words of the proposed Rule 34 be deleted and that the following be substituted therefore: No. 1; the proceedings on the Orders of the Day for resuming debate on the motion for an address in reply to His Honour's Speech, and on any amendments proposed thereto, shall not exceed nine sitting days during which the Throne Speech has been debated. On the fourth of the said days, if a sub-amendment be under consideration at 40 minutes before the ordinary time of daily adjournment, Mr. Speaker, shall allow the member then speaking to finish his speech but shall immediately thereafter put the question on the said sub-amendment. On the sixth of said days, if any amendment be under consideration at 40 minutes before the ordinary time of daily adjournment, Mr. Speaker shall allow the member then speaking to finish his speech but shall immediately thereafter put the question on the said amendment. On the ninth of said days, at 40 minutes before the ordinary time of daily adjournment unless the said debate be previously concluded, Mr. Speaker shall allow the member then speaking to finish his speech but shall immediately thereafter put every question necessary to dispose of the main motion.

MR. SPEAKER: I would inform the honourable member that apparently his motion is out of order, and I would quote Citation 561, page 203 of Beauchesne's third edition, I believe, which reads as follows: "When a motion is made for concurrence on a Select Committee Report it is competent for the House to adopt it, reject it, refer it back to the Committee, or decide that the of the report would take place this day six months hence." There appears to be no provision for the amendment of the report, and for that reason, I would have to reject the motion.

MR. D. ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words with regard to this question. I have no notes; I hadn't intended to speak. I was a member of that Committee, not because I particularly wanted to be on it, but because I was assigned to the job. I am a new member who, on two occasions in this present session, was interrupted and was told that he was out of order, and I am in good company, once by the Honourable Member from Selkirk and once by the Honourable the First Minister, so I have no particular love for the present rules. I have no stake in them because of past associations but it seems to me that most of what the Member from La Verendrye said was really of very little consequence.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the reading of speeches. This is something which has been in the Rule Book. We discussed it in our committee and we came to the conclusion that it is virtually impossible to enforce. I don't know who the honourable member thinks would call the member supposedly reading his speech to order. Personally, I prefer not to read a speech. I think, maybe I'm wrong, that I do a better job when I don't have to read the speech as I pretty well had to do last night. But I don't know that the Speaker or anybody else is able to check the members. I think maybe the member from LaVerendrye while he was speaking tonight suggesting that one shouldn't speak, was himself, if not reading his speech, following pretty closely on his notes.

Now on the question of the second reading, I agree with the honourable members that one ought not to vote for second reading if one disagrees with the principle of the question which is being discussed. Now if it's a simple act like the Margarine Act, then one can easily make up one's mind on whether one is for it or against it; but I want to suggest to the Honourable member, Mr. Speaker, that if it's a bill like the Metro Bill which was 126 pages long or a Bill like the Sunday Sports, that it's pretty difficult. I happened, last night, to be sitting in the gallery while the Honourable the Minister of Education was speaking on the Sunday Sports Bill. I must admit I must have been climbing the stairs when he started because the first few lines of his speech -- I won't read it -- he says that he's going to vote for it, but I must admit that all the time that he was speaking on the Bill I assumed from what he was saying that he was going to vote against it; and lo and behold, he couldn't have been listening to what the Honourable the Attorney-General said to us this afternoon, because lo and behold, he then said he would vote for the Bill. So I think while it is easy to say that one should vote against a bill if you're opposed to the principle, that if it's a long bill and a complicated bill, it's very difficult to say what is principle and what is detail.

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.)... Now as far as the last suggestion, the suggestion that in limiting the debate on the speech from the Throne that we are limiting debate, I want to disagree with that completely, Mr. Speaker. I don't think that any member who wants to speak will find it impossible to speak in the days which are allocated. I for one, Mr. Speaker, would much prefer to meet morning and afternoon every day at the beginning of the session and not be here from 9:00 o'clock in the morning till 12 o'clock at night as we are the last week or two of the session. If this will be helped by getting the members not to adjourn the debate, and I've been just as guilty as other members, instead of speaking after another member speaks one adjourns the debate so one can go home and prepare a little better. I think if we get rid of some of that and get more members speaking at the beginning of the session, maybe, I'm not certain, but maybe we won't have to be here for 18 hours a day the last week or ten days of the House. And so I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that the objections are very serious. I don't think that if we adopted them that we would help to get the House working better. I think the committee, although I was a member of the Committee I must admit that I was, for me anyway, I thought unusually silent while the committee was meeting. I don't claim to be an expert on the Rules but I am satisfied that the committee did a reasonable job, one which will help the work of the House in the future and one which we can support.

MR. G. MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the members of the House to proceed this evening with the completion of this item of business.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I really don't see why the government has adopted that attitude on these matters of adjournment. This has been done now on several of the debates that have been asked to be adjourned. There is no particular urgency to proceed with debates. This report has not been on the Order Paper for a great length of time. There are many other items that have been on the Order Papers for weeks, including a resolution of my own, that have never come up for debate since that time. I cannot see that this is impeding the work of the House and I suggest that the government might consider that there's no rush on this. The House is not prepared to rise; we're not trying to hold up this matter; and I would appeal to the Leader of the House that the adjournment be allowed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I say a word on this. I believe it's a separate motion. I would agree with the contentions of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. Now then, the question and the reason why it was suggested by the Premier that we should have no further adjournments was in order to facilitate the getting of bills into the committee stage and with that, Mr. Speaker, I agreed most heartily. But here we are dealing with a resolution rather than something that the committee has to take under consideration, and I think that the Honourable the Member for Ste. Rose is on firm ground when he mentions that and I would suggest to the government that there is a different consideration here. Whereas before we were anxious to get the matter before the various committees in order to consider bills, with which I agreed, I think that there is a different case insofar as resolutions of this nature, which are before the House, and it will not make any difference to the orderly conduct of the House if resolutions of this nature are only agreed upon, say at the last day which we meet.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, if we have an undertaking from the groups opposite to clean this item up tomorrow, we will agree. If not, I suggest we vote on the motion for adjournment.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I suppose if we can discuss this as a point of order, I would like to support the position that the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose and the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party have taken, because I think we have progressed very well with the government legislation and with the Private Member's legislation too as far as legislation is concerned. All the bills, I believe, that are before us, have now been sent to the committee--all that have advanced to that state--and so the work is not being impeded in any way at all. I hope my honourable friend will not insist on an undertaking because it's difficult for us to give an undertaking. Somebody might decide that they want to speak later on. I would like to speak quite briefly and certainly not in any attempt to hold up this report being received, but we have work before us this evening that can be proceeded with, and as far as I'm concerned, certainly I would be prepared to go on tomorrow and make my contribution at that time. I know that it

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.)...has somewhat complicated our plans the fact that Mr. Speaker found the amendment out of order that was moved, and it may take some little time to get an amendment that is in order according to that ruling. I think the undertaking is unnecessary that we should finish this debate tomorrow. As far as I'm concerned, I'll certainly try to do that.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): If I might just speak for a moment, Sir, to the point of order that has been raised. This matter, unless my memory is faulty and I stand subject to correction, I think this matter has been on the Order Paper now since the 7th of March. It's true that there were two speeches, I think by the Honourable Member from Carillon and by the First Minister and I think -- was there one more by the Leader of the CCF? But the point I'm trying to make is this, Sir, that while it is true this has not been reached on the Order Paper because other business was given precedence over it, I suggest most respectfully that everyone, including myself the mover of the resolution, has had sufficient time to organize his thoughts and his words. I know at least I have tried to do that and I'm ready tonight, if need be, to close off the debate on this. I merely suggest that the government is not being unfair on this matter at all because the matter has been before us at least two to three weeks and that gives everyone, I would think, ample opportunity to prepare their thoughts and make their speeches when the time comes up to deal with the matter. And I would also add, Sir, if there's anyone else tonight who wishes to speak on this matter that they avail themselves of the opportunity before the motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose is put.

MR. MOLGAT: I have no objection whatever to anyone speaking at all, but my point in asking for adjournment is simply this, and I'm speaking now to the point of order, that we had proposed an amendment. It has not been accepted by yourself, Sir, and I'm not questioning your decision in that regard, but we do want to propose an amendment that will make sense and that will be accepted. I'm working on one now but it's not something that you can prepare in exactly two minutes.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. There is no amendment, if I understand the ruling that you have made correctly, there is no amendment that requires any time. The only motion that could be made would be a motion to refer the report back to the committee and it would just take about six seconds to make that motion if that is the wish of the honourable members of the Liberal Party. I don't think there's any time involved in preparing an amendment. You would obviously rule it out of order if one were presented.

MR. SPEAKER: I might inform the Honourable the Minister of Education that the committee has completed its work and made its report to the House, and it would have to be reconstituted if it were referred back to the committee. And on the point of order of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, a motion to adjourn a motion is always in order unless your escalator motion negates it.

MR. E. PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, on the point or order, I would like to.....

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution of the Honourable the First Minister. Stand?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Secretary)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the House would allow this matter to stand in the absence of the First Minister.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask one question before that is put. Is it the intention of the government to proceed with this resolution at this session of the Legislature?

MR. EVANS: It's on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the motion of the Honourable the First Minister and the motion in amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the CCF and the motion in amendment to the amendment by the Honourable Member for St. John's. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, if there is no one else that wishes to speak at this time, I would ask the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that everyone, who has prepared to speak, do proceed at this time. I feel that we must push this debate forward. I do suggest that the

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.)...honourable member has had an opportunity to prepare his thoughts. He might wish to stand aside and let someone else speak at this time.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sort of an amiable guy at some times and I can appreciate very much the desirability of the Leader of the House to get along with this debate, and while the hour is very late and the Honourable the Member for Rhineland apparently does not wish to speak at this time, possibly I can say a few words which I had anticipated or intended to say on the amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member for St. John's in respect of the sub-amendment at this time. And then I'd suggest, Mr. Speaker that if the honourable member for, or nobody else speaks, then the adjournment could be held in the name of the Honourable Member for Rhineland. I would have liked to have followed him because I am sure that he has an interesting story to tell us of the great advances that have been made in the Province of Alberta, which fortunately or unfortunately for the people of that province has a Social Credit Government, and are fortunate in that great Province of Alberta to have unlimited natural resources in order for them to appear to be something which in theory and in fact they are not. However, I'm sure that my honourable friend when he comes to deliver his oration to this legislature will be able to tell us all about the theories of Social Credit and how they would approach this problem. In anticipation of what he has to say I simply want to say that thus far the Province of Manitoba has not been blessed or have not discovered the blessings that are the blessings of Alberta. However, we will be most interested in hearing what he has to say a little later.

And as I say, Mr. Speaker, the main reason that I rise at this time is to just facilitate my friends on the other side of the House and at least have one other speech made on the budget debate this evening rather than wait for a future day. But let me assure them, let me assure them, that if the occasion arises and if I am provoked I still have two other opportunities to speak to my honourable friends opposite -- (Interjection) -- Perish the thought. -- (Interjection) -- My contribution at this stage, Mr. Speaker, will be rather brief.

This has been a most interesting session to me because it has revealed to me, I'm sure to any student of the political affairs of Manitoba, that basically there is no difference at all between my honourable friends opposite and those to my right. --(Interjection)-- The proposals of the Honourable the First Minister in respect of the financial undertakings and problems of the province as enunciated in his budget, and the criticisms thereof of the Leader of the Opposition, have convinced me more and more that there is no difference in the basic philosophies of either of them. Indeed Sir, when we were listening during the speech in reply to His Honour we had the situation of the Honourable Leader of the House arising and pointing his finger at the Liberal Party to my right and saying "while you are there and while we are here all is well for Manitoba." And then a little while later the Honourable the Member for Carillon stood up and said the same thing only in the reverse, pointing to the Honourable the First Minister of the House, and I haven't got his wording correctly, but in theory he said the same thing, that I agree with you that while you are over there and we are here or vice versa "it's well for the people of Manitoba." I think that in their thinking that they are both right, because of the fact Mr. Speaker, there is no basic difference between their philosophies and ideologies. But I do say that there is in the horizon or on the horizon today the opportunity for the people of Manitoba and the people of Canada to get behind and to support an alternative to this coalition of Liberal and Conservative thinking in Canada. And I say and that is the text of my few remarks this evening, and I say that the people of Manitoba, the people of Canada, are going to have an opportunity in the not too far distant future to get together and to support a new party which has as its basic fundamental principles the advancement of Canada as a whole without any consideration for sections of our economy, and without any strings attached.

Now, Sir, we read in the daily press--and they have a duty to perform, because like both the Liberals and Conservatives they have to pay the piper for the tune that is played--we have in the daily press today and in the press across Canada a fear of the formation of a new party. And that fear is being expressed in antagonisms toward the formation for on every occasion that it is possible for the press they pick up threads and words that are spoken by individuals who are engaged in the promotion of the new party and use them to attempt to becloud the issues that are in the minds of the readers of their papers. The last illustration that I have of this was just a few short days ago when reading in the local press, and this includes both the Winnipeg Free Press and the Winnipeg Tribune, news articles referring to the statements made in Saskatchewan

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.)...by Premier Douglas of that province. An attempt was made to infer that because Premier Douglas had said that insofar as the CCF Party in the Province of Saskatchewan was concerned, irrespective of the formation of a new party, we are going to retain our provincial economy. There's nothing new in this, Mr. Speaker; this has been the policy of the CCF throughout its years of history. While we have had a national movement and while in our national conventions we have declared policies insofar as the national party is concerned, we have at all times held our provincial conventions which have formulated provincial policies, and there's going to be or it is anticipated that there will be no change whatsoever when the new party is formed, and Premier Douglas in making his statement made that amply clear. And he said this, and I say it's an honest statement of fact, "that we are going to appeal in the short months ahead possibly to the electorate of Saskatchewan for a re-endorsement of our program for the Province of Saskatchewan." And he said that irrespective of what changes are made on the national scene that having been elected or re-elected in Saskatchewan the policies that were laid down at our provincial convention at the grass roots level will still be retained. And I suggest to you Mr. Speaker, that that is a fair statement and a correct statement. We, here in the Province of Manitoba, have agreed to our convention to continue study, to continue negotiations with the Canadian Congress of Labour, farm organizations and other individuals on the formation of a national party. We have not yet deviated at all from the premise that at our provincial convention that we will deviate at all from the manner in which our provincial program is enunciated, at least until such time as a new party has been formed. I say, Mr. Speaker, that there is a great fear of both my honourable friends opposite and those on my right in this new party, because there are contained in the ranks of both of the old line parties thinking individuals who could quite properly become members of the new party.

I want to read an excerpt or two, Mr. Speaker, from a little brochure that has recently come to life called "The Canadian Democrat". This book is published by what is known as the Winnipeg Woodsworth Society, and being a democratic paper, it invites comment from all sectors of our political life and our economic life. I would like to read an excerpt or two, and I am sure that the Honourable Member for River Heights will be most interested in this excerpt, an article which was written for this little magazine by a chap by the name of Ord Morton, whom I believe is the son of Professor W. L. Morton a very prominent Conservative, and his son Ord is a prominent Conservative and is a third year's honour history student in St. John's College at the University of Manitoba. And as I say, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my friend the Honourable Member for River Heights, who I admit and I think that he will admit belongs to the old school and who loves to get up in this Legislature and berate me because of my socialistic ideas, I am sure he will be interested to know what this very advanced thinking Conservative has to say in his remarks in this little magazine. I am quoting from page 17, and I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that my friend the Honourable Member for River Heights and all the members on the other side take the time out to obtain this little booklet. It's most interesting and educational. Now then, I have said that I was going to read a few sentences written by this very progressive individual. Page 17--"Conservatism is close to and even in some cases identical with Socialism today. Socialists, who by and large take their creed with seriousness merited only by its faults and who rejoice in never having been corrupted by offices which they have never been called upon to fill, will doubtless not care to be seen in public in such company. But it remains true that the left side of the political arena is occupied today by the Socialist and Conservative Parties. If indeed Socialism ever omits from its cannon of things necessary to salvation, those doctrines which concern the means, there is no logical reason why the same person should not be at least once a Conservative and a Socialist." So I say, Mr. Speaker, that I think this very intelligent young fellow is on the right track and so I make an appeal to the members opposite, who are advanced thinkers, to join with me and my colleagues and friends in a new party which will sift the chaff from the wheat and give us progressive government for the Dominion of Canada. Because, notwithstanding the remarks of this young man, there are still altogether too many of the old type of Conservatives, Mr. Speaker, that are holding back the advancement as enunciated by this particular young man. Now then, lest my friends on my right feel that I am neglecting them, let me say that they too....

MR. CAMPBELL:not in that company.

MR. PAULLEY: No, no. But some of their members are becoming a little more

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd) advanced than their present leader in this Legislature. And I am going to refer, Mr. Speaker, to another very interesting article in this book that is written by the present President of the Manitoba Liberal Association. If he follows through with his ideologies as expounded in here he, too, would be a likely candidate for the new party. I just want to read, Mr. Speaker, this comment because in this article of Mr. Joe O'Sullivan, the President of the Manitoba Liberal Association, he was dealing with one of the questions that the former Liberal administration at Ottawa had an opportunity over the years to deal with; namely, the question of the institution of a capital gains tax in order to obtain revenue for the Treasury of Canada. And this is what Mr. O'Sullivan has to say in connection with that: "Well, there is no doubt that the man on salary or on wages pays his assessment because his taxes are deducted from his income before he even sees it. But it is common knowledge that many people living on incomes, incomes that are not fixed, fail to pay what the law calls for; and since nobody seems to go to jail in Canada for income tax fraud, there is no really effective deterrent against those who cheat the community by evasion and false declaration. Adding to the inequities in our tax structure is the absence of a capital gains tax. It is scandalous that a man can make hundreds of thousands of dollars a year from capital gains without paying a cent in income tax, while a man earning \$3,000 a year has to pay before he sees his money. It is said that a capital gains tax would stifle enterprise, but the United States has had one since the early '20s and nowhere in the world is there a more enterprising people." So I say that just in case my friends on my right felt that I was neglecting them when I was talking of my Conservative Socialist friends across the road, I thought that I would just draw to their attention that the leader of their party in the executive field in the Province of Manitoba joins with we of the CCF, and as I understand it, those who are anticipating or taking part in the formation of a new party, he joins with us too in trying to obtain something that the Liberal Party has rejected over the years.

So I say that in both parties, Mr. Speaker, there are individuals who are forward thinking that we would welcome into our ranks.

MR. K. ALEXANDER (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. PAULLEY: Why certainly.

MR. ALEXANDER: I was wondering if the honourable member would recommend that we follow Saskatchewan's practice and also adopt a sales tax in Manitoba immediately.

MR. PAULLEY: You know it's very interesting --

A MEMBER: He probably will.

MR. PAULLEY: My honourable friend has asked that question. I have said in this House that I object to a sales tax and when his party, if they're in here long enough, I can't see any question of doubt but what he will be standing up, following the leader, and voting in favour of it.

A MEMBER: You'd probably vote with him.

MR. PAULLEY: Pardon?-- (Interjection) -- Oh definitely not. I am glad too that the honourable member has asked me that, because quite frankly and quite honestly and sincerely I have tried to diagnose my friends opposite in their philosophy, and I can't for the life of me see how anybody who looks beyond their nose can follow those policies. -- (Interjection) -- Oh you're deep -- you're deep. You know the old adage, Mr. Speaker, about the still stream running deep. You never get to the bottom of it and there's no light or life on the top of it. --(Interjection) -- However, Mr. Speaker -- and I don't mind the interjections of my honourable friends across the way at all. I've got used to them. It reminds me, and I am not referring to them insofar as the animal that I am going to use as an illustration, I don't suggest that they're the same but it always reminds me of the little Pekinese dog that's just behind the fence as you are walking around there. They are trying to gnash their teeth through the bars but never get beyond that for fear of what will happen. So I am used to this sort of stuff, Mr. Speaker, and it doesn't bother me one little bit. Now then. . . .

A MEMBER: But you let these fellows into the trouble they're in.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, dear me no, no, no. I don't agree with my honourable friend that we let them into the trouble they're in, Mr. Speaker. I will admit, I will admit this though, that they did take a lot of coaxing to start advancing and they did use some of our program in

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . their appeal to the people, and the people listened to them and elected them, but I'm equally sure, Mr. Speaker, that it will not be long before the people get wise and reject them and elect us and put these people further in the mire. Oh, they'll listen to me. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I'm getting more convinced and more convinced that they are listening to us, and not only are the people listening to us but the people on that side of the House are listening to us and the people on this side opposite or close to me are listening as well, because they're trying to outdo each other in an endeavour to put into effect those things which we have advocated for years. But they're going to fail in their endeavours because I'm convinced that the people of Manitoba and the people of Canada are going to join with us in the formation of a new party which has, as its basis, the human needs before the needs of vested interests such as they have at the present time.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to speak as long as I have, but I'd just like to say this, that while the program and the policies of the new party have not as yet been formulated, they have been set out for study and consideration and they contain, and I submit to my honourable friends of no matter what political creed they may be in this House, that they undertake and study them; because I feel that many of them, after having seriously read and studied them, will be prepared to come along with us in the formation of this new party. It is said by some, what of the CCF in the new party? It has been said by some that when the new party is formulated it means the end of the CCF. I say, Mr. Speaker, that such is not the case because the CCF is simply a title given to a creed and to a philosophy, and notwithstanding what the name may be, the ideals and basic principles will be the same. But there is this one basic difference, that those ideals and that philosophy will, as in the future as has been in the past, been formulated at the grass roots. And so I say, Mr. Speaker, while we have a program for study, and it's available and open for anyone who chooses to study and I recommend it to all members of this House, in the final analysis it will be established at a national convention.

The Canadian Labour Congress are going to meet in April to decide as to whether or not they're going to continue or whether they're going to take part in the formation of the new party. In August, in Regina, the CCF Party will do likewise, and if both groups agree on that, then possibly in 1961 there will be a founding convention of the new party to which individuals and farm organizations and others will be invited to attend, even Progressive Conservatives. So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that while I haven't taken the time to enumerate the program and policies of the new party, as far as I am concerned as an individual, and I think I have a lot of support even in my present position as House Leader of this group in the Legislature, that here is an opportunity for forward-looking people to throw off the shackles that are their burden by their association with the old line parties and go forward with those of us who have become convinced that the two old line parties, as such, have failed miserably in the best interests of the people of Canada; that both Liberal and Conservative have only attempted to patch up the economy of Canada as circumstances arise. There has been no planning of the economy of any description in any of the jurisdictions that have been under the control of either Liberal or Conservatives. As my colleague said last night in introducing our resolution, it was a "Wing and a Prayer," and I say, Mr. Speaker, that insofar as they're conducting the affairs and the economies of Canada, that that has been the policy of both Liberals and Conservatives since the dawn of politics here in Canada. I say, Mr. Speaker, that there is a new dawn within the grasp of the people of Manitoba and Canada; and I give an invitation to all of the Progressive, and I will exclude some smiling faces opposite, I give an invitation to -- (Interjection)-- yes, it will be a revolution, Mr. Speaker. It will be a revolution that will give without force to the people of Canada, many of those things that they have been deprived of because of the policies of the parties that my honourable friend follows. So I say, in all seriousness and all earnestness, here is an opportunity; grasp it if you will.

MR. SCARTH: Mr. Speaker, just in very brief reply. I would like to say that we Conservatives have a sense of humour. We like to be amused and I for one would like to attend and accept this invitation so that we can meet all ten of the honourable member's party at their convention.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other member wish to speak?

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, just a few brief words in reply to what the

(Mr. Alexander, cont'd.)...Honourable Leader of the CCF Party had to say. I gathered, first of all, from the way he answered my question that he advocates the fact that we should do everything better and do everything that Saskatchewan is doing, but please, please don't adopt the methods that they adopt to pay for the wonderful things that are happening over there. -- (Interjection) -- You don't?

MR. PAULLEY: No, definitely not.

MR. ALEXANDER: That's the first time I've heard the honourable member say that anything was wrong with Saskatchewan.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh no, no, no.

MR. ALEXANDER: Secondly, Mr. Speaker, he said quite a bit on the fact that the old line parties, as he called them, and I can't think of a newer party than the Conservative party that's sitting in the House at this time, but he went on to say that the old line parties had failed miserably, as he said, in the past. All they have done, Mr. Speaker, is develop this country to the point where it has been developed in a very short period of its history; and have also developed it to the point where it now has the second highest living standard of any other country in the world. And don't forget there's a few Conservative governments in there as well that started Canada off on the right foot. I would also say, Mr. Speaker, that I don't think that we can find too many cases if we go back in history where any country has been developed and developed as fast and as well as Canada has without the benefit and assistance of a Socialist government.

MR. EVANS: I would now suggest that perhaps if the Honourable Member for Rhineland cared to move his motion for the adjournment, we might consider that.

MR. SPEAKER: It's already adjourned in the name of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. EVANS: I wonder then if the House would agree, Mr. Speaker, if I asked you to call the last motion on the Order Paper, the resolution in the name of the Honourable Member from Brandon. I understand this matter may not take long and it would be an advantage if we could advance to this stage tonight.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that the Rules of the House dealing with Private Bills, other than Rule 104, be suspended with respect to An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "Brandon College Incorporated" and that the Bill may be proceeded with as a public Bill. An Act to amend An Act to incorporate "Brandon College Incorporated."

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

MR. LISSAMAN introduced Bill No. 136, An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate Brandon College Incorporated.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the House do now adjourn.

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