

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Saturday, May 4, 1963

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Education. The Honourable the Member for Emerson.

MR. J. P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, I suppose I should ask to have this matter stand but I'm not going to do it. You'll have to excuse me, I have a slight cold and I'm a little bit hoarse, and maybe for that reason I'll be very, very brief today. In fact, so much has been said that about all I can do is stress certain points and maybe bring in a few new elements into the debate.

First, I would like to say that the charge was not directed at Hydro but at the government. Listening to some of the members across, it seems to me they are trying very hard to switch the blame -- they do not consider it is, but I still do -- the blame onto Hydro and they try to make it appear that the members on this side actually charged Hydro with it. I say that it was the government who was charged because the Minister of the Department has charge of the department and is responsible for the actions of the Hydro. I presume that the government tries not to interfere too much in the workings of the different commissions but I doubt whether the government really keeps its fingers completely out of it, therefore, the charge is against the government. We heard some members of the opposite side say that this charge is such that it is not even worth bothering with, that it isn't worth talking about. Well I wonder, if that is the case, why the Attorney-General in his last speech spent 90 minutes trying to defend the government. I am just wondering.

Now other things have been brought in, some references have been made to previous charges. The Honourable the Member the Conservative Whip tried to bring a red herring in relating to something two years ago and trying to suggest that this was similar. Now I do not expect, and I never have expected the committee which sat on this to decide in favour of the accused. I never did expect. No matter how heavy the evidence would have been in his favour, the verdict I believe would still have been in favour of the government. It is quite understandable why. It's very simple too. How could one be so naive as to expect that the government members would reprimand themselves. Therefore, I would say that the rest of the members might as well have not voted since the government has a considerable majority in the committee.

So one would say then, why bring the charge? Why would the true opposition even attempt to bring a charge and then to prove it? I would say that it is the duty of the opposition to scrutinize the government expenditures and especially the expenditures of the government very very closely, and if there's any suspicion whatsoever that the government is guilty of abusing the handling of our financing of the moneys of the people, I think therefore it is the duty of the opposition to probe. That's what the opposition did, because there definitely was suspicion and is suspicion that the government mishandled moneys of the people in our opinion, and still, in my opinion, that suspicion does exist. If nothing is accomplished, at least our democratic privilege has been exercised and I say this is our democratic privilege to probe -- the opposition. I well remember when I had the privilege of sitting for one year across with the government, I well remember how the opposition members at that time brought up all kinds of matters and probes and did just about exactly the same thing as the opposition, the true and proper opposition is doing at the present time.

I read quite a bit about the Beer Probe -- this Probe coming in -- I took the time to read everything up on that. Also, if the opposition does nothing else but just scare the government into closer consideration of greater action, closer consideration of the provincial moneys, something has been accomplished already. I am sure that this investigation or this committee has, I am sure, sharpened the wits of the government to some extent to be more careful in the future. A lot, I say, has been accomplished so far by this investigation.

Now every member of the Legislature sits on several committees. Last week, as you

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.) . . . all know, we had the committee on Public Utilities considering this charge that the government wasted about, or almost \$2 million on the Grand Rapids Hydro project. In my opinion, and it is the opinion of the great majority of the people of Manitoba, that that charge was and is valid, regardless of what the government members may say. I'm speaking for myself and I'm speaking for some people who have talked to me in different parts of Manitoba. I'm not a member of this Committee but I did sit in quite frequently as a spectator.

Now you are going to say that I am biased. I am trying hard not to be biased. But if you say I am biased, don't laugh because you are more biased than I am, and it is quite natural for you to be biased. You come to the defence of your colleagues and it is your privilege to be biased, and I say that you were biased on this. The members in the Committee supporting the government can't help but be biased because it's their Party, so there is nothing to laugh. I tried not to be biased. I said I tried but I didn't say I accomplished it. I say I tried not to be biased in judging the procedure and the fairness of this hearing. That's what I'm coming to, and to any clear-minded, well-intentioned and honest individual, it was quite evident that the Committee was so guided, to me it seemed, as to give a favourable report as far as the government was concerned. They have the Chairman, who is a lawyer and at the same time a Cabinet Minister -- he was the Chairman of the Committee. I'll ask you, wouldn't it be in his interests to guide the Committee so as to give a favourable report as far as the government was concerned? It was in his interests because he's the Minister. I do not say that he was completely unjust, but he must have been biased and it was to his credit, you could say, or it was his desire to have this Committee give a favourable report.

It seemed to me that the government was not interested in justice at the time at all but simply interested in being absolved of all blame. The Honourable the Attorney-General said in this House just about two weeks or so ago, "That the government will take full responsibility for the actions of the Hydro" who are under his department. He promised that. "He'll take full responsibility." Therefore, when we lay a charge against the government, whatever the Hydro did, the government and the Attorney-General, who is the head of the department, is fully responsible for that department. So our charge is laid against the government and not at the Hydro. The Manitoba Hydro is a public utility and it is in his department.

Now the Premier, I remember well when the charge was laid, stood on his feet and what did he say? "I promise a fair and impartial hearing." That's what the Premier promised. In my opinion, the Committee Hearing was not only unfair but it was, I would say, even a disgrace to any Party, because it was unfair and unjust, trying to withhold certain evidence.

The Honourable Member for St. George was not permitted by the Chairman and the huge government majority in the Committee, as we know before, to bring forth certain witnesses -- his own witnesses, nor was his lawyer allowed to have "freedom of speech" as he would have liked to. That was curtailing. I don't think that was just in any way. Likewise, the same people, the government and the Chairman of the Committee, and I presume there are the two lawyers sitting in, forbid the accused to have certain documents disclosed. Why forbid it? What was the government hiding? What was the government afraid of? If the government wasn't afraid, they should have permitted these documents to be brought forth. If they were completely innocent they had nothing to fear. Of course there's an excuse that we're delving into personal affairs, but this is a probe and the people are interested in it. It is of vital importance that all such documents be brought forward so the charge could be fairly and justly tried.

Now the same group forbid the honourable member's lawyer to take full and active part in questioning and refused permission to bring forth material. In my opinion this hearing, guided by government influence, was unfair, unjust and undemocratic.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that the debate be adjourned.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend would be kind enough to make his speech now as we would not be willing to support the adjournment of the debate. After it is dealt with we have the motion of concurrence, and that will require no doubt some further consideration. So I would ask my honourable friend if he would be kind enough to make his speech now.

MR. MOLGAT: No, I wouldn't want to make my speech now, Madam Speaker. I don't want to hold up the works of the House at all and if I had thought that there was a possibility that the House would complete today, it would be a different proposition, but I see no possibility whatever. We still have most of the Bills before us in Committee plus third reading of them of course, as well as all the resolutions standing; the Budget Debate has barely been entered into; and one of the resolutions is not even been moved onto the Order Paper so -- (Interjection) -- yes, in Committee of Ways and Means -- so I see no possibility of finishing today. However, I'm not in any way trying to obstruct the procedures, and if the First Minister would prefer to have this motion passed now and then enter concurrence and give me the right to adjourn the concurrence motion on the understanding that I would speak on Monday, I would have no objection to that.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I thank my honourable friend. That's a perfectly satisfactory arrangement and we'll dispose of this motion. The Minister will ask for leave to introduce concurrence, he will move it, and my honourable friend may adjourn it if no one else wishes to speak and we'll debate that.

MR. MOLGAT: have the right to adjournment of the concurrence motion till Monday, I can make the speech on Monday.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The question before the House is the proposed motion that the first report of the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources be received.

A standing vote was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Evans, Froese, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Jeanotte, Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Paulley, Peters, Roblin, Schreyer, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Desjardins, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak and Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 40; Nays, 11.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

Notices of Motion.

Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the Day.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, if I have leave of the House, I should like to introduce a resolution on concurrence in the matter of the report of the Public Utilities Committee. Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health, that this House doth concur in the report of the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources received by the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba on Saturday the 4th day of May, 1963.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker -- oh, I'm sorry, third reading.

MADAM SPEAKER: Third reading of Bill No. 122. The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move that

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I had something to raise on Orders of the Day. I don't believe you called it, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: I did, but it's in order.

MR. CAMPBELL: A couple of weeks ago, Madam Speaker, I had occasion to be away from the House when it sat in the evening. As honourable members know, I'm not very often away but unfortunately I was on that occasion, Friday evening April 19th. My Leader, in discussing Manitoba Club fees and dues paid, made the statement that he understood that when I

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) was heading the government that I paid my own membership in the Manitoba Club and my own annual dues. I understand, I'm told by my colleagues, that when my honourable colleague made that statement that the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce shook his head. Now unfortunately head shakings and head noddings cannot be recorded in Hansard so that I was not aware of this, but the honourable gentleman admits that he did, which would be taken as disagreeing with that statement. I want to state, Madam Speaker, that the statement was accurate in every detail, that for approximately the dozen years that I was a member of the Manitoba Club that I paid my membership fees and I also paid my annual dues, and I know that that statement will be taken as being accurate. If it were necessary, I'm sure I could produce cheques covering the most of those items although I may not keep them all, but this statement is accurate. At that time there was a membership fee and I presume there is still. I paid that from my own personal account. There were annual dues and I always paid that from my own personal account.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I think where the misunderstanding may have arisen is that I think certain bills were paid for -- monthly bills that my honourable friend had at the club as opposed to the annual dues.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, there were no monthly bills paid either. The only occasion that the government would ever pay a bill on my account would be on those very few occasions where I entertained at the club for some folks who were visiting here or where something was given. I recall one occasion where Chief Justice Turgeon was entertained; another one where some visitors from some European country was here on a buying mission. On occasions of that kind, where I felt it was government business, the bill went in as expenses in the usual way, the same as the bill went in for my expenses when I attended functions out of town and incurred expenses. I was very careful about that, but I was speaking about the membership fee and the annual dues, and everything of that kind was paid entirely by myself. I even paid for my meals when I was not entertaining other people.

MADAM SPEAKER: Third reading of Bill No. 122.

MR. ROBLIN presented Bill No. 122, An Act to provide for the Imposition of a Tax on Purchasers and Users of Tobacco, for third reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, I just want to reaffirm on third reading of this bill the position that my group alone took in this House on second reading of this Bill in opposition. I was very intrigued this morning with the statements of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce when he was discussing the Sports Bill in committee this morning, when he stated that in his opinion if we started by adopting a partial open Sunday in respect of commercialized sports that it was just the thin edge of the wedge and eventually we would find ourselves, insofar as our Sundays are concerned, with wide-open Sundays -- commercialized Sundays. I think, Madam Speaker, the same basic principle applies in respect of the bill that we are now going to give third reading to cover our objections, that this is just the thin edge of the wedge into a sales tax for the Province of Manitoba. Therefore, Madam, I discussed this matter with my colleagues and, unless my honourable friend the Leader of the House or the Leader of the Official Opposition wishes a recorded vote, my statement will be sufficient I think to place again on the record that we of the New Democratic Party are opposed to the commencement, albeit called a "luxury tax", of a sales tax in the Province of Manitoba.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Third reading of Bill No. 24.

Bill No. 24 was read a third time and passed.

MADAM SPEAKER: Third reading of Bill No. 34.

HON. ROBERT SMELLIE (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell) presented Bill No. 34, An Act to provide for the Observance of Official Time in the Province, for third reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. RICHARD SEABORN (Wellington): Madam Speaker, I do not wish to take up too much time of the members on this bill, I only wish to express my opposition to the move to reduce the period of Daylight Saving Time in the Greater Winnipeg area by two months. I must

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd) say that I could have supported the bill in its original form. When I spoke at second reading I pointed out the almost impossible position of the radio and television industry, which was supported by Mr. James Findlay of the CBC in Law Amendments, and while I'm convinced that this confusion is going to have a detrimental effect on our community, however, it would not have been sufficient for me to take such a definite stand as I do now. The fact is I've made some enquiries among the folks in my constituency and I would say that there's about a 95 percent desire to have the six months as presently in effect. Personally, I have often wondered why we do not have Daylight Saving Time in the winter time when the period of daylight is so limited, but that's another question. However, appreciating the apparent view of my constituents, I cannot with conscience deprive them of two months when they desire the extra hours of daylight recreation, and therefore I must vote against this bill.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Madam Speaker, I have already expressed my opinions on this subject, but I just want to record my opposition to the Bill as it now stands.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, likewise, I wish to record my opposition to the bill as it's passed. I was in favour of uniform time, but that it be Central Standard Time.

MR. MOLGAT: to extend this particular debate. We had originally introduced the motion in the House recommending what we felt was a reasonable compromise on this matter, and I appreciate that it is a question of compromise because you're not going to please everyone whichever way you go at it. It seems to me really that what is required in the long run is a new look at our time zones. I think the time zones were set up many years ago in different circumstances, and also that they do not necessarily apply the further north you go, because the facts are that in the southern regions, let's say in the southern part of the United States, in mid-summer the days are not as long as our own days are, and while a time zone may be applicable there to extend the time zones, as we do on a straight north-south line, means that in effect they are not in keeping with what the sun actually is doing and that they have a different effect at the southern fringe of the time zone than they have at the northern fringe of that time zone. It seems to me what is really required to settle this is to have our time zones actually on a slanted basis, and that this would permit then for a proper relationship. Now this sounds odd, I appreciate, but it is in fact what the sun does. My honourable friend from Thompson can certainly vouch for that because in mid-summer he has an extremely long day up there by comparison even to ourselves, so I would suggest that what is needed in the long run is a review of this right across the country and an analysis of whether we wouldn't be better off to change our time zones completely and have a new basis applicable more in keeping with what the sun is doing. I still prefer the compromise in this particular case that we had suggested originally.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I'm just rising on a point of information for members of the House. They may be interested to know that at the next meeting of the Premiers of Canada, I intend to raise this question of time to see whether anything can be initiated there that might be uniform across the nation and provide an improvement over the arrangements that we have at the present time.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister would tell us if he's going to press for diagonal time zones?

MR. MOLGAT: of the First Minister in detail, my proposition for slanted time zones, Madam Speaker.

MR. ROBLIN: My friend's ideas are slanted enough, I don't need any

MR. MOLGAT: in the right direction.

MR. ROBLIN: I wish that were the case.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Yeas and Nays, please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A standing vote was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Evans, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Jeanotte, Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Paulley, Peters, Roblin, Shewman, Smellie, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Molgat, Patrick, Schreyer, Seaborn, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Stanes, Tanchak, and Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 36; Nays, 15.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. Third reading of Bill No. 58.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, I wonder if you would be kind enough to call the proposed resolution standing in my name first, the one that was reported out of Committee of the Whole this morning.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Welfare, Whereas this House has received the report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders (See Page 1932)

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Third reading of Bill No. 58. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 58, An Act to amend The Time Sale Agreement Act, for third reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. John's): Madam Speaker, this matter has been debated at length and I don't think it's necessary to debate it any further. I just want to state that the dropping of the attempt to have an interest rate related to the total charges for the time payment is one which could still have been done and could still have been carried out, and I believe with some study it could have been made a portion of the Act. I regret that and I think that in the coming year we will have an opportunity to study the effect of the Act as it is now and hopefully be able to improve on it in the future.

I also would like to record my understanding that the Honourable Attorney-General has indicated that studies are being made in the expectation that there will possibly be amendments made next year, either to some other Act or a new Act brought in to take into account the relief against acceleration or forfeiture and pre-payment privileges. He indicated that the Cabinet was looking at this with the view of attempting to do something about it. I'm clear in my mind that he did not make an undertaking that it will be done, but rather that it is being looked at in a favourable manner.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, Bill 58 is amending Bill No. 101 that was passed last year, which dealt with the matter of interest rates. While I see that there are complications under the deferred payment plan and I recognize them, but I still feel that Bill 101 was much better and that I oppose Bill 58 as it now stands.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. Bills No. 70 and 81 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following bills for third reading.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: We left off with discussion of Bill No. 102. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to concur with the remarks made before noon by the Member for River Heights. I thought he put the question very well but there is one point that I'd like to touch on and that is the remarks made by the Minister of Industry and Commerce. When he was speaking this morning he referred to the matter of commercialism on making money on Sundays. I'd like to take issue with him on this particular point, particularly with the professional sport that is played in Winnipeg. For example, the Winnipeg Blue Bombers, they're paid on a contract basis and whether they play on Sunday or Monday or Friday it makes no difference to them, and the point in hand is that it's the people who go to see the Blue Bombers play that are anxious that they play on Sunday.

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd) The football players themselves or the baseball players, if we're dealing with baseball, they couldn't care less personally what day of the week they play on because they're paid on a contract basis and therefore they just play whenever the schedule calls for them to play. There are so many games in the season.

I'd like to refer to one other point to those people in the House who are opposed to Sunday sport. In the spring we had the Stanley Cup played on Sunday and it was televised nationally. In the autumn and in October we watch the World Series which is televised nationally and we see it on Sunday. Then later in the year we have professional football coming in from the United States which is televised nationally in Canada, and I venture to say that a great number of those people in this House who are opposed to Sunday sports, those same people who will sit in their living room on a Sunday afternoon or Sunday evening and watch professional sports on the screen. They may then come back with the argument that they're not paying for it, but they are indirectly, because the spectacle is paid for by the advertiser and we pay indirectly in that matter. I think it's totally wrong for us to oppose Sunday sport in our own city while we allow it to be brought in on the television, and I say I think nearly all of us, if not all of us, watch these sports on our television screen on Sundays, therefore I can see no reason why we should oppose Sunday sports in Winnipeg.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I think that this debate is one that lends itself to a good deal of discussion on several points. For example, whether or not the opening up of Sunday to professional sport would have a bad effect on amateur sport; and secondly, as to whether or not a referendum really compels every member in an Assembly to abide by it. One can argue at length about whether we operate by direct democracy or by representative democracy and so on, but I hardly think that under the circumstances one should discuss these things now. I only want to say this, so that at least my position is clear when I vote. For one, I am in favour of having open Sunday afternoon for sport, be it amateur or professional, but I consider it to be very unfortunate -- the picking -- that we should be going about it the way we are and I therefore am going to oppose the legislation. I shall vote for the amendment in fact because I think we should not pass this until every other single municipality in the province is given equal treatment or the amendment is made to allow them to avail themselves of having a vote on it and so on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question before the House is that Bill No. 102 be amended by deleting Section 24 and Section 25 as amended.

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

A MEMBER: Standing vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A standing vote.

A standing vote was taken, the results being as follows: Yeas, 27; Nays, 21.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion carried.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the committee would grant me two sentences just to make a request of the government in respect of this matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This matter has already been decided.

MR. PAULLEY: No, I'm not referring to the vote, Mr. Chairman, but the principle of the matter. In view of the statement of my colleague from Brokenhead, I wonder if we could have an undertaking from the government to give consideration to extending The Municipal Act in order to make it permissive for a vote in all municipalities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Legislative Counsel will have to renumber the Sections again. I'll call the sections as they presently stand in the Bill. Section 26 passed. There is a new Section 27 amended in Law Amendments Committee. New Section 27 passed. Section 27(a) and (b) passed; 27 passed. Old 27 is now 28 -- passed. -- (Interjection) -- After the inclusion of the new 27. Section 29 passed. Schedules A, B and C -- passed. Sections 4 and 5 passed; preamble and title passed. Bill be reported -- passed.

Bills No. 104, 108 and 110 were each read page by page and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 112 -- (Interjection) -- Bill No. 113.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a comment on this Bill. I have no objections at all to the fact of the Bill in general and the provisions in the Bill in general, but I want to draw again to the attention of the Committee that I think that there is a considerable number of young men and women in the Province of Manitoba that are going to be prejudiced

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd) against in following a nursing career in the future, and that is because of the fact that under Section 3 the stipulations of academic qualifications for the entry into the nursing profession is restricted to that of junior matriculation.

Now the Honourable the Minister of Education has on a number of occasions in this House drawn to our attention the great advantages that will accrue to our youngsters in the Province of Manitoba through the general course. I've asked him on a number of occasions, and also the other members of the front bench, to take steps to inform all of the school districts, the school trustees and, through them, to instruct or inform all of the youngsters who are contemplating taking the general course that there will be certain restrictions and barriers if they take this course. If I recall correctly, it wasn't too long ago that one of the requisites for a girl to become a nurse was Grade X education, and I think now -- of course now that has been changed -- but I do think, I do think, Mr. Chairman, that if a student takes the general course and completes the general course to Grade XII, that they should be entitled following that to take a nurse's training course and become a nurse in the Province of Manitoba. I think, and I'm only suggesting this on the completion of Grade XII at the present time insofar as the general course is concerned, that it should be considered the equivalent for this purpose of Grade XI matriculation.

Now I understand the Honourable the Minister of Education, or it might have been the Minister of Health -- and I must apologize for not being present at the time the statements were made -- I understand that either one of these two gentlemen said that we will have to delay a little while; we have to take a look at this thing. Well, Mr. Chairman, one of the honourable gentlemen nods his head one way and the other one nods it the other way, so I don't know where I stand. But I believe that this was stated -- at least I've been so informed. Now then, I don't think this is fair to the girls that are in the process at the present time of taking the general course in our public school system in Manitoba and I appeal once again, as I have done on a couple of occasions dealing with this Bill, to have the Bill contain the provision so that a student taking the general course, on completion of Grade XII, will be entitled to take up the nursing profession, which we all respect.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health) (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the Leader of the NDP's attention some aspects of The Registered Nurses Act that I think we're probably overlooking. I think we should understand that the Accrediting Committee under The Nurses Act, which consists of some executive officers of the Association, members of the Board of Governors of the University, two members from the Associated Hospitals, and two members appointed by the Minister, are the people who approve the curricula in the various schools, and each School of Nursing is autonomous unto itself. For example, certain hospitals demand a Grade XII matriculation; others Grade XI.

Now we thought it was -- or I thought, and whether it was right or wrong, to preserve the provision that has been in the Act since '53 that we leave in the Grade XI requirement in the Act. It's understood that, in trying to give some direction, that Grade XI is the University Entrance Course and is the desirable course for a girl going into nursing. No change was made in this until the Minister of Education drew to my attention that the proper terminology was University Entrance Course in Grade XI and that we should amend the present wording to that wording, and this is the amendment which has been made.

The Minister also informs me that the general course is not evolved to the point where he himself is prepared, or the department, to make a recommendation to the Accrediting Committee or to the Schools of Nursing and meet with them concerning the general course provision. That may well come in time, but at this time I'm advised that we should not put it in the Act at the present time. The Leader of the NDP will note it also says, "or any other equivalent course the Minister of Education may designate." I think we should leave this provision in at the present time because with our School of Nursing expanding, some girls who may finish their RN degree -- standing rather -- and wish to go on to university qualification are covered in that they take the matriculation. If they have their matriculation Grade XI standing, or university entrance standing, there won't be any problem in them carrying on.

I would, for these reasons, at this time recommend to the Committee that the amendment as proposed by the Honourable the Minister of Education in Committee with respect to Section 3 and the terminology used in describing the University Entrance Course of Grade XI

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd) standing be maintained in the Act and that the matter of the general course be left in abeyance at this time in view of the statements that have been made.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, then I would respectfully ask the Honourable the Minister of Education to send a bulletin to all of the school districts in the Province of Manitoba who have, or are contemplating, instituting the general course in their respective districts that at least for the time being any student entering into the general course in our public school system will not qualify to become registered nurses until such time as it is changed. I think this is only fair for the Minister to do this so that there is no misunderstanding, Mr. Chairman, on the part of the students in our schools.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I think in view of what has been said that I had better say something as briefly as I can. First of all, I don't think there is any misunderstanding. There never has been any. Those who were contemplating going into nursing, I'm sure, are fully aware of the requirements so far as their high school education is concerned just as those who wish to teach, or go to university, or go to the technical institute. These facts are reasonably well known and I would think that it's quite certain -- I'm quite certain that those who are undertaking the new general course are quite aware of the limitations insofar as further training is concerned. For example they cannot, as of the present moment, enter training as a registered nurse; they cannot enter the University of Manitoba or any university or college; they cannot enter teacher training; there are a number of others and all of these facts are drawn to the attention of the students who undertake the new general course, as indeed they are drawn to the attention of students who undertake other courses. That is, we don't have only two alternatives in our educational system. Students may take other courses, various options, and so on. There's a rather elaborate system for trying to ensure that students are aware of this.

On the question of whether or not graduates of the general course should be accepted into the training of nursing, which is really a more important point for us to consider, all I said -- and I hope no one reported that I said we were thinking about discussing it, because we have had a very careful discussion going on for quite a time with the Registered Nurses Association. Anyone in this House, Mr. Chairman, who has conducted negotiations with an organization which is composed entirely of women will understand that that has its special problems. But I want to assure the members of the House, the members of the Committee that we are not overlooking this because I may give it as, certainly my own opinion, that successful graduation from the general course would be a satisfactory preparation for the entering into training as a registered nurse. However, I don't govern the Registered Nurses Association and many years ago -- not just recently -- but many years ago, they were given a legislative authority to determine their own entrance requirements and, until we see fit to take it away from them, we have to abide by that situation. But I urge the greatest patience; I believe we're making good progress; I have every hope that we'll come out all right.

I would remind the members of the Committee that of course we have no graduates of the general course yet, the new general course, so perhaps it may be a little early to be trying to press the point too much in certain areas of post-high school training where they have been accustomed to having the matriculation, or what is now more properly known as the University Entrance Course, as their requirement for undertaking a particular type of training. I want to assure the members of the Committee that we have not lost sight of this, as indeed we haven't lost sight of it in a number of other fields, and that we shall press forward.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect for the effort that both Ministers have been making in this regard and I think they have both been working diligently on it. I am somewhat aware of the problem that is faced by the two departments in dealing with the Nurses Association, but I am still inclined to support the position taken by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party because I think it's not only the question of fairness that he suggests, but in addition to that it's going to be, I would think in future, a question of getting the nurses to take part in the registered nurses course, or the nurses course as we generally understand it preparatory to being a registered nurse, because this has been mentioned in the Committee I know -- the professional course is now starting. I believe there is -- is there a class in the university already? If not, there's arrangements made for one. -- (Interjection) -- It's starting in 1963.

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd)

Well now I would expect, with the emphasis that's being put on more and more education these times, that you will find an increasing percentage as time goes on of the young folk who are thinking of making nursing a career -- and a great many of them have an inclination in that regard and I think it should be encouraged -- will tend, especially those who have taken through-out the matriculation course, will tend to veer towards the professional course, the university course, where they're going to get a degree pretty much on all fours with the other academic graduates. I think in the interest of getting the people to start into this very important career that it is essential that we should make arrangements for either the general course to be accepted as is, or the general course to be altered to the extent that it's necessary to get it accepted, because I think you will find that there will be quite a few of the nurses who commence their training who, at some place during their career, will decide to go on and take the professional course as well. There again the question of fairness comes in, because if a young lady has started on her course and finds that she can't go on to the university course, it will be a considerable disappointment to her.

This nursing course as at present, and I speak with some experience in this subject having had a lot of people in our own home as they were going through the training course -- not all my own family -- that it's a really tough course. It's not as tough now as it used to be. There's been quite a change in recent years but it still is one of the few places where you go in and get absolutely no salary, and this is true, and some of the very best hospitals are the most stringent in that regard, and for a young lady to contemplate in these times of other lines of endeavour that offer remuneration right from the start, to face the nursing training is really quite a decision on her part and requires a whole lot of initiative.

And then on graduation -- I'm not noted as being an advocate of high salaries, but I certainly think that if there's one place that we should be looking at salaries, it's the salary that the graduate nurse gets. No one of those girls that I've been speaking of is a working nurse now, they've all done what so many nurses do and graduated into matrimony, so I'm not speaking on their behalf -- either my own daughter or the two or three nieces who lived at our place when they were going through -- I'm speaking on behalf of the ones who are still in training or just about to graduate, because they put in this long course of three years with no pay and then when they graduate they do not get, in general, as high a wage as some of the people who perform simple labouring jobs in these times. This is something that I think should be looked at.

But to get back to the point under discussion and that's always a good principle to observe here at times, I think that the two Ministers have this matter under consideration; I hope they will make an effort to do something about it, because I verily believe that with the institution of -- what for want of a better name I'll call the professional course or the graduate course -- with the institution of it, that you will find that it will become increasingly difficult to get the number that we need; and the way the hospital admissions are going up all the time, surely to goodness we do need the nurses encouraged to go into them.

MR. M. A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, there is a tendency now on the American continent for less and less young men and women taking up a profession of doctors and nurses. It's known, and I think the Minister of Health will agree with me, that the sick individual -- sick person needs hospitalization; needs a doctor and needs a nurse, either male or female. I think that everything should be done now, even if the situation is not serious -- I'd like the doctor to listen to me -- I'd like the Minister of Health to listen to me, if possible -- and I think that plans should be made from now on. Although the situation is not too serious now, but reading -- and I'm reading medical magazines and newspapers -- that less and less students have taken up the profession of medical and the profession of nursing, whether it's male or female. Even if the situation is not too serious now, it will become serious. A government has to look forward years ahead and I would not be in the way of any student that wants to take up one of these two professions, whether he has a Grade XI or a Grade XII or a Grade X matriculation, so I think perhaps that all we are interested in today, all we should be interested today is to encourage more and more students to take up any one of these two professions, and of course hospitals. I think in the long run it would save considerable money to the taxpayers -- and we are worrying about the taxpayers -- by giving them this service where they could recuperate much faster and save the expense of the state, to keep them for use in the hospitals.

(Mr. Gray, cont'd)

I know, being quite often a patient of the hospital, that the service that we get there means more to get well again than nature itself. I'm not suggesting anything now, but I was just bringing to the attention of the powers that be, that nothing should stop anyone -- and furthermore we should encourage anyone to take up any of these professions, otherwise, five or ten years later we will be in trouble because medical profession and nursing profession is not any more an encouragement for anyone to take it up. As far as salaries are concerned, a stenographer gets more pay than a nurse. I think everyone that wants to become a nurse is not for economic reasons, because they may like the profession, and there are still certain individuals in our community and in the community of the world that take up a profession because they like it, because they want to serve the people.

I remember when teachers were getting \$600 a year and they could have been, let's say a chambermaid for more money, but they liked the profession of teaching; they liked the profession of serving the people. I have a very case in mind; my own daughter is a teacher in New York. She had to go through five years in Columbia University before you may call her a teacher. She could have been a secretary to an executive officer or she could have been a stenographer, and furthermore she doesn't need the money that she's receiving now as a teacher but she loves the profession and loved it all the time. Let's encourage them and let's not always look at a situation five or ten years from now. Usually we are dealing in this House of matters coming up today, but they forget about it in the near future.

Bills No. 113, 114, 117, 121, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127 and 128 were each read page by page and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 129, Page 1.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we enter into the page by page description of this bill, I believe I understood the Minister yesterday in committee to say that he was investigating making increases retroactive on people who went on the compensation some years ago and who are on the old basis. I just want to verify this while we're discussing the Bill.

MR. OBIE BAZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is referring to cases that have silicosis now. Is this right?

MR. MOLGAT: Yes.

MR. BAZLEY: Yes, this is right. They're going to be considered by the Board at this time. They make application to the board.

MR. MOLGAT: I am referring to cases, not just of silicosis but in general, on the Workmen's Compensation. Someone who went on compensation say ten years ago at a very low rate because he may have happened to have been on a very low rate of salary at that time. Now there's been a general increase in salaries. Did I understand the Minister correctly yesterday to say that he was looking into this whole matter of retroactive increases in all fields? I just want that verification.

MR. BAZLEY: be retroactive. No, they won't be retroactive.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could clarify this point now.

MR. BAZLEY: We're looking at the basis of pensions that were established years ago. Now if there is a revision, I don't presume that they would be retroactive. They would be increased.

Bills No. 129, 130 and 131 were each read page by page and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 132, clause by clause. Section 1 -- passed; Section 2 --

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on this matter of the retention of the same numbers, is this not automatic under our present system where most of our licences are mailed out? Do you not automatically retain the same licence number as you've had all along?

MR. LYON: Are you referring now to the reserve plates? Well there's only a certain portion of the plates that are reserved, that is for those persons who wish to have a number that perhaps coincides with their house number. This reservation has been permitted for many years and it will be continued. The only difference at the present time in the Act, as according to the amendment that we have here now, is that if you wish to have a reserve plate you will pay \$5.00 for that reserve plate for the expense, the administrative expense and so on occasioned by having a reservation. That's a once only fee for five years of course.

MR. MOLGAT: I was under the impression that under the system that we have now

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd) where we mail a good number of the registrations, do you not retain the same number automatically?

MR. LYON: From year to year -- yes, we do from year to year. For instance in the new licence year if my honourable friend were to get a certain number for his vehicle that he wanted, he would get the validation strip for that same plate during the currency of the term of the plate, but I really don't know what he's getting at. That's what it is; that's what the system is.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): know what he's getting at, is up to now when you get in the new licence year, people up to a certain number, if they applied by a certain date, got the same number as they had. They were more or less reserved. Does this mean now that in future if they want the same number they're going to have to pay \$5.00?

MR. LYON: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sections 1 and 2 -- passed. The Section 3 as amended and the amendment is in Section 3, subsection (6) of Section 11 of the Act as amended: (a) by adding thereto immediately after the word "Canada" in the fourth line thereof the words "or any state of the United States of America or the District of Columbia in the United States of America"; and (b) by adding thereto immediately after the word "province" in the fifth line thereof the word "or states". Sections 3 to 5 -- passed.

MR. MOLGAT: check the amendment, but what does it mean?

MR. LYON: The amendment, Mr. Chairman, merely brings the reciprocity arrangements with the American states into the same category as those in the Canadian provinces, that is as to their validation. There is a subsequent section at the end of the bill where it validates all of the agreements that have been entered into by this administration and by the previous administration in accordance with this new section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sections 6 to 9 -- passed. -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes. In 6 -- is under suspension is renewed as the case may be -- that is in subsection (b) of Section 6 -- passed. Section 8 --

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): On Section 8, Mr. Chairman, I understand from some people that these amber lights on the front of a vehicle are confusing on the highway, that some of these amber lights as they approach you, you almost think it's the back end of the car. The difference between the red light and the amber light at night time is not so distinct and I was just wondering whether the Minister could give us any explanation as to why these amber lights have been introduced.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, these amber lights are being installed by the manufacturers. Apparently one can only presume this, because I don't have direct information on it, presumably because they have found through the tests that they undertake that amber lights for some reason or another are better to indicate a turn than the normal white light that we have. The only purpose of the section of course is to bring the law really into conformity with the type of equipment the vehicles are carrying. I make no brief one way or the other for amber lights. That would have to be left to the manufacturers, but the fact is that a good number of our new cars are carrying amber turning lights and we thought that they should be validated as a proper turning light under The Highway Traffic Act.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Why I bring it up, Mr. Chairman, is due to the fact that quite a number of people have spoken to me about how they have been confused. I think it's only the '63 models -- that's the first model that has introduced the amber light and they tell me that they are confusing on the highway.

MR. MOLGAT: particular section in keeping with other provinces? Because here whenever we run into areas, particularly with trucks that travel across the country, I think it would be very desirable that we have some relationship in our legislation with that of other provinces. Has this been checked out with Ontario to the east of us and Alberta and Saskatchewan?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, these three amendments, 10, 11 and 12 are really meant to clear up any misunderstandings that there might have been because of the wording of the previous section. Apparently there has been some doubt if the present wording includes the load which might well protrude over the back end, and the purpose of the amendment will make it clear that the meaning is the over-all length including the load. Now I can't say as to

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd) whether or not other provinces have done this, but we feel that it's advisable to do it in Manitoba.

MR. MOLGAT: more of the lights.

MR. LYON: Oh, I'm sorry. I have no information on the lights. This was just recommended to us by the branch to bring our section into harmony with the actual equipment on the cars.

MR. MOLGAT: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that it would be very desirable to have a relationship between the provinces on these matters, because if you simply have difficulties, if you have special laws here and different laws in Saskatchewan or Ontario, it puts truckers in a very difficult position where they have to have a whole series of different types of equipment or different types of lights and it really should be standardized.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): I think, Mr. Chairman, it is now understood all through Canada. It used to be that way. I remember that we had to have two switches. In one province it would be green lights and in another province it would be amber lights, and when we'd cross the border we had to get out and switch the amber lights off and put the green on, but as far as I know for the last few years it has been agreed from one end of the continent to the other that it is all amber lights.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member from Selkirk brought in a point and both the Attorney-General and the First Minister have indicated that they are ready to look into that. My question is this, now I wonder if by passing this is there anything that can be done later on to rectify this? I don't know how that could be done but this is what I personally would like to see. I wouldn't want us to wait until we have a few bad accidents and loss of life. I wonder if there's anything that -- could this be amended in any way that the Attorney-General or the government has the privilege of changing this? Can that be done? It would be too bad to have to wait until a few people are killed before we rectify this.

MR. GRAY: I don't know whether the question is under this section or others. Is there any age limit? How long can a man drive a car, whether he's capable or not? In other words -- (Interjection) -- I know what you are going to say, but the question is serious -- serious to me. How long or how old can a man be to drive a car in the opinion of the Act -- to continue driving it? In other words, wouldn't it be a good idea of adding to any section here that a man can drive to about 100 years or 99 or 98 or 75?

MR. LYON: The Legislature in its wisdom over the years has tended to equate the driver with the motor vehicle. It's like a motor vehicle, it doesn't matter on the age of the motor vehicle, it's whether or not the equipment is in good working order. The same applies to the driver.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Attorney-General could comment on what I had said about this light. Both the Attorney-General and the First Minister had implied their interest to check into this, and my point was if this is dangerous, can we stop it or do we have to wait another year? There might be a few loss of lives. I don't know. I'm not saying there's anything wrong but I'm worried, the same as the Attorney-General and the First Minister after listening to the remarks from the Member from Selkirk, and if it is dangerous I would like to see -- I don't know how this could be done -- but I would like to see either an amendment, something that would give permission to the government to change this.

MR. LYON: I'm not aware, other than the statement of the Honourable Member from Selkirk, to which certainly we all pay some heed, that these lights are considered dangerous by anyone other than perhaps the person or persons who have reported it to him. I've had no such indication from the branch. In fact they recommend this amendment because I think there has been some feeling that the white turning light was perhaps more dangerous than the amber turning light. That the white turning light sometimes could be mistaken for something other than what it was, whereas the amber turning light certainly catches your eye; it's a different colour from the main field beams of the car, the main driving lights of the car, and with the contrast in colour between the two it's quite clear that a car is turning when the amber light shows the off and on signal that it gives. So I wouldn't be prepared to adopt the proposition that these lights are dangerous. All I say is that they are now standard equipment in some of the 1963 models and the branch suggests to us that it would be wise to take account of this fact

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd) so that they could be used within the law properly because right now the requirement is that the turning light should be white. The purpose of the section of course is merely to say white or amber. I think it will have to be a question of experience. As I said before I hold no brief for or against them but I have certainly heard nothing other than the comments of the Member for Selkirk that they perhaps might be dangerous.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not suggesting -- I don't know if they're dangerous -- this is not my point. Although if they look the same as the red lights as indicated by some people to the Minister of Selkirk and if you think you're following a car and if it's coming straight at you, I'm sure it's dangerous. And apparently the Member from Assiniboia has heard the same thing. Now, my point is this: if everything is all right, fine, but I would like to see -- and I don't know how that can be done -- this is my question -- but if it is dangerous and one loss of life is too much to pay to find out -- if it is dangerous -- I don't know if it's possible -- but I'd like to see something put in this Bill that would give the government a chance to change it, or to stop it immediately, not have to wait 'til next year to come at the Session to amend it. Because one loss of life -- I'm not suggesting that this will happen. I don't know. But even if it's a little chance, it's too big a chance to take. That's my point.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I wouldn't like to leave the impression, Mr. Chairman, that I said they were dangerous. I think perhaps the people are more confused through the novelty because this is the first year that they have been used. The only reason why I raised the question was I thought perhaps the Minister may have some information as to what tests have been made by the automobile industry before they introduced these amber lights. It may be that the novelty is confusing people and as they become accustomed to it they'll perhaps be just as much used to them as they are to the present white light.

MR. O. F. BJORNSON (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Chairman, I think I could cast a little bit of light on this as I'm in the automobile business. I think that this is not the first time that the question of amber has appeared; I seem to remember previous years where amber were used. This was brought about because of the import of some vehicles from England and other places than the United States and Canada. I think pretty well all the vehicles that come from across the line and are manufactured here have red and white lights and I think this part of the section came through when we started to import them from outside, from foreign countries, and they did have amber lights. This was sort of a permissive bit of business to permit them to use the amber light as parking lights and turn indicators where they were standard equipment. I think that was the explanation that was given to the House previously, if I remember correctly.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Well, this is worthy of a few minutes, I think, this question. One of the reasons why they went to amber light was because -- and as the honourable member that last spoke said, we imported this idea from other lands -- and the reason is that they're more legible or more visible under fog conditions. I think the Honourable Member for Selkirk hit it on the head when he said it's more confusing than anything else. I'm just as concerned about these trucks that are driving down the highway with a big band of lights across the top with all colours on them -- it looks like Christmas. I have seen tail lights that look more purple than anything else. I think we should stay to the two standards and if we are going to allow turning lights that are amber for the sake of visibility, I think just as much attention should be paid to some of these rear lights that are being used because these novelties that you see in the automobile accessory business don't add very much to safety.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I note there's a typographical error in 25(a), Subsection (1) of Section 7. The word is proper -- it's property as in here. The word is proper in the second line. 25(a) Subsection (1) of 7 in the second line.

Sections 8 to 17 of Bill 132 read and passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Under Section 18. Has the Minister a list of the highways in the province where an extra speed limit has been allowed -- 70 miles?

MR. LYON: No, I don't believe to date -- and the Chairman of that board is within my hearing and he can correct me -- but I don't believe to date that there have been any 70 mile limits set. Although I saw an advertisement of the board recently that it was having hearings with respect to portions of certain highways where the board was prepared to give consideration to the extra limit. None of them to my knowledge have yet been set.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I realized that we had both the Minister and the

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) Chairman of the Board within hearing at one time and I thought maybe that was a good time to make a suggestion -- I was rather under the impression that the press had carried the report that one highway had at least been considered for an extra speed limit. My proposal is that some more should be considered. I'm a great believer in making the law conform to the practice if you can't change the practice, and it appears to be definite that on some of our highways we haven't been able to change the practice. I'm not complaining about that too much because with the good roads in the province that were built by the previous administration a lot of the highways are eligible, I think, for higher speed limits and certainly the cars are capable of going faster than they used to and perhaps more so with safety too. But my point is that there's a highway that I travel very frequently and I stay very close to the speed limit -- just so close that I always have the comfortable feeling that even if one of those concealed speed traps should be waiting for me that they still wouldn't take the trouble to check up for the very minor infraction that there might be. That's one advantage of having a "poor man's car", you don't have the same temptation to dash along fast in the way that some of those people do who are heckling me from behind. And on that highway while I travel practically at the proper speed there are many more people pass me than stay with me -- and I'm not complaining about that. I think on that highway that you could have eligible for consideration pretty soon -- no doubt there are some others. Either that or then the speed limits should be still better controlled than they are because I think that it's unfortunate to have too great violation of the existing statute. If it's right then have the folks with big cars obey them. If it isn't right, then let's change it.

I think the Minister knows the highway that I'm talking about. I have the feeling that the accidents that have been covered in the stretch that have been spoken of there, have probably been -- speed has maybe been more responsible than anything else -- that certainly would be an argument against raising the speed limit. If it's an argument against raising the speed limit, then it's an argument for some enforcement of the present speed limit. I don't know what's right to do. Maybe the Traffic Board should be taking a look at the whole situation pretty soon.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could at this time indicate what the minimum rate of speed is going to be that will be allowed?

MR. LYON: Well that matter is left for the determination of the board, having regard to the highway that they're dealing with; the condition of the highway; the amount of traffic that might be expected to be upon the highway at any particular time; and all of the different factors that the board will have to look into. That's why it's left as a determination for the board -- the minimum speed.

Dealing with the point raised by the Member for Lakeside, I believe that the Co-ordination Board, first of all with respect to its extended limits of speed, is looking at the divided and four-lane highways first of all, which are naturally the ones most susceptible to this increase; and having looked at that group of highways, which, of course, is growing larger every year now too, they will then move on to stretches such as the highway that he refers to, and that I'm interested in, that I travel a fair amount in the summer, and that I hold similar views about to his.

. Continued on next page

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I was going to raise the matter of minimum speed under Section 19 but since it's been raised already, I'll pursue it a bit at this point. So then, we're given to understand that it will be left to the discretion of the policing officers -- and I suppose that's --(interjection) -- Oh, I see. I'm really puzzled to know how people are to know whether they are in fact going too slow or not. I say that because a good many times I -- well I know of a good many people -- not a good many but a fair number -- who habitually drive very, very slowly and will continue to do so now -- up to now, of course, there's been no problem, but if you're going to have statute law here put into force making it unlawful to go, say, below 30 or 35, or some specified rate of speed, it's going to be difficult to have this enforced; people will be very confused. I wish the Minister would give some clarification of that point.

The second question I wanted to ask him is -- he will recall about a month to a month and a half ago, I asked him if he didn't think it might be a good idea to amend The Highway Traffic Act to have included as definition of legal parking a vehicle that has stopped by command of the law. Now it's possible that on weighing it he found that there are too many ramifications to make this practical move, but has he considered it and what are the objections to doing that?

MR. LYON: Dealing with the first part of the Member from Brokenhead's question, Mr. Chairman, if he will look at the present section 70 -5 of The Highway Traffic Act, he will find that there is provision and always has been in The Highway Traffic Act for prosecution of a person who is travelling too slowly upon a highway and I can read him the actual Subsection 1: "No person -- and this is the law at the present time and has been for some time --"No person shall drive a motor vehicle at such a slow speed as to impede or block the normal and reasonable flow of traffic, except when it is necessary to do so for safe operation or to comply with this part". And then Subsection (2) says: "A traffic authority may by regulation or by-law fix the minimum rate of speed". And really all we're doing is repealing Subsection (2) and saying that instead of the traffic authority, which means, either the Minister of Public Works or a local municipality, it now will mean The Highway Traffic Co-ordination Board may fix these speeds which could have been fixed under the existing law by the traffic authorities before.

MR. SCHREYER: Then, Mr. Chairman, it's not a substantive change at all; it's only a change in administrative procedure or whatever you want to call it.

MR. LYON: a change, yes, in the authority who will make the order. I think it will be a change in practice too, because the traffic authorities in the past, namely the Minister and the other municipalities and so on, really haven't availed themselves of this section. In fact I can't think of too many highways in Manitoba where you see a posted minimum speed sign. I'm anticipating that when the Board takes this over, after this amendment is passed, that they will start to look at the highways of Manitoba and you will soon see signs indicating "minimum speeds" on at least the major highways of our province or the portions thereof that are deemed susceptible to this type of minimum speed limit by the Board.

Dealing with his second point. We have looked of course at the particular case to which he made reference. I have not considered it advisable to have a general amendment put into the Act which would take account of that particular type of case, because it would lead to some considerable problems, that is as to the length of duration of the stay and so on and so forth. There's the old adage of course, that hard cases make bad law and very often you're much safer to stay with what you know, to stay with the definition of parking which is understandable to the public and to everybody else and for that reason we have advanced no such amendment in this Bill.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, yesterday, I think there was a driver who had a heart attack at a certain place and he lost his own life and injured others, because he had a heart attack driving at a fast speed. I was just wondering, what is the difference between 60 miles and hour and 50 miles an hour -- a man does not go out of the City say to Portage la Prairie and expect to be down there at a certain time. Between 50 miles an hour and 60 miles and hour, he's only delayed about 10 minutes and I don't think that 10 minutes means very much, particularly in a case where the driver collapsed. I think that -- of course I'm speaking as an old man -- I would not put up this argument if I were young, but why not reduce the speed to 50 miles an hour which is fast enough in my opinion.

MR. CHAIRMAN:18 passed, 19 (4) (a) passed.....

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, under 19 -- I had occasion last eveing to have a brief discussion with the Minister on this subject under somewhat different circumstances than

(Mr. Molgat cont'd) those that we're involved in now, and it seems to me that we require some more -- I see the Minister is busy --(interjection) -- Fine, then I shall wait. The point I was making to the Minister last night is that the exclusions that we have here (a) (b) and (c) are not sufficient, because there are other circumstances that we have to take recognition of: road conditions, weather condition, such things as the sun -- at sunset the sun's right in the eyes, and circumstances like this. Now, if he has an amendment, I'll wait and see what it says.

MR. LYON: Yes, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his suggestion because it is a worthy one. Notwithstanding the fact, however, that Subsection (1) does seem to provide certain defences in itself: "No person shall drive a motor vehicle at such a slow speed as to impede or block the normal and reasonable flow of traffic, except when it is necessary to do so for safe operation or to comply with this part;" now that "safe operation" I think would connote weather, road and all of these other things, but I don't think it hurts to make certainly double-sure, and we're prepared in (a), 19 (4) (a), to suggest this amendment. It would read ". . . . he is impeded by other traffic travelling on the highway or the condition of the highway or weather." I think that would meet his point and it's a worthwhile point.

MR. MOLGAT: Yes, I think that the conditions that I was concerned with in this matter, Mr. Chairman.

Sections 19 to 25 were read and passed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I move that clause 26 be deleted.

MR. LYON: anything for licenses?

MR. PAULLEY: No, Mr. Chairman, if the section is deleted then the section that's in the Act at the present time will remain in the Act and the fees as are now being charged will be the fees. They will not be increased.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Chairman, --(interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The member for Emerson.

MR. TANCHAK: I don't think the Chairman caught I think I was up before the Honourable Leader of the NDP -- (interjection) -- No, I don't put anybody to shame. He has no pie in the back We were discussing highways and as far as I'm concerned this section 26, subsection (b), I would consider highway robbery. I consider it a tax. The Premier likes to call it a "fee" and in my estimation a fee is a charge which takes care of a certain service in a certain department and I doubt whether the expenses in that department have gone up by just about 100 percent to justify this increase in licenses. You may say it isn't very much; it's a very small amount; but the trouble is that we've heard that so often in this House. Some two years ago we heard the same thing, when the provincial income tax was first brought in: "It isn't so very much; it isn't a big amount, and it is worthwhile because the province needs the money." Then the gasoline tax come in -- three cents on the gasoline, and that isn't so very much. That's what we hear. Individually it doesn't cost so much. Then the cigarette tax came in this year -- the cigarette tax and

A MEMBER: You voted for it.

MR. TANCHAK: The cigarette tax came in -- well wait a minute, I'm not finished yet -- and even that; they say "It isn't so much, between \$12.00 and \$13.00 per head." Now the license increase and the fishing licenses. Now if you take them all together -- I've got one party who has a family of four and I just took him as an example. The income taxpayer -- the new provincial income tax was \$25.00. Now, the gasoline tax -- the first one, the three cents -- cost him \$35.00 a year extra. Now he has the cigarette tax -- he and his wife smoke; of course it's their own fault because they do -- but we figure that will be in the neighbourhood of \$26.00 more for the year. Three licenses in that family -- it happens to be on the farm -- and there are three licenses. The wife drives -- she has to, because she has to help her husband out -- and also the son drives; so there's three licenses. That means an increase of \$6.00. Also all three of them like to go out fishing, so that means an increase of \$3.75 because our fishing licenses are increased by 125 percent all of a sudden, so that totals \$95.75 in one single year. So when you say it fast and take the individual items it doesn't seem so much, but if you lump all these taxes together it's quite an amount. Then if you add to that in the recent years, property tax that has risen -- and in most cases it's gone up at least 50 percent; the property tax. In this particular family, the property tax has risen by \$150.00. That's all within three years. So the total extra expense is \$245.75; add other fees that this government has raised in very many

(Mr. Tanchak cont'd) different places -- add another five, so it makes an even \$250.00, and I think it is quite a burden, quite a burden to carry this taxation. I have nothing to say as far as the \$5.00, the first item 26 (2) (a). It's a choice. If a person wants to retain a certain number in the future, well and good. He doesn't need it, doesn't have to, because he can get along with any number as long as he has a license, but then when we come to chauffeur's license -- this was increased by 50 percent. It used to be \$4.00; now it's \$6.00. That's an increase of 50 percent and I don't think that's justified. Now the chauffeur's license, \$3.00 for half the period. That's also increased by 50 percent. The greatest increase is on the driver's licenses. It used to be \$2.00 and now \$4.00. We're asking for \$4.00. That's 100 percent increase; and so on down. For half a period it's a \$2.00 increase. So I don't think that we're justified in imposing this extra tax in view of the fact that some other taxes have been imposed this year. I think it's not fair to the ordinary "joe" on the street; the poor folk. They cannot afford it. Therefore, -- I don't know if I'm in order now, whose amendment will come first -- I would like to amend, and moved by the Honourable Member from Gladstone, that 26 (b) with all its subsections (a), (a-1) (b) and (b-1) be deleted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: for the motion, those in favour

MR. LYON: on a point of order, that probably the Leader of the NDP's motion would have to take precedence because it wipes out everything. I doubt very much if the Member from Emerson's motion would be in order until we dealt with the Member from Radisson's motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, on second reading I asked the Minister if he would obtain for us certain information when he came Has he got that information?

MR. LYON: I've got the information and I carried the paper around with me faithfully for four days and I was searching vainly trying to find it now, anticipating the question; and I can't find it, so I'm thrust back on my memory and this will have to be subject to question as to exact figures but the figures that were given to me were these: the number of driver's licenses issued in the last fiscal year, I believe it was, was 297,000 and some odd -- some hundred. I can't accurately recall the number of chauffeur licenses. The total increase in revenue that is expected from the increases provided in the schedule is in the area of \$750,000 in two years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2 (a) passed; (b) passed.

MR. PAULLEY: motion that clause 26 be deleted.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, before the question is put. There's been some talk about the fee -- about this being an untoward fee. It isn't actually, because when you compare it with other provinces -- New Brunswick charges the same fee, two years, \$4.00 -- that is for driver's licenses I'm speaking of. Quebec, a one-year license is \$2.50. The bulk of the provinces do charge a \$1.00 fee. Manitoba will be in line with the provinces that charge more; slightly less than one and even with another. This fee was set in 1930 when a dollar was a dollar and since that time I think even the Honourable Member from Emerson will have to admit that all of the connotations that go with the receipt of a driver's license today cost considerably more than they did in 1930, and I am speaking now of the services that are provided through the Safety Branch, Safety Division -- through the Registration Branch, with respect to the point system that we maintain; the system of suspensions and so on and so forth. I don't raise this as any blanket reason for the increase, because certainly there is -- it will mean an increase in the revenues of the province, but I think at the same time one must admit that the costs of administration of this service since 1930 have gone up much more than any increase that is being provided for licenses in this Schedule Amendment.

MR. FROESE: I'd like to ask the Minister whether they're raising these fees in anticipation also -- they're paying those people that sell licenses, give them a better return for selling them.

MR. LYON: I believe they had an increase on the motor vehicle registrations last year. Not on the driver's licenses. I'm not sure of drivers; there's nothing anticipated that I know of at present.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, there'd been a further question that I had asked the Minister and that was what the present revenue was from this. He's given me the answer to my third question which was, how much more was expected, and that's three-quarters of a million over the two-year period. My second question is what were the revenues now?

MR. LYON: I don't have that figure with me. It would be in last year's revenue statement -- as to the actual revenue from this. If my honourable friend can't find it I can look it up and provide it for him.

MR. MOLGAT: The reason for my asking those particular questions, Mr. Chairman, is that I suspect that the increase is substantially more than what the costs involved in the administration of this particular department, and therefore that this is not a fee increase but, in effect, a tax; because if we follow the argument that the government has been using that a fee is something to be charged to cover the cost of a service, and if you increase it beyond the cost of the service then obviously what you are doing is you are imposing a tax.

MR. LYON: I think the same argument would have applied in 1930 when I think that the total cost of operation of the whole Motor Vehicle setup in Manitoba was something like \$30,000, and the same fee was charged then that is charged -- that will be charged -- up until the present time.

MR. MOLGAT: That may well be, Mr. Chairman, but my honourable friends have been the ones who have claimed all along that these increases in fees of theirs were not taxes. These were the words of the First Minister when this was discussed previously, and -- a fee is a fee is a fee -- and by your definition a fee is to cover a cost. Now if it's beyond the cost, as this is, and you're proceeding to increase it, then you are in effect putting on a tax in this field. This is the only

MR. LYON: I would be quite happy to agree with my honourable friend if I didn't have some responsibility for other fees that are charged; for instance in the Land Titles and in other areas where when we raised the fees, I think it was some three or four years ago, my honourable friends across the way made exactly the same charge. They said this was a tax. But in effect all we were trying to do was to adjust the intake of revenue to expense to bring it into accord with the same ratio that had obtained when my honourable friends' people had responsibility for affairs in Manitoba, and when they of course said the fees were fees. We still say that fees are fees and that we get proportionately about the same return as they did from their fees.

MR. MOLGAT: My friend has shifted his ground substantially from the previous discussion that we had on the subject, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: passed.

MR. PAULLEY: my amendment? I moved, Mr. Chairman, that Section 26 be deleted.

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

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I think it's quite in order now to move my amendment. I agree in some instances with the Honourable the Attorney-General, but my contention is that we are, or the government is hitting the poor man too hard in this one year, with the cigarette tax, with the fishing license tax or fee increase, and now the license increase and I don't think that it is fair to the poor man on the street. Therefore I move that Section 26, subsection (b) with all its appendices be deleted, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make one comment on the remarks of my honourable friend the Member for Emerson. He comes before this committee on this particular bill with apparently tears in his eyes because of the situation of the poor worker, the poor individual and he makes reference to the fact that other fees and taxes have been increased or new impositions made. Now I would suggest that my honourable friend should have a little consistency in his arguments in this House, because he voted for a tax in respect of tobacco and cigarettes and cigars which a great majority of the poor people that he's concerned with do imbibe in, and may I assure him that the great majority of the poor people that he's so concerned with do not own automobiles and do not require driver's licenses, so I suggest to my honourable friend that he should be just a little bit more consistent in his concern for the average ordinary joe in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. TANCHAK: I think, Mr. Chairman, I'm more consistent than the Honourable the Leader of the NDP. He doesn't seem to differentiate between the two different taxes. In the first instance I happened to go along with the government because we are not forcing the man and the poor man to smoke, and that's a tax there and it's his choice. But when he has a car

(Mr. Tanchak cont'd) we are forcing him to get a license

A MEMBER: He's not so poor if he has a car.

MR. TANCHAK: He has to. Quite a lot of poor men have cars too; it just depends on the definition of "poor". A car now is a necessity; so there is consistency here, I would say, because we are forcing this man to get a license if he has a car. While we're not forcing

MR. PETERS: buy a car.

MR. TANCHAK: we're not forcing him to smoke cigarettes. It's his own choice and he can certainly leave smoking

MR. PETERS: We're not forcing him to buy a car either.

MR. TANCHAK: It's a necessity.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) passed; (b) passed; (c) passed and -- 19 (a); there is a ...

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the word for "a" -- the word "a" be struck out and the words "an annual" be inserted, so it will read "for an annual permit to operate a school" -- Oh. Well we're going to substitute the whole thing; that's easier; 19 (a) we'll just substitute a new section reading this way: "for annual permit to operate a school for instruction in proper operation of motor vehicles \$50.00; (b) for the first year of permit to instruct persons in proper operation of motor vehicles, \$10.00. (c) for annual renewal of permit mentioned in clause (b) \$5.00." I think members will recall that I said at second reading of the bill that we would make provision for a lesser fee for the annual renewal of the driver instructor's permit.

MR. MOLGAT: What are the present fees?

MR. LYON: No fees at the present time other than the regular driver's license.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 27 passed; 28 passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I have asked one further matter from the Minister, whether he would consider bringing in an amendment regarding dealer plates for trailers. Has he had a chance to consider that one?

MR. LYON: I spoke to the Registrar about that at the same time -- shortly after my honourable friend spoke, and I must confess that I have had no word back from him on it and he left last evening for Halifax. Now I take it -- and I am only making a presumption -- that if he had had something to suggest, some recommendation, he would have brought it forward to us, but I'm sorry I have nothing from him in that regard at all, but we can still consider the matter and if any remedial action is required we can bring it in next year if he so reports to me.

The remainder of Bill No. 132 was read and passed.

MR. ROBLIN: the next bill page by page, as this was done in detail in committee already.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 133. Page 1

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill and I just wanted to ask the Minister if he wouldn't agree that this bill is proof of the old adage that "good things are often painfully slow in coming."

MR. McLEAN: Exactly when I said it was going to be.

Bill No. 133 was read page by page.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, before we leave the bill. I asked the Minister the other day just what additional amounts would be needed and what the additional cost would be from the old plan to the new. I think that the contributions that the government will make are going to be very much larger; in fact I think it's between 200 and 300 percent. I'd like to know from the Minister whether he could give us some indication as to how much it is going to be. After all he must have included it in the budget somewhere and must have made allowance for it, so I would like to know from him whether my assumptions are somewhere correct.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable Member for Rhineland will recall that in the estimates for the department we had \$140,000 for the current fiscal year. I'm unable to say what amount will be required in future years. That will depend upon the number of persons in receipt of retirement pensions. The point is, the province is obligated to pay the one-half portion of the pension from that fund and will have to provide annually for the money in the

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill be reported passed.

Bill No. 134 was read section by section and passed. Mr. Chairman correcting name in 3rd line of Section 3 to Daniel MacKay.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I have no particular objection to going page by page as long as we're following the proper rules, but these bills were not considered clause by clause and if they have to be at some stage, considered clause by clause --(interjection) -- well

Bills No. 135, 136, 137 and 138 were read page by page and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 139, Page 1 passed

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, on Bill No. 139, I would like to move, seconded by the Minister of Welfare, that Section 4 be deleted. That was the one on which we had the representation and the subsequent meeting with the Deputy Minister and the Securities people.

MR. ROBLIN: We have a motion before us to delete Section 4. Perhaps we could deal with that, then we would hear my honourable friend.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you'd be good enough to put the question on my motion to delete Section 4. Thank you.

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

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, speaking on the bill in general and not under sections, I personally, I'm not interested in the prepayment of general expense -- not because I could pay it -- but I think the principle entirely is wrong. Those in this trade, which is a necessary trade -- you cannot leave a dead body lying on the street -- and it has to be taken care of. Personally I don't care because I know that the authorities, the Health authorities will not let my body lie on the sidewalk. They'll bury me somewhere, and I don't care where -- I'll get to Heaven anyway.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I don't like to interrupt my honourable friend but we are supposed to be dealing with the bill clause by clause, at third reading.

MR. GRAY: Are you dealing with it clause by clause?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, that's what we're supposed to be doing, and what my honourable friend is saying might well be dealt with at third reading if he wishes to oppose the bill on principle, but I think we should be dealing with it clause by clause.

MR. GRAY: So when can I express my opinion?

MR. ROBLIN: At third reading, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 2 there's a -- on subsection (c) (6) there's an error there in "writing to" the second line, writing -- putting in the word "to" and "hearing" and striking out the word "of" -- "so that the board may what it consider necessary after notice in writing to and hearing the licensing." That's in section 3.

Sections 4, 5 and 6 and page 3 of Bill 139 were read and passed.

MR. LYON: typographical error, Mr. Chairman, in what appears as Section 8 of the Bill -- those sections will be renumbered, yes. Change -- in the second line of subsection 2 of Section 12, you would change the word 'shall' to 'may'.

The remainder of Bill No. 139 was read and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered certain Bills and directed me to report as follows: Bills No. 104, 108, 110, 113, 114, 117, 121, 123, 125, 124, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138 without amendment; and Bills No. 102, 132 and 139 with amendments, directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

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

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from River Heights, that the report of the Committee be not received with respect to Bill No. 102 and that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole for further consideration.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I'll be very short. My reason for moving this -- it seems to me from the words of some of the members that they felt they were voting, by voting -- I should start by saying that I'm referring to the clause on Sunday sports, and some of the members seemed to be more interested in deleting the clause of theatres and so on, on Sunday.

(Mr. Desjardins cont'd) That seemed to be one of the reasons why they voted for this. They were afraid that this might be brought back. And I think that there are some of the members that aren't here today that might have a chance to bring this in -- to bring their points in this. Now the Minister of Industry and Commerce has also said that we should have more time. I hasten to say that I feel that this will certainly not delay us here any longer. We have to sit on Monday. This is the Committee of the Whole House. I don't think that this will delay any longer. And there's one thing that I've noticed -- but before even saying this, to make sure that this is not an accusation, I'm sure that this wasn't done purposely. This was a slip; but the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce said -- if it was his idea not to honour this he certainly wouldn't have informed the Committee, but he told us that he was paired and then he forgot. I think that this is one of the reasons, and as I say, Madam Speaker, this will not delay anything and I think it would be advisable to send it back.

Madam Speaker put the question.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The question before the House is the motion that the Report of the Committee be not received with respect to Bill No. 102 but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for further consideration.

A standing vote was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Cherniack, Cowan, Desjardins, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Jeannotte, Johnson (Gimli), McDonald, Mills, Molgat, Patrick, Peters, Roblin, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Steinkopf, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Witney and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Bilton, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Froese, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McLean, Martin, Moeller, Paulley, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Weir and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 26; Nays 23.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I wish to announce that I was paired with the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and had I voted, I would have voted in the negative.

Bills No. 104, 108, 110, 113, 114, 117, 121, 123, 125, 124, 126, 127, 128, 129 and 130 were each read a Third time and passed.

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 131, An Act to provide for the Repeal of The Debt Adjustment Act, for third reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, just the one question that I would like to direct to the Minister at this time. Has the government any intention of bringing in any legislation at some future date, replacing this legislation that is now being repealed?

MR. ROBLIN: I rise to a point of order to explain to my honourable friend that the Attorney-General doesn't wish to be rude, but he's not able to make any speech at this stage of the game. He's moved the third reading and he cannot speak, and the answer is no. I will give it on his behalf.

Bills No. 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137 and 138 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 139, An Act to amend The Prearranged Funeral Services Act, for third reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. GRAY: I'm not going to move deletion and I'm not going to support it. First of all, I don't think this bill is necessary. I think that no one knows when the providence will send the individual the "heavenly summons" -- when he's going; how long he's going to live in this world. Secondly, I'm a little worried about it, that the institution known as the funeral directors, or the funeral parlours, will not go out, for it contains the same as the agents for the insurance companies and tries to persuade people to do this in their own interest. Everybody is afraid of death, and they may scare them, and they probably will invest money, and if the agreement is not carried out they're losing 20 percent of their money, because the man that is financially secure is not going into a prepaid arrangement with a funeral parlour. It is, in my opinion, not justified to have those that are financially not well fixed to be afraid that in case of death that nobody is going to take care of them. I have not seen yet dead bodies

(Mr. Gray cont'd) anywhere which are not being taken care of, one way or the other, either by the family or by the state. Salesmanship sometimes works. We need salesmen to sell our bonds; we need salesmen to sell insurance; but when it comes to such a situation where the people would be thinking, not how to get older, but when will he or she require funeral arrangements, and then they sign a contract, which is unnecessary to go through all this routine. So I feel that the funeral parlours -- I mean everyone; I'm not singling out any-one of any religion -- but when the salesman comes and says, "Here now; you want a funeral with flowers or without flowers? With limousine, hearse or otherwise?" They put a little indirect scare into them. So I feel that the whole bill was not necessary, but if it is, of course, then It's not necessary. I'll stop right there. I feel that this is an imposition and, may I state, and if I'm wrong I'll withdraw my statement, it is commercializing on the life and death of the individual, so I feel that I'm not going to support it. I am not going to ask for the Yeas and Nays, but I want to place myself on record, that I disagree with the entire bill, and I'm not worrying about the different sections in the bill.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I feel that I should say a few words at this time, because I think that the Honourable Member doesn't quite understand what is involved here today, and again he might have left the impression that this was a bill brought in by the funeral directors. I can say that, personally, I'm against this -- the bill. Not this; this is not a bill; this is an amendment. I'm against this bill. We should have decided that last year, and I think that maybe next session we should look at this again. I'm not against the principle of pre-arrangements, but I'm against the principle of door-to-door peddling of funerals, and I can assure my honourable friend that no funeral directors are very interested in that. In fact they were against this bill, but in all fairness -- (interjection) -- Beg your pardon?

MR. PAULLEY: You've been trying to get me for a long time.

MR. DESJARDINS: That was and it won't be too long either; and I won't make much money. But Madam Speaker, I think in all justice to the Attorney-General and in explanation to the honourable member that spoke last, this is not a bill. This will only help protect the people a little more. This is just strengthening the bill that was passed last year -- the principle of the bill was last year. I certainly will vote for this, because I think it's just giving more protection to the public, but I didn't want to leave the impression that the funeral directors were in favour of this or that they were vultures just waiting for somebody to go.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce that the House do now adjourn until 9:30 Monday morning.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, just before the motion is put. I wonder if the Honourable the First Minister could indicate when the Committee on Law Amendments might be meeting. If I understand the vote, the Committee on Law Amendments must now reconsider the bill on The Winnipeg Charter.

MR. ROBLIN: My honourable friend misinterprets the vote. The reference was back to the Committee of the Whole, and on Monday morning's Order Paper there will be an item of business referring this bill back to the Committee of the Whole.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 9:30 Monday morning.