

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

9:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 26, 1966

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker:

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
 Reading and Receiving Petitions
 Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
 Notices of Motion
 Introduction of Bills
 Orders of the Day

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to address a question to the Leader of the House. Could he inform me as to when we may be receiving the Orders for Return and Address for Papers that are outstanding.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Fort Rouge): I have no information beyond what the First Minister gave yesterday.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the House Leader. Could you indicate to us whether amendments to the Election Act will be made prior to the next election?

MR. EVANS: I must make the same answer in that connection, that I have no information beyond what the First Minister gave yesterday.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder Madam Speaker, if the Honourable House Leader could indicate to us whether or not the First Minister will be here, so he may be questioned in this regard?

MR. EVANS: I think not this morning. So far as I am aware, he will be here this afternoon.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. Can he indicate now to me when either the Minister or the First Minister will be communicating with the citizens committee of Windsor and Niakwa Park in reply to letters which they have sent to the government?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): I couldn't say at the moment, Madam Speaker. I am sure he will give it every consideration at the first opportunity.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Education. Has he received any report from the Advisory Committee on the sub-committee's report on the learning of reading?

MR. JOHNSON: I believe yesterday afternoon I received copies of the material which were given to the advisory board members. They arrived in my office as an inter-departmental memorandum.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question of the Honourable the Leader of the House. I would like to ask him, Madam Speaker, if the amendments to the Election Act are going to be dealt with before the next election, how long would that give us to deal with the amendment to the Election Act?

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, this is a complicated calculation I am not able to make as I stand here. I wonder . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I want to ask a subsequent question of the Minister of Education. Will copies of that material be available to members of the House?

MR. JOHNSON: I'll have to check. I don't want to deny any proper material to the Honourable Members. I'd like to check on that. It's prepared by the Committee I believe and sent to the Advisory Board. I think it should be made available, I'll see what I can do about it.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland) Madam Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the House Leader. Is there a copy of the Financial Statement of Monoca available; and if so, would the government table the same?

MR. EVANS: There is no such copy available to me.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. I understand that among other duties my honourable friend is the Chairman of the Steering Committee on Legislation. I wonder if my honourable friend could indicate to us whether or not the Law Amendments Committee will be meeting again before the House rises?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party affords me a title which I neither deserve

(MR. McLEAN, cont'd) . . . nor have. I'm in the hands of the House in regard to matters of that sort.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker I wonder if I could consult the House about the conduct the House about the conduct of business for the rest of this morning. --(Interjection)-- That hasn't got out of hand yet.

We still have the debate on the Order Paper concerning injuries to persons who assist peace officers in the conduct of their duties and if the House should approve that, it would be the intention to refer it to the committee that's being considered under the resolution in the name of the Attorney-General. Therefore, I wonder if it would suit the House to call the debate which starts on Page 10 and stands in the name of the Honourable Member for St. John's at the moment on an amendment, and finish that debate, and if it's decided to pass that resolution or the amended resolution, then it can be referred to the committee and included in it when it's discussed. Does that sound like a good idea?

MR. MOLGAT: There's no objection on our part, Madam Speaker. Before we leave the Orders of the Day though I would like to ask a subsequent question of the Leader of the House, Madam Speaker. In view of the fact that it is entirely possible that the House will finish it's work today - it would even be conceivable I suppose that it might finish this morning, although not likely - the opportunities for getting to the House Orders for Return and Address for Papers is very limited, will the government undertake to supply them after the House rises?

MR. EVANS: I would prefer my honourable friend to ask that question of the First Minister. I am not able to make a statement on it at the present time. I'll give him notice of the question you have just asked.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, the First Minister will not be here this morning. Will the Leader of the House then undertake to give the House an answer before the House rises?

MR. EVANS: Yes - assuming we don't rise this morning. I think that's a pretty fair assumption. I will endeavour to and if I have an opportunity to consult with the First Minister I'll undertake to see that an answer is provided.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF Q. C. (Provincial Secretary) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the table of the House a return to an Order of the House No. 61 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Radisson; and a Return to an Order of the House No. 42 on the motion of the Honourable Member from St. Boniface.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Provincial Secretary. In view of the fact that all members have been supplied with a new Manitoba flag this morning, could the Honourable the Provincial Secretary indicate whether the new Manitoba flags are available to the public; and if so, where may they be purchased; and in what sizes?

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, I'm informed that there will be a supply in various retail stores before May 12th the date of our flag raising. I believe there are some flags in not too many sizes in one or two of the department stores downtown now, but they should all be available in pretty near every size pretty close to May 12th.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . the price range comparable with the other flags or . . .

MR. STEINKOPF: I can only give you a very rough idea, that the 3 x 6 flag should cost around \$9.95, under \$10.00 in the stores, and that may vary depending on the quality of the flag. There are so many other sizes that I wouldn't want to venture even a guess. The large one that could be used on most buildings should be in the neighbourhood of \$10.00. That is for the cloth flag. --(Interjection)-- Sales tax included.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, may I ask you to call the resolution appearing on page 10 standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. John's and the amendment thereto in the name of the Honourable Member for Selkirk and the further amendment in the name of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. John's and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre. The Honourable the Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Madam Speaker, I was extremely pleased to listen to the address on this question by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre to note the extent and thoroughness of his preparation and investigation of this problem. I feel that it

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) will be a very important step that this House will undertake and I'm proud of the fact that I was permitted to bring it before the House.

The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre introduced a number of questions and extended the entire problem indicating how advisable it was to have this committee investigate the entire problem and make recommendations, and it may well be that Manitoba will be amongst the leaders in this field of extending social responsibility to people who deserve consideration because of acts from which they suffer and for which they are not at all at fault.

Specifically, the Member for Winnipeg Centre found the amendment of the Member for Selkirk to be restrictive and limiting and I do not share his view. He said as I recall it that that amendment would make it necessary for the person being injured to have been ordered by a police officer to assist him and I don't read that amendment that way at all. The amendment reads, that if a person does assist a police officer in the honest belief that the officer was legally executing his duty in making the arrest, then he should be compensated; and therefore a person seeing a police officer in the process of making an arrest would not have to investigate the legality of it but believing that it was a legal arrest, would then be compensated. I think one of the points made however, which does deserve consideration is the occasion when a person is injured whilst himself making an arrest, not in company with a police officer but rather making a citizen arrest, where this amendment and indeed I think the original resolution did not quite cover.

Now the thoughts expressed by the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre make it clear that he endorses the first proposal wholeheartedly. I think there wasn't the slightest doubt in his mind that the first proposal, that is, the compensation to a person who is injured whilst assisting a police officer was one which he felt was right and I must say I am disappointed that he did not see his way clear to agreeing with the resolution to put that into effect without need for further consideration, as he himself indicated and as I had indicated the cost would not be such as to frighten off a recognition now of that need. I think that since the government in any event would have had to prepare legislation and indeed prepare the whole blueprint for this type of compensation, any of the doubts that may have been in the mind of the honourable member could have been resolved by the government. However, it's clear that the government is not prepared to accept the first principle as it now stands and wishes to have the committee study it, and of course I accept that proposal and am pleased that there will be a study and I'm sure that as a result of a study there will be legislation brought forth recognizing what we said was a necessary step in social responsibility to individual members of society. So that naturally, Madam Speaker, I accept the amendment - I certainly accept the amendment of the Honourable Member for Selkirk because I think it reworded and strengthened a portion of the original resolution and I'm very pleased to see this matter carried forward in the manner in which it has been done.

I'm sorry, Madam Speaker, I did have - I wasn't quite through. I did want to bring to the attention of the House an article which appeared in Time Magazine of March 4th, 1966, in which it describes the occasion where a bus driver in New York spotted a dozen youths beating up a policeman. He slammed on his brakes, he jumped out of the bus to fight the attackers and he suffered certain facial wounds. He later spent seven days testifying against two of the youths who were ultimately convicted of assault. For his trouble this bus driver whose name is Randazo, had his pay docked \$232.00. Because the fight was in the street rather than on his bus, the City Transit authority ruled that this driver was on his own time each and every minute he spent in court. The report states that the district attorney named Randazo a winner of an honour certificate for the exercise of exceptional citizenship responsibility. Unfortunately, though, in what the district attorney aptly called the cold society, awards seem unlikely to reform those who live by the big city philosophy, "ignore thy neighbour." And then the article proceeds to indicate the recognition of the need in New York and the problem that must be solved. And the article concludes with a sentence: "It is about time we consider violent assault on persons as important as automobile crashes."

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Madam Speaker, I was interested in what the previous speaker had to say as I am interested in this entire subject and I feel I'd be remiss if I passed up this opportunity of associating myself with the Member for St. John's and others who have spoken on this important subject of assistance to those who come to the aid of a policeman in carrying out his duties in the protection of society.

It is interesting that the mover of this resolution and the Member of Selkirk in offering an amendment together with the Member for Winnipeg Centre are all lawyers and by this they are

(MR. BILTON cont'd.) well able to expound the subject from their experience before the Bar. I accept the opinions put forward, particularly the one by the Honourable Member for Selkirk by way of an amendment in which he quoted Section 110 in the Criminal Code of Canada which calls upon citizens to assist a policeman in the performance of his duties and failing to do so, they are liable. Rarely, Madam Speaker, does a policeman lay a charge under this section of the Criminal Code. Normally he is intent on apprehending the offender or offenders. I would wish however, that the public could be made more and more conscious of the importance of this section of the criminal code. It seems to me that a policeman no matter whether it is the RCMP, the Municipal Police or a village policeman, these days are fair game for those who would flaunt the law at the slightest opportunity.

The Member for Winnipeg Centre indicated the other day that our penitentiaries and provincial jails are full to overflowing as never before, Madam Speaker, and that millions are spent by society in the maintenance and the rehabilitation of prisoners. None will deny that those who chose a life of crime are becoming more and more a plague on society. There are thousands who choose, for some unknown reason, this way of life, and are the types, Madam Speaker, that the policeman must grapple with in his every day duties. Added to this vast growing army, there are those that are in and out of our provincial jails, as a matter of course. It is fair to say that when the snow flies each fall, crimes are committed by some assuring themselves of a winters room and board at public expense.

My thoughts in entering this discussion, Madam Speaker, are to point out today that a policeman's job is not a happy one. Almost every week we are reminded of the apathy of the public in coming to the aid of a policeman in the performance of his duties. In making a legitimate arrest in a public place, how often have we read and heard of a policeman finding himself in difficulties. People will stand idly by and do exactly nothing. The policeman, in spite of his appeal, must struggle on, often sustaining serious injury that would have been avoided with a slight help from those bystanders. It is happening up and down our province, Madam Speaker, and throughout the nation every day. There are those, Madam Speaker, with no respect for themselves, their neighbours, fellow countrymen, or the laws of the land, who would destroy our way of life and tear our nation apart to satisfy their selfish criminal gains. There are people who would ridicule the efforts of our law enforcement bodies whose purpose it is to guard, guard us, Madam Speaker, when we sleep, and to overcome those bent on robbery, violence, and terrorizing of respectable citizens, in their tracking down and bringing to justice those who would poison the minds of the people in the distribution of dope and narcotics for their ill-gotten gains.

Current accounts call for the bringing together and the opposing upon public opinion for more support and respect of those men that wear the uniform and have the responsibility of enforcing the laws of the land. People, Madam Speaker, for some reason or other, have lost the respect of the man in the uniform. The man who is there to protect and insure the intermingling of society in a normal and decent manner, and to protect our life, limb and property at all times, 24 hours a day.

Madam Speaker, a policeman is a human being. Sometimes I think this is forgotten. People think he is a mechanical robot. This he isn't. He's flesh and blood as much as you or I, and I feel that they are entitled to the respect and assistance of society. It's no child's play, Madam Speaker, to look down the receiving end of a revolver or rifle in the hands of a wrongdoer who has nothing to lose in his opinion, than to pull the trigger and now that peace officer down. A man who has pride in wearing that uniform and only too anxious to serve the people to the best of his ability.

I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that society as a whole should take a good look at this problem. By tradition, law enforcement bodies are reluctant to speak out on this important matter, but would I am sure, in fact I am positive, acknowledge with open arms a better understanding on the part of the public at large, the men who are often misunderstood in their efforts in maintaining the peace of the land. I support a careful and thorough study as suggested in this proposition, in the hope that our policemen at all levels will be given the recognition their profession rightfully deserves.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate the mover of this motion in bringing this matter forward, and also those people that took part in the debate. I think this is a very worthwhile and a very worthy resolution for us to consider because I find, and I am sure that other members of this House will support me on that, that there is a certain lack of involvement by people today. People do not want to get involved, and from the various press reports

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) that we receive from time to time -- I remember on one occasion which I read about, apparently a party was attacked three times by the same attacker and people went by, saw this person and would do nothing about it. They wouldn't even report it, and in this way the person was attacked three times and died later on as a result of the injuries. But no one would do anything about it. Nobody would come to the rescue. People were all afraid to get involved and I think this is a matter that we should take notice of and try and correct it. There must be some reasons for this. Why do people not want to get involved today?

I think this is also true in connection with volunteer witnesses. Today we find so often that people witness a certain incident or accident, whatever the case may be, and yet will not come out voluntarily and witness. They are afraid they might get involved and this might take them from their work; it might cost them money; or even other matters might come into consideration. So that people are reluctant to come forward in this way and I think there must be some basic reasons for this, and certainly a committee of this type could look into these various matters.

One of these reasons, in my opinion, no doubt is that, as already mentioned by other speakers, there is no compensation involved here, and that we should probably do something in this connection, that compensation be made for those people who suffer loss as a result by assisting law officers or assisting the law in this way. Once more, I will fully support the motion and also the amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member for Selkirk. I think it's a very timely resolution.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed amendment as amended by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. John's as amended.

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

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that Madam Speaker to now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the proposed resolutions which are set out on the Order Paper and are in the names of the Honourable the Minister of Education, the Honourable the Provincial Secretary, and myself. And, Madam Speaker, with leave, may I include in this resolution a further resolution which will be in my name with respect to the Committee on Regulations and Orders, the terms of which will assign to that Committee the study of the resolution which has just received the approval of the House, together with one or two other matters which have already been considered by the House. I should like to have leave to include that resolution with those now being moved into Committee, and say that the Clerk has very kindly undertaken to have copies of the fourth resolution reproduced and they'll be available for us within a few moments.

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 House with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, the Committee to proceed with the resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Provincial Secretary first. Could I have agreement to that as a matter of courtesy? The honourable member must get away.

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs - and again I must ask the leave of the House to make a correction in the resolution as it appeared standing on the Order Paper. You will recall that last night we amended the resolution by deleting the word "such" in two places. Unfortunately, in the Order Paper the deletion did not occur the second time that it appeared and I would ask leave to amend the resolution. At the fifth line from the bottom of the Order Paper the word "such" appears - "all such aspects" - to have the word "such" deleted. -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon?

MR. CHERNIACK: "Such" also appears just before the first whereas - "to make such recommendations" - was not that "such" also deleted?

MR. STEINKOPF: That one wasn't deleted, just the word "such" - "to investigate all such aspects" where it appeared twice. Once above that in the paragraph preceding. May I have that leave?

MR. MOLGAT: You're removing "such" the once only?

MR. STEINKOPF: Yes.

MR. MOLGAT: The fifth line from the bottom?

MR. STEINKOPF: Fifth line from the bottom. I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs,

WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba at its Fifth Session of the 27th Legislature on the 25th day of April, 1966, adopted the following Resolution:

WHEREAS insurers licensed to sell automobile insurance in the Province of Manitoba have indicated that they will probably increase their rates for such insurance in the province;

AND WHEREAS in recent years there have been a series of increases in automobile insurance rates;

AND WHEREAS it is recognized that such rates ought to be directly related to the claims experience of insurers in the Province of Manitoba;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed advisable in the public interest to study and investigate these matters;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed advisable to review the proposed variations in rates, as well as any rate increases which have been effected in recent years, for the purpose of considering and weighing the factors to which these increases have been attributed and thereby assessing the justifications for such increases, and without restricting the generality of the foregoing:

to investigate all aspects of automobile insurance as it deems appropriate for the purpose of safeguarding the interests of the public;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT a Special Committee of the House consisting of nine members be appointed to review the proposed variations in automobile insurance rates, as well as any rate increases which have been effected in recent years, for the purpose of considering and weighing the factors to which these increases have been attributed and thereby assessing the justification for such increases, and without restricting the generality of the foregoing:

to investigate all aspects of automobile insurance as it deems appropriate for the purpose of safeguarding the interests of the public;

And to make such recommendations as are deemed advisable thereto.

AND WHEREAS it is deemed advisable that a Special Committee consisting of nine members of the Legislature be appointed to review the proposed variations in automobile insurance rates, as well as any rate increases which have been effected in recent years, for the purpose of considering and weighing the factors to which these increases have been attributed and thereby assessing the justification for such increases, and without restricting the generality of the foregoing:

to investigate all aspects of automobile insurance as it deems appropriate for the purpose of safeguarding the interests of the public;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed advisable that this Special Committee be authorized to hold public hearings as may be deemed advisable during this Session or during recess after prorogation and report its findings and recommendations at this Session or at the next Session of the Legislature.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that a Special Committee consisting of Honourable Messrs. Lyon, Steinkopf, Weir, and Messrs. Cowan, Desjardins, Hillhouse, McKellar, Paulley and Strickland be appointed to review the proposed variations in automobile insurance rates within the meaning of the above resolution adopted by the House on the 25th day of April, 1966.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Special Committee have power to sit during the present Session and in recess after prorogation and to report to this House on the matters referred to them during this Session or at the next Session of the Legislature;

AND THAT the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund to the members of the said Committee the amount of expenses incurred by the members in the performances of duties ordered by the Committee in recess after prorogation as are approved by the Comptroller-General;

(MR. STEINKOPF cont'd.)

AND THAT the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund all other expenses of a kind and nature required to assist the Committee in carrying out the provisions of this resolution and the said resolution adopted on the 25th day of April, 1966 and provided the same have received the prior approval of the Treasury Board.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word on this. This morning is the first opportunity we've had of looking at the honourable members who have been appointed or selected to be on this Committee, and it's quite interesting to note that on the Committee of nine, there are eight who in some way or other may be connected with the automobile insurance industry, for we have four lawyers who may be involved in court cases and litigation and one thing or another; we have two insurance agents who obviously have something to do with automobile insurance; we have two undertakers which may be benefactors as a result of automobile insurance; and me. And I can see, Mr. Chairman, that we're likely to have some difficulty in the Committee itself, if and when it meets, but I want to assure my friends on the Committee that "me" will try and do my utmost in face of the tremendous odds that face me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution -- passed. The next resolution before the Committee, the resolution of the Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. McLEAN: Normally you would read that resolution when we're in Committee, or do you wish me to do so?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well the Honourable the Minister of Utilities read it.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I'll be glad to. The resolution which is before the Committee is this resolution:

WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba at the Fifth Session of the 27th Legislature, on Thursday, the 29th day of March, 1966, adopted the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Government consider the advisability of establishing a Special Committee of the Legislature to examine the statutes and regulations governing Professional Associations and the licensing, provision of standards and disciplining of professionals in the Province of Manitoba, as set out therein, and to consider the advisability of enacting uniform legislation wherever practical and applicable.

AND WHEREAS it is deemed advisable that a Special Committee consisting of nine members of the Legislature be appointed to consider the aforesaid resolution:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT a Special Committee consisting of Honourable Messrs. Baizley, Johnson, McLean, Messrs. Campbell, Cherniack, Hillhouse, McGregor, Seaborn and Stanes be appointed to consider the aforesaid Resolution;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: THAT the said Committee may hold such public hearings as it may deem advisable.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Special Committee have power to sit during the present session and in recess after prorogation and to report to this House on the matters referred to them at the next session of this Legislature;

AND THAT the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund to the members of the said Committee the amount of expenses incurred by the members in the performances of duties ordered by the Committee in recess after prorogation as are approved by the Comptroller-General;

AND THAT the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund all other expenses of a kind and nature required to assist the Committee in carrying out the provisions of this resolution and the said resolution adopted on the 29th day of March, 1966, and provided the same have received the prior approval of the Treasury Board.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I think the resolution, as its terms indicate, is to establish the Committee to conduct this study which was unanimously approved by the House earlier during this Session, and I'm authorized to say that the Honourable Member for St. John's did not propose his resolution in order to shelve the consideration of this matter but rather because of his earnest interest, and certainly I join him in that interest in having this study and recommend the approval by the Committee of the resolution.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, what is the intention with regard to the resolution that we passed in the House a few moments ago regarding assistance to those who suffer injury when assisting. Is it not the intention to have this Committee look at it as well?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, it's the other Committee, as will be indicated when we have the other resolution. That's the other resolution which I had asked leave to present and we propose to deal with that under that resolution.

MR. MOLGAT: There's another resolution coming forward?

MR. McLEAN: Yes, there is.

MR. FROESE: Do I understand that by considering regulations as well that we will be given a revised edition of all the regulations that are presently in effect in the Province of Manitoba and that the members of this House will receive bound copies of such revised regulations?

MR. McLEAN: I'm not too clear what the honourable member means by his question. This would be a Committee to examine the Statutes and Regulations which govern professional associations, and the licensing and so on of professionals. Of course, it in itself would make no new regulations and certainly any recommendations of that Committee would have to come to the Legislature for consideration.

MR. FROESE: I realize this, Mr. Minister. My problem has been that we are now getting bound copies of regulations each year but we don't have these of past years, and if we could get the revised edition of all past years regulations, I think this would be very valuable for members of this House.

MR. MOLGAT: Does the Minister have a list of which associations are going to be asked to appear before the Committee?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I do not. I think the one person who made reference to practically all of them was the Honourable Member for St. John's when he spoke on his resolution, and I would have to say that I myself have made no study nor no compilation of the associations. I am assuming it would be intended to present to this Committee everything that is now provided for by Statute and it would be simply a straight case of going through the Statutes and getting them all copied in a form that the Committee could study, and particularly do the kind of work which the Honourable Member for St. John's did where he compared provisions as they affected various groups, and as they are now established either by Statute or Regulation. But basically, everything stems from a Statute although there may be regulations which follow pursuant to the Statute. I have made no analysis up to the present time.

MR. MOLGAT: These then presumably are the ones that are established by Statutes of Manitoba. Are there some that have a Federal Statute and are operating here with which we would be concerned, and yet unable to take any action because it is not really in our hands?

MR. McLEAN: A quick off-the-cuff opinion would be that there would be none which would be affected by Federal Statute, since I think it would be unconstitutional to have a professional group having its authority established by a Federal Statute. However, certainly in my view it would be within the competence of this Committee to examine the Federal Statutes if there are any which are applicable in this general field of activity.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, might I just -- I think that the Honourable Minister is correct in his estimate of the impact of any Federal legislation. I think there are certain bodies that have a national charter which is recognized by the provincial, but the licensing itself I think is provincial.

Might I indicate, Mr. Chairman, that I think that a great deal could be accomplished even before the Committee actually starts its work by having this comparison made, as the Honourable Minister has suggested. I wouldn't be at all surprised if the Manitoba Bar might not be willing to be involved in supplementing the work of this Committee by doing its own research into this comparison and preparing a schedule, or whatever form it would take, showing the various methods used by the various professional bodies in their acts and regulations in the different facets of carrying out their responsibilities.

Might I also suggest that this Committee would, could and should -- I should reverse that -- should, would and could look into the by-laws of the various professions which are of course authorized by Statute and which themselves in many cases contain the real powers of the various professional bodies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution -- passed. The next resolution, the resolution of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and Conservation.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Chairman, do you wish that I read the resolution?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. HUTTON: WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba at its Fifth Session of the 27th Legislature on Saturday, the 16th day of April, 1966, adopted the following Resolution:

WHEREAS agriculture is the basic industry of Manitoba, and

WHEREAS agricultural prosperity is vital to the over-all economy of the province, and

WHEREAS cost of production is a major factor in our farmers' ability to improve their standard of living, and

WHEREAS farm costs have been increasing rapidly, and

WHEREAS every cost increase causes a deterioration in our farmers' competitive position in world markets, and

WHEREAS the capital investment of Manitoba farmers in machinery and equipment is second only to their investment in land and buildings, and

WHEREAS machinery operation is much the largest single item in our farmers' cost of production, and

WHEREAS an increase in prices of farm machinery and repair parts immediately adds to our farmers' cost of production in both capital investment and machinery operation, and

WHEREAS during recent years prices of farm machinery have increased tremendously in this province, and

WHEREAS another price increase has already been announced, and

WHEREAS it is not possible for the province to control prices of farm machinery and repairs, and

WHEREAS the Agriculture and Colonization Committee of the House of Commons studied the matter of farm machinery prices and recommended, in 1961, that further study be carried out, and

WHEREAS as the cost of farm mechanization increases, the dependability of the machinery and the service provided to maintain it becomes more critical, and

WHEREAS the intent of The Farm Implement Act is to ensure dependability of farm equipment being offered for sale and to assure adequate maintenance of this farm equipment for a reasonable period of time, and

WHEREAS the farmers and farm organizations have from time to time questioned the efficacy of existing legislation, especially as it relates to the very high cost of modern farm equipment and the importance of timeliness in present day farm operations, and

WHEREAS the method by which new types of machinery can be designated for agricultural use and be exempted from excise tax and duty under federal legislation is cumbersome and does not readily accommodate the needs of a rapidly changing agricultural industry.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT this Legislature urgently request the Federal Government to conduct a further investigation of farm machinery prices, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a Committee of the Legislature be appointed to investigate and report on all aspects of sale and use of farm machinery and repairs in Manitoba, with particular reference to adequacy of provincial legislation, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Committee examine the method by which machinery is designated for agricultural use and exempted from excise tax and duty under federal legislation with a view to making recommendations in this respect to the appropriate authorities of the Government of Canada,

AND WHEREAS it is deemed advisable that a Special Committee consisting of nine members of the Legislature be appointed to investigate and report on all aspects of sale and use of farm machinery and repairs in Manitoba, with particular reference to adequacy of provincial legislation and examine the method by which machinery is designated for agricultural use and exempted from excise tax and duty under federal legislation with a view to making recommendations in this respect to the appropriate authorities of the Government of Canada.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT a Special Committee consisting of Messrs. Bjornson, Campbell, Harris, Klym, Moeller, Shewman, Strickland, Vielfaure and Watt be appointed to investigate and report on all aspects of sale and use of farm machinery and repairs in Manitoba, with particular reference to adequacy of provincial legislation, and examine the method by which machinery is designated for agricultural use and exempted from excise tax and duty under federal legislation with a view to making recommendations in this respect to the appropriate authorities of the Government of Canada.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the said Special Committee of the House shall have power to sit during the present Session and in recess after prorogation to hear representations, and to report to this House on the matters referred to it at this Session or the next Session of the Legislature.

(MR. HUTTON cont'd.)

AND THAT the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund, to the members of the said Committee, the amount of expenses incurred by the members in attending the sittings of the Committee, or expenses incurred by the members in the performances of duties ordered by the Committee, in recess, after prorogation, as are approved by the Comptroller-General.

AND THAT the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund all other expenses of a kind and nature required to assist the said Committee in carrying out the provisions of this resolution and provided the same have received the prior approval of the Treasury Board.

Mr. Chairman, there is no need for me to say very much after reading this resolution because it's a speech in itself, and I think that it very clearly and succinctly states the problem and the hopes that all members in the Legislature have that a full investigation of this problem at this time would be in the best interests of the citizens of Manitoba. I think that it will be of benefit not only to the farmers but, as was the case in the investigation into costs of automobile insurance, I think it is of benefit to those who sell and service farm equipment in Manitoba.

I think that it's very important that we have a clear understanding of what the real situation is, because from my experience as a farmer, and I think most members who are familiar with the farm industry in Manitoba, I think would support the contention that a good understanding, a good relationship between the farmer and the people who service this industry is essential and in the best interests of the province. And I think that at the same time that this Committee may discover areas which can be improved, I think at the same time they can serve the community well by contributing to an active understanding of what the problem is.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to take much time on this but I just want to say a very few words. I have already spoken on the subject on the resolution that was introduced by my colleague the Member for La Verendrye constituency. There's no question about it that one of the most difficult problems for the farmers today is this question of farm machinery and its price. In order to improve his efficiency the farmer has no choice but to mechanize, and there is no point in thinking that this situation is going to change. In all probability it will accelerate. The machines are getting constantly larger and more powerful, and in order to keep up with the demands of efficiency the farmers will increasingly be increasing their investments in machinery, and at the present pace the prices will keep on going up.

It is very important therefore that we look at every possible opportunity of minimizing the cost on the farmer, because this has become, I would say, his major cost in operation, and whatever we can do to minimize this is a very important step in correcting the cost-price squeeze on the farmer. It was for this reason that our group introduced the resolution at the beginning of the Session on this matter, realizing that the whole matter is not within the competence of the Provincial Government and that much of it lies in the federal field, but feeling nevertheless that whatever can be done at the provincial level is useful, plus anything that we can do to put pressure on the Federal Government and have consensus from Manitoba in our approach to them, would be helpful.

I note that in the Federal House - yesterday I believe the question came up there again where there was an attempt by some members to have a debate on a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the very rapid increase in the price of combines, and the news reports are that the Federal Minister of Agriculture will be making a statement shortly on the whole subject of farm machinery prices. Well, whatever it is that they do at their end, I think we should encourage them to get going on it as quickly as possible. From our own standpoint, I think that the sooner we start this investigation here, the better it will be for the farming industry in the Province of Manitoba.

As I pointed out in my comments originally, I think there is more here than just the farm industry too, and while this is the prime consideration, I think there is the whole question of the industrialization of the province, and that this Committee could make, I think, some useful investigation into the field of industry and commerce and may come out with some useful recommendations insofar as the Department of Industry and Commerce and in the development of the farm machinery industry in the Province of Manitoba. This decentralization would be very beneficial to the whole of our economy and very beneficial to the farmers because of the intimate connection.

I would hope that in all this we would make use of the facilities that we have available to us. I know that the University of Manitoba have a department that looks into this whole question

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) of farm machinery and so on, which undoubtedly would have a good deal of information. I think, too, that we might ask the Saskatchewan Government to make available to us any studies and working papers which they may have developed in the course of their investigations. Their problems are not identical to ours, and yet I think there would be enough there to fit into our study here, and whatever it is that they have already done, I think we should ask for immediately, and I would hope that the Minister could get in touch with the Saskatchewan Government at the earliest possible time, ask them to provide us with all of the materials that they have themselves produced, and if this could be made available to the members of our Committee here at an early date so that they could start going through this, get all the background they can, then when the Committee meets and we hear representations, the background material will be there and the members would be in a position to ask knowledgeable questions of those who appear. I think we would end up by having a very useful investigation by the members of this House.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, while this resolution is before us, I wanted to just emphasize once again what my Leader has said a moment ago about the industrialization that has already taken place in Manitoba in the field of farm machinery. I think this is quite a remarkable development and one that we should pay a good bit of attention to here. The fact that two companies that are now becoming quite major, and several other companies, are specializing in farm equipment that is designed to work right in the prairie provinces and the neighbouring states to the south, and by specializing on those particular pieces of equipment is able, I would think, to keep its costs down as compared to the companies that have to extend their field of operations over the whole area of farm machinery, is I believe a major factor in the success of several of these companies, and in that connection I wanted to ask the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce about a notice that I found in the paper some months or thereabouts ago, of a meeting that was held here that, as I recollect, the term was called Agricultural Implement Design, or something of this kind. Was there such a meeting held in the City here some time ago? It seemed to me to be sponsored by the -- or in association with the Department of Industry and Commerce. Is my honourable friend familiar with the terms of it, and what particular relation does that have to the farm implement industry?

MR. EVANS: . . . speaking from memory, I think a meeting or seminar was convened by the Design Institute to consider matters in connection with design of agricultural implements. I didn't attend and I haven't seen the report of the seminar. I am afraid that's all the information I can give my honourable friend from memory.

MR. CAMPBELL: I found the very announcement of such a meeting interesting indeed, because while we sometimes are critical of automobile companies for appearing to add to the cost of their product by changing the models what some of us would think was too frequently, I was wondering if the same type of thing was creeping in somewhere in the agricultural industry. I would hope that it didn't in the same way.

Now I am all for the safety features that have been having more attention paid to them in recent years - and safety features are tremendously important on agricultural implements - and now that mechanization is almost complete in a lot of areas, safety features certainly should be applied very very carefully. But if it went the next step in following automobiles, although I am informed that down in the United States there is quite a difference of opinion as to how safe automobiles are too, but if it followed the other pattern of the automobile industry and started some types of model change every year just in order for aesthetical consideration, I would not think that that was a development that we would be too pleased with.

However, the developments are continuing all the time, and this is something that I think the Committee could give some attention to, and I, in addition to agreeing completely with the idea that this is one of the major points of concern to the farm industry in the province, I am also quite interested in this question from the point of industrialization in Manitoba and the specialization in major lines of equipment that have their market right close to us, because this has been one of the problems - the high cost of distribution - in years gone by. However, we'll all have more of an opportunity later on to consider those matters and I hope we can have from the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and Conservation the same assurance that we have already had from the Honourable the Provincial Secretary, that this Committee will sit, and will sit soon. I'm not suggesting that the provisions in the resolution giving us power to sit during the time of this Session should be invoked immediately, or that we will likely report at this Session, although I notice that that authority is contained in the resolution, but I would suggest that even if we don't sit at this Session that we do sit rather than disbanding.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add a couple of thoughts to the discussion here. First of all, I would like to assure the Member for Lakeside that I think this Committee should get down to business right away. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition suggested some sources of information. I think one of the things that we want to call for immediately is information on this question of servicing of farm equipment. Now I have had enough complaints; I shouldn't say "many" but I have had enough complaints, both from individual farmers and from farm organizations, and now I'm not just merely talking about the Farm Bureau or the Manitoba Farmers Union, but this has been the subject of discussion at the Pool Elevators Annual Convention and other major meetings of the farm industry.

The whole question of service to this farm equipment - I am not optimistic about our ability to do very much either at the federal level or the provincial level about the cost of farm equipment, because we are in a world market. Most of the major companies are international and it appears, I think, rather unlikely that we can do anything to lower the initial cost of farm equipment, but there's another aspect. It might have been all right when you paid \$2,400 or \$3,000 for a combine. It was one thing to be held up a few hours or a day with that kind of an investment. It was bad enough then. But today, when you're paying anywhere from \$8,000 to \$15,000 for, say, a harvesting machine or a combine, then it becomes absolutely essential that the efficiency of that machine be of a much greater calibre than was the efficiency of the \$3,000 machine, and unfortunately we do have experiences where a man has put ten, twelve, fifteen thousand dollars into a machine, and because of the unavailability of parts, of one little part, that machine is sitting in the yard. And this sort of thing I think must be minimized and the situation is rather critical in this respect, and becoming more critical every time the price of farm equipment increases. And I would hope that the Committee is able, through its discussions with the farm machinery people and with the farmers, to find ways and means of improving service to this farm equipment.

Now the other thing that I think is quite important today, this is the matter of the method of exempting certain farm equipment from excise tax and duty on the part of the Federal Government. The mechanization of the farm industry is going on at such a rapid rate that many items which yesterday were industrial items today are being pressed into use on the farm front; certain types of loading equipment, and I can think of the case of the concrete silos. Now our farmers are in direct competition with the feeders across the border here just 60 miles south of us, and yet the fact is that the silo that the man in North Dakota or Minnesota buys carries a 17-1/2 percent tax on it when it's bought by the farmer in Manitoba.

Now if we're going to promote the feeding industry in Manitoba, then the tools of that industry must be made available to our farmers at as close to the same cost as what they are made available to our competitors across the 49th parallel, and I would hope that our Committee can make a useful contribution here in examining this whole question and finding ways and means of having new types and new varieties of machines that are being pressed into use in the agricultural industry at a remarkable rate. If they can find a quicker means of getting the prices of these machines competitive with the prices to our U.S. feeders, etc., if we can find a quicker way of getting this recognition - because it is very important that our farmers adopt the latest methods, which is their only way of cutting costs; but the cost of adopting these latest methods must not be enlarged by taxes which simply are there because we haven't got set up the kind of machinery here which can recognize the agricultural use of certain equipment, etc.

So my big hope here is really in assisting our farmers in two major areas. One, in getting greater efficiency out of the machines that they have to buy today; and the second is in eliminating the costs which in principle everybody agrees that farm equipment should be tax free and duty free, and it is in principle. But the problem lies in getting it recognized for this purpose as soon as it should be, and I think the Committee in these two areas can make a very worthwhile contribution and, as I say, I think that we can't brook any delay in getting down to the business of studying these matters.

MR. EVANS: At this point, I think we haven't got the -- or have we? Yes we have -- in what's called the nick of time, I think. I congratulate the Clerk on having got this printed so quickly and I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if we could allow a minute or two for copies to be distributed and then we can proceed to discuss this resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Perhaps the Attorney-General could start reading it. I haven't got a copy.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, this is the fourth resolution in the Committee and the one which the House gave leave to consider even though it does not appear on the Order Paper, and

(MR. McLEAN cont'd) . . . the resolution reads as follows:

WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba at its Fifth Session of the 27th Legislature pursuant to Rule 67 of the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba appointed a Standing Committee of the House on Statutory Regulations and Orders on Wednesday, the 23rd day of February, 1966;

AND WHEREAS the members of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders consists of the Honourable Messrs. Lyon, McLean, Smellie, Steinkopf, Messrs. Campbell, Cherniack, Cowan, Froese, Groves, Hamilton, Johnston, Mills, Molgat, Shewman and Wright;

AND WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba on the 20th day of April, 1966, gave second reading to Bill (No. 82) - An Act to establish Procedures for the Acquisition of Land by Expropriation and for the Determination of Compensation for Land Expropriated and Land Injurious affected by the Maintenance, Operation or Use of Works Constructed, Maintained or Used under Statutory Powers, and referred same to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders;

AND WHEREAS the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders in its report tabled and received on February 23rd, 1966 dealt with the ways and means of safeguarding the rights of individual citizens vis-a-vis the State;

AND WHEREAS Sir Guy Powles, K. B. E., C. M. G., E. D., LL. B., Ombudsman for New Zealand, addressed the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders and the members of the Legislative Assembly on March 1st, 1966, and outlined the jurisdiction and the duties of his office in New Zealand;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed expedient and advisable that the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders should continue its study with respect to ways and means of safeguarding the rights of individual citizens vis-a-vis the State, and report on these matters during this Session or at the next Session;

AND WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba at its Fifth Session of the 27th Legislature on Tuesday the 26th day of April, 1966 adopted the following Resolution:

WHEREAS full co-operation between the general public and law enforcement officers is both desirable and necessary; and

WHEREAS Section 110 of the Criminal Code of Canada, inter alia provides, that everyone who omits, without reasonable excuse, to assist a public officer or peace officer in the execution of his duty in arresting a person or in preserving the peace, after having reasonable notice that he is required to do so, is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for two years; and

WHEREAS in a number of jurisdictions the advisability of paying compensation to citizens who suffer loss, property damage or injury while engaged in assisting law enforcement officers or while attempting to prevent a crime or to catch a criminal, or who are victims of criminal activity, is being considered and studied; and

WHEREAS a resolution on the subject of paying compensation to victims of criminal activity has been introduced into the House of Commons (Canada);

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that a committee of the Legislature be directed to consider the advisability of paying compensation to citizens who may suffer loss, property damage or injury while engaged in assisting law enforcement officers or while attempting to prevent a crime or catch a criminal, and to consider the advisability of paying compensation to the victim of criminal activity.

AND WHEREAS it is deemed expedient and advisable that the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders consider

a) Bill (No. 82) - An Act to establish Procedures for the Acquisition of Land by Expropriation and for the Determination of Compensation for Land Expropriated and Land Injurious affected by the Maintenance, Operation or Use of Works Constructed, Maintained or Used under Statutory Powers.

b) The ways and means of safeguarding the rights of individual citizens vis-a-vis the State.

c) The aforesaid resolution adopted on the 26th day of April, 1966 and report thereon at this Session or the next Session of the Legislature;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed advisable that this Committee sit during the present Session, and, if necessary, in recess after prorogation to hear representations with respect to these bills and the matters above referred to.

(MR. McLEAN cont'd.)

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders appointed at the Fifth Session of the 27th Legislature on Wednesday, the 23rd day of February, 1966 consisting of Hon. Messrs. Lyon, McLean, Smellie, Steinkopf, Messrs. Campbell, Cherniack, Cowan, Froese, Groves, Hamilton, Johnston, Mills, Molgat, Shewman and Wright do Consider, study and report with respect to:

a) Bill (No. 82) - An Act to establish Procedures for the Acquisition of Land by Expropriation and for the Determination of Compensation for Land Expropriated and Land Injurious affected by the Maintenance, Operation or Use of Works Constructed, Maintained or Used under Statutory Powers.

b) The ways and means of safeguarding the rights of individual citizens vis-a-vis the State.

c) The aforesaid resolution adopted on the 26th day of April, 1966.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

THAT the said Standing Committee of the House shall have power to sit during the present Session and in recess after prorogation to hear representations, and to report to this House on the matters referred to it at this Session or the next Session of the Legislature.

AND THAT the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund, to the members of the said Committee, the amount of expenses incurred by the members in attending the sittings of the Committee, or expenses incurred by the members in the performances of duties ordered by the Committee, in recess, after prorogation, as are approved by the Comptroller-General.

AND THAT the Provincial Treasurer be authorized to pay out of the Consolidated Fund all other expenses of a kind and nature required to assist the said Committee in carrying out the provisions of this resolution and provided the same have received the prior approval of the Treasury Board.

Mr. Chairman, as indicated, this refers to this Committee the matter of the Ombudsman, the Expropriation Bill, and the compensation to persons who are injured while assisting police officers or as a result of criminal activities, to this Committee for consideration.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, last night when speaking on the concurrence of the Report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations, I expressed my disappointment that more had not been done during the course of the Session to proceed with the report of the Committee, and where more study was needed for example on the question of the Ombudsman, at least where the majority of the Committee felt there was more study necessary, that there weren't steps taken to make that study during the course of our present Session. I am still extremely disappointed that this has been so.

I do not intend to vote against this present resolution, but again I want to repeat, Mr. Chairman, that the purpose of setting up these committees is to get action. The Minister who is proposing the resolution now gave us a long speech last night as to why there should be no action; why there should be delay; why these things should be held up; and why there should be more time taken and so on, that we have to be very careful and all the rest of these things. I certainly agree that all the proposals that this House considers and passes should be very carefully studied, but there is a wide difference, Mr. Chairman, between careful study and between delay and procrastination, and I say that there has been too much delay and procrastination on a number of these matters.

The question of the Ombudsman or public protector has been before this House now for some five years. If my memory serves me correctly, I brought the resolution in originally in the Session of 1962. It certainly isn't a new discussion in our House, so for the Minister to say that we must be very careful how we move, it seems to me that five years gives the House ample time for discussion. I don't know exactly how much time the Minister feels that he needs. When something has become urgent and when they can be delayed, it appears to me to depend on what side of the issue you happen to be on, because I was looking over my bills last night and I find that since the 5th of April we have received some very major legislation from the government involving all sorts of subjects, some very important to the Province of Manitoba, and there had been no previous notice to the members of the House.

We received, for example, Bill No. 127, The Mineral Exploration Assistance Act - it came on our desks on the 18th of April. We received Bill No. 126, An Act Respecting Access to Certain Highways and the Control of Land Along Certain Highways - it came on our desks on the 15th of April. Bill No. 125, An Act to Amend The Development Authority Act, 1963 - it came on our desk on the 15th of April. It involves things like the growth account, the Youth

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd) . . . and Manpower Agency, the Nelson Agency. We received on our desks Bill No. 124, An Act Respecting the Department of Tourism and Recreation - it came on our desks on the 15th of April. Bill No. 122, An Act to Amend The Public Utility Board Act - it came on our desks on the 15th of April. Bill No. 121, An Act to Amend The Social Allowances Act - it appeared on our desks on the 13th of April. Bill No. 111, the Commissioner of Northern Manitoba Affairs Act - on our desks on the 5th of April. Bill 109 to Amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act - on our desks on the 13th of April. The Manitoba Development Fund - on our desks on Monday, the 18th of April.

Now all of these, Mr. Chairman, have come to us in a very short time recently. The discussion on these, unfortunately, has by the very nature of the events of the House not been as thorough insofar as the members on this side. We have made it as thorough as possible, but with the time available to us and three Sessions a day, it is virtually impossible to do all the verifying that you could do. We have done all that we could within the time available to us. So it seems that when the Government decides on some of these matters that it wants to act, then in the course of some 15 days it can produce a large number of bills and put them through the House in that period of time. On other matters the Minister says, "Well, we must delay. We must take all the time we need to study them." Mr. Chairman, I am all in favour of study and proper consideration but I think that we also have to take action, and I'm disappointed that the action has not been taken on some of these matters before this.

I intend to support the resolution, but I repeat that I hope that this Committee will get to work and produce a report soon. Now we had a definite statement last night from the Provincial Secretary that his Committee was going to get to work and sit immediately, that it wasn't a window dressing operation; that he had the intentions that they would do something. I presume that the same applies to this Committee, that it's the clear-cut intention of the mover of this resolution that the Committee is going to sit; that we are going to proceed to do some work and come out with a report.

I say again, Mr. Chairman, if it's the intention of the government not to proceed in this course, if they have other intentions with regard to this House, that's fine. I have no objections to that at all. I'm quite prepared to go into an election campaign - fine by me. But I say, don't deceive the House and pretend that we're going to do something on these resolutions if it is not the intention of the government to do so. Let them not set up committees if they have no intention that these committees are going to sit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution -- passed. Committee Rise. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee has adopted certain resolutions and request leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. JAMES COWAN Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the report of the Committee be received.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, before the question is put, I would like to make a comment or two. In appointing the committee to look into the matter of farm machinery, I notice that they say that this is the basic industry - agriculture is the basic industry. I doubt whether the government really believes that and whether they really mean what they are saying here, because when you look at the Committee that they are setting up, there's not one member of the front benches appointed to this Committee, whereas in all other special committees that are being set up, you normally see two or three of the Cabinet Ministers appointed to such a Committee. Here, this is not the case - not one of them - not a single one on the government side is appointed to this Committee. So, in my opinion, they are allocating this as one of minor importance, and I take exception to that.

Another point that I would like to raise is that why wasn't my party, or why wasn't I consulted in the appointment of any of these Committees? No doubt the other parties were informed, were consulted, and no doubt the Whips must have been getting together to see who would be appointed to the various committees, yet as far as I was concerned, nothing of the kind. Not once was I consulted. On the other hand, I would say that I was rather insulted when I come to see these reports on the Order Paper and the appointment of committees, without ever giving me notice, without ever asking me. Even if I would not be appointed to any of the committees, at least I think the courtesy should be extended in such a case.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I feel constrained to say a word with respect to the fact that there are no Cabinet Ministers on the proposed committee to investigate farm equipment.

(MR. HUTTON, cont'd) I think probably one of the most useful studies that was ever carried out by a Legislative Committee was the one that investigated all aspects of the marketing of livestock in Manitoba. They did a magnificent job. A very significant contribution was made in respect to the marketing of hogs in Manitoba, but in addition to that, there were many other recommendations in that report which merit the continual and continued consideration of those of us who are responsible for agricultural policy in Manitoba.

I think it's a wonderful thing that we have a Legislature where we have the calibre of people who are not members of the front bench but who know enough about the agricultural industry in this province that we can commit to them the interests of that industry and know that they will do a good job. I have no excuses nor apologies to make for the fact that there are no front benches on this committee, and I have every confidence that the people who are on this committee will do the same kind of a job with respect to agricultural equipment as the committee did in respect to another important area of study, namely, the study of marketing of livestock in the Province of Manitoba.

I'm not going to comment on the other complaints that the Honourable Member for Rhineland raised. I think he is well enough aware of the rules of the House that he knows that it was impossible to name him to the committee. But I think insofar as the fact that I am not on that committee or other of my Cabinet colleagues are concerned, I have no worries at all because there is plenty of talent on that committee, and the agricultural industry in Manitoba can rest assured that they're going to do the same kind of a job on this that they did in respect to livestock marketing in Manitoba.

I would just like to tell the Honourable Member for Rhineland that despite what he thinks, farmers and people responsible for agriculture, not only in this province but right across Canada, have taken note of the job that was done by that other committee in respect to marketing of livestock and I'm looking forward to this committee doing the kind of a job which will command the same kind of respect and recognition, not only in this province but in other provinces across this nation.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. McLEAN read the Resolution. (See text on Page 2279).

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation.

MR. HUTTON read the Resolution (See text on Pages 2281 and 2282).

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I'm not going to repeat my speech on this one as I have on the other two resolutions setting up committees, I only wish to make the point again that I expect, due to the statements of the government, that this committee will sit, will proceed to take action, and that this is in fact a clear-cut decision of the government to proceed with these committees. Anything less than this, in view of the statements of the Minister, I think would be considered as deceiving this House.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Provincial Secretary.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, in the absence of the Provincial Secretary, read the Resolution. (See text on Pages 2278 and 2279.)

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, we're back on my pet again and I feel that I should say a word or two. The Provincial Secretary indicated that this Committee would get down to business pretty quickly and one or two of the other Ministers speaking on resolutions this morning have indicated that they too are raring to go on the resolutions that they have proposed, and indeed it is rare to find that the Ministers opposite are ready to go, and if their new-found expressions of speed are an indication of what's going to happen in the days to come, it is most interesting to all of us in the House I am sure.

This resolution dealing with the question of automobile insurance is most intriguing because we are going to have the power of investigating all aspects of automobile insurance and also all aspects of automobile insurance apart from the insurance itself, as I understand the Resolution that we have before us.

Now I hope, Madam Speaker, that I don't prejudice the activities of the committee. It might have been better had the committee not put - or the House not put a member of the New

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).....Democratic Party on this particular committee, because as I indicated previously, it seems to me that some of the organizations at least, or the insurance companies or the spokesmen for insurance companies are rather reticent to give any information to New Democrats as to the operation of the insurance industry. And of course, Madam Speaker, I'm referring to the Brief that the All Canada Insurance organization gave to the members of this House with the exception of the members of my party, and it might be that the members of the other parties who are on this committee will have to try and convince the likes of the All Canada Insurance organization that I'm really not too bad of a sort of a fellow and that I might be able to, at least on this committee, be treated as an equal with the representatives of the other parties.

As the Honourable the Provincial Secretary on the introduction of this resolution said that we were going to get down to business immediately and start compiling our report, I trust and hope that that honourable gentleman already has taken the initial step and written to the All Canada Insurance organization to the effect that they are in a bit of a spot now; we are going to investigate into the question of automobile insurance and unfortunately the Leader of the New Democratic Party is a member of our committee and, generally speaking, we try in the Legislature of Manitoba to treat all members of the committee more or less as equals. So I say, Madam Speaker, I imagine that this has already been done by the Provincial Secretary who is raring, chafing at the bit, ready to get cracking on cracking down on many aspects of automobile insurance in the Province of Manitoba.

I imagine this is going to be quite a task, the investigation of all aspects of the automobile insurance agency. I don't know for sure, Madam Speaker, how many different insurance companies there are that are operating in the Province of Manitoba, but I think that it will be necessary for the committee to receive from the insurance companies much detailed information as to how they set their rates and all aspects of arriving at those particular rates, and it would be necessary to obtain from them the information as to rate setting over a period of years back, in order that we may make a reasonably intelligent investigation into the question of automobile insurance rates.

It will be necessary for us, too, to receive from them, in my opinion at least, the costs of litigation and what is the percentage of the cost of automobile insurance that automobile drivers make for instance to the legal fraternity. I heard the other day the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne tell us that his commission rates were cut in order that there may be some lessening in the costs of automobile insurance. I haven't heard from any of the legal fraternity that their fees have been cut in order to help out the purchaser of automobile insurance. It could be, in all due respect to the legal fraternity, that the reduction that was suffered, if indeed it was suffering by the automobile insurance agents, that the slack might have been taken up by increased legal fees. Of course in the Province of Saskatchewan they have the lowest amount of court cases in any province in Canada insofar as automobile insurance is concerned.

So I say, Madam Speaker, I support the resolution that we have before us. The Honourable the Provincial Secretary indicated that we were going to get cracking and cracking soon, and I suggest and I hope that he's already written to All Canada and said Paulley isn't such a bad guy after all, we're going to have to give him the information.

I also suggest that at the first meeting of the committee I'm going to suggest that a thorough and detailed investigation into automobile insurance rates be proceeded with, and as far as I am concerned, I don't think we should come back to this House or to any subsequent Legislature with any half-baked investigation. I think the whole thing should be thoroughly investigated, and I look forward with anticipation to this investigation and it will give me another opportunity of proposing - as I am sure I will be in a better position to even than I am now - of proposing that the Province of Manitoba adopt a similar system to which is in vogue in the Province of Saskatchewan.

I will have a little better advantage this time, Madam Speaker, in that I'll only have to convince eight people out of nine. The difficulty is here in the House the odds are a little more against me, but I look forward in anticipation to the edification of the rest of the members of the committee, as I indicated earlier this morning, comprised of four lawyers, two automobile insurance agents, two undertakers, all of whom may have some varying degree of interest in automobile insurance and the results of accidents on our highways.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I spoke on the resolution yesterday, but I take it that since it has appeared in another form that I can make another comment or two today.

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd).....

Yesterday, I asked the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities to bring to the committee's attention certain aspects of the insurance industry as I saw them as an agent. I neglected however, Madam Speaker, to mention another aspect which concerns me and disturbs me a little, and that is the high cost of adjusting that some of the adjusting firms levy against the insurance companies.

Now my guess is that when the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities was describing the accident in which his girl was involved, his daughter, I think he said that he thought at first sight that the accident might be about \$10; it resulted on examination by the body mechanic, it was around \$140. My guess is that some adjuster charged about \$60 to determine that it would cost \$140, so that likely the over-all cost would be in the neighborhood of \$200. It seems to me to be a little ridiculous for an insurance company to pay an adjuster \$25, and that's about the minimum you can get by with on these adjusters, to look at a broken windshield and to say, well go ahead and fix it. They'll drive about 50 miles - and mind you, Madam Speaker, there's a lot of the insurance companies that will not allow the agents to settle these things. In our office two or three of them will, they'll take our word for it, but other companies insist that an adjuster drive out about 100 miles and back to have a look at a broken windshield and charge them more than the windshield is worth for the adjusting fees. I think this really needs to be looked into, and it would reduce considerably the premiums charged by some companies, I am certain, and I thought I should raise that particular point.

The Honourable the Leader of the NDP envisages that he will have a simple task to convince the other eight members --(Interjection)-- Not simple - a simple bunch of people -- (Interjection)-- I see. Well, in any case, I wish him well and I think that if he talks as long as the other eight together and is pretty convincing, perhaps he will be able to have a few converts. Thank you kindly.

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

MR. McLEAN, by leave, read the Resolution. (See text on Page 2285 and 2286.)

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

..... continued on next page.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, as far as this resolution is concerned, in view of the resolution that we have passed, as amended by the Honourable the Provincial Secretary, I would suggest that had the other motion been on the books prior to this one, this then would have been out of order.

I think I have pretty well said everything I have to say at this particular time respecting automobile insurance, Madam Speaker. There are two courses open to me. I think one would be to ask the unanimous consent of the House to withdraw the motion, and the other is just to let the matter die. I think possibly the latter would be more proper. So with these few remarks, Madam Speaker, I leave the resolutions in the hands of the House.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed to

MR. PAULLEY: Well just call for the vote.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution as amended of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable the Member for St. James.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Madam Speaker, I regret that the Honourable Member for Burrows is not in his seat this morning. I acknowledge the honourable member as a well-qualified person on a number of subjects but I was hoping to bring a small matter to his attention. When this resolution was debated last on Friday week, he stated on Page 1836 - and speaking about development of industry - "We can go into the electrical smelting and refining of ores; we can then develop the production of special ingots of special steels that we can export to the world markets with very little competition, because we possess one of the largest deposits of nickel in the world. This in turn would develop a refractory industry that would run into hundreds of millions of dollars per year, and we have these deposits of refractory material that can be developed, and can also be developed if we have the demand for it in the electrical smelting industry."

I presume, Madam Speaker, the honourable member is referring to a deposit of fairly high quality clay in the area of my colleague the Honourable Member for Swan River. This deposit is what they call a high duty quality. Unfortunately, because of its location and the small demand in this area, several people have been unsuccessful in developing this material. The refractory business with the use of fire clays is an extremely large business. In fact, in the United States the tendency has been during the last few years to concentrate production in larger plants and closing down smaller plants. I regret to say, Madam Speaker, that although we have that deposit there, I cannot see a development of that raw material for these and many other reasons.

I would like to have corrected the honourable member in saying that this material can be used in the electric refining and smelting business, in that an electric furnace contains in the bottoms and sidewalls a refractory material not made from fire clay but made from chromagnesite, basic material, practically all of which comes from Eastern Canada. The upper part and the roof of such electric furnace is of a much higher quality and is not available in Canada. So I am sorry, Madam Speaker, that he wasn't in his seat that I could correct him on this very important point which I do know something about.

Madam Speaker, returning to the resolution, much has been said, much more could be said, and I don't think this is either the time to say those things. I think it would be perfectly true and I think that it would be unanimous in this House to say that every one of us would like to see more industry, that at no time will we ever be in a position where we have too much industry. It is a very important subject, a subject, together with people, that we need in the developing of our province.

However, the amendment of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia does include a number of, not perhaps inaccuracies, but innuendoes which I cannot completely agree with. Much has been done by the province and our department and our Minister in developing our industries. We have gone over that in some detail.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, it was my intention, if time had permitted for me to move an amendment and to speak at some length on this subject, but in view of the circumstances, Madam Speaker, on balance, I would support the amendment and leave the matter for another day.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I am sorry that the honourable member did not decide to proceed with his amendment. We could have been very interested to see what it says. But did I understand him correctly to say that he is going to support this amendment? Well in that case, I commend him highly, Madam Speaker, because I think that this is a sound amendment to the original resolution.

The whole purpose of our resolution in the first place, Madam Speaker - then when it was subsequently amended, this destroyed the purpose of it - the whole purpose was to make sure that the Province of Manitoba makes use of every possible federal program that exists. There should be no federal programs that can be of use to Manitoba that are not used to the complete extent to which we can possibly do so.

It was our feeling that the designated area plan has in fact been highly effective. It's been used in Brandon most effectively; it's been used in Minnedosa regarding the industry that I spoke about the other day, Agristeel Products, the farm implement industry that is there, it has helped to retain them in the Province of Manitoba when they intended to move elsewhere; it is going to be used apparently in The Pas development; and these are all factors which influence businessmen in establishing in an area.

Well, when one looks at the over-all picture in the Province of Manitoba, when one reads the report of the Economic Consultative Board, I think it is clear that all of the Province of Manitoba requires this particular incentive that the Federal Government can provide to us. The fact that we've been losing population, the fact that we have not been keeping pace with other provinces in Canada, puts us in a position where we can legitimately ask the Federal Government to declare all of the province to be a designated area.

I realize that there were some reservations on the part of some people as to whether or not the Greater Winnipeg area should be included. I want to make it very clear that I think that in the long run the interests of all of the Province of Manitoba, including the interests of Greater Winnipeg, lie in a decentralization of industry and, in many cases, of population through the province. I don't think that it is desirable for the City of Winnipeg or for the Province of Manitoba to have only one major centre growing and the rest of the province falling behind. In fact, even our major centre has not been growing at the pace as other major centres in other provinces, and I think that we have to keep in mind at all stages, proper regional development, proper decentralization, that it would be in the interests of Manitoba to have not only one big city but two or three major centres and a very healthy rural area, because the interests of all of the province, be it city or country, are after all very closely inter-related, so having considered the situation from an over-all Manitoba standpoint, and realizing that while the need may not be as great in the Greater Winnipeg area as it is in other areas, that nevertheless there was need too for incentives, we decided that our resolution should be based on urging the Federal Government to make all of Manitoba in a position where they can avail themselves of the program which has been designed to assist those areas that are not keeping pace with the national growth.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, it's most interesting for me to hear the Honourable Member for St. James say that the amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia finds favour in his eyes. I was somewhat amazed to hear my honourable friend say that if time permitted he would have proposed an amendment to the amendment. I don't see any lack of time as far as the House is concerned; it's only getting on toward the end of April and we don't have to get out of here yet. It's 27 above this morning. You can't grow wheat or potatoes or even petunias with weather like we've got, so I can't see any rush of getting out of the House and I'm sure the Honourable Minister of Welfare is not, as he says, wanting to get home. I presume that he means by home, up to the designated area of The Pas.

However, the reason that I'm surprised to hear the Honourable Member for St. James say that he finds favour in the agreement, or in the amendment, is that after having sat in this House now for almost three months, after we in opposition - and in this I include the Liberal Party along with the New Democrats - we in opposition have been endeavouring and telling the Government of Manitoba that they haven't been doing a job at all; that insofar as Manitoba is concerned it's falling behind the rest of Canada insofar as industrial progress is concerned, as far as the welfare of the citizens of Manitoba. I made comments of this nature, Madam Speaker, in my first contribution in the House in proposing an amendment to the Throne Speech. My colleague for St. John's, dealing with the subject matter of the economic well-being of Manitoba, did likewise when he had under consideration the budget of the Government of Manitoba.

Well, on each and every occasion spokesmen for the Government turned around and said,

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)... in effect, that we were all wrong, that we were progressing in Manitoba; that things were reasonably good in Manitoba. Subsequent to the Throne Speech debate and the Budget debate we've had a number of other debates, and on every occasion, almost without exception, representatives of the government have said, "Thanks to our initiative, thanks to our orderly development in the Province of Manitoba, things are good for Manitoba." And now, Madam Speaker, on the very last day, or what appears to be the last day of the Session, the truth comes out - somewhat belatedly. And why do I say the truth comes out? I say it and I place the onus on the shoulders of the Member for St. James because I feel that his participation in this debate and the accepting of the amendment of the Member for Assiniboia, indicates governmental attitude to the subject matter of the amendment. And what are the last lines of the amendment? - "and that in the meantime, the Government of Manitoba urge the Government of Canada to declare all of Manitoba a designated area."

And what is a designated area, Madam Speaker? A designated area, as I recall, is an area in which the average income of the people in any particular area is of such a low standard that the taxpayer of the Dominion of Canada should come to the aid of industry and help them locate there in order to lift up the standards of the people in that area. We have been telling the Government of Manitoba this, as I say Madam Speaker, since the beginning of the Session. We have endeavoured to convince the Honourable the Minister of Labour that the average income of Manitobans is one of the lowest in Canada. We have tried to convince the Minister of Labour and the Government of Manitoba that one of the factors required to bring our standards up higher is an increase in the minimum wage in the Province of Manitoba. We still have a resolution on the paper, Madam Speaker, dealing with that question, and if really the government means what they say, they can make a contribution to raising standards of living in the Province of Manitoba by supporting the resolution which stands in the name of one of my colleagues.

We pointed out during discussions in this House that the average income - weekly income - of people in the Winnipeg area was the lowest, the lowest of all of the provinces from Ontario to British Columbia, yet the government has not indicated to us until now that we are a designated area insofar as legislation is concerned, at the federal level. We tried, Madam Speaker, dealing with the question of the Province of Manitoba and its economic standards, to convince the Minister of Education that we are having a drain of our graduates or our universities and our colleges outside of Manitoba because of the economic situation and the lesser amount of salaries which are paid to our professional graduates and to others. We have suggested to the Honourable Minister of Education that one of the reasons for the exodus of teachers out of the Province of Manitoba is due to the lesser salaries paid to our teaching profession. But the attitude of government, Madam Speaker, throughout all of this has been: "No; such isn't the case. We're one of the better places. We're one of those who treat our people and our citizens more equally than anyone else or any other province in Canada."

So I say, Madam Speaker, that as a Member in opposition, as the Leader of the New Democratic Party, it's taken three months almost to have a confession of failure from the government, and it is apparent with this confession of failure that the government will be appealing to the people of Manitoba ere long to perpetuate them in office so that they might continue failing the people of Manitoba. But I have no hope for the people of Manitoba and I suggest that the confession, the death-bed confession - death-bed as far as this Session is concerned - confession of failure of the Government of Manitoba, is indicated in the support of the resolution as proposed by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, the next door neighbour to the Member for St. James, who I feel on behalf of the government spoke this morning, who told us that we didn't have time left to remedy the ills of Manitoba, otherwise he might have proposed an amendment to the amendment.

I find it most intriguing and most interesting to observe the remarks of my honourable friend and to say that he, as a member of Government, is prepared to go down to Ottawa and say to Mike Pearson and his minority government, "Will you please help out . . . all in Manitoba, in every corner of Manitoba. Will you please undertake to underwrite any new industrial development in Manitoba because we have failed in our task." And this, Madam Speaker, is the theme, I suggest, for the forthcoming election whether it be held in 35 days from today or any subsequent date from that. Failure, failure indeed, but the government in its usually slippery manner, had not faced up to its failure until this morning. And I say to the government, the record now is clear. You have agreed with those of us in opposition that Manitoba is worthier of a better type of government that would run to Ottawa and say, "Please pull us out of the hole that we have put Manitoba into."

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I must say that I owe a great deal of debt to yourself for being so broad-minded in allowing this amendment to come forward, that in essence it has turned the debate right back to where it was at the beginning in that we are asking this government to urge Ottawa to declare all of Manitoba a designated area, and I am extremely happy at this time that because we have had the second chance to make our points that we have finally convinced the Honourable Member for St. James, and he has openly admitted and said that he would support the amendment, and I only hope that he has talked some of his colleagues into the same stand.

As you all know, I have quoted the problems of Portage la Prairie in this regard in that they are located between a city, the City of Brandon that has been declared a designated area, and between the City of Winnipeg that has certain advantages due to size and the size of the local market and so on. But I would like to ask the Minister of Commerce with respect to the industrialization of Manitoba and all programs related thereto, what in his opinion are the towns or cities or areas that do not need industrial incentives such as the designated area program, because if there are some of these areas, well then perhaps they should be excluded.

In my opinion and in the opinion of others - and I have here the Third Annual Report of the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board, the one that has received some discussion this Session - on Page 5, and I would like to quote: "We note also the exclusion of Winnipeg and its adjacent area from the industrial development incentives provided by the Federal Area Development Agency. This, we believe, is inconsistent with sound regional development strategy since Winnipeg and surrounding area account for most of the industrial employment in the province." I am the first to admit that Winnipeg has had some success, but it can be seen that with unequal competition across Manitoba, that the industrial incentive program does inspire that Winnipeg in a year or two may feel that they have lost some industries to other areas of the province.

So I suggest that unless this present inequality and unequal competition between communities in Manitoba, unless this situation is corrected there is going to be a great deal of dislocation around the province in industries that are either moving in or industries that may think of relocating. For instance, at Portage la Prairie we have one industry now making plans to relocate in a designated area in order that they may take advantage of the generous grant system and tax incentive that is given under the federal program.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Clerk of the House has just given me notice that the Honourable Member for Portage spoke on this amendment on April 12. I realize it's so long ago that probably many of us have forgotten, but his rights are limited on this.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the proposed motion in amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Bilton, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Evans, Froese, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Jeannotte, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Tanchak, Watt, Weir, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Nil.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 40; Nays, 0.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie as amended.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question.

MADAM SPEAKER: In my

MR. JOHNSTON: close the debate if no one else wishes to speak.

MADAM SPEAKER: I have already placed the motion. It's carried. I declare the motion carried.

The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

In my opinion, the amendment is in order and any honourable member wishing to speak may do so:

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, the matter before us is the one area where the

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)... Committee on Consumer Credit left a sort of a vague recommendation, stating as it did that in the area of consumer purchasing there should be an organization of some type established with government financial assistance of a nature which will look after the various complexities involved in this problem, and it was suggested that this committee could be set up by such organizations as the Better Business Bureau, the Family Bureau, the Credit Grantors' Bureau and the Consumers Association.

Well, Madam Speaker, I don't see that this amendment helps the problem at all. The amendment suggests a two-pronged manner of dealing with it. Firstly, it proposes the establishment of a Standing Committee of the Legislature on Consumer Credit, and I am not aware of any committee, any Standing Committee of the Legislature which is ever used to continue on a year round basis to review matters of this type. It seems to me that all Standing Committees that do exist are committees to which legislation or regulation is referred for study and report back, and this is usually in the form of bills which are dealt with section by section after second reading. So I can't quite envision the Standing Committee as suggested by the Honourable Member for Selkirk unless he has in mind the type of committee which sits in Washington, where they do have continuing studies and therefore I assume would be similar to the committee itself which dealt with this problem, that is the Consumer Credit Committee which has already reported. Now we do have committees such as the Committee on Public Utilities which receives reports, but I don't know from whom a Standing Committee such as proposed by the Honourable Member for Selkirk would receive reports, and therefore it does not seem to be a practical method of tackling the problem.

His second suggestion, and that is the appointment of a Special Counsel, would of course be a step in the direction in which we, our main motion would like to go, and that is that some official of government should be involved in the entire question of protection in consumer purchasing - and I'm not dealing only with consumer credit. You will recall, Madam Speaker, that we dealt with the fact that this resolution was not confined to credit purchasing but rather to all purchasing and thus involved matters like packaging, truth in advertising and the like - misrepresentation, high pressure sales. But a Special Counsel to advise on and co-ordinate the activities of these other organizations would really have a peculiar sort of a task because the fact is that these organizations have different objectives and to some extent different problems to deal with, and co-ordinating their work, I think, would be an awfully difficult and unrewarding task. Therefore, I feel that the second proposal does not have any merit to it in terms of real accomplishment.

What I had hoped and what I would be happy - and our party would be happy to settle for, is rather than the thought of a separate department with a separate Minister to look after consumer affairs, which of course is our first preference, we would hope that it would be possible that within a department of government, such as the Provincial Secretary's Department, there would be an office established for this very purpose, and the idea of Special Counsel could be replaced by the idea of an officer of the department whose responsibility it would be to become aware of selling techniques and methods; give information and bulletins on the nature of various methods that are used for high pressure sales; and advise people on their legal rights and in enforcing those rights under the various Acts which have been passed and which hopefully will be passed in the future.

So that I would have hoped that an amendment would have come, preferably of course from the government side because it would have passed, but from any side which would have accepted our principle, but if they were fearful of a full department, to amend the resolution itself in such a way as to indicate that there should be an office in a department of the Cabinet which would be charged with this responsibility, which I think all of us have recognized as being an important field which does require a great deal of attention. Now I am hoping that regardless of the outcome of this resolution, that we will have some positive action on the part of the government, not only in making laws but also in seeing to it that these laws are enforced.

The Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre spoke at great length and enumerated all the things that were available and all the various offices and associations which were concerned with the problem, but the fact is that these various offices and all these associations that have been working have made a great impact on the problem but have not yet really co-ordinated the problem in one sense and have it as a unified office for the purpose of the protection of this all-important section of our community. So I think the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre did in his usual thorough fashion a great deal of research but he did not come up with a solution at all in that respect.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)...

Now this amendment, I am afraid, does not really deal with the problem but suggests two procedures which I think are not feasible and not workable.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, I would just like to add a word on this. We have had a lot of conversation in this Session on consumer credit and consumer protection. The problem is one that is both growing in intensity and more people are taking advantage of consumer credit, while at the same time the abuses in the field of consumer credit seem to be levelling off or are being minimized; and the government has got a very definite policy in connection with all the matters related to consumer credit, consumer protection and misleading advertising, and all of the many problems that are associated with the general one of consumer credit.

The policy of course is to make sure that the use and the distribution of credit, as it probably could be considered as a piece of merchandise, is not abused. At the same time, we are very anxious not to disturb the regular channels of trade and to throw any kind of hardships either on the part of those who are taking advantage of the credit and who actually need it, and they are by far in the vast majority, and also not to do anything that would disrupt the ordinary flow of business.

There is no easy solution to a problem that is changing as rapidly as the one is in consumer credit. One of the reasons it's not easy to solve is the fact that it is not a local problem in itself. It is a problem that is national; it is certainly dominion-wide and one that requires certain co-operation in the field of legislation and methods in which this is attacked from a federal level and between the provinces themselves. So the legislation that has been proposed and has been put on the books has been of a type that won't affect inter-provincial trade or in any way confuse those who are in the business of issuing credit nor those who receive it.

In the field of protection there are now any number of agencies who use their best efforts to see that the public is being protected. There is a very strong need, I believe, and a necessity now for some direction of all of these agencies so that the work is channeled through the proper sources and it gets to the consumer in the easiest and the best manner, but whether we are ready yet for either a department of consumer credit or a branch in one of the departments as just suggested by the Honourable Member for St. John's, the need for it is not yet so clearly defined that this could be done.

It would be no small chore to set up a department of this type. Whether it was a department in itself or one that would be a branch of an existing department, one would be called upon to deal with almost every person of an age that were capable of going out and making a purchase on a time sale agreement basis, but the government has, through the use of the Consumer Credit Committee and with the help of all of the members of the House, developed an over-all policy and it will take the next six months or so to put into legislation and have it ready for the next Session of the House, and to prepare the necessary administrative departments to see that the laws are being capably administered before even any other steps can be taken.

So although I do not object to the sentiments expressed either in the resolution or in the amendment, I think that in the future if some such department or branch may be needed, there may again be a need and probably there will be a need for a Standing Committee as suggested in the amendment, but not at this time, because as we all know, we have ventilated the whole problem very thoroughly over the last two years and we now would like to have a breather in order to establish the necessary administrative facilities in our department and also to prepare the rather comprehensive and important legislation that will be required to make sure that the suggestions of the Consumer Credit Committee of last year can be fully implemented.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. CHERNIACK: As I was permitted to introduce the motion on behalf of the honourable member who is absent, may I have a moment to close debate on his behalf?

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the Honourable Member leave of the House?

MR. MOLGAT: I was going to say a few words myself on the resolution before it's closed if I may. I wonder if in view of the hour we might not agree to call it 12:30.

MR. EVANS: I'm just considering the question as to whether we should adjourn the House, which will then bring us to Orders of the Day again and answer questions and so on.

MR. MOLGAT: That is what I really meant, Madam Speaker, as I think we have no choice anyway. Under the rules that we passed, we have to adjourn the House.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Before I put the motion, I'd like to ask the honourable members to keep their Order Paper that we are using this morning and also to keep any motions you might have on your desks. Although we will have another sitting this afternoon, we will be still using the same Order Paper.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Tuesday afternoon.