

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

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, March 3rd, 1964.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Union Centre praying for the passing of an Act respecting Union Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of James Malcolm Halliday and others praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate Selkirk Savings and Loan Association.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Brandon Golf and Country Club praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Brandon Golf and Country Club.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Ernest Arthur Birch and others praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate the Riverview Golf and Country Club.

MADAM SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions.

MR. CLERK: The petition of Winnipeg Bible Institute and College of Theology praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Winnipeg Bible Institute and College of Theology.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker I wish to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg leave to present the following as their first report. Your committee met for organization and appointed Honourable Mr. McLean as chairman. Your committee recommend that for the remainder of the session the quorum of this committee shall consist of ten members. Your committee has considered Bill No. 22, an Act to amend The Testators Family Maintenance Act and have agreed to report the same without amendment. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I move that the report be received, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

MR. COWAN introduced Bill No. 73, an Act respecting North West Trust Company.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk) introduced Bill No. 61, an Act respecting the holding of real property by The Manitoba and Northwestern Ontario Provincial Command of the Army, Navy and Air Force Veterans in Canada and Units of the Army, Navy and Air Force Veterans in Canada.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day I would like to attract your attention to the Speaker's Gallery where there are some 44 students taking the Diploma Course of Agriculture at the University of Manitoba. They are with and under the direction of Mr. Lange.

Due to the fact that Law Amendments will be meeting on March 10th, the seminar that I announced yesterday will be held on March 11th in the Speaker's room for members of the Legislative Assembly who wish to attend.

Orders of the Day.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to table a Return to an Order of the House No. 14 on the motion of the Honourable Member for St. George, and also a Return to an Order of the House No. 21 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day there is some information that I would like the privilege of placing before the House, because on March 18th next it is expected that a memorandum will be presented to His Excellency the Governor-General-in-Council on behalf of the Governments of the Provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, seeking the removal of the constitutional

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . limitations on taxing power imposed by an Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, Chapter 1 Statutes of Canada 1881; an Act to provide for the extension of the boundaries of the Province of Manitoba, Chapter 14, Statutes of Canada 1881; an Act to establish and provide for the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan, Chapter 42, Statutes of Canada, 1905; an Act to establish and provide for the Government of the Province of Alberta, Chapter 3, Statutes of Canada 1905; and the accompanying document is in my hands and I will see that seven copies are laid on the Table of the House for the information of the members.

I think, however, that I would wish to read into the record the covering letter which outlines the position of the Province of Manitoba respecting these rather complicated matters. This letter, referring to the material that is in this memorandum to which I have made reference, reads as follows: -- Addressed to the Honourable W. S. Lloyd, Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan, the Honourable E. C. Manning, Premier of the Province of Alberta: "My dear Premiers: Re submission to the Governor-General-in-Council CPR mainline tax exemption. The Government of Manitoba has signed the memorandum addressed to the Governor-General-in-Council which is to be submitted on behalf of our respective provinces, but since we have not had the opportunity to discuss this matter among the three Premiers, I thought I should inform you of the position that the Government of Manitoba will be taking when this matter is before the federal Cabinet.

It will be our position as set out on the memorandum that the statutes in question should be repealed in order to remove the existing discrimination in regard to the sovereign powers vested in the three western provinces. This fact is referred to in the memorandum but we will add in our verbal submission that Manitoba is in no way commenting upon the reasonableness or the validity of clause 16 of the contract of 1880. We were not a party to that agreement, but as a result of the document very onerous burdens were placed on the people of Manitoba. In addition, the powers of the Province of Manitoba in the field of taxation were seriously restricted. It will be our position that we are not recommending any unilateral abrogation of the contract between the Government of Canada and the Pacific syndicate, and that if the parties to that contract deem it reasonable that compensation should be paid the Canadian Pacific Railway for the repeal of clause 16 of the contract, then this is a matter between the federal government and the corporation.

As pointed out in the memorandum, only the three western provinces have been so discriminated against and the basis of our submission is the removal of the existing restriction on our sovereignty. I am sure that the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta will take the same position, but I felt that I should make it clear that the Province of Manitoba, in making this request to the central government, is not suggesting that the validity of long-standing contracts should be unilaterally violated. On the contrary, we suggest that the contractual aspect of this problem be settled between the contracting parties. This position is consistent with the position taken by the Province of Manitoba in regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway's attempt to defeat the terms of the Crow's Nest Pass agreement in relation to the carriage of grain for export. The submission in question is being forwarded to Mr. Manning herewith." That is the end of my letter.

I point out, Madam Speaker, in tabling this information, that it is done so with the consent of the two other prairie provinces and also with the knowledge and consent of the federal government as well.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, this only deals, I presume, with the exemption from taxation in respect of the CPR mainline. I believe it was conferred at the time of the setting up of the western provinces. Is this correct?

MR. ROBLIN: If I may answer my honourable friend, may I say that he is correct. It refers only to that part of the Province of Manitoba which is outside the boundaries of the old postage-stamp province. Members will recall that this boundary more or less went through Gladstone, north and south, in the western part of Manitoba and the contracts in question dealt with the lands that were formerly part of the Northwestern Territories, which at that time was Gladstone and west to the border of the Province of British Columbia, and it is the Canadian Pacific lines within that former Northwestern Territory area that is covered by this particular point. It does not have anything to do with railway taxation within the old postage-stamp

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) Province of Manitoba which was not affected by those agreements.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Before the Orders of the Day I would like to remind the honourable members of our visit scheduled for the Manitoba Institute of Technology, which will take place this evening. A bus will be at the front door at 5:30, Madam Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, in connection with this, do I recall that we were going to start half an hour late as far as the evening session is concerned?

MR. JOHNSON: Sorry, I believe there was unanimity in the decision to arrive back here by 8:30 ready for the House.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, in view of the interest that was shown in committee last night in the Interlake district, I wonder if the Minister of Education is planning a trip for the members to that district.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, Madam Speaker, I would be delighted to arrange such a trip and there are certain facilities in the Town of Arborg which the Honourable Member from Selkirk will be only too happy to check upon.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Utilities. There is considerable concern expressed in the rural areas because of the announced increase in telephone rates. Has the Minister given any consideration to having these increased rates revoked?

MR. STEINKOPF: The answer is no.

MR. GUTTORMSON: No to what?

MR. STEINKOPF: isn't going to.

MR. PAULLEY: Before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Public Works. I apologize for not giving him due notice of my question. I note that the carpets that were laid in the entrance lobby to the building have now been removed. I have two questions. Have they disintegrated because of the salt that was going onto them or have they been recovered by the Ontario laundry? I believe that they were -- at least underneath the carpets there were the words "These belong to the Ontario laundry." Have they retaken them? Have they fallen apart as a result of the salt content, or why are they not here any longer?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works)(Minnedosa): Madam Speaker, the answer to the first question is no. I don't know where the carpets are. They were there on a lease basis as an experiment and they were specially treated to serve the purpose for which they were put there, which was the sand and salt that was coming in on the feet. The rental figure was \$4.50 per week, and if they were needed they would be re-processed. I imagine the reason they have been removed is the weather that we have been favoured with in Manitoba has greatly improved the conditions underfoot outside.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, if I may, a subsequent question. Then the Minister would agree that there is a problem as a result of the salting of the streets in the Greater Winnipeg area.

MR. WEIR: Madam Speaker, the Minister would agree that salt and sand and things of that nature do stick to the feet if it's walked through outside, and that it does fall off when it comes inside.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, I too was interested in this matter and I want to inform the House that they were taken away for safety reasons. It was found that some of the ladies were tripping over them.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. Has it been brought to his attention of some difficulties at Thompson which prompted the company to send in additional guards to quell disturbances on the property?

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I had been informed informally that there were some extra security people taken in by the company. I don't know the details or the circumstances.

MR. GUTTORMSON: ask for any additional help themselves -- I mean by putting more RCMP officers in the area?

MR. McLEAN: No additional RCMP were requested.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Could the Minister tell us whether it is true or not the allegations that are being made that the RCMP cannot enter the property without permission of the company?

MR. McLEAN: I can't answer that. I have no knowledge of that.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): before the Orders of the Day, Madam Speaker. Again this year it is a pleasure for me in the name of La Societé de St.-Jean-Baptiste and its president Monsieur Hebert as well as all the residents of St. Boniface, to invite all the members to the famous Pea Soup night which will be held at St. Boniface College on Wednesday, March 25th. It will start approximately 8:00 o'clock as in previous years, and of course the members of the press know that they are also invited at this thing.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may join with my friend and colleague from St. Boniface, having the honour of representing a goodly portion, I want to second the invitation on behalf of the Society and Monsieur Hebert, and also to inform the House that special provision has been made in the event of the Honourable Member for St. Vital and the Honourable Member for St. Boniface both showing up, that there will be adequate protection for both of them.

MR. GROVES: I thank the Honourable Member of the NDP for that last statement, and I'm sure I speak on behalf of the Honourable Member from St. Boniface and myself that as one of the members who also represents a portion of St. Boniface I'm glad to associate myself with the honourable member in this invitation.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to direct a question to my friend, the Honourable Minister of Public Utilities. Is it a fact that the province own a number of powered toboggans, and is it a fact that they are licenced? And if they are licenced, are they licenced for registration purposes only, or by reason of the fact that they are required to do so under the Highway Traffic Act?

MR. STEINKOPF: Can I take that as notice and get the answer for you for tomorrow?

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for St. James, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Wellington, and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the member from Assiniboia. The Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, can I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks. The Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I would beg leave of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Carillon, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Fisher, and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, I beg leave of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Emerson. The Honourable the Member for La Verendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, just to change the trend, I'll say a few words. When the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain spoke on this resolution the other day and said that it didn't matter too much to him because he had no secondary highways in his constituency, I could not help but adjourn the debate. Not that I want to criticize his statement but I want to say that things are very different in my constituency, and in the very short time that this resolution has been on the floor there have been three delegations from my constituency asking the Minister the very things that are proposed in this resolution, with claims which I think were very logical because in most cases it was a matter of the road being in one municipality and being used by people living in adjoining municipalities. Therefore I would like to be on record in this House as being in favour of this resolution.

MR. WEIR: Madam Speaker, I hadn't really intended taking part in this debate, but I think that the remarks of the last speaker are such that I should maybe just say a word or two. He referred to some delegations that had approached me about taking over some roads. I don't recall all of them but I think certainly some of them were concerned about the take-over of a main market road, not necessarily secondary highways, and I think that circumstances

(Mr. Weir, cont'd.) . . . being what they are, the secondary highways qualifying for a 75 percent capital and a 75 percent maintenance grant, the hardship to the municipalities involved is financially not as great as the responsibility that falls on some other municipalities on main market roads where they can receive only a capital grant of 60 percent and must provide the maintenance themselves. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye knows my position and my attitude, I think probably as well as any member of the House. I am of the opinion that with the Michener Commission sitting, Madam Speaker, charged with the responsibility of defining the responsibilities and the tax basis of the various levels of government in Manitoba, that we would be using extremely bad taste to change any of the existing formulas as they sit on our books at the present time. For this reason, and for the reason that the resolution itself would not provide the answer to the problems that the municipalities have in total, I too, am going to oppose it.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Those

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, if I adjourn the debate I will be closing it, so

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. TANCHAK: No. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from St. George, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster. The Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster and the proposed amendment thereto of the Honourable the Member for Brandon, and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Member for Inkster. I have had this resolution under consideration, and may I refer the honourable members to Beauchesne's fourth edition, citation 202, paragraph 14, which reads as follows: "An amendment which would produce the same result as if the original motion were simply negative is out of order." Accordingly, I must rule the sub-amendment out of order. Anyone wishing to speak on the amendment? Are you ready for the question?

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Seven Oaks, that the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Madam Speaker, I wonder if I may speak on this?

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

MR. CHERNIACK: I would just like to present to the House, Madam Speaker, the problem of domestic relations in this respect as it appears to some lawyers, who find that they are called upon to represent people in domestic difficulties under two circumstances. One is where a breakdown has occurred and adultery cannot be proven and the result then puts these people into family court; and the other is a clean-cut case where the complaining party, being able to prove adultery, wishes to proceed with a divorce, and the lawyer and the judge, under The Wives and Childrens Maintenance Act and under the precedents which have been established, are charged with making every attempt to reconcile the couple to see whether something can be done to mend that broken home, to make an effort to maintain, renew, or reinvigorate a situation which has deteriorated, in the interests of the couple and the interests of the children, and, in the end, in the interests of society itself. But in divorce as we know it today, Madam Speaker, there is no question involved about reconciliation. There seems to be a hard and fast rule that if adultery may be proven a petition may be launched, it may be proceeded with and dealt with, and the only thing the court is concerned with in the main, other than the technical aspects, are jurisdiction of the court, and has adultery been proven. Now I think it is well-known that a divorce can take 15 to 20 to 25 minutes in court, because a lawyer who prepares his case properly, knows what he must present to the court in order to satisfy the court as to whether or not the petition is well founded, and he can do so quite well in that short period of time. Very often the matter involving The Wives and the Childrens Maintenance Act lasts

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd.) . . . for a long time, because there are many other aspects involved and in the end the court has a great deal of discretion to decide what is best and in the interests of these people.

In divorce, once adultery is proven and the court decides that it shall grant the divorce, the question of custody of children is referred to and is dealt with and is disposed of, and usually very quickly. One of the main reasons it happens so quickly is that by this time the decision has already been made in that the separation of husband and wife has continued for a long enough period of time that as between the two of them they have already disposed of the problem of actual or physical custody of the children, and all they have to do then is to ask the court to confirm what has in fact taken place. And the result is that we find -- and when I say "We", I as one practising lawyer, has found that a divorce problem is really a simple one because the rules are so clearly defined that you just go through the necessary proofs for the court and the court has no alternative. If it believes the evidence, it proceeds.

But one of the reasons why this matter has become rather simple to handle in divorce court is that, in my experience, the adultery which is the basis for the divorce, or the official cause, has taken place as incidental or subsequent to the fact that other serious marital difficulties have arisen and separation has taken place, and the home is broken, and the couple each go their own way, and very often, subsequent to that, adultery takes place and the divorce is proceeded with. By this time there is no hope for reconciliation and it becomes cut and dried; but really what we all pay lip service to, and that is the fact that adultery is and shall be the only cause for divorce, defeats its own purpose because it is never, in my experience, the initial cause for the breakdown. Then as such it just confirms the fact that a home has been broken irreparably, and then we find that people who have separated for any number of reasons which might, in the opinion of The Wives and Childrens Maintenance Act and the opinion of the family court judge have been a justifiable reason, they are barred from divorce until one of them commits an act which is considered to be immoral, improper. That act may have been one which the participant in the act did only casually and incidentally to his or her way of life; had nothing whatsoever to do with the break in the marriage; and yet we degrade -- and I think that word is a fair word -- degrade the whole system of justice by relating to a permanent divorce situation the need to go into the unpleasant aspects of only one of what may have been a cause.

Now I have a very useful booklet which I think probably all members of this House received a year or more ago, which is a report of a committee or commission of the United Church made in 1962 on the question of marriage breakdown, divorce and re-marriage, and it contains a good deal of factual information as well as conclusions. Now one of the bits of information which comes readily to hand here is a summary of the law as it is in some of the other provinces. We know that in Manitoba the cause for divorce is only adultery. It seems to me that it's not very long ago where adultery of the wife was sufficient to be proven but that in the case of a husband it was necessary to prove, not only adultery, but also -- what was the -- cruelty -- I tried to think of that word. Cruelty, in addition to adultery. Now there we had that peculiar situation that a husband was, well presumably could commit adultery -- if he wasn't cruel to his wife in addition thereto she couldn't get a divorce. And then the courts began to recognize that in adultery an act of adultery itself could be considered as cruelty and got around it that way.

However, in New Brunswick and in Prince Edward Island, in addition to the question of adultery, either frigidity or impotence could be a ground for divorce. In Nova Scotia impotence or cruelty could be grounds for divorce, and these recognize the very important aspects of what might cause a serious breakdown in marriage other than adultery, and it should stand to reason that a person who can come to court asking for a divorce on the grounds of frigidity or impotence is not likely to be asking for a divorce on the ground of adultery; and yet, either of these causes, and more particularly the ones of frigidity and impotence, to my mind, may be a much more serious cause of breakdown in a marriage.

The pamphlet to which I have referred refers in greater detail to the law in Australia, which is much more extensive than that proposed in the motion itself here, and if I might recap very quickly the grounds in Australia, they are: adultery; desertion for two years; wilful refusal to consummate; habitual cruelty for one year; habitual drunkenness; frequent convictions

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd.) . . . for crime and failure to support; imprisonment of some extended period; and many others of this nature which are serious causes that break up a marriage. But let me draw to your attention, Madam Speaker, that there are two aspects in Australia which are somewhat more rigorous than that in this province, and that is that no decree nisi may become absolute until the court by order has declared that it is satisfied that proper arrangements have been made for the welfare of the children. Secondly, no proceedings can be initiated except by special permission of the court unless three years of marriage have elapsed. Now these are two pretty good sensible approaches to this problem which we don't have in this province. You could actually -- well I needn't describe all the different circumstances that could arise that would justify the court granting a divorce here where the question of the welfare of the children, where the question of a real effort to make a marriage last is not even gone into in any respect.

The mover of this resolution, Madam Speaker, has dealt rather extensively with some of the bad effects of making divorce so difficult to obtain. I think we all must recognize the misery that can be caused, that is caused by a broken home. We recognize how long a broken home can cause a whole situation in the community to deteriorate so adversely. It seems to me that we must recognize that a continuation over a long period of time of a broken home can be much more harmful to the members of the family affected, and to the society in which they live, than can a divorce which is based on some real ground for divorce, but not necessarily that of adultery alone.

The problem that is created and which all lawyers, and I'm sure all social workers -- certainly all clergymen -- are familiar with, is the problems created by common-law relationships, which arise just as sure as can be, following an extended period of a breakdown in marriage which is not terminated by a divorce. The problem of illegitimacy, of inheritance, maintenance, all these matters come about as serious problems which are caused and which are with us today largely because of the fact that it is impossible to obtain a divorce unless either you can prove adultery or there is an arrangement to commit or appear to commit adultery, and I must say that in my experience this is extremely small in comparison to the actual cases because it's just not necessary. The evidence is often available.

I would like to suggest to the House that it must consider which is morally the poorer, the problem of extending the grounds for divorce, or the problem of permitting a continuation of an immoral or socially unacceptable relationship. It seems to me that the people who are most rigid in their sense of morality, of their debt to society, are the people who are going to be adversely affected by the fact that their home will continue to be broken and a marriage not terminated, whereas the people to whom morality is least important are the people who could either conspire to commit adultery for the purpose of divorce or are people to whom a common-law relationship is not unacceptable. In other words, those who care least of all about the morals of our society are the ones who are least adversely affected by the law as we know it today. Those who feel most seriously the effects of committing and being charged with and having aired the problem of adultery are the ones who are most likely to suffer over a continued period.

I would like to draw again the attention of the House to this pamphlet issued by the United Church, which suggests in the recommendation portion on page 114, that court procedures ought to provide means whereby either consort could require the other to participate in conciliation procedure with a view to avoiding further legal proceedings. That an attempt at conciliation be compulsory as requisite to the obtaining of a separation or divorce. That no divorce proceedings be initiated until after three years of marriage have elapsed, unless by special permission of the court. That protection be given in the interests and welfare of the children involved and that no decree be granted until the welfare of the children has been attended to. But in the recommendations dealing with the causes for which divorces are justified, the general council recognizes, according to page 113 of this pamphlet, justification of divorce under certain circumstances, and that adultery is not the only ground on which divorce should be granted. The resolution continues to spell out that it thinks a Royal Commission ought to be appointed to go even further into the question and study it, and if by passing this resolution we prompt a further review and discussion of this entire problem I think that, in the long run, we will be doing what is best for society and best for the individuals who today are being adversely affected by what is

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd.) . . . a pretty rigid and unrealistic approach to our whole problem of domestic relations.

MADAM SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable the Member for Inkster, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks, that the government give consideration to the advisability of instructing the Co-operative Department of the Department of Agriculture to make a study of ways and means of transforming the production of sugar in Manitoba, from a privately owned to a co-operatively owned and a co-operatively operated enterprise, and to make a report thereon to the Minister of Agriculture and through the Minister to this Legislature.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, the Co-operative Department of the Department of Agriculture has been praised so much in the last few years for their wonderful work in investigation and preparation and in their recommendations to the Minister of matters of this kind. The resolution speaks for itself. It asks for a study by the Co-operative Department of the Department of agriculture for either taking over the present plant or building a new one in competition. A year ago a similar motion was defeated with only the New Democratic members supporting it. A short time later the First Minister, I believe, took a real interest in an endeavour to try and remedy the situation, by going to Ottawa himself. Some adjustments in the price of sugar have been made but not sufficiently, and the price is still unjustifiably high, and the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission, for reasons of their own, perhaps through lack of evidence, have not taken any drastic action although three companies pleaded guilty to price fix of sugar imports from Cuba in 1954, and were fined \$25,000 each, but still it did not affect the local industry nor bring about a reduction in the price of sugar in Manitoba, which last year was the highest in history.

I believe that the only remedy for the protection of the consumer is to encourage the establishment of co-operatives where the consumers and the producers can gain. We all know that this province advanced a large sum of money to a private company for the purpose of establishing a sugar industry in Manitoba, particularly having in mind the beet growers of the province. This I have no quarrel with, but surely financial help could be offered to a co-operative to exist and be supervised by the Department of Agriculture. In 1940, Manitoba Government bonds of the Manitoba Sugar Company to the extent I believe of \$600,000.00. In January 1957, the Combine Investigation Commission reported, and I read: "For the foregoing reason, we consider that it would not be in the public interest for B.C. Sugar Refining Company to have an interest in or control over Manitoba Sugar Company through the purchase of shares or otherwise. Therefore it is our opinion a proposed merger should be renounced. We believe that the public interest would be best served if Manitoba Sugar operated as an independent company, with no share interest in it or control over it held directly or indirectly by any other Canadian sugar refining company."

In spite of this finding, B.C. Sugar Company went ahead with plans to get complete control over the Manitoba Sugar. The Government of Canada decided to prosecute. There were many lengthy hearings. The prosecuting counsel told the courts that the price of sugar in Manitoba was highest in the world. In August 1960, Chief Justice McWilliams ruled that the merger of B.C. Sugar Refining Company was not operating to the detriment of the public. Events have proved how wrong he was. Only 20 percent of the sugar consumed in Canada comes from sugar beets; 80 percent is from sugar cane, which is imported as raw sugar mostly from Commonwealth countries. In 1960 three eastern sugar companies, Acadia-Atlantic, Canadian Dominion Sugar Company; and St. Lawrence Sugar Company were prosecuted, and fined \$25,000 each for operating as a combine.

In 1963 I submitted the following motion to the Manitoba Legislature: "That the government give consideration to the advisability of instructing the Co-operative Department of the Department of Agriculture to make a study of ways and means of transforming the production of sugar in Manitoba from a privately-owned to a co-operative-owned" and so on. The motion was

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) . . . defeated, all Conservatives and Liberals voting against it, only the New Democratic Party supporting it. Later, I mention, Premier Roblin wired to the Minister of Justice in Ottawa asking for an investigation -- not very long after the resolution was defeated here -- he had previously refused a request made by the Winnipeg Labour Council for an enquiry. Prime Minister Pearson replied the Federal Government have no authority for price control in peace time and that it has a provincial responsibility.

Australia is the fourth largest producer of sugar cane in the world. Cane is grown mostly in Queensland. White labour is used to cut the cane, well paid. By an agreement with the federal government, the Queensland government buys up the whole of the cane that is produced and has it distributed among the sugar refining mills. In addition to supplying the population of Australia with sugar, over half a million tons are exported annually. Cash receipts from the sale of sugar are pooled and after expense -- refining costs, freight, administration costs, extra charges -- have been deducted, the balance is divided among the millers and the growers, 70 percent going to the growers and 30 percent to the refiners. Periodically, by an agreement with the federal government, the wholesale and retail price of sugar is determined for the whole Australia, and special prices set for sugar used by the fruit industry. The Australian government is conducting an enquiry into the sugar and the fruit processing industries.

International. An agreement negotiated by the United Nations in Geneva in 1959 was supposed to run for 5 years. It is under the terms of this agreement that Australia exports 651,000 tons of sugar a year. But this agreement has not been lived up to. Trouble with Cuba is partly the reason. Another agreement is to be considered in the later half of 1963. There should be further investigation and action in support of sugar and other articles of food.

The First Minister should be held responsible by the consumers so far as Manitoba is concerned; that it's not sufficient, beets are being grown to be more or less independent by a co-operative movement. I think we could get all the raw material we want without importing from anywhere else. We could provide more employment and we could provide an opportunity of reducing the price of not only sugar but of all the commodities necessary for the housekeeper, and everybody will tell you now that the cost of living is so high that many, many people in all sections of the province are suffering from lack of necessities. We have complaints about the high taxes. I don't think anybody complains of high taxes but they are complaining of not having the money to pay the taxes on account of the very high cost of living. I respectfully ask that this matter be given consideration. You don't have to do it today, you don't have to do it tomorrow. You can still discuss the advisability or otherwise of making large investments but at the same time, I said the same time, we have the machinery. You don't have to lay out any money -- we have the members of the department quite capable and able to study it, and after the study, the matter will be discussed again and hope some day that this province will give protection as to the cost of commodities to the consumers and provide a living for the producers.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. WILLIAM HOMER HAMILTON (Dufferin): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable the Member for Morris.

MR. LISSAMAN: Madam Speaker, the honourable member is not in his seat immediately. I wonder if the House would allow this matter to stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Lakeside. The Honourable the Minister without Portfolio.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Madam Speaker, with the indulgence of the House, could I have this matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that whereas crops were very poor in the region north and east of Winnipeg; and whereas the size of this region is so large as to include several contiguous municipalities; and whereas the farmers and potato growers in this area are finding it difficult to obtain seed

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) grain and seed potatoes, and in addition are finding it difficult to finance such purchases of seed; and whereas the Provincial Government has undertaken in the past various programs of emergency regional assistance; as for example, its Feed and Fodder Program in 1961; therefore, be it resolved that this House requests the Government of Manitoba to bring in a measure respecting assistance to certain of those municipalities in the region and areas having a poor crop in 1963, and providing among other matters for the making of loans to these municipalities to assist them in financing a seed grain and seed potato purchasing program.

MADAM SPEAKER: the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I must confess that I was not sure whether to proceed with this resolution because there is presently provision for assistance to farmers that are having difficulty in obtaining and financing seed grain that they might need in the spring, but the difference is that the provisions that we have now under The Municipal Act, section 854 to 882 of The Municipal Act, do allow for municipalities to float debentures and use this money to finance such a program. The main reason therefore that I put this resolution before members is to attempt to have some discussion at least on the desirability of the present program and also to try to solicit some kind of consensus from members as to whether it isn't time that we have a serious look at changing this legislation, because I believe that under present circumstances, and in the present day, it is no more than fair that the province concern itself a little more directly with financing these emergency seed grain programs than it has been up to now. I know that there can be some convincing arguments for saying that, "well provision is there in The Municipal Act, let's leave it that way!" but on the other hand there are some strong arguments too, for saying that the province should concern itself and involve itself more directly. In the first place, if a municipality or a number of adjoining municipalities have had poor crops in their areas in a year, then it doesn't seem to make much sense that those very same municipalities with their local economy undermined a bit, that we should expect these same municipalities to finance emergency programs, even if it is by way of loans. And secondly, just as the federal government concerns itself with regional disaster and regional crop failure, and enters into shared emergency programs with the province -- just as the federal government does that, so should the provincial government, I suggest, concern itself with area and small region emergency programs.

In 1961, we know that in that year of drought the Province of Manitoba spent over \$400,000 on the emergency Feed and Fodder Program. The provincial government was able to get \$400,000, an equal amount, from the federal government. Now this was a regional emergency program. The federal government entered into that. To do what? To assist over 6,000 farmers in the transportation and moving of hay supplies and the movement of some feeder cattle and so on. Well if the federal government can involve itself directly with a regional emergency program, why shouldn't the province involve itself directly with an area emergency that might arise? Now this is not a very small problem; there are several municipalities involved here that I mention in this resolution, approximately four or five municipalities have -- the farmers of those municipalities have had such poor crops in the past year and in the case of two or three municipalities, there have been crop failures for two and three years in a row and they are up against it, many of them, with respect to the purchase of seed grain. I know that some of them were in to see the Minister and he referred them to the present provisions of The Municipal Act. Now this is better than nothing, but I suggest that it is time now that we look towards new possibilities, and one of them I suggest is that the province involve itself more directly with these regional emergency programs that might be needed from time to time.

The farmers in the area north and east of Winnipeg in the municipalities of St. Clement, St. Andrews, Brokenhead, to some extent Springfield, possibly Rosser, and one or two other municipalities in the Interlake that I'm not aware of at the moment, crop yields, for example, were 3, 4, 5 bushels an acre in many areas in these municipalities. I hope that this resolution will be discussed with a view towards seeing whether or not it is feasible to have the province become more directly involved in these regional programs of seed grain purchase and so on.

Madam Speaker put the question.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Lakeside. The Honourable the Member for Brandon.

MR. LISSAMAN: Madam Speaker, this is a very technical resolution and I haven't been able to accumulate all the information I would like to get. I wonder if the House would allow me to have this matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, "whereas there is a six month delay in the payment of grants to school divisions; whereas this delay forces the school division to borrow money at 6 percent to meet their current expenditures, and in effect requires the school division to be a borrowing agency for the Province of Manitoba; therefore be it resolved that this House give consideration to the advisability of the payment of all grants to school divisions on receipt of statement of claim.

Madam Speaker put the question.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, this resolution is quite similar to one that I had put forward last year and I have no new evidence, shall we say, of need, except that I have heard from other school boards with the same problem exactly as the particular school board that I quoted from last year. This year I would like to take some figures from the financial statement of the Kirkfield Park Elementary School District No. 30. On glancing at their financial statement for the year '63, it was found that they had paid out approximately \$8,230 in interest on short term loans or bank overdrafts. Upon examining this figure it was found that roughly from one-third to one-half of this amount was used in current expenses, not a capital figure. In other words, there is no money here that is on long-term borrowings.

On talking to a member of this particular board, he told me that they were quite concerned with the fact that year after year they had to budget for interest in amounts like this and in their efforts to cut this down they had even gone so far as to change the method of paying their teachers. In the past they had paid their teachers on the 25th of each month and in an effort to cut down some of their interest paying they changed this to pay the teachers on the second last day of the month and just by two or three days of a delay of the payroll for this district it was found that they could save \$1,600 in interest for the year. Now the feeling is amongst some of the school people that I have talked to that if a payment was made in, say, the month of January which would cover the period ending in December -- now it is my understanding that this particular half year grant comes in March -- this would have the effect of cutting down the amount of interest that the school boards would have to pay. Now it might be said that the government themselves would have to enter into borrowing if they were going to meet this. Possibly this is true, but the school boards in their short-term borrowing have to pay bank interest; there has been no arrangement made for longer term borrowing. Therefore, I contend that the province would be in a position to have more favourable rates for their borrowing than individual school boards across the province would have in individual dealings with the banks in their areas. Now, while this figure of interest of \$8,230 may be a little higher than average -- I'm not qualified to say that, or I don't know, but I believe it's pretty well established that across Manitoba every school board is paying out considerable amounts of interest money year after year, which is a burden on the taxpayers, and with some reorganization in the financing by the province, the Department of Education, this could be avoided and the savings would go to the taxpayer directly.

MADAM SPEAKER: All those in favour

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I just have a very brief comment to make on this. I brought this problem up during the Educational estimates, and I still can't see why any school district should be required to pay carrying charges on grants that the school district has already spent, just because the government wishes to withhold the payment of grants in some cases for a period of six to ten months. At that time, I asked the Minister of Education during estimates whether any change was being contemplated and I got a very short answer. I believe -- I may be wrong, but the former Minister can approach the present Minister, because the present Minister got up and said that the grants now are being paid -- I don't know what word he used -- immediately. And when I pressed the question further, the Minister of Education wasn't

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.) . . . ready to give us clarification on that, but on two occasions subsequently when I asked, he said that he'd get me the information. I have not received the information, and that's my interest in this. I would like to see some action taken as far as this submission is concerned, but I would like the clarification to my question in the Educational estimates.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): debate be adjourned. Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable the Member for St. James.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Madam Speaker, may I have the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. John's.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if Madam Speaker will allow this matter to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. John's. All

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I believe it was the intention of my colleague to propose or introduce for debate one or two of these. I think he anticipated that some of the other resolutions might be proceeded with. I am sure if your Honour would just, if it's possible just to hold your fire -- the fire's been held.

MADAM SPEAKER: The second one?

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan: whereas a recent trend in the used car business has indicated an area of criminal and / or unethical practices which, if permitted to grow, will prove harmful to the Manitoba consumer and to a very important commercial enterprise in this Province; therefore be it resolved that the Government take steps to curb this trend by means of licensing and bonding used car dealers to protect the consumer from criminal and unethical practices.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I think there is very little that need be said on this resolution. I think generally it is well known that a small number, a small percentage of people in the used car business have been responsible for an inordinate proportion of unscrupulous practices which have resulted in loss to people who are least able to suffer such loss. There is today a requirement under the Highway Traffic Act that a used car dealer shall obtain a permit, and I think that it has to be renewed annually. I think too that he is required to give some sort of certificate in connection with the sale of a car, but the permit which is issued to him is, in my opinion, inadequate in terms of protection to those people who may suffer because of his unscrupulous or, in some cases, criminal approaches to his customers. And again I want to say that I'm sure that the vast majority of people in the used car business are the ones who suffer most because they are not guilty of this type of practice and yet their own business must suffer by that. So that I am suggesting, Madam Speaker, that if it were necessary that these people be licensed and thus a measure of control over them to the extent that they might be required to post a bond with an authority such as the Municipal Board -- or the Public Utilities Board, I think, is the one -- that this bond could then be made available to protect and to recompense those people who suffer loss.

I have had the experience of acting for a person who advertised his car for sale, was approached by a used car dealer on a Friday night or Saturday morning, and who made a deal for the purchase of that car, and who offered a very good price, a little more than the car was worth, and then said: "Well, I'll give you a cheque for this car," took a bill of sale, issued a cheque, and said: "Well, the banks won't open till Monday, so I'll date it Monday." By doing that, this person converted the NSF cheque, which it was on Monday, from a fraudulent act into an act of postponement of a debt. In other words, instead of giving a cheque in exchange for the car he gave a promissory note; and as a result, this person who sold the car discovered that the cheque was no good, the dealer was not worth suing, it was not a criminal act -- it was one which was just poor business on the part of the vendor of the car. This was not an uncommon situation.

I also had occasion to deal with a problem of a man who went to purchase a car from a

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd.) . . . used car dealer, gave a deposit to the car dealer for, say \$200, I think it was -- I forget the amount -- and then the car wasn't delivered to him for one reason or another. All he had, then, was the claim for return of his deposit, and when he went to claim the deposit the car dealer just wasn't worth suing for his deposit, and he was stuck.

I am aware of a case where -- especially it has had a great deal of application in other provinces -- in Ontario, where an overpayment was made to a used car dealer, overpayment in terms of what they called an "unconscionable" bargain. Now, in the event that there is an unconscionable bargain, after a deal was closed the courts could rule that the excess monies paid should be refunded, but getting a civil judgment that a refund shall be made is not good enough, because if the man in this business doesn't have the financial backing, he therefore cannot repay the amount which it is ruled he is liable to repay. There have been cases of used car dealers taking automobiles on consignment, holding them until they would sell them, and when they sell them they would then pay. But consignment questions are often questions where the criminal law aspects have to be proven to the hilt, and if they can't be proven, very often they become only a question of civil liability, and again, if the dealer is unable to deliver the money or the goods, all you have is a judgment against him.

So that I am proposing, Madam Speaker, that the government give consideration to the method by which it can bond people in this business, so as to make sure that if they do take unfair or illegal advantage of a customer that there be a bond to stand behind the ability of the dealer to repay the person who has suffered. I should point out the additional possibility that a used car dealer commits a criminal act in relation to a transaction. He may go to jail, but the person who has suffered loss may have only the satisfaction of knowing that the dealer has gone to jail. He does not get the return of the money he has lost. And since this is in the realm of a business where business is often transacted on the street or in the home of the purchaser, or over the -- in the home of the customer, whether he be the seller or the buyer of the vehicle, it is transacted under such circumstances that lend themselves to an unscrupulous practice; and I think that in that case the protection which I am suggesting -- that of bonding -- would hurt no-one who is honest and responsible, but would protect those who are misled by dealing with unscrupulous or criminal people in that line of work.

MR. McKELLAR: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that whereas interest payable under various types of loans and time sales contracts is computed in various methods so that the persons paying interest cannot relate these various methods to each other, to know the comparative costs of same; and whereas it is deemed desirable, in the interest of fair competition, for such interest charges to be fully disclosed at the time the contract is entered into; therefore be it resolved that the Government give such consideration as appears necessary to enforce the disclosure of interest rates on the basis of a rate payable on the amount outstanding from time to time computed not in advance, by the supplier or lender making such charge.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I had occasion last year to debate some of this problem with the then the Honourable the Attorney-General, and the point made then by him was that it was not feasible or even possible to relate carrying charges, interest rates, other charges, of deferred time payments into a formula which would show what I wish to term a true interest rate. I don't intend to go into that debate all over again. I have worded this resolution in such a way as to not arouse anybody's resentment or antagonism to what I have in mind, in the hope that this resolution will be accepted by the majority in this House and taken back for purposes of study. I don't want to be in a position of raising anybody's hackles. I just want people to recognize that a problem exists and that it is the responsibility of the government to study the problem and look for an answer. Now I want, at the outset, Madam Speaker, to say that in the question of interest rates there are many times where high interest

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd.) . . . rates are acceptable and are even necessary in order to finance a certain type of a purchase or a certain type of a loan. It may well be that if the interest rates were kept at a certain level that one or other type of enterprise would not proceed with because of the risk involved by the lender. So I don't want to suggest for a moment that the purpose of this resolution is to restrict the extent of interest charges or carrying charges or what you call it. That I think is a federal responsibility and to the extent that unconscionable bargains are a provincial responsibility, it could be dealt with elsewhere. All I am asking in terms of this resolution is that the person who will be required to pay the interest rate should know what he is paying in terms of a comparison with what others will be charging him. If he pays 50 percent per annum interest on whatever the deferred payment is, that, for the purpose of this resolution, is his business, providing he knows what he is paying.

What disturbs me, Madam Speaker, is the many cases that we are aware of where people don't know what they are paying, they are misled. And I'll give you an example of what probably the most respectable financial houses in this country are doing which result in misleading the customer. As far as I know, a bank is not allowed to charge more than 6 percent per annum. I think under The Bank Act there is that restriction. And yet I am aware of the fact that certain banks have set up a machinery of lending money whereby they are receiving a return equivalent up to 9 percent on their money. The way I understand it is done is that they will lend a person -- and I may be wrong and I may be challenged -- but I think generally I'm going to describe the system correctly. I understand that they will lend a person \$100 at 6 percent interest, repayable over a year, that means \$6, and that they may then deduct the \$6 out of the \$100, so that he gets \$94.00. He is already paying -- on the basis of \$6 on \$94, it's a fraction more than 6 percent. Then I understand that he is required to pay monthly into a savings account his monthly payment, so that he will get interest on his savings account of whatever they're paying -- 2 percent or 2 1/2 percent -- interest on the money in the savings account, and when at the end of the year he has accumulated the \$100 which he has to repay to the bank, he pays the \$100.00. But he has actually paid 6 percent interest per annum on the money he has borrowed -- he has only received savings bank interest on the money that he has been depositing from month to month on his monthly instalments. Now this is what I understand is being done by some of the banks -- and I'm not critical at the moment of the fact that they are charging more than 6 percent. Possibly they are saving that person the much higher rate of interest that he would have to pay if he wanted to purchase something with that money under a time sales contract. My objection is that this person may think that he is paying 6 percent per annum because that's what the banker tells him and that's what The Bank Act tells him, but if he is actually paying 8 1/2 percent per annum I want him to know it. That is the purpose of this resolution.

Now I was amused, Madam Speaker, last year after our debates on this question, to receive newspaper clippings, and I have one before me from a Toronto newspaper whose name I don't have on this clipping but it is a Canadian Press dispatch from Toronto dealing with the report on the select committee of the Ontario Legislature on the question of mortgage charges, where they deal with the fact that people are paying very high rates of interest and don't know it, and the concluding paragraph of this clipping reads that the vice president of a certain investment company who was then the current president of the Ontario Mortgage Brokers Association said that "true disclosure would allow the borrower to shop around." That's what I want -- if we're speaking now of the free enterprise system and fair competition and the right for a person to be able to assess the different offers that are made so he can pick the best deal for himself he can only do so by having some knowledge of what the true interest is, but I can't expect him to be a mathematician of an order that can calculate and assess all the factors that come into the relationship of time, and dollars, and the value of dollars in terms of time.

Another clipping from Halifax report which also -- in Nova Scotia. Let me start that sentence again. In Nova Scotia there was a royal commission appointed to deal with the entire question of charges on credit, and there were hearings held in Halifax. This item refers to a person who told the commission -- this was a lawyer who addressed the commission on behalf of a couple that had been unfairly charged, in his estimation, charged high interest rates -- and he pointed out to the commission that he calculated that the couple were paying 41.2 percent interest on the loan which he had described. In his testimony on Wednesday, the person who

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd)... made the loan denied that the interest amounted to 41 percent. He said it was more in the neighbourhood of about 31 or 32 percent. Now that was his contribution: Oh, no, I've been accused of charging too much interest; all I've been charging is 31 or 32 percent. All I am pointing out is that he was able to calculate what his interest was and when challenged with charging a truly exorbitant rate of 41 percent he denied it and said, oh, no, it was only 31 percent.

Madam Speaker, I think that people who wish to do business on time, I mean time sales or wish to lend money and charge interest, are people who should be charged with the responsibility of giving a true description of the charges that they are attaching to the money that they are renting out. In almost every other aspect of business we know that competition brings about a true picture of what it is that the customer is expected to pay, but I feel that in this case it is impossible for the customer to evaluate his cost, but should be quite easy for the person setting the cost, or the price, to determine what that means in terms of true interest -- which is what I described in the resolution. It may be a bit of a hardship on him but I am not one bit sorry for a person who has to overcome some obstacle and acquire a little more information to give the true picture, if in his business he wants to earn his living out of charging these rates. Now there are tables which I was able to produce last year, and especially after the debate ended on the time sale contract. After that I acquired one or two charts which show a conversion table that is fairly easy to deal with -- I think is possible to do -- and I urge on the government the need to investigate this possibility which I am suggesting in the hope that they will be able to come back next year and say we've worked out a method whereby this can be done. We agree that it ought to be done. We will try to do it.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, might I ask a question of the sponsor of the resolution? I would like to ask the mover of the resolution if it is not, in his opinion, even more important to have the rate of interest made known for the protection of the borrower, and the purchaser as the case may be, than just in the interest of fair competition? And if so, if he agrees with that, would he not prefer to add those words to his resolution: "In the interest of fair competition and for the protection of the borrower and purchaser."

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, in answer to the Member for Lakeside, I must say that I'm very happy to note that his association on this side of the House with people in this corner has rubbed off enough for him to realize that this would be something that he could expect from a member of our party. Certainly I welcome his suggestion. Either it was an oversight or in my desire to attract as much favourable comment and favourable support to this bill I, have made as acceptable as possible by appealing to the sense of fair play. I may have gone a little overboard. I certainly feel that the point made by the honourable member is valid, important, and acceptable.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, would the honourable member permit another question? Does the honourable member know that in Washington, in Ottawa, and in Toronto, various commissions and committees have tried to find an answer to this question and haven't been successful?

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I know that the attempt has been made. I have not satisfied myself that they have really tried to do it and have not been successful. I believe that I've been able to show that it is possible providing the people who are charged with the responsibility accept it and do it. It can be done.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Madam Speaker, if my colleague would permit another question? Would the adoption of his resolution not make a "real first" for Manitoba, as against the "first" that we've heard quite frequently from across the other side of the House?

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm sure it would,

MADAM SPEAKER: All those in favour?

MR. RICHARD SEABORN (Wellington): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from St. Vital the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. John's.

MR. PAULLEY: ...could we have this item stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. CHERNIACK: In the absence of the honourable member could we have this matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable La Verendrye.

MR. VIELFAURE: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Emerson that whereas farming is still the basic industry in the Province of Manitoba; and whereas the basic purposes of the Gasoline Tax Act is to provide revenues for the construction of maintenance of public roads and highways; and whereas a farm truck travels many miles per year on the farm property in the performance of essential farm work; therefore be it resolved that the Government give consideration to the advisability of amending the Gasoline Tax Act to allow a bona fide farmer who has a farm truck licence one hundred gallons of tax-exempt gas per year for each quarter section of land farmed by him.

Madam Speaker put the question.

MR. VIELFAURE: Madam Speaker, this resolution is fairly self-explanatory. However, I would like to point out that if we look at The Gasoline Tax Act we find that its primary purpose was to collect money from gas-burning vehicles using public roads. With today's mechanization of the farm we find that the farm truck has become an essential part of the farm operation. The farm truck is being used today to repair fences, haul stones, haul hay, bring gas to the machines in the field, take repairs back and forth, all mileage that is travelled on the farm and for which the farmer does not get any compensation for the roads that the truck is travelling on.

Now I imagine I will be told that this will be quite a drain on the Treasury. However, I would like to point out that if this resolution is not passed many a farmer instead of using the farm truck to do this kind of work will be using his tractor on which he will not be paying the 14 cents. However, this will make it more difficult and not as efficient in his work. I agree that 100 gallons is maybe not an exact figure for every farm. Some farms will use more than 100 gallons and some others will use less. I have investigated with many farmers and I find that 100 gallons is fairly close to the average amount being used on a farm for the operation that I have described before. I personally was not in favour of making it an open policy for all trucks to be exempted because I thought this would lead into some abuse of the Act. However, with the 100 gallon limit I think this makes it a fairly acceptable resolution and I also think that the administration cost would be very little because, if I understand right, the department is still maintaining an office for the remitting of gas tax on boat owners. Therefore, I think this resolution is very constructive and I ask the members of the House for their support.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

.....continued on next page.

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

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside, that whereas a great number of easements for public utilities, and in particular pipelines, are being requested from land owners in Manitoba, and whereas there is a great deal of damage being caused to valuable farm land by improper methods of moving and replacing soil when projects are being constructed, therefore be it resolved that legislation be enacted requiring that when topsoil is removed by companies and utilities under easement and other agreements, adequate precautions be taken to preserve the original soil fertility.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, most of the resolutions, as you well know, that are introduced into this House, stem from a group of people who feel that they have been done an injustice by reason of certain legislation or the lack of certain legislation, and about a month or so ago a group of farmers met with me one Sunday to tell me about the problem that they are presently faced with and that is the problem that is stated in the resolution. Now, this group of farmers have also met with the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and he's quite conversant with the problems that are mentioned herein. I will admit that the Manitoba farmers did not take the same steps that the farmers in Alberta took a year or so ago on this very same subject matter. Up there, as you know perhaps -- because I do think, Madam Speaker, that in your own constituency the pipeline runs from one end of it to the other perhaps. I might say at this time that there are no pipelines in my constituency but very close to it.

Now the farmers in Alberta about a year ago, and one farmer in particular refused to let the pipeline -- the Pan American Petroleum people -- on his land, and of course when he refused to let them on his land this brought the whole situation to a point where something had to be done, and I would refer you to an editorial in the Pembina News Advertiser, Drayton Valley, Alberta, dated November 13th last, so it's a relatively new one, and I would like to read just one paragraph from it because it outlines the problem that they had there and it is an exact parallel to the ones that the farmers have here, and I quote: "For years the farmers have complained (1) that the contractors for the oil companies took a wider swathe in right-of-way than the 33 feet the oil companies leased; and (2) that topsoil, and extremely precious commodity in this area, was ruthlessly stripped from the right-of-way and then just as ruthlessly dumped into the bottom of the pipeline ditch while hard, unworkable clay, formerly 6 feet to 10 feet down, was brought to the surface and spread on top of the wide right-of-way to leave a hard unworkable scar across the face of the field; and (3) that crews working on the right-of-way in the fields tore down fences which were never properly replaced, if at all, and the farmers' livestock was left to run at large all over the countryside, sometimes a hazard on roads and highways and a nuisance generally to neighbouring farmers."

Now, Madam Speaker, I can't say truthfully that the last line as regards the livestock running at large was referred to me by the group of farmers in the Brookdale-Oberon country but the rest of it applies very much so.

As a result of this test case -- I suppose you could call it that -- in Alberta, the government of Alberta, I guess at their last session, enacted legislation that forced the pipeline people, or those seeking to bury pipe of any kind -- I think it covers wells and the like -- it forces them to return the soil in the same condition that they found it, and thereby does not disturb the fertility of the soil. In Alberta they have appointed, according to this same editorial, they have appointed two government pipeline inspectors, they call them; and I quote again from the same editorial: "Rocky Rapids farmer Jack Thomas will have his land back in good shape by next spring." That's this spring they're talking about now. "Two government pipeline inspectors at Rocky Rapids Thursday to check complaints that arable land was being ruined by a pipeline crew, have recommended that full remedial action be taken by Pan American Petroleum." So it is evident, Madam Speaker, that these two government appointed pipeline inspectors have the authority to force the pipeline people to make the remedial action necessary to put the soil back in its original condition.

The resolution that is before us simply requests that similar action be taken in this province. Now the farmers, as you know perhaps Madam Speaker, and certainly the Minister of Agriculture knows, that -- as I think a group of 16 farmers, or perhaps more than that, met with him earlier this year or in the last month of last year, to bring this matter to his

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd)... attention, and I believe it is a fact too, Madam Speaker, that these 16 farmers or so refused to sign easements for the petroleum transmission company in the spring of 1963 because they felt that the petroleum company should strip the land to reduce the damage to the farms -- these farmers argue that the fertility of the soil -- and I might interject here that there are a great number of acres affected, because every pipeline or every easement, I understand, calls for a sixty foot right-of-way, and a pipeline running from Alberta to Toronto, say two or three thousand miles and 60 feet wide, would represent 10 or 15 thousand acres of land, if my quick calculations are right. I think sixty feet in width and one mile long would be roughly 7 acres or something like that, so 1,000 miles in length you would have 7,000 acres of land affected.

I believe too, Madam Speaker, that it is quite common for the various pipelines to acquire their easements immediately adjacent to the one that has just been laid, so that on one farm you might have four or five or six different easements crossing the one piece of land. Now, I agree that that is good, but it doesn't make the particular farmer any more happy about it unless they replace the soil as they recommend here, so that one farmer for instance, with a section of land could very easily have 25 acres affected by this. Now, the farmers argue that even when they dig this trench up -- and the trench is about six feet deep and about seven feet wide -- they dig it up and they do not set the topsoil to one side; when they lay their 34 inch pipe down, they just push the dirt back in on top of the pipe, and naturally they cannot compress all of that soil where it was, because there's a 34 inch pipe, so that you have a ridge of soil up above the natural terrain of the land. Now, in addition to this particular strip now having its topsoil on it, by reason of the fact that it is up above the normal terrain of the land, it is subject to all of the whims that come along, like a snowdrift in the wintertime, and the wind starts a soil erosion condition all across his farm. Now, anyone that's ever travelled on what we farmers call a "washboard" road will know what I'm talking about. One dip causes another, and it's just like a snowdrift, or a wind sifting the snow along in the wintertime; you get a whole series of these ridges. Now, this is what is happening to this land, and it is argued by these farmers that it depreciates their land in value by at least 10 or 15 or 25 percent, and it's quite understandable that that would be so.

The farmers by and large do not object to these easements, providing it does not disturb their farm, and providing of course that it does not depreciate their farm. You understand, Madam Speaker, that the pipeline people are attempting to compensate them for certain loss of production in some fashion or other, by some means. I think they assess the land every few years and pay them a certain sum for compensation. I believe that just last year the oil companies paid the farmers \$100 an acre for the acres in the easement for all the loss of crop for the last several years, so I suppose it amounted to about \$10 an acre or something of that kind.

Now, Madam Speaker, I feel that inasmuch as the Province of Alberta has seen fit to enact legislation of the kind requested in this resolution, that it is only right and proper that this government should act likewise. The farmers in North Cypress -- and I believe, Madam Speaker, that that is part of your constituency -- the Municipality of North Cypress, as you know, at a council meeting on January the 9th last, moved a resolution, and a copy concerning this very same subject -- it's a little more involved than the resolution that I have -- it was moved and seconded and a copy sent, I believe, to the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation. So, Madam Speaker, I urge the government to take the same steps in this province that the Province of Alberta apparently has seen fit to do and thereby please the farmers in your constituency, Madam Speaker, and in the constituency of several of the members opposite.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

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

MR. E. R. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks the resolution standing in my name.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, the Honourable Member didn't read

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd)... it. It would be preferable I think to have it on the record. I must say that I don't think we should put you in the position of reading it. My honourable friend should be prepared to do his own chores, but so long as one or the other does it, I'd be satisfied.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I thought I could save the honourable members some time, but I think the member for Lakeside is right. I shouldn't impose on you to do my chores. So with your permission I'll read it from the Orders of the Day. Can I? --interjection -- Oh yes, yes, yes. Quite well, thank you. --"I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Seven Oaks that whereas the modern positive state imposes growing demands on Government; and whereas increased Government activity and the growth of administrative law imposes a problem insofar as individual civil rights are concerned; and whereas experience in social democratic countries has shown that there are institutional means of investigating complaints of individuals that allege governmental infringements of their rights outside the rule of law; and whereas this means of investigation has proven successful and has resulted in the redress of legitimate grievances; therefore be it resolved that in the opinion of this House, the Government should give consideration to the advisability of establishing an institution to be known as 'The Office of the Public Protector' or 'Ombudsman' having the authority and power to receive and investigate complaints regarding Government actions made by any citizens, and that this institution be given such powers as are necessary to the carrying out of this function and responsibility including specifically: (i) The right to have access to departmental files and any other public papers whatsoever, and (ii) The holder of this office should have the power to initiate an investigation and to submit a report of his findings to the public. The holder of this office shall be appointed by the Legislature, shall be responsible to the Legislature, shall submit an annual report to the Legislature, and shall be removable from office by a two-thirds vote of the Assembly.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker resolution is essentially the same, in purpose at least, as the one which was before honourable members two years ago in the session of 1962, and I think that the reasons for putting it before members here are just as valid today as they were then, if not more so. I don't feel that enough consideration was given to the matter at that time, although it is true that about five or six members did speak to it, specifically including the former Attorney-General who spoke at length in refuting the arguments put forward by this side of the House calling for this institutional office.

The fact of the matter is, Madam Speaker, that in the course of the past decade or two government expenditures have been rising rather rapidly, and this indicates, among other things, that government activity is increasing rather rapidly. And there is no one in public life today, I think, who is not becoming concerned about the extent to which government activity is impinging on the individual rights of citizens and affecting them in their daily lives. Now, there's a painful dilemma that faces men in public life because for the most part on one hand they must seek to pass legislation and authorize the passing of regulations that serve distinct social and economic needs. So, we've had the growth of the modern positive state, as some people like to call it, but at the same time, and on the other hand, this growth in desirable government activity has posed a threat to individual rights, civil liberties, and we seem to be at a loss as to how best to cope with this sort of threat. There has been in this century, but particularly in the post-war period, growth in administrative power, growth in administrative law, growth in delegated legislative power, and in the number of quasi-judicial boards, commissions, tribunals and agencies. Now these quasi-judicial or administrative boards, commissions, agencies, etcetera have as the name implies, quasi-judicial power. They affect citizens in very direct ways, and yet very often one is prevented from appealing their decision directly to the courts, and even where appeal is possible, very often the courts are not in a position to deal with many of these involved, detailed, intricate problems that are decided upon in these administrative tribunals.

There is something about administrative matters that do not lend themselves to adjudication in the ordinary courts. I think one can say, in short, that the ordinary courts are not flexible enough; the process is too cumbersome to be able to deal with this sort of problem. And yet most people who have a feeling for British parliamentary practice and have a feeling of respect

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd)... and love for British common law are very much disturbed, because the trend is toward more delegated legislative power, more discretionary power being given to the administration, and this detracts from parliamentary responsibility. So there's a feeling of frustration, if not of guilt. There are other things, Madam Speaker, that can be done to attempt to safeguard civil rights. One obvious safeguard lies right in the rules of procedure of this Assembly itself. We have ample opportunity, various places in the course of a day's proceedings to raise complaints and to attempt to obtain redress of grievances. In the Throne Speech debate, in the budget debate, in any motion to go into Supply or Ways and Means on questions before Orders of the Day, we can attempt to raise complaints and obtain redress of grievance. But this is still in itself not adequate in the modern day. We in this legislature, of course, do have the prerogative and the power to analyze all regulations, and in fact we do have a special legislative committee on statutory orders and regulations to go over the regulations that are issued by way of Order-In-Council, to see whether any of them are issued beyond statutory power. But this too is insufficient. So I think that it is time, it was even in 1962 but as the years pass, as our government activity increases, it becomes increasingly mandatory on our part to look seriously at the institution known as ombudsman in some countries, referred to as public protector or commissioner of civil rights in some of the English-speaking countries now. I notice that -- it's not new to members -- New Zealand has adopted this institution as of two years ago. The provinces of Saskatchewan and the Province of Nova Scotia are not looking at the feasibility, and in fact they are actually taking steps to implement, establish, an institutional office known as commissioner of citizens' rights -- and this is really, in effect, what we are proposing here.

The technique involved here has one decided advantage and that is responsibility is charged to a highly respected, highly trained, highly competent individual who, along with a small staff, is then in a position to -- and he's given the power to investigate all complaints of alleged maladministration and because of his training and powers vested in him he is able to do a job in that regard. After he makes the necessary probe and investigation his reports are made public, and this is another good point because it helps to stimulate public awareness of what rights citizens do have; it stimulates awareness of ways in which grievances can be investigated and so on; and, generally speaking, helps to promote greater citizen awareness of what is involved in growing government today. I think that this is a very basic responsibility on our part who are in public life because it seems to me that not only is government activity growing but at the same time there seems to be no concomitant or proportionate rise of the awareness of people as to what is involved in the multiplicity of government departments, bureaus, branches and so on down the line, and this would be one way of trying to stimulate some greater amount of awareness.

The discussion in 1962 was a good one on the part of everyone taking part. The Attorney-General made a very extensive rebuttal of what was involved here and it was really masterly, but as is usually the case with him, he had to over-state at one place or another. He went on to say at some point that the function of the ombudsman in the Scandinavian countries was seriously circumscribed because the ombudsman's power of investigation was restricted to areas outside of the discretionary power of the administrators -- and that is correct. But surely, even to draw this restriction is not really hampering an ombudsman, because his function, as I understand it, would be to investigate complaints alleging maladministration. There are enough such complaints, either real or fancied, in the minds of many citizens that it would warrant having a small institutional office such as what we propose here.

The Attorney-General also said that the office of public protector is incompatible with the practise of ministerial responsibility, and that one I simply could not understand because, in the first place, ministerial responsibility is practised in at least two of the three countries which he referred to that have ombudsmen; and secondly, New Zealand certainly practises ministerial responsibility in its government and it now has an ombudsman. Now then, Premier Stanfield and his advisors in Nova Scotia obviously practise responsible government -- I'm sure my friend would admit to that -- and they are now establishing such an office.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, just on a point of order, I'm sure the honourable member would want to be completely factually correct. As I understand it, the Nova Scotia Legislature are considering

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd)... the establishment of a committee to consider an ombudsman.

MR. SCHREYER: Well now, they're more like my friend here than I thought because apparently they're going to be studying the matter for some time. But in any case I daresay that the New Zealand experience and precedent should remove from my honourable friend's mind the idea that the office of citizen protector, or public protector, is incompatible with ministerial responsibility. This can be worked out. It's a matter which I'm sure can be worked out by anyone who has got any interest and knowledge of cabinet government, parliamentary democracy and so on.

So, despite the arguments made by my honourable friend last time, I suggest to him that this matter warrants his close attention at this time; I insist that there are enough cases that crop up in our province, enough cases where people feel at least that they have some legitimate complaint and we should provide the machinery -- rather inexpensive machinery to enable their complaints to be handled and investigated properly.

Now before I sit down I want to say to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition that when I first introduced, or handed this resolution in to the Clerk's office I certainly didn't know at that time that he was sending his Whip into the office with very much the same kind of resolution. He feels that I should have withdrawn this resolution, but I say to him that if I beat him to the punch this time, certainly in 1962 it was somewhat the opposite. There was no ill feeling on my part. I said then and I say again that we should adopt the philosophy of Confucius on this point that as long as men don't care who gets the credit there's no limit to the amount of good that they can do.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that the debate be adjourned.

MADAM SPEAKER: Did the Honourable Member from Rhineland wish to speak?

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): No, I was going to adjourn the debate.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The second reading of Bill No. 33. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 33, an Act to incorporate Canadian Nazarene College for second reading.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, the Church of The Nazarene was established in the United States about fifty years ago as an outgrowth of the Methodist Church. It is a Protestant Evangelical Church and has six colleges in United States and one in Canada, the one in Canada being in Winnipeg. The Canadian Nazarene College was originally established in Calgary in 1921; it was moved to Red Deer in 1927 and to Winnipeg in 1961 and opened here in the fall of 1961. It operates in the buildings in the former St. John's College on Church Avenue and adjoining buildings and it has courses for Grade 12, three years theology and three years of music. The first year theology is a liberal arts course. The Church has an option on 30 acres of land in Fort Garry about two miles east of the present university buildings and it intends to construct new buildings on that land, and it has approval in principle from Metro for the construction of the buildings there. The Church has about 45 congregations in Alberta and the same number in Ontario and a smaller number in the other provinces of Canada; some congregations, as a matter of fact, in each province in Canada.

This Act is requested in order to facilitate the carrying on of the work of the Canadian Nazarene College and to help it with regard to the ownership of its property. It is being drawn up in similar ways to the Act of Incorporation of the colleges that are affiliated with the University of Manitoba.

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

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 42, an Act respecting United Dominions Investment Limited, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, this is an Act which authorizes this loan company, incorporated in Ontario, to carry on business in Manitoba.

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

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 43, an Act respecting Traders Mortgage Company for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, this Bill permits this company incorporated under the laws of Ontario to carry on a loan business in Manitoba.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I'd just like to make a word or two in connection with this Bill. I think the same thing could be said of many of the bills, not only those that are introduced by my honourable friend, but others as well, dealing with the question of loan companies and the mushrooming of the numbers of loan companies in the province here. You may recall, Madam Speaker, the other day that my colleague from Inkster had conversations with the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities in his capacity as Provincial Secretary in an endeavour to find out how many loan companies were operating in the Province of Manitoba, and it seemed to me at least, that the Honourable Member for Inkster and the Honourable the Provincial Secretary couldn't come to any reasonable agreement as to actually how many loan companies we did have in the Province of Manitoba. It seems to me that every year we have bills increasing the numbers and I sometimes wonder, and have said in the past, whether or not it wasn't time that we put an end to the increasing numbers of loan companies here in the Province of Manitoba. Now I do know some of the answers that are given, not only by members opposite but even some on this side of the House, is the question of, "Well, don't you believe in free enterprise?" -- also the fact or presumed fact that "Don't you agree that by having a considerable number of companies of this nature that you set up a competition between them which is good, and that they must conduct themselves in the spirit of competition." I think this might have been valid at one time, Madam Speaker, then there were a relatively few, but it seems to me as I go through the telephone directory, or drive through the streets of our towns and villages and cities, that we're finding that there are more loan companies than there are grocery stores, that it's easier to fall into the clutches of a loan company in the Province of Manitoba than it is some of the other professions in our province for which we have legislative laws for the protection of the individual. So I say, Madam Speaker, that I think that it is time for us here in this Legislature to give due consideration as to whether or not we should continue.

I'm sure that every member of this Legislature has had individuals come to them complaining because of the fact that they are deep in debt. We've argued this point here in this Legislature on numerous occasions before and many of them are only in debt because of the availability of so-called easy credit. I had a case the other day of an elderly gentleman over the age of 70 who is only in receipt of the \$75 a month pension that he's got, asking me to find out whether or not there was any way in which he could arrange to call off the loan sharks . . . who had put into the hands of a collection agency payment for back debts. Now I know my honourable friend will say, "Well after all this is just one of the features of ordinary life; if the man got himself into this sort of a position then it's his fault and nobody else's." I suggest, Madam Speaker, that it's not just quite as simple as that because persuasion in many cases of the types that we get from some of our loan companies do make reasonably thinking individuals think unreasonably, and I have a great fear -- well, knowledge -- that many of our lending agencies in the Province of Manitoba and elsewhere do this. And coupled with this, Madam Speaker, is the fact that we have no protection now in the Province of Manitoba like we did at one time under our Small Debts Limitation Act or whatever the Act was called -- Orderly Payments of Debts Act. We used to have this Act in the Province of Manitoba where individuals who found themselves over their heads in aggregate because of their debts, could go before a judge and the judge could then decide, as I understood the operation of the Act, what was within the financial capabilities of the individuals to pay; but such legislation is no longer in effect in Manitoba because of the fact that a court ruled the legislation ultra vires, and I appreciate the fact as I understand it, that our Federal authorities and the Federal House will be taking under consideration the possibility of some other legislation to take the place of The Orderly Payments of Debts Act.

I also understand from conversations with the Honourable the Attorney-General that there have been some objections from some of the other provinces at Ottawa against this type of legislation. But I suggest, Madam Speaker, and I'm using this bill, not because of the name or anything else, but I'm using the bill as a vehicle to give me an opportunity to once again draw to the attention of this Legislature that I think that the time has come when we should investigate into the whole matter of the explosion of loan companies here in the Province of Manitoba; and

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)... this is not just peculiar to Manitoba because I know that the same is happening right across the length and breadth of Canada. I recall, two or three years ago I had before me, when I took part in a debate of this nature, a number of advertisements where if you go and see Jim Walker or Tom Brown, all of the problems that you have will be solved readily. I'll give you more money than you need to pay off of your debts at lower rates of interest so that you can have money to get yourself further in debt. I was amazed, Madam Speaker, the other day. I thought that Jim Walker was peculiar to the City of Winnipeg. I thought he was only here. I picked up a Vancouver paper and who was staring me in the face from the pages of the paper? Jim Walker. And I'm sure that the same is happening right across the whole length and breadth of our Dominion. Now we talk here -- pardonnez moi? Pardon? I don't know, I think the Man With The Axe is gone but I'm gonna tell you the axe of the loan companies is more than the Man With The Axe ever was here in Winnipeg. So I say, Madam Speaker, I raise in protest, using this bill as I say as a vehicle. I appreciate the fact, as the former Minister of Welfare said, Mr. Christianson, when he was on this side of the House, I appreciate the fact that you can't legislate in this area for control of morals, and what the individual will do; but I do suggest this -- I do suggest this -- that as we've had to do in many other fields, make legislation of the type so that we, by media of advertising, point out the traps that the individuals may find themselves in through these companies. And I'm not suggesting again Madam Speaker that this is true of the company that is requesting the bill at this time, but in general, and so I appeal to the members of the Legislature to take this matter under consideration and advisement. As one reads the financial position of the Dominion of Canada -- my honourable friends to my right are constantly talking about the Public Debt in the Province of Manitoba, the same is true of the public debt insofar as our federal authorities are concerned, but Madam Speaker, I think the self-same thing is true and it may be far more serious insofar as individuals are concerned, as a result of the easy availability of cash from such organizations that we're allowing to set up in addition to all of the others in the Province of Manitoba at this time. Are you with me George?

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, one of the results of some of these additional companies coming to Manitoba is that people have been able to borrow money on terms that weren't so harsh as was formerly the case. Perhaps a few years ago it was more normal that the interest rate on a second mortgage would work out to perhaps 20 percent and now it is down to about what the Credit Union charges -- firstly about 12 percent, and so that because of the increased competition, people are able to borrow on better terms than formerly. There's one other thing, is that more people now are making more use of The Bankruptcy Act. They can go through the bankruptcy proceedings and have their debts reduced and that is being done by more people than formerly, and with the new legislation being proposed by the Dominion government it will likely take the place of The Orderly Payments of Debts Act.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, now that we've come to the end of private members' day, private members' business, I wonder if you'd be good enough to call the second reading of the adjourned debate on Bill No. 37 and Bill No. 38.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 37. The Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I would ask that that item be allowed to stand if possible.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 38, the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, by the leave of the House could I have this stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, would you be good enough to call the debate on the motion to go into a Committee of Ways and Means.

MR. PAULLEY: Stand, please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. EVANS: Now, Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve

(Mr. Evans, cont'd)...itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are now on item 4, Economics and Publications. Passed.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I did not get a reply, or a satisfactory one so far as I'm concerned, to the questions that I asked at about 10 minutes to 11 last evening, and I refer you to page 671 of Hansard that has just been placed on our desks. Mr. Chairman, the question that I asked was: "Is it a fact that there are only two ARDA areas designated in the province as of this date?" And then I asked the question: "Am I to go home and tell the Riding Mountain-White Mud River Committee that they are to look now to ARDA for direction, advice and instruction?" The only answer that I got last night, Mr. Chairman, was a blast and suggestion from my honourable friend that ag reps went out with the Model T Ford and Doctor Bell, and that from now on in we can expect a lot more of the green sheets and a lot less of ag reps.

Now I know, Mr. Chairman, that a delegation met with my honourable friend here -- earlier this month I believe -- certainly not more than six weeks ago, to try and impress upon him the need for more ag rep services in the Gladstone area. I thought that the delegation went home more or less satisfied that they were going to have, probably not an ag rep station at Gladstone, but certainly they were going to be served better in Gladstone by ag rep services. I hope that he did not tell that delegation, "Well, you can go on home, we're not going to give you an ag rep; but I'll tell you what we'll do, we'll give you several tons of the green sheets," because if that's what he told them I'm satisfied they're going to be very very disappointed.

I perhaps have been more critical than I should have been on some of the publications. I insist that a lot of the publications that are coming out are nothing but propaganda and mean very little. The Glassco Commission that was not appointed to look into savings that might be made by this government, but savings that might be made by the federal government, had something to say on Information Services, and I would like to refer you to a Tribune editorial of January 8, 1963 on this very same subject. "A disturbing amount of publicity is produced, the Commission said" --that's the Glassco Commission -- "aimed at influencing public opinion. On the general subject of information services the report gives a warning that deserves emphasis -- "agressive efforts to capture public attention constitute regardless of intent attempts to win public support. When this occurs, government information services become active participants in the political process, keeping the mass media supplied with a flood of so-called news releases is not a function of a department." That's not what I said, but it's what I endorse. The statement was made by the Glassco Commission. I have one example here of what I think is not of much interest to agriculture. It was one of the Farm and Home News for Manitoba, the green ones that we discussed about, dated 20th of December '63 headed: "New Looks for Hosiery" and -- the second paragraph: "A new fibre has been introduced to the hosiery field that could give nylons the first competition in its history. Other new hosiery features include garterless stockings, . . . shock absorbers, heel guards and textured hosiery. Well, I don't think the farmers are very interested in built-in shock absorbers for ladies' hosiery. I don't know how many more -- I've got a whole . . . maybe (Interjection) -- My honourable friend here, the Honourable Member for Lakeside as you know, he's always been a champion for the ladies and he remains unchallenged yet in our group.

Now, I would like to refer to another document here, and I would like to ask what it cost to put out. It was laid on our desks I believe three years ago, in 1961. Four editions, I believe. The one I have here is the economic survey for southwest Manitoba. I do believe that there was one made for northwest Manitoba, southeast and northeast perhaps. Maybe only three. I don't recall. If there were four volumes they would be almost as thick as that very famous COMEF report. On pages 104, 105, 106 and 107 and so on for several pages here -- 108, 109, they set out their recommendations for development in Neepawa, Minnedosa, Carberry, Erickson, Rapid City and so on -- Carberry here -- and in each and every district I have named they suggest that the farmers should get into the Christmas tree growing business. In Neepawa, there's four recommendations, and No. 4 is "Christmas Tree Farming." "Neepawa might be

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd)...the logical centre for the proposed Christmas tree marketing board." -- (Interjection) -- Minnedosa; Christmas tree farming; Carberry; Christmas tree farming; Erickson; Christmas tree farming; and so on. Now, I haven't heard a report from my honourable friend -- and at Carberry, it says: "Christmas tree farming and a Christmas tree marketing board should be set up."

If we are going to further encourage the Christmas tree industry in this province then my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce should place an embargo on the manufactured imported Christmas trees from outside the province. We've used one in our office the last two years, one of these manufactured ones with the silver stems and the artificial -- (Interjection) -- I shouldn't do it, but it's a lot more permanent than the ones that you grow. But, if my honourable friends are really sincere about this, well then they should put an embargo on these artificial trees that are endangering the life blood of agriculture I suppose -- (Interjection) -- Back to the publications? Well, it's all touching on agriculture and the welfare of the farmers.

Now, on publications -- this is publications, these are publications. Then there was a publication put out here. I don't know the exact date of it, but it was headed: "Duck Nesting Havens Planned for Manitoba." And another one: "A New Plan for Duck Havens." And the one says: "United States-Canada Migratory Bird Committee is coming close to an agreement on recommendations that if carried out could mean hundreds of thousands of dollars for the prairie farmers. Now, I'd like a further report on that one, Mr. Chairman.

And, Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as we will all be going out to the MIT is it, tonight at 6 o'clock? -- (Interjection) -- 5:30, perhaps I should let my honourable friend give us a lecture before we board the bus.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I can answer -- I think the honourable member has answered his own question. He's against communication, he's against information, so why should he want any from me? I would say that what the honourable gentleman representing Gladstone has said has substantiated what I always believed about the Liberal Party. They would like us to go back to the Middle Ages because this would be a circumstance devoutly to be wished for for them because they wouldn't be troubled by the fact that the people were getting the facts and the information on which to base sound judgments.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: if I may, please. I think that the Honourable Member for Gladstone had perfectly legitimate questions and the honourable Minister is not answering them simply because he hasn't an answer. He spoke about the Christmas tree industry. It may be the industry for this particular area. Nobody is denying that, but I think we should have a report on the progress that is being made. How many farms have gone into this particular type of industry. There's some mention there of forming a board at Carberry. I think the House is entitled to know whether a board has been formed, and what are the functions of this board. Do they supervise the growing of these trees; are they merchandising them? What are they there for? I think that we all are interested in this, because we have other lands that are no doubt suitable for Christmas tree growing, and if this particular project is proving successful I think there are other areas would like to go into it. And if the Minister refuses to answer the question then evidently he has something to hide and I think that this committee should know what he is hiding. If this particular program is not panning out as thought it would, if he feels that that was a wasted effort I think he should admit it, because there may be others thinking about the same type of industry. And I for one would certainly like to have his answers to these questions.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, can I please have an answer to this one. Are we to assume then that we are going to have less ag reps in the province and more propaganda sheets? Can I have an answer to that one, please?

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, there are not going to be less ag reps. As I look ahead, undoubtedly at some stage we will have to add more to this staff, but they will not be added to do the work that can be done by using modern media of communication, and we have no intention of, on the recommendations of the Honourable Member for Gladstone-Neepawa, of lessening our efforts to bring information to the farmers by way of the press, radio and television.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4 passed

MR. HRYHORCZUK: . . . we're still waiting for an answer to our questions. If the Honourable Minister hasn't the answer, if he just tells us he hasn't any answer, well then we'll be satisfied.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4 passed

MR. HRYHORCZUK: But, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this committee is to get information from the government. That's what we're sitting here for, and surely he -- it isn't fair at all -- a member asks a perfectly legitimate question without even getting an answer. I don't think it's fair. What are we here for? Does that indicate that we in the Opposition must just sit here and have these items passed without the Ministers giving any explanations of them at all? I don't think it's fair. I think we're entitled to an answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4 passed. Item 5, passed

MR. CAMPBELL: There's no amount, Mr. Chairman, I would like to find out how much was spent of the \$53,395 that we appropriated under the Canada Manitoba ARDA Agreement in the year that we're in now. How much is expected to be spent in the total year?

Mr. Chairman, in case the ARDA expenditures, both capital and current, are kept in the same -- the Minister has them on the same sheet, he might as well look up the one under 16 at the same time for I'll be asking that question there as well.

MR. HUTTON: I'm not able, Mr. Chairman, to reconcile these figures in the estimates here with the figures in my detailed estimate book. Maybe we could just leave this item open until we reconvene after the supper hour and I can get the actual figure for the honourable member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll let that item stand. Item 6.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, under Item 6, dealing with horticulture, I would like to know from the Minister, what is this government doing? Are they endorsing both canning and freezing for Manitoba of vegetables; and if so, what is the difference in cost between freezing and canning? Because I know that since I am familiar somewhat with the canning of vegetables -- I'm not familiar with the freezing of them -- and certainly canned goods can be stored for years, I would say, a number of years anyway, and the commodity can still be sold; whereas if you freeze vegetables, they have to be disposed of within a certain period of time, and if they are not being disposed of then they won't be able to sell them and, therefore, this can become a very costly matter. As a result of this I'd like to know just what the government is recommending in the case of canning and freezing.

MR. HUTTON: I presume we're on Item 6, Mr. Chairman. I don't know what canning and freezing has to do with agricultural societies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agricultural and horticultural societies that we're . . .

MR. FROESE: Well I took it that we were dealing with horticulture in the agricultural report that was distributed here. Under horticulture we read about the canning crops, so naturally I should bring this up under horticulture.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, evasion by the Minister?

MR. HUTTON: No, Mr. Chairman. If the honourable members want to stay here till the first of June, I'd be happy to accommodate them.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: for an answer to the same question we'll be here a long time.

MR. HUTTON: This Item 6 does not concern itself with the horticultural industry in terms of canning crops and so forth. The horticultural societies referred to here are not commercial organizations, but nevertheless a short answer to the honourable member is that I don't have the specific information that he asks for. I think that he could direct his question to one of our horticulturalist specialists in the department and he could probably get that kind of detailed information. I just don't have it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Ethelbert.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, there is some rumor, which I hope is unfounded, that the grants to Class C fairs in the Province are going to be discontinued. These fairs are important to the localities in which they were held in the past. I would appreciate very much if the Minister would give us an explanation as to why, if the rumour is true, that the grants to these fairs are going to be discontinued. So that the people in the province will know

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd)...why this particular service -- which I believe was very important to some of the locals, and was one of the days upon which the farming community, as well as the community interested in the exhibits of home cooking, and sewing, and so forth and so on -- is being discontinued. And I'd very much appreciate if the Honourable the Minister would give us the reasons for that discontinuance.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, we are not discontinuing any grants to any Class C fairs. I might say at the outset that Manitoba, despite our relative economic strength, size, etc., is the province most generous with agricultural societies of any province in Canada. On either base either relatively or in total, we give our agricultural societies in this province more monies by way of grants than any province in Canada. Now that's quite a statement, but it's true. What we have attempted to do -- we've been a little bit concerned about the way this money was being spent and we wanted to make sure that these monies that were expended would result in a major contribution to the development of the agricultural economy -- and with a view to making sure that these monies were used, or at least a portion of them were used to generally upgrade and to stimulate our agricultural economy, we made a policy statement to the agricultural societies. We wanted to get balance in our exhibits. We don't mind giving prize money but we want some of it, at least, used for commercial to exhibit and to promote commercial farm enterprises. I'm going to read a statement of our policy to put it on the record and so that all the members will be familiar with the changes in our policy. "The following is a brief outline of proposed programs effective in 1964 for agricultural societies. The primary purposes of these changes are to encourage greater participation of local exhibitors and patrons at exhibitions or fairs, and in the further development of an effective agricultural society program throughout the year. It is hoped that in future the community as a whole will be emphasized to a greater degree and the resources, both human and natural, will be fully utilized.

1. Balance in Exhibits. It is suggested that at least 50 percent of the total prize money awarded at an exhibition or fair shall be for commercial farm enterprises, such to include primarily breeding, market, and dressed classes, the latter at fall fairs, if refrigeration is available. Cattle, sheep, hogs, and in addition, special crops, horticultural crops, honey, and other special produce competition of importance to particular areas. The balance, 50 percent, shall be divided among classes and sections for horses, 4-H activities at the fair, home craft, such as foods, clothing, and handicraft. It is pointed out, however, that not more than \$900 shall be paid out in prize money to classes for horses. The government grant, 65 percent of the total prize money awarded, exclusive of specials, will be continued, so that we are not changing the percentage of the grant that will be made. All we are saying is, that we want 50 percent of the exhibits that we pay on to exhibit commercial farm enterprises.

The second one is on the competitions. Abuses have crept in where there really was no competition at all in the sense that one man would turn up with one beast, and we were paying 65 percent of the prize money when there was no competition. So we say there shall be a minimum of two entries in any class or section in which the department shares the prize money. No government prize money grants will be paid on classes or sections where exhibitors are less than two in number. Societies are urged to seek more exhibitors for each and every class or section. This will result in a stronger fair, more interest and heavier competition. It is assumed that each Agricultural Society will carefully scrutinize the prize list each year, based on past experience in an attempt to keep it in line with the above.

Commercial Market Classes. Societies are requested to consider placing considerable emphasis on market cattle, lambs and hogs at fairs. Beef Cattle: Classes for finished steers, single, pairs, groups of five and groups of ten. Lambs: Marketable age and finish, singles, pairs, groups of five and groups of ten. Market Hogs: Marketable age and weight, singles, barrows, gilts, pairs and groups.

Societies are encouraged to consider sponsoring some separate projects for farm-fed commercial cattle and prize money participation by the department will be considered when there are at least ten individual exhibitors and at least 40 head of cattle displayed. And then: Deletion of live poultry classes from summer exhibition. It is suggested that classes for live poultry, bantams, pigeons, rabbits, cades, be deleted from summer fairs and

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd)...exhibitions. If the society insists on featuring these, then funds for prize money shall be provided out of their own treasury. Dressed poultry may be exhibited at fall shows and other approved lists of live poultry.

Duplication of 4-H prize money to be avoided. A number of agricultural societies in Manitoba are adding classes for 4-H clubs at their summer fairs. These are to all intents and purposes identical with the prize money offered at achievement days for 4-H club members. In future it is suggested that a government grant will not be provided to a society for such classes unless the project featured has been approved by the department and relates to a sponsored and approved 4-H club rally or an annual achievement day. Grants for this enterprise will be channeled direct to the 4-H club department appropriation. Agriculture.....

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Chairman may I on behalf of the Minister of Education remind the members that buses will be leaving the front door at quarter to six -- that will be 15 minutes from now -- and I think, Mr. Chairman, you will be leaving the Chair until 8:30.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I leave the Chair now at 5:30, until 8:30.