

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
7:30 o'clock, Wednesday, April 15, 1964

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

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

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House on the motion of the Honourable the Member for St. George, April 14, 1964.

MR. M. A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to express my sincere thanks to the Minister of Public Works who has promised to me personally that he is going to put up a hand rail on the stairs in front of the building.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question to the First Minister. It's a question that's been worrying me for a few days now, since an announcement that I saw in the newspapers, and I've been expecting to see some changes in the House here and I'm still awaiting them. When is he going to remove his moustache?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): Madam Speaker, it only shows to what length some people will go to get their name and pictures in the newspaper.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): the Honourable the First Minister, is he referring to a number of cartoons that were in the Winnipeg Tribune the other day when he's making reference to individuals getting their pictures in the paper. I'm thinking of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in particular.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce)(Fort Rouge): . . . call the Orders, I would like to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 46, on the motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and I would like to tell my honourable friend of St. George I think it is, that it has been impossible to complete two of his orders in the meantime, one dealing with advertising agencies -- the amount of advertising placed by departments. It was a considerable job to get together all the information both in that connection and in connection with the cement companies, not only from all government departments but from all the agencies and boards as well. I regret to have to tell him that I have not been able to complete it in the time. I would like to lay on the table also Return to an Order No. 47, on the motion of the Leader of the Opposition. That is dated April 10th.

MR. M. G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and in view of the fact that he's not in his chair, I think possibly that the First Minister might be in a position to answer this. My information is that the San Antonio Mines at Bissett have made what might be regarded as a major discovery, and although I do not have the exact details, I do hope that this is a turning point in the ups and downs of the San Antonio Mines, and I was wondering if the First Minister does have any information on this more recent discovery; and it augurs well into what was said just about a year ago, and that it should just come at about the same time, that some of these old mines do have a way of coming back into their own, and I don't care to make a speech, Madam Speaker, but I would like to know if there's any truth in this statement.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I have no information on the point.

MADAM SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Portage and the proposed amendment by the Honourable Member for Springfield. The Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, I suppose that at this late stage in our proceedings that I should keep with my usual practice of speaking very briefly and to the point, and so I will continue to follow that practice. Now, you will recall, Madam Speaker, that just about one year ago the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie introduced

(Mr. Shoemaker, Cont'd.) . . . a resolution just about exactly the same in nature and wording as the one that is presently before us; and it was amended, and then I moved an amendment to the amendment. I intend to do exactly the same thing tonight, so I'll give you warning on that right now. But the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie and myself and many others who traverse over this road frequently, as I do, are really concerned over the number of accidents on this particular stretch of road, that is from Winnipeg to the junction of 1 and 4, west of Portage la Prairie. We are really concerned over the great number of accidents on this stretch, and in particular, the number of fatal accidents on it. A very close friend of mine died as a result of a car accident on this road not more than two years ago, and so it's natural that we hold concern over the frequency of the accidents here. The resolution simply states that we believe that many of these accidents could be prevented with the construction of a four-lane highway. I'm thoroughly convinced that many of the accidents have resulted by reason of the fact that the two lanes is not wide enough to provide a thoroughfare for the 10,000 cars a day -- I think that's about the figure -- that travel over this particular section of road. Now, my honourable friend, the member for Springfield apparently does not agree with us, or he started out by not agreeing with us. He said that -- and I want to read just one sentence. He said: "However, I've often wondered whether the building of two-lane highways, four-lane highways or multi-lane highways would solve such difficulties; whether it would prevent accidents. I do not think so," he said. And he says that in his opinion what really is causing the accidents here is people buying cars the colour of the girl's hair and then changing the colour of the car as frequently as the girls change the colour of their hair, he says; and by the fact that they have seat belts and little cars and big cars and so on. And then he talks about No. 4 east. Well, I'm not concerned about No. 4 east; in this resolution we're concerned about 4 west, and -- well, 1 west, 1 west to the junction of No. 4. And so, Madam Speaker, he ends up though, my honourable friend from Springfield, by admitting that he, too, is concerned about it, and he wants to commend the government of the day for initiating a start on this program. Now in the amendment to the resolution they suggest that the Portage by-pass is the first stage, an indication that a four-lane highway will very shortly be built. Now, we on this side of the House are not opposed to commending the government, if the government are really serious in their intention to do things; and so Madam Speaker, just to make certain that they have good intentions to get started on this very worthwhile project in the very near future, and with the increased traffic that is bound to ensue as a result of all of our centennial celebrations that are forthcoming, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that the amendment be further amended by adding at the end thereof the following words: "And be it further resolved that the House request the Government of Manitoba to initiate a start at the construction of the project at the earliest possible date, to assure completion prior to Canada's Centennial."

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works)(Minnedosa): Madam Speaker, the first word I would like to say is to commend the Honourable Member for Gladstone for his unusual brevity. I thought he was kidding when he stood up and said that he would be brief because this isn't one of his normal faults, this matter of being brief, and I would like to commend him for making the statement to start with and for following through and being brief. I don't think that I will delve any further into the situation and the concern that we all have for accidents on this stretch of road, or too deeply into the fact that work does need to be done on that stretch of road in the not too-distant future, any more than to point out that I think that it would be the wrong thing to do to move prior to the time that a decision is made on the Harte Subdivision of the CNR in that area. If there is a rail line in Manitoba that is capable of abandonment, I think probably the Harte Subdivision is it, and the CPR are planning to apply for abandonment, and if it was abandoned, the fact that there was a road built on the other side, it certainly would not look too well when you have to take good farmland from people along the side; and you would have land on the other side of the road within a matter of a few months that wasn't fit for anything. I might say that while there may be a possibility of a portion of the amendment of his taking place, that it's certainly not certain enough for me to support at the present time. I'm going to have to vote against his amendment.

MR. SHOEMAKER: . . . permit a question. Are we to assume from his remarks that

(Mr. Shoemaker, Cont'd.) . . . it will be impossible to even start the project before the CNR make application to abandon this line and the province acquire the particular Harte Subdivision? Madam Speaker put the question.

A MEMBER: The Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the motion of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

A standing vote was taken with the following results:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaur, and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cown, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 21; Nays, 30.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The proposed amendment by the Honourable the Member for Springfield.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Portage as amended. Are you ready for the question?

MR. G. E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I will close the debate. First of all, I'd like to refer to the amendment made by the Honourable Member for Springfield. In his first "whereas" he says, "Whereas the accident rate on this section of Highway, while not being above average, continues to warrant concern, as does the accident rate throughout all of Manitoba." Now Madam Speaker, I'm wondering if the Honourable Member, because he may be a bit closer to the government side than I am, if he has got official information to back up that contention. Well if he has, I say good luck to him because in support of my resolution I was denied any of the official information to support my resolution. However, I still don't think that part of the resolution is correct, yet Madam Speaker, I am not in a position to be able to prove it because we were denied the information. However, I did gather up some information, some that I got from the newspapers, some others I got from publications, and I have here one publication that was prepared for the Insurance Agents Association of Manitoba, and the source of their information is the Manitoba Department of Public Utilities. Apparently they could get this with no trouble at all. It says in the opening line, "Statistics recently released for the Province of Manitoba, which reflect a similar pattern across Canada, reveal a grim picture of death and destruction on our highways. To help you visualize the seriousness of the situation here are some of the statistics."

Now, Madam Speaker, I won't belabour the House by quoting all the statistics. I will just content myself with quoting the percentage of increase in each class, and this refers to a nine-month period of 1963, at that time the latest figures available. In all accidents they were up 3.36 percent. Total deaths were up 3.57 percent. Personal injury accidents were up 16.63 percent. Total injured were up for Manitoba 17.63 percent. Property damage was up 2.29 percent, and the total amount of property damage in dollars was up 7.39 percent, while during this period vehicle registration was up 3.94 percent. Now I realize that this is general. It's for all the province of Manitoba, and according to our road map for the province we have 6,000 miles of highway. I have here a clipping from the Winnipeg Tribune, Wednesday, March 18, 1964, in which Mr. James Mason, Chief Reviewing Officer of the Public Utilities, was addressing the Manitoba Optometric Society, and according to his figure that he released, there were 168 people killed in 40 Manitoba traffic accidents last year, and when asked, he quoted the following reasons for accidents in our province, and he said: "Speed is the number one cause in all accidents; and failing to anticipate hazardous traffic conditions is second; and failing to comply with traffic control devices, third. Amazingly, liquor is fourth."

Now Madam Speaker, in my request for information I was able to get a hold of a traffic count, and probably the Minister while he can't speak on the debate it would be for him to say whether this was authoritative or not, or how recent it was, but I have been given to understand that it is reasonably recent figures for No. 1 highway west between Portage and Winnipeg.

(Mr. Johnston, Cont'd.) . . . Incidentally, I received this information from someone who is closely connected with an oil company, and if one of the pages will come here, if he would just distribute some of these around the House for others to follow. According to this, if I interpret it correctly, every 24-hour period over 6,800 vehicles head west on No. 1 highway from Metro Winnipeg. Now with housing developments and turn-offs and what not, this number do not arrive at Portage la Prairie but a figure in excess of 3,500 do. Similarly in the opposite direction, leaving Portage la Prairie every 24-hour period, 3,850 vehicles leave Portage, so with a little bit of mental arithmetic by the members it will be noted that over 10,000 vehicles are on this stretch of highway every 24 hours. I am not qualified in engineering work or traffic control work to know how much traffic is needed to decide whether four lanes are warranted. All I can do is put together the accident statistics, the unofficial count of accidents that I have kept myself on this highway, and I have arrived at this figure which could be corrected. Of the 168 people who were killed in 140 Manitoba traffic accidents last year -- and this is a rough calculation on my part and I say it could be out somewhat but I don't believe it's that far out on the official figures -- but the way I have it figured here is 5 percent of the people killed in traffic accidents in Manitoba are killed on slightly over one percent of the 6,000 miles of highway, that is, the 40-mile stretch from Headingley west to Portage la Prairie, and it's my consideration, after looking at all the news accounts all year long, the frequency that accidents are reported, and the accidents I know that do not hit the newspapers -- for instance in the last storm a few days ago when I was coming in from Portage at 10:00 o'clock in the morning, I passed an accident where there were -- it was a head-on -- there was an ambulance there and they were picking up one or more people; there were three or four policemen there; and I watched the papers quite closely and that accident was not recorded. Also at the same time there were three cars in the ditch which probably would not constitute an accident, but Madam Speaker, in closing, I maintain that over 10,000 vehicles on a highway with one lane each way, a narrow highway with the speed limit we have, warrants immediate action to correct this.

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

A MEMBER: The Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Portage, as amended.

A standing vote was taken with the following result:

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Evans, Froese, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Smellie, Smerchanski, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Nil.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, at the last moment I finally decided to subscribe to the philosophy of the Honourable Member for Inkster who always says that half a loaf is better than none.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 50, Nays, Nil.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. John's. The Honourable the Member for Kildonan.

MR. JAMES T. MILLS (Kildonan): . . . the resolution sponsored by the Honourable Member from St. John's. At the outset I must commend him for his delivery he gave, and to say that he must be given marks for the great length he went in preparing his final oration on this particular subject, but Madam Speaker, I'm sure a person of his ability must be aware that this resolution is not actually a brain-child of his but rather one that really belongs to the government of today. They must be given credit for trying to alleviate the sufferings of these unfortunate people by bringing in such deterrents -- for example Bill 40, requiring the registration of real estate brokers and real estate salesmen; also Bill 89, an Act to provide for the relief of certain unconscionable transactions, and the other bill, 113, creating a bill requiring the registration of mortgage brokers which will regulate and discourage fly-by-night operators. There is an Act that was granted Royal Assent some two years ago also, that respects the sale

(Mr. Mills, Cont'd.) . . . of goods under this time sale agreement. Yes, Madam Speaker, he may claim that this Act, however, does not apply to monies under \$100, but nevertheless these bills prevent the many injustices that the honourable member speaks of, and will outline and direct this government the way it's going.

Nevertheless, I, as a retailer, Madam Speaker, in Winnipeg here, abhor the idea that if we were to follow this particular theory he has we would have inspectors checking on every complaint or grievance the general public would care to lay with the Department. He recommends particularly those who buy on credit. I can see it all now. If the merchandise they purchased did not stand up to their particular standard they would stop paying on their account until this government department investigated the complaint. On behalf of the retailers of Winnipeg, please deliver us from this. This resolution Madam Speaker, in my opinion, would place all legitimate and honourable retailers under a shadow of doubt and scrutiny each time the sales were transacted. You will note I said "transacted" and not "consummated," as the latter means "final" and no sale in my opinion would be final on this proposed resolution.

My honourable friend, in his remarks, criticized the newspaper media for their acceptance of misleading advertisements. This, I agree, may be true to some extent and a degree, but I feel however, Madam Speaker, that he is criticizing a long, and to a large degree, an honourable profession and I am satisfied that the printing trade can be depended on to do what is right and proper. Failing this policy the general public would not be too long in writing "finish" to any newspaper not living up to the principle of honesty in advertising.

The Honourable Member for St. John's stated people do not know that they can call the Better Business Bureau, and I think it was unfair of him to say that he felt the general public would not receive much help on being guided. He mentioned that they were not up to too much value to him, but I assure you Madam Speaker this is indeed not the case. The Better Business Bureau play a very important part in policing the smaller cases that the honourable member speaks of, according to my information. They are now expanding, I understand, to rural areas in their operations, and in their particular way they're doing a yeoman's task. I admit the Better Business Bureau have no teeth to prosecute, but through their efforts in the past, firms who deliberately tried to cheat people are soon found out and are apprehended by the Better Business Bureau, and through the vehicle of public opinion are soon weeded out. Yes, Madam Speaker, the Better Business Bureau must be congratulated on their efforts to eliminate dishonest practices and to protect the consumer's interest. This firm does not require government aid, as they are supported by contributions from various firms who want to protect the general public. This, in my humble opinion, is far better than legislation for protection.

Madam Speaker, I agree with the honourable member when he states legislation alone will not carry out the effect on protection the consumer is entitled to have. He claims that it is very important to educate the people to investigate before they invest, but Madam Speaker, I must say I cannot support his resolution because I believe that one of the best ways of handling the problem he talks of is a well-informed public. They are also assisted heavily-promoted gimmicks or bargains through their local merchants associations and Better Business Bureaus which produces information and pamphlets on business ethics that are definitely helpful. The public themselves can solve their problems better than legislative action by more careful scrutiny, careful questioning and a demand for better services. Legislation can be protective to a point but it can be more effective with an alert public. Legislation alone cannot and will not cure all the injustices conferred on the unwary consumers in everyday transactions.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, if I may say a word or two at this time in connection with this, unless you had a question you were going to ask. Were you? I would like to say a word or two in this debate, particularly following the Honourable Member for Kildonan. I sincerely trust and hope, Madam Speaker, that the honourable gentleman was not speaking for the Government of Manitoba, because I suggest to this House that if the honourable member was speaking for the Government of Manitoba we should not allow this sitting to complete itself this evening without the thorough defeat of the Government of Manitoba on behalf of the public of Manitoba, for I have never heard in the years that I have been in this House a more non-sensical contribution to a sincere effort proposed by a Member of this House in the interests of the public than I have heard from the Honourable Member for Kildonan this evening, and I

(Mr. Paulley, Cont'd.) . . . want no one to think that I'm taking a disadvantage of my honourable friend because of the fact that he hasn't been very long in the political arena in the Province of Manitoba. I vaguely suspect, however, with regret, that my honourable friend must have had some consultation with some who may have been here a lot longer than he has in order to arrive at the conclusion that he attempted to present to us this evening.

Among other remarks the Honourable Member made was that the Member for St. John's must be ware that this is not a brain-child of his. Of course it's not a brain-child of the Honourable Member for St. John's, and I'm sure Madam Speaker that the Member for St. John's would be the first to admit it. And I want to say to my honourable friend for Kildonan that if he thinks because of the fact that a few bills have been passed in this House, or a few bills have been given second reading and referred to the Committee on Statutory Regulations for consideration, that the proposition has been solved, then he's chasing at moonbeams; he's absolutely ignorant of the facts and the conditions that prevail in the Province of Manitoba, and indeed in many other jurisdictions as well. My friend mentions because of the fact that the Honourable Minister of Public Utilities in his capacity as Provincial Secretary has introduced legislation calling for broker registration, introduced an unconscionable transaction Act, and one or other two things, that the solution has been solved. I say, take another look, my good friend. My honourable friend says, "speaking as a retailer here in Manitoba," and I suggest that he's a fairly good one, but that if the resolution as proposed by the Member of St. John's was adopted then his store would be cluttered up with inspectors looking over the merchandise. It certainly doesn't speak very highly of most businesses or the intelligence of inspectors, the manufacturers who manufacture the goods. Surely not!

My honourable friend mentions the fact this is a job that is being done by the Better Business Bureau. My colleague from St. John's, on introducing this resolution, paid tribute to the work that is being done by Better Business Bureaus, and recognized the job that they are doing. He also pointed out in the introduction, Madam Speaker, that the Better Business Bureau itself admits that it hasn't got all of the necessary or required resources in order to carry out what it is attempting to do at the present time. I doubt very much whether the Honourable Member for Kildonan even took the time to read the resolution, because I'm sure that if he had, he couldn't have come to the conclusion that apparently he had that we were requiring in the resolution a lot of legislation in regard to protecting consumers from fraudulent practices, for misleading deceptive sales methods.

I want to say to my honourable friend that in the United Kingdom a measure has been introduced at the present time to accomplish what is intended to be accomplished by the resolution of the Honourable Member for St. John's, and I say to the Honourable Member for Kildonan, does he think that the government of the United Kingdom, the Mother of Parliament, hasn't over the years passed such legislation that he referred to which we are now going to have placed before a committee for consideration in between our sessions here, such as registration of brokers, and the other bills that my friend referred to? In the old land a bill was introduced by the Conservative Government there which is called an Act to Amend the Laws Relating to Hire Purchase and Sale on Credit of Goods and for the Purpose Connected Therewith, for the sole purpose of protecting the consumer, so that Madam Speaker, a consumer -- (Interjection) -- it's just referred to, my friend, in a bill that's proposed now before the government of Canada -- I'll let you see it later. A bill, Madam Speaker, that it is recorded was introduced in the United Kingdom for the purpose of consumer protection; and I wish to read into the record a further reference to this matter as published in the Winnipeg Tribune of January I believe of this or last year -- I believe it was this year, January of this year -- by Bill Gould of the Southern News Society, datelined London: "An election-conscious Conservative Government is giving British consumers added protection under instalment-buying contracts as an Easter present. Recently introduced legislation which had not been forecast in the Speech from the Throne caught consumers' associations and finance companies by surprise. The House of Commons will likely pass it by Easter. In day-to-day terms, the most important provision may be that which will allow a three-day cooling-off period before instalment purchases made off the premises of a store become effective. In other words, the door-to-door salesman will no longer be able to hook a fish with a fast line, get a signature on the bottom of a standard contract form, then laugh in the face of the housewife who repents and reconsiders a few hours

(Mr. Paulley, Cont'd.) . . . later."

My honourable friend, I wonder, when he was considering the remarks that he was going to make in connection with the resolution, I wonder if he thought of the situations of flip salesmen going from house to house that has led to the passage of this legislation by the Mother of Parliament, and the protection of the consumer. This is the intent, Madam Speaker, of the resolution that is before this House proposed by my colleague from St. John's. A former member of this House now, the MP for Winnipeg North at Ottawa and the representative of the Member for Kildonan, has been pleased to place before the House of Commons at Ottawa a bill C44, which endeavours to procure the same or similar protection as the bill being presented or passed in the United Kingdom, which has as its purpose -- and I read from the bill itself: "The purpose of this bill is to protect the Canadian consumer when he or she is approached in his home or other off-store premises, and is pressured into signing a contract for goods, services or works, labour and materials that are to be paid for by the consumer in future instalments. The principle of the bill is to afford the consumer a period of second sober thoughts. Surely my honourable friend could not have read the significance of the resolution as proposed by the Honourable Member for St. John's.

But let us not be too concerned, Madam Speaker, about what's happening in the United Kingdom, what's happening here in Canada, but let us take a brief look at what is happening across the line in the United States in reference to this matter. And I might say that the boys on this side of the House have been doing a little homework in connection with this resolution, which I accuse my honourable friend of Kildonan of not doing, for we have attempted to find out what is going on. Efforts have been made to find out what other jurisdictions are doing in order to prevent exploitation of consumers through false advertising, etc. From replies received it is indicated that many states to the south of us have taken steps by legislation and others are contemplating doing the same. In order that members of the House are informed as to what is being done, I would like to read from some of the reports which have been obtained. The State of New York, which I suggest no-one will doubt is a great state of free enterprises, passed legislation in 1957 to protect the consumer, and has added to it from time to time. What is the result of the legislation? I want to read, Madam Speaker, from a clipping of the New York Times of Tuesday, February 18th of just this year, where because of the State Consumer Frauds Bureau which was set up, "nearly 80,000 complaints were handled by the State Consumer Frauds Bureau in 1963, and more than \$1 million was regained for consumers in restitution. These statistics of the Attorney-General of the State of New York reflect that the schemes of the white collar bandit continue to plague the New York consumer and a harassed legitimate merchant." I might say, Madam Speaker, that in the State of New York they are continuously improving on their legislation to protect the consumer.

The State of New Jersey in 1960 passed legislation, and issue from time to time statements and bulletins to the public drawing to their attention how they may be defrauded by false advertising and unscrupulous merchants and salesmen. The State of Minnesota, passed legislation in 1960 wherein they also periodically draw to the consumers of that state just immediately to the south of us, why they have to be ever wary. I show to the members of the House, Madam Speaker, a leaflet issued by the State of Minnesota, Department of Law, which outlines 10 points of a buying guide for consumers, pointing out what they should be wary of insofar as business is concerned in Minnesota. The State of Washington passed legislation in '61 and '63 dealing with the same thing. The State of Illinois in 1961; Alaska, 1961; Kansas, in 1962; Massachusetts, 1963; and Ohio -- are issuing bulletins constantly, making the public wary of transactions, false advertising and the likes of that in their respective states.

Now, Madam Speaker, I had originally intended to read out fully into the record exactly what is taking place in these states to which I've made reference to. I am not going to burden the House, but I do say this to the government, that this material has been compiled. As far as my colleague from St. John's is concerned, he has authorized me to say to the government, if you are really interested in protection of the consumer in Manitoba, you don't need to worry. We'll gladly loan you the information that we have compiled respecting the necessity of methods to be taken to prevent, protect consumers from fraudulent practices or misleading and deceptive sales methods. So, Madam Speaker, I finish off where I started, that I sincerely trust and hope that the Honourable Member for Kildonan was not speaking for the government of

(Mr. Paulley, Cont'd.) . . . Manitoba. If perchance he was, then they should hang their heads in shame if they support the contentions and the remarks of the Member for Kildona. And I must say once again, I regret, very, very much to have to take such a belligerent attitude as I do to the remarks of a comparatively new member in this House; but if he is going to continue as a member in this House, I suggest to him that he give more consideration to such important subjects as this that we have before us today.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE (Selkirk): Madam, it's unfortunate that this resolution has come at the dying hours of parliament, because I consider it to be a very important resolution. I consider that there is great need for setting up a special committee of this House to go into this whole question. This question is not new. I myself have raised it in this House on several occasions. Now, as to the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Kildonan referring to retail outlets, I don't think for one moment that the Honourable Member for St. John's ever made any criticism of the retail outlets. I think that the Honourable Member for St. John's would be perfectly willing to admit that most of his remarks were directed towards the itinerant salesmen, the people who have no permanent place of business, and who go around the country taking orders. These are the type of men that we want to curb. Now, there are numerous ways that they can be curbed. The methods which the Honourable Member for Kildonan -- at least the legislation which the Honourable Member for Kildonan has mentioned as being on the Order Paper and having been referred to the Special Committee on Statutory Rules and Regulations -- even if all of that legislation were enacted tomorrow, it would not give the consumer of Manitoba one bit of protection against the malpractices that the Honourable Member for St. John's wishes to control or curb. What he is trying to control and curb is the dishonest salesman who goes out into the country and who takes orders by high pressure methods, either for the sale of goods or for the doing of work, and leaves with an unsuspecting individual a contract which is completely undecipherable; and then that individual finds that he or she has signed up for something which is going to take them years to pay and in respect of which they are getting no consideration or very little consideration at all.

Now, there are one or two methods that we could use immediately to perhaps place some brakes on that type of practice. We could introduce into this House legislation similar to what they have in the Province of Saskatchewan, and I mentioned this legislation and recommended its adoption by this House several years ago; and I refer to an Act respecting commercial agents, to be found in Chapter 97 of the 1958 Statutes of Saskatchewan. Now, under this statute a commercial agent or a salesman has to be licensed. He is under the control of the Department of the Provincial Secretary, and the Provincial Secretary in licensing that person has a right to investigate the type of contracts or service that he is selling or peddling throughout the province, and if he so desires he can bond that individual, and if that individual acts without having a license and without being bonded as ordered to be so bonded by the Provincial Secretary, the contract made by that individual is null and void.

Now, I would just like to refer to some of the sections of this Act. The first section deals with the commercial agent. It defines a commercial agent. Then section 3 deals with licenses. It says: "No person shall carry on the business of a commercial agent in the province unless he is a holder of subsisting license under this Act as a commercial agent or as a salesman of a licensed commercial agent." Then again: "No person shall carry on business as a commercial agent or a salesman in the province unless he is licensed as an itinerant salesman by the municipality." Now, we in Manitoba today, we repealed our Act dealing with itinerant salesmen. We have no legislation in this province under which itinerant salesmen are licensed by the province, and the only license that's available today is that in a municipality, but that is not sufficient, because the license is only a revenue license to the municipality; it's not a policing license, and what we need here is a policing license.

Now this Act goes on to say: "The Provincial Secretary may grant a license or renewal of license where in his opinion the applicant is suitable to be licensed, and the proposed licensing is not for any reason objectionable;" and it gives the Provincial Secretary the right to peruse and approve the type of contract that that individual is offering to the general public. Then it states that the Provincial Secretary may require that applicant to be bonded. It gives the Provincial Secretary certain powers regarding the cancellation of the license. It also states

(Mr. Hillhouse, Cont'd.) . . . that "any person who acts as a commercial agent or a salesman in the province must produce his license before he can interview a prospective purchaser." Then it also says too that "no action shall be brought by a commercial agent against the purchaser for the enforcement of any such contract unless the person who made the sale was at the time the contract was entered into licensed under this Act." Now, we have no such protection in Manitoba. And so on and so forth.

Now I submit that that is one bit of legislation we could introduce into Manitoba which would give some protection just now to the unwary and unsuspecting consumer. I also believe that there's another type of legislation which we must have in Manitoba, and we must have it soon, because as far as the type of contracts are concerned today which these people have purchasers enter into, there is no law relating to that contract; there is no law which lays down what the terms of that contract can be. It's an open jungle, and the law of the jungle actually applies. Now I have submitted on numerous occasions in this House that we should have, in respect of conditional sales contracts in Manitoba, a statutory form of contract. We have a statutory form of contract in Manitoba today dealing with the sale of farm implements, and I don't think anybody could say that that contract is not fair both to the implement dealer and to the farmer. Now I submit that we should have a similar contract in Manitoba in respect of other conditional sales agreements, regardless of what you are selling.

But, Madam Speaker, notwithstanding everything that I have said, notwithstanding everything that has been said by the Leader of the NDP and by the Member for St. John's, this is not a subject which can be resolved by any one single debate in this Legislature. It's a subject which can only be solved or resolved by setting up a special committee of this House to go into the matter in all its ramifications and amplifications; and I don't -- it's unfortunate, as I said at the beginning, that this resolution came in at the dying days of the session, because I consider this to be a very important resolution. I consider that this is a resolution which is worthy of the support of every member of this House, and even though nothing is accomplished by the introduction of this resolution at this session, I hope that the Honourable Member for St. John's, or some other member in this House, will continue to bring in this resolution until some effective action is taken.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, about two months ago when I was speaking on the Throne Speech Debate, I cited three or four examples of where the public were being short-changed. You will recall, Madam Speaker, that I spoke in particular of the Farm Union brief, page 16, when they brought to the attention of the Cabinet and to the attention of every member of this House the unethical business practices that were going on in our midst. Page 16, the second last paragraph says, "During the last two years, we can conservatively estimate that the farmers in Manitoba have paid out over three quarters of a million dollars to business operations which class themselves as so-called discount clubs or wholesale associations, and whose business operations have no relationship whatsoever to that which their respective salesmen present to the individual farmer.

Now, these type of operators have been working in and around the Neepawa-Gladstone area. Their tactics seem to follow this fashion. They drive into a farmer's yard and say that they represent a discount club, and if they buy a membership in the club they present them with a card certificate which enables this particular farmer to buy all of his machinery, all of his repairs, his tires, his batteries and accessories at wholesale prices from certain firms. Upon checking on these firms just every one of them have denied that they had any connection whatever with the organization. To prove that, I reported -- and read I think -- an article from the Western Producer of Thursday, January 9, 1964, headed "The Fast Buck Boys are at Work Again in Rural Areas of Manitoba" describing how these discount club people are operating, and I say that it is high time that something was done to stop their operations.

I know that the Honourable Member for St. John's was not referring to retail outlet stores as suggested by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, nor was he attacking real estate operators or so on. I mentioned during the Throne Speech, Madam Speaker, that perhaps what we should have in Manitoba is a Consumers' Guide. Perhaps the Better Business Bureau could be given more power by the government. Perhaps the Better Business Bureau could issue a monthly or a weekly or a bi-monthly publication that might be called a Consumers' Guide, listing the firms that in their opinion were unethical, that they had made an investigation of

(Mr. Shoemaker, Cont'd.) . . . these firms and it would be better if the public had no truck with them. Now this type of publication, I think, is available in certain States in United States. I don't know -- perhaps it is available in Canada, but certainly there are publications in the states that are known as Consumers' Guides or Consumer Reports, etc.

Now I mentioned as well the experience of a chap in my constituency who had received this watch by mail, and that the mails were being used for fraud. I mentioned another one or two cases where these cheque artists were going around. I don't know what we can do with those but I'll bet you just every member of this House knows of these cheque artists that visit the country and the towns and the cities from time to time cashing worthless cheques. True, they catch these people occasionally and throw them in jail, but they're never made to pay restitution. So I certainly intend, as my little speech will indicate, to support the resolution that is before us.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Logan.

MR. L. HARRIS (Logan): Madam Speaker, I would like to speak too on this consumers' protection. We've had in this last session resolutions brought up on the price of sugar. There is one good example. We talk about retail. We don't need to go to retail, when it is taken out of everyone's pocket. It's not a matter of a small salesman coming to you but you go to the store and there's a bag of sugar there. I can remember going to the store and getting a five-pound bag of sugar or ten-pound bag of sugar for nothing, but could you get that today? No! Somebody has cornered the market and the poor chap himself has to pay through the nose because some greedy guy has got hold of the sugar and it's taken out of his pocket whether he likes it or not. So when we are talking about this small fellow that comes around to the door, he's just peanuts. When you look into these vast chain stores and when you see what has been said about them in various countries throughout the world, then you begin to realize that they themselves control what you are. We have no control over ourselves. We think we have, but have we? When we get down to facts we find out that we're just like a chaff in the wind or a little grain of sand, as far as that goes.

Ours is an age of organization. Virtually all segments of our society are organized for their own self interest -- all, that is, except the consumer. There was a time when competition among producers protected the consumer against profit-inflated prices. That time is long past. A vast proportion of the commodities sold in our stores are produced in industries dominated by one or a few firms. In these industries price competition has disappeared. The law of supply and demand has been largely . . . by the administration of prices by dominant firms. Those members of the labour force that are fortunate to be in strong trade unions can protect themselves through collective bargaining, but more often than not it is the consumer that bears the burden of the resulting wage increase, for most of the businesses simply pass on the wage increases to the consumer in the form of higher prices. Now governments too can protect themselves against rising prices, but their remedy is, namely, higher taxes. It is also a burden to the consumer.

It is time for the government to intervene on behalf of the consumer. It is clear he cannot protect himself and there is no longer any automatic market mechanism to do it for him. It is equally clear that the consumer is more and more becoming the victim of unscrupulous practices of certain businessmen and confusing and misleading advertising and labelling. It is urgent that a Department of Consumers Affairs be established to examine the implication of the prices on particular commodities, of wage increases and of tax increases. What is the relationship between a raise in the price paid to the farmer and the price paid to the wholesale and retail stores? What is the relationship between wage increases and price increases? What kind of taxes place the greatest burden on the consumer? Is the labelling unnecessarily confusing and are consumers adequately protected against shady deals? These are the kind of questions which must be answered to ensure the protection of the consumer. They are now being asked. This is why a Department of Consumers Affairs must now be given top-most priority.

We are going through life -- no matter where you go, they always blame it on the increase of wages, this and that and everything else, but when you get down to facts you find out that it's not the increase in wages or it is not the price of materials that come into . . . but you'll find out that a lot of these people are lining their pockets from what they can get, for

(Mr. Harris, Cont'd.) . . . what the trade will carry. So we actually do need something here to look into all these affairs, a consumers' protection, and if we would get something like that and have a committee working on it and see to these various things that come out all the way along the line, I think then we could actually do something. I thank you!

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I will support the resolution and I'm all in favour of the resolution, but it . . . to a discretion which I think perhaps is not proper. The impression which speakers have given us today is that any man we meet on the street is a crook, and be careful. This impression I do not like to let it go. The protection is very necessary; the resolution is important, timely; but at the same time we must consider that not all -- when I mean all, I mean all -- are in the same position as this resolution intends to protect from.

HON. M. B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary)(River Heights): the Honourable Member from Logan widened and broadened the field of the unscrupulous sales operation by quite a bit, I daresay that the percentage of unscrupulous operations in Manitoba, if anything is on the decline, although there is a certain field, a type of operation, of many types of operation, that should be looked into and are of a type that we could well do without in this province. I don't think that there is any unnecessary cause for alarm, that this situation has just developed in the last little while. It is something I think that has been with us for a long time but because of probably the good work of the Minister of Public Works by opening up the roads these people seem to be able to get around a little bit easier and with a little less expense, and are hitting areas for the first time that never had been hit before in Manitoba. In this field there is quite a bit of catching up to do and also a lot of defining as to what we're really trying to get at. As you know, we have six Acts, really one of them all related to one another, that don't necessarily deal in this particular field, but throughout all of them there's a thread that smacks of getting finally to this kind of an operation, and up until recently, until that decision of the Supreme Court of Canada declaring the Ontario Unconscionable Transactions Act *intra vires* of the Province of Ontario, there has been quite a considerable doubt as to how far a province could go in matters of inter-provincial trade or the transient trader -- matters of interest and the like. These have always been the prerogative and in the field of the federal government; but I think that the matter seems to be -- the air is clearing up quite a bit on it and our rules will be easier to define and easier to play by. I certainly concur in the suggestion of the Honourable Member from Selkirk that this is a matter that requires a considerable amount of discussion and the best way it can be attacked is via the means of a committee, such as he suggested, that could consider this matter. And I, for one, would be very happy to support that kind of a suggestion. I don't know whether we have to wait for another session of the House to do it and it is possible we may be able to get started on it this summer in the field that I think deserves a lot of consideration, but I cannot support the suggested resolution in its present state.

MR. JOHNSTON: permit a question? What part of the resolution do you object to?

MR. STEINKOPF: I object to the whole resolution because I don't think it's effective. I don't think that it would mean anything if we passed it.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. John's): Madam Speaker, I listened with interest to what was said by the Honourable Member for Kildonan. I would hate to hurt his feelings. I would hate to attack him and possibly embarrass him on what may yet be the last session of the House this spring, so I won't comment at all on what he said.

I am glad, however, that we had an opportunity to listen to the Honourable the Minister, who I believe said clearly and loudly and distinctly that he favours the idea presented by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, and that is that a committee should look into this problem. Of course, he did say that there is a decline in this kind of a thing and to that extent I must say that he is a little naive. Possibly he lives in an ivory tower and maybe I could invite him to come back into the practice of law where he would deal in that field of law where people are involved, and he would then find that there are methods of sales which he in his young days never knew about, and these, rather than declining in unscrupulous sales methods, are increasing. Because of the time element, the Honourable Member for Brokenhead put aside a speech that was that long, and when I'm showing that long it's weighty and full of actual cases which he had which he was willing and desirous of presenting to this House, of an indication, not of the

(Mr. Cherniack, Cont'd.) . . . specific cases but of the nature of the cases which have been occurring in the last few years, dealing with sales of water softeners, dealing with sales of house sidings, dealing with all those itinerant salesmen, and -- the Honourable Member for Selkirk spoke of them going out into the country -- we still have a lot left right in this city, and the sales methods used by them are the kind of sales methods which must be checked and reviewed.

Now the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, in addition to all these examples he had, was also in a position to draw to the attention of this House something to supplement what the Honourable the Leader of our Party had to say. He had a very voluminous file of all the measures that have been taken in a number of the states of the United States of America. He had examples of the type of bulletins that they issue and the type of information they give, which because of lack of time he felt he should not deal in detail.

The Honourable Member for Brokenhead had a little book which I wanted him to read into the records. It's a book which has reports of committees on government operations and in that is a section of 338 pages which are entitled "Consumer Protection Activities of Federal Departments and Agencies" being the eighth report by the Committee on Government Operations and dealing in detail with all the United States Federal Government's work in that connection. 1961 is the year in which this was issued. So that I would be foolish to pretend that this is my brain-child. Even the Honourable the First Minister who thought that the shared services plan was his brain-child learned that it wasn't. There is nothing new.

But what disturbs me is the fear that we will be falling behind all the other legislations on this continent in doing that very thing which is no necessary, and that is consumer protection. For that reason I am happy to hear what the Honourable the Provincial Secretary had to say about the thought that it might not even be necessary to wait for a session of the Legislature to set up a committee. I believe he said that it should be possible this summer to do some work in exploring this field, and I am glad he said it because that indicates the type of attitude which he showed a year ago when he felt the need for certain types of legislation and we know that through the summer and fall of 1963 he did do work in this field and he did invite help from people outside of the Legislature, and as a result he did bring measures before us -- which we haven't passed, but which we will be studying. So that I welcome the attitude which he has shown in this regard. It is one which I didn't really think that we would be getting after hearing the first speaker on behalf of the government.

It seems to me, therefore, that although he says that he cannot support any part of the resolution, I, like the Honourable Member for Portage, wondered just what that could be, because aside from the preamble, which incidentally praises the work of the Better Business Bureau and does suggest that there is loss suffered from unscrupulous sales methods, then says in the resolution portion, "Therefore be it resolved that the Government give immediate consideration to the advisability of protecting consumers from fraudulent practices, or misleading and deceptive sales methods." I think that the Honourable the Minister has indicated that he is prepared to give immediate consideration; that he is prepared this summer to make an investigation just along the lines of the resolution, and if it will salve the feelings of the government to not support this resolution but do the work and get the credit next year, that's fine. I'm not looking for credit; and as long as the work is done, frankly I don't think I would deserve the credit because there is much that has to be done and much that has already been done in other jurisdictions which give us an indication of what ought to be done. So that I find it peculiar that the government will not support a resolution suggesting that it do give the immediate consideration which I now believe it will give because of what has been said by the Honourable Minister. But be that as it may, I look forward to progress in this field.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The question before the House, the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. John's.

A standing vote was taken the result being as follows: **NAYS:** Messrs. Alexanser, Baizley, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison. **YEAS:** Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 20; Nays, 29.

Madam Speaker declared the motion lost.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. John's and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Logan. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): (Recording failure)..... practices that they were following. Apparently the practices are that, wherever possible, they give very easy payments and then after a period of two or three years this is followed by a "balloon" payment, that means that the borrower will have very easy payments for the first two years, or three years for that matter, and then is up against a "balloon" payment which he cannot meet. This then means that he has to re-finance his loan and in most cases includes a substantial bonus that they collect from them. This keeps on and goes into another cycle, and apparently once a fellow is hooked there's almost no end to this. He's kept in a perpetual stage like that.

Now I do not want to paint all the companies with the same brush. We know that not all companies do business in the same way and that we have finance companies too that will treat persons well, I would say. But we also have those who take advantage of the situation and we find that the people that have to go to these places, and especially those with the higher risk, those are the ones that advantage is being taken of, and as a result we find that I think we could almost call it fraud that is being perpetrated in these contracts that are being made.

I have had information on a good many companies, especially also in connection with credit unions, how these companies are carrying on business. We find that very often these same people then come to us and ask for loans and we re-finance them, and as a result we know what these people are charging and we find that in many cases this is outrageous, and we have people coming to us that are having their loans re-financed at the unions that are making very large savings. The credit unions naturally are only charging interest on the unpaid balance, This is not so with most of these other financial organizations that do business with people who are larger risks.

I also know of other provinces and states in the United States that have been seeking legislation that we are asking for in this resolution. I know of a good number of states that have put some legislation into effect. Others are studying it and even here in the Dominion of Canada we have provinces that are at the present time considering legislation to protect people from this very thing. This does not only apply to people who are doing business with finance companies, it applies in many cases where they are seeking second mortgages on their houses and on their homes, and here too we find that a very high rate of interest exists and where the practice of "balloon" payments or bonuses is also in existence.

I had intended earlier to bring in some actual cases of legislation that is being considered or has been enacted in various states and in the provinces, but I felt that the members at this point would not be interested in those so I will not do that tonight. But I hope and trust that if nothing is being done about this matter that I shall do so at the next session of this House.

Therefore, I would strongly recommend and request that members endorse this resolution because I think it is a very valid one, one that needs attention and needs action to prevent fraud and to protect the people from these abnormal high rates of interest; and also, as stated in the resolution, that the interest rates be shown in clear language so that people who sign contracts will not find out later that they've signed something completely different than what they were told, and which was not shown in large print but in small print in these contracts. That's where people get fooled and caught so often. So, Madam Speaker, I would recommend the resolution to the House and ask their support.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, it's interesting that these two resolutions follow side by side one after the other as they have quite a bit in common. Speaking on the amendment of the last speaker and his complaint about the "balloon" payments, where I think he said after two or three years the borrower finds that the -- or the purchaser -- finds that there's quite a substantial amount left over and it means a re-financing and he's pretty well in the clutches of the vendor from then on for as long as he lives. I don't think that he's talking about the kind of purchases that were contemplated by this resolution. Certainly he's not talking about the bigger items such as cars or homes or things like that. I think it's in the field of the smaller purchases, say those that are under \$500, and in these items I have yet to see a contract that extends over a period of the two years which he talks about and if he does, unless it's a very

(Mr. Steinkopf, cont'd)... unusual case, there is no balloon at the end of it.

The opportunity of getting on my feet again gives me a chance to reply to my learned friend from St. John's and probably telling a little bit about my own background in the legal profession when it comes to collections on items that have been sold under sort of a cloud. In the depression we had a fairly large business, and I may say practically the only business in our law firm for a few years was that of collections, and we represented at that time so many different mail order houses that were selling extension courses. I remember one very vividly that sold over a thousand contracts by mail in Manitoba and all of them it turned out had contracts that couldn't stand up in the courts here. We also acted for, until we found out, a cream separator company, and we found that the only thing that the machines separated was the cash from the farmer. I think we had in those days as much ingenuity on how to figure out ways of selling merchandise and things that were as useless as what can be done today. I too have been a door-to-door salesman selling magazines and selling pictures. We also had a little pony and we took pictures from door to door with your child on there.

I think that the matter of the main resolution, and that is the disclosure of interest rates, is one that has been well debated here before and in committee on very many times. I know of very few jurisdictions that have been able to solve this problem. Again referring to the general field of the protection of the purchaser, this is part of an over-all package that I believe won't solve itself, but again will be minimized by any action that we may take on say the former resolution. In the discussion of the former resolution -- as a matter of fact this can again come up and if the Honourable Member for St. John's knows of any plan that will work, maybe at that time he'll give us something that we can take a good look at and see if we can do it or not -- and the Honourable Leader of the Party shakes his head.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I again welcome what was said by the Honourable the Minister. I wouldn't be surprised if we can get along pretty well in bringing in some progressive legislation into this House in not too many years. Of course we still have to bring him a long way from the depression years which are the years of his experience and when he was a door-to-door salesman, but I'm sure that we will manage to do that.

I want to speak but briefly on some of the comments made by the Honourable Member for Wellington who spoke on March 17th, on the matter of this motion, and one of the statements he made in Hansard on Page 1201 was: "one appreciates his motivation" -- speaking of my motivation -- "and concern for those who are apparently tricked or trapped by their fellow creatures, one will understand I think why he belongs to this particular party." I'm glad that the honourable member acknowledges that it makes this only logical for a person who was motivated on behalf of those who are apparently tricked or trapped to belong to this party, which is the New Democratic Party. He says further: "There is no area in our society where abuse exists as in the realm of credit and the interest attached thereto." So again I'm glad that a representative of the government agrees with what I have to say in this connection.

The honourable member stated further, speaking on page 1202, "We have an unconscionable transaction before us and if anyone gets entangled with a 31 or 32 percent interest rate on a loan, as the honourable member suggests, I'm sure he will be able to appeal against it through this legislation." Madam Speaker, he is speaking obviously of The Unconscionable Transactions Act which is before us and suggests that a person who is entangled in a 31 or 32 percent interest rate can seek redress if we pass that act, but Madam Speaker, all I am saying in this Resolution is let the man know what he is paying. I am not even saying that a 31 percent interest rate is necessarily an unconscionable transaction, but I am saying that if the purchaser or the borrower doesn't know the interest rate, he may not know enough to come before the courts for a review of the transaction under that act.

Finally, the honourable member said, "I would suggest his proposal has been tried by this government but was found impractical and incapable of fulfilment." Again he must be speaking of The Time Sales Agreement Act, or the act passed a couple of years ago by this government which was -- I don't mean passed, it was -- yes, it was passed two years ago. Last year it had still not been proclaimed and the government then came along and said we want to change it from a declaration of interest rate into a declaration of a total dollar amount because it is not practical. But it's not true as the Honourable Member for Wellington said that they found it to be impracticable and incapable of fulfilment. They backed down because

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd)... they were approached by all the various people in the business, all the vested interests who came to the government and said, you can't make us do this thing because it's impractical and incapable of fulfilment. In other words, they said, we can't carry this out therefore it's not possible to do it. I remember after that debate I had an opportunity to send to the then Honourable Attorney-General a very simple conversion table which made it possible to apply the table in order to work out the rates.

Now I don't want to belabour this point. I want to draw to the attention of the House a circular which came to my hands fairly recently issued by the Bank of Nova Scotia. Now people who know anything about the Federal Bank Act know that there is a limitation on a bank charging more than six percent per annum on a loan. This Bank of Nova Scotia form has a table which speaks of the nature of the loan and they say -- one example -- amount of loan, \$500.00; monthly payment for 12 months, \$44.17; total repayable, \$530.00. Now the simple arithmetician might say well \$30.00 is six percent for one year for \$500.00 which it is, 5 times 6 is 30, but is not aware of the fact that as the loan is being repaid monthly there is an advantage to the bank in having the benefit of this man's money monthly, and by the simple conversion table which I had sent over to the former the Attorney-General, it shows that this is an eleven percent per annum loan on the amount outstanding from time to time. The Bank of Nova Scotia -- not an unscrupulous firm by any means.

No. 2. I have recently received in my office a very good-looking brochure issued by the Industrial Acceptance Corporation Ltd., I. A. C., which I think is one of the largest in Canada in this loan business field. Whether or not it's the largest, it has a big beautiful looking circular and on Page 10 and 11 it gives samples of various loans it can make. At the bottom with an asterisk which leads back to every one of the examples is a note: "included in this figure were charges based on" -- and I'm quoting this -- "included in this figure were charges based on the equivalent of six percent or seven percent of the amount financed per year." Note what I have just read -- equivalent of six percent or seven percent of the amount financed per year.

I have just taken, Madam Speaker, the annual report of the Manitoba Development Fund for the year ended March 31, 1963, and on page 5 I find the statement "the average rate of interest charged to borrowers during 1962-63 was 7.05 percent." I've read that verbatim; I read the I.A.C. verbatim. The Manitoba Development Bank I am sure follows the law regarding the disclosure of interest rates on real property as fixed by The Interest Act of the Federal Government to which I'll refer in a moment.

The I.A.C. gives us examples -- I'll just read one. Amount financed, \$175,000; repayment scheduled to be repaid in equal monthly installments over three years, total amount of contract with the asterisk to which I had referred about the six or seven percent equivalent, total amount of contract, \$206,500; 36 monthly payments of \$5,736.00. The rest of the sheet is covered with some of my scribbling which reveals, Madam Speaker, that at six percent per annum on the full amount of the original loan, the interest amounts to the difference between the amount financed and the total amount of the contract. In other words, the interest here at six percent was added on -- what you would call "add-on interest" -- added on on the full amount for the full three years without regard being given to the fact that there are monthly payments of \$5,736.00 being paid so that the company has the benefit of it. My simple conversion table told me that this was an eleven percent per annum loan on the amount outstanding from time to time.

This is the kind of competition that the Manitoba Development Fund is facing. Two beautiful looking leaflets -- one issued by I.A.C. which uses the statement which is probably grammatically correct so as to bring out the real truth, "based on the equivalent of six or seven percent of the amount financed per year." That's the I.A.C. The Manitoba Development Fund -- "the average rate of interest charged to borrowers was 7.05 percent," I think it takes a pretty careful reader to understand the difference between the Manitoba Development Fund's 7.05 which is what I consider a true picture and the I.A.C.'s statement of the equivalent of six or seven percent which I say is a false picture, and I am not saying that they are overcharging, the I.A.C., I'm only saying they are not giving a picture which gives the purchaser or the borrower a proper knowledge of what it is that he is paying.

Madam Speaker, I want to read into the records Section 6 of The Interest Act of the

(Mr. Cherniack, cont'd)... Federal Government which appears in Chapter 156 of the 1952 Revised Statutes of Canada on Page 3462. "Whenever any principal money or interest secured by mortgage of real estate is by the same made payable on the sinking fund plan or on any plan under which the payments of principal money and interest are blended, or on any plan chargeable, payable or recoverable on any part of the principal money advanced unless the mortgage contains a statement showing the amount of such principal money and the rate of interest chargeable thereon calculated yearly or half-yearly, not in advance."

Now this is the law that affects real property mortgages. I see no reason why that same law and the principle involved cannot be carried into other transactions. Now people will say it is hard on the lender or the sales force to calculate the interest rates. Well isn't that too bad, Madam Speaker. If they intend to sell at an interest rate, then I think they should have the additional burden of calculating the interest rate so that the purchaser or the person dealing with them knows what he is paying on a comparable basis. In the sum and substance of this resolution there is no attempt made at regulating the amount of interest to be charged. The only purpose of this Resolution is to make sure that people know on a comparable basis what they are expected to pay and so that the Manitoba Development Fund wouldn't be in an unfair position vis-a-vis the firms, respectable though they be, like the I. A. C. which is the example I gave.

Madam Speaker, I have spoken on the amendment. I do not intend to speak on the Resolution of course unless someone else speaks. I urge the acceptance of the amendment regardless of what is intended to be done with the resolution, because the Honourable Member for Lakeside pointed out the admission; I was quick to accept it and ask the Honourable Member for Logan to move it so that it will give a fuller picture of what I had in mind. So I would ask as a courtesy that the amendment be accepted to form part of the resolution in order that the resolution can be dealt with in the form in which I personally felt it ought to be.

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

A MEMBER: Yeas and nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the proposed motion in amendment by the Honourable the Member for Logan.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 20; Nays, 32.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. John's.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Could I have it recorded on the same division, which would be satisfactory as far as I'm concerned in this corner, I don't know about the others.

MR. MOLGAT: It's agreeable to us.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood. The Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, the reason I rise to speak on this resolution is because, in my opinion, the members of the government party have not seemed to take this resolution seriously enough, and this is puzzling because it is this same government that saw fit two years ago to set up an enquiry commission to look into aspects of firearm safety in this province. The report of that committee includes several recommendations, somewhere in the order of 16 or so, and some of those recommendations seem to bear quite directly on the sum and substance of this resolution and yet the government opposite has not seen fit to give it very much attention at all.

In other jurisdictions, and I have taken the trouble to try to investigate what other jurisdictions are thinking or doing in this connection of firearm safety, and I find that in several of

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd)... the states in the U. S., and even at the federal level, committees or sub-committees of Congress have been looking into the matter. We have too and hence we have this report, but apparently we don't see it necessary to follow it up with any sort of concrete proposals.

The Member for Swan River did take the trouble to speak to this resolution and he seemed to be of the opinion that there wasn't really all that much need for something as proposed in this resolution because the number of accidents was not that large. In addition to that he did make the point that in his opinion you couldn't legislate for safety, but yet it is a fact that in industrial operations for years, decades or scores of years we have had regulations

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River):couldn't legislate for carelessness.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Madam Speaker, this is semantics as far as I'm concerned. You legislate against carelessness and when you do that you're legislating for safety. I think that it is but the other side of the coin -- of the same coin -- the same problem. It would seem that what is proposed in this resolution is to try at least to guard just a little bit more against carelessness, to try and do something just a little bit more to promote safe hunting and rifle using practices.

It might be of interest to members to note that in the State of New York, for example, when a man applies or wants to get a hunting license for the first time he is obliged to put in seven hours in a short course which involves some education in safety measures and the proper method to use a rifle and so on and so forth, and at the end of that time he is required to pass a short written and verbal examination somewhat analogous to what we do in Manitoba with regard to drivers of automobiles who have had their licenses suspended and so on or who, in the City of Winnipeg, apply for a driver's license the first time. So there are all sorts of variations; there are all sorts of possibilities as to what positive action could be taken to guard against these unfortunate accidents that take place from time to time. I'm not suggesting nor does the Member from Elmwood suggest that if this resolution were implemented that it would end the problem for all time. All that it purports to do is to have a salutary effect, an effect of reducing these accidents to which we were referring.

As to the legal aspect of the proposal, I am given to understand by one or two lawyers to whom I've spoke that insofar as the legal practicability of the resolution that there was nothing wrong with it and, in fact, did deserve support in their opinion. So I would ask members opposite to act just a little more consistently. If you deemed it necessary a few years ago to set up the commission to enquire into firearms use in this province, be consistent and vote on this resolution in a way that will support the recommendations of that enquiry commission.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Turtle Mountain.

I have had this under consideration and I'd like to refer the honourable members to Beauchesne's 4th edition, Citation 202-11: "An amendment proposing that a resolution which does not require second reading be considered this day six months is out of order." In other words the six months hoist only applies to readings or other proceedings which take place on an appointed date. It has no application to motions for direct adoption.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, the member for Emerson constituency wishes to say something on this resolution. He's coming in the House now.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): I promise to be quite brief, Madam Speaker -- interjection -- my conversation is going to be short.

It seems to me that, as far as I can see, that there are two principles involved in this and I'll come to them later. But first of all I want to comment on what has been said by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. I'm really surprised to have heard the words uttered by him since he himself says that he is a farmer and he is also interested in the welfare of the farmer. He was concerned about the 40-acre farmer. So am I concerned and we're all concerned on this side about the farmer who operates a farm of 40 acres. He should be considered. We're also concerned about him. He was concerned about the cattle, or the stock raiser who may have a small holding and then rents land or cuts hay on permits and so on, that

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd)... he needs to be looked after. He was also concerned about the beet farmer who used his truck all over -- or used his truck on his farm. He was concerned, and evidently he seemed to think that these farmers -- or he should have considered them worthy of consideration for tax-exempt gasoline, but he does not say that. He simply said that he was concerned about these people. Well we are concerned too.

I do not think that it is up to the opposition to go ahead and make regulations as far as an Act is concerned. The regulations should be left probably to the Cabinet Ministers, but this was a suggestion -- 100 gallons per quarter section. Now the regulations could go ahead and stipulate there could be a maximum -- there could be a minimum set or a maximum. This was just an idea and I'll quote some of the things that he had to say. He did mention -- and here it seems to me that there's insinuation that some of the farmers, probably including himself since, but there's insinuation that the farmer may be dishonest.

In May 1963, I spoke to this resolution and I complained at that time that the Honourable the First Minister was insinuating that our farmer is not being honest and now the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain seems to insinuate because he says that some of these farmers were supplying his neighbours and relatives with gasoline at the same time run his own car. Well I would say that that's an insinuation that the farmer is dishonest. Again he said once more, "I have interest in the farmer but some people may even use that gasoline to take a ride to this Legislative Building." That wasn't too clear. Does that apply to some of the farmer members here? I do not know. He is one of them. I would hate to think -- and I'm sure he wouldn't use tax-free gasoline to come here to the Legislature, but he does say that here. I wonder how many -- there are a few other farm members here and I doubt whether any of them would do that.

And then what does he say? "I'm interested in the farmer. The honourable member when he did bring this resolution in did not think too hard. He didn't plan it right." Well I think it would have been proper for the honourable member for Turtle Mountain to do some thinking of his own. Why didn't he give some suggestion here? Why didn't he do some planning and thinking? But simply say I'm for it and I think the farmer deserves it, but to heck with him. Let's give this resolution a six months' hoist. I would say that it does not show too much concern for the farmers that he represents, and here I would say, Oh where is Ed Dow? I'm sure that he would have taken an interest in the farmer himself.

I hope that the present member wakes up and does not make these insinuations. I resented that insinuation a year ago that our farmer is not honest, and I claim that the First Minister made that insinuation because he said at the time that the government would be able to save somewhere in the neighbourhood of half a million dollars if the Act was changed, and it was changed on May 6, 1963.

Now I have a short interpretation of this Act, May 6, 1963, and in here -- it's by one of the companies -- it's divided into three main sections on gasoline and two on diesel fuel, and I'll just try to bring this out that it does in a way insinuate that the farmer may not be trusted. It says "any purchaser using gasoline for farm machinery" -- it doesn't mention trucks -- "fire-fighting apparatus, motor boats used for trapping, prospecting and freighting, commercial fishing transportation, could use purple gas." That is fine. These people can apply for a permit to get tax-exempt gasoline. -- People using gasoline for lighting or heating, cleaning fluids and purposes other than operating internal combustion engines." That's fine. Now here are people who can apply for a rebate, and that's where the principle comes in. We did not do away with the rebate department. It is still here, but the farmer cannot apply for a rebate evidently because the government does not trust him. He may chisel and that's what I object to.

Here are the people who can claim rebates: operating aircraft -- I'll agree with that -- operating aircraft. Now at (b), operating a motor boat or a canoe. Not a fisherman because he has to use purple gas, not for prospecting, but just an ordinary motor boat for pleasure, and he can go ahead and claim a rebate of 14 cents per gallon. Why isn't the farmer permitted to claim a rebate. Now you go to diesel fuel and here are people who may claim 15 cents per gallon rebate on their diesel: motor boats, stationary engines, portable engines and tractors off highways, trucks off highways, machinery for industrial purposes, machinery used in making or repairing roads, trucks. They may claim 15 cents per gallon on diesel fuel. And then any purchaser using diesel fuel for fire-fighting,machinery, agricultural machinery

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd)... purposes other than in an internal combustion engine.

So some of these people are being trusted, and that's my main concern. I think that our farmers, the farmer in the Province of Manitoba deserves our trust and I think the farmer of the Province of Manitoba is traditionally honest. There may be the odd one who isn't but it isn't fair to punish all, and I think that the farmers of Manitoba are entitled to the use of tax-exempt gas in trucks which they engage in the purpose of their industry.

As far as the regulations are concerned, it is up to the government to make the regulations. I think we should accept this and we should respect the farmers. We should accept this resolution as it's stated here and show that we do respect the farmer and show that we believe that he is entitled to this tax-exempt gasoline, at least 100 gallons per quarter section. We can set a limit, or the government can set a limit, the maximum and the minimum.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, about a year ago now the Bill to provide for the colouring of gasoline and motor fuels was before the House and I moved an amendment at that time that farm trucks be considered a farm implement under the Act, and of course that was defeated. I said at that time and I repeat again now that just about every member of this House, and every member of every Assembly in Canada I think, pays lip-service to the farmer and just about every member will admit that the farmer has been caught in a cost-price squeeze. They know what we mean when we talk about a cost-price squeeze.

Now there have been many measure introduced to alleviate this squeeze to some degree. I suggest, Madam Speaker, that the measure as outlined in the resolution before us will alleviate this squeeze and recognize it to some degree. I believe that the average size of the farm today would be in the neighbourhood of 400 acres. My honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture is not here or perhaps he could give us the exact figure. But assuming that it is three-quarters, assuming that the average size of the farm is 480 acres, then the resolution would mean that we would be giving the farmer 300 gallons of tax-exempt fuel for use in his truck. It would mean by the same token that we would be giving him three times \$14 because I believe the tax is 14 cents per gallon and 300 gallons would be \$42.00. Now surely we can't give him much less than this amount. Then we must determine in our minds whether or not it is necessary for a farmer to have a truck to successfully carry out his operations and conveniently carry them out. We recognize he must have a tractor, and I suggest, Madam Speaker, that in many cases a farmer uses his truck as much as he does his tractor.

I have before me a page from "Good Farming Quarterly". It is an American publication I believe. This is not an advertisement, it is headed "Buying a Truck? All trucks are good," it says, "but some are better than others, particularly if you have followed the advice of the man who knows, your dealer." And it goes on to point out how much a truck is used on the average farm today and I would like to read just one short paragraph. "A piece of machinery that is being seen more and more in constant use around the farm is the truck, the farm truck, available in by far the widest variety of shapes, colours, sizes and power features and also having the widest variety of uses. On many of today's modern farms, the truck is the hardest working machine. If you own a truck, consider how much you use it. You will probably find that you are using it more than your tractor. Field work, chores, on the road to market, hauling seed, fertilizer and other supplies, these are but a few of the jobs a truck can do. It is because a farm truck is so versatile in its use that the general efficiency of a farm operation receives such a big boost when one is introduced."

Well, Madam Speaker, I don't have to tell you or most of the members of this House that it is next to impossible to operate a farm today without a truck, and I suggest that since all members of the House would like to be sincere in recognizing the cost-price squeeze, they would like to show their appreciation and alleviate this squeeze to some degree, and I suggest that we all vote for the resolution before us.

Now, Madam Speaker, there is one other matter, one other feature that I would like to raise and that is this. With the introduction of coloured gas, a statement was made by the oil companies that the extra storage space that they would require to handle this coloured gas would cost the firms in Manitoba at least \$4 million. I have before me the Free Press of August 20, 1963 pointing up that fact. "Government Under Pressure - Coloured Farm Gas Plan Stalled - Oil firms say that extra storage tanks on farms would cost \$4 million."

Now if this is so and if this is a fact, then you can bet your bottom dollar that the cost of

(Mr. Shoemaker, cont'd)... coloured gas will rise, because it just isn't like the oil companies to assume an expenditure of this kind. My guess is that they will be passing it along to the farmer in the way of a price increase before very long. In fact, I bet a dealer at Neepawa the other day \$5.00 that within 12 months the price of coloured gas would be up by three or four cents just to pay for this \$4 million. Now that is understandable, that the oil companies would have to get back their money, but this is one more reason why we in this House should support the resolution before us.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (LaVerendrye): Madam Speaker, if nobody else wishes to speak, I will close the debate, and at this time I am sure that most members are much more interested in, to use the First Minister's terms, go into other activities than listening to me, therefore I'll be very brief.

However, Madam Speaker, I was really concerned at the lack of interest by the members on the other side on this very important resolution which actually affects every farmer in this province, and if we have to deal with it at this time, it is certainly not my fault because it was on the Order Paper a good six weeks ago. My honourable friend the member from Turtle Mountain stood it for about four weeks, I think, and then when he spoke on it he treated it, as far as I am concerned, as if it was a farce. Well, Madam Speaker, I don't think that this resolution is perfect but we have had many Bills this session that were not perfect. They were held in Committee, were brought back to Committee, were amended by the Ministers, and I don't see why the same thing could not have been done with this Resolution. However, I will not belabour the point. It is late, but I want to serve notice that I will bring this resolution back next year.

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 20; Nays, 32.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

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

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