



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



I N D E X

Friday, July 17, 1959

	Page
<u>Introduction of Bills</u> , Nos. 41 (Mr. Lyon), No. 90 (Mr. Thompson), No. 93 (Mr. Schreyer) .....	1039
<u>Questions</u> .....	1039
<u>Correction of Hansard</u> , Mr. Martin .....	1041
<u>Bill 38</u> , re Treasury Act (Mr. Roblin) Adjourned Third Reading: Mr. Hillhouse .....	1042
<u>Third Readings</u>	
<u>Bills 39, 40, 55, 57</u> .....	1043
<u>Bill 59</u> , re M. H. S. A.: Mr. Paulley .....	1043
Mr. Johnson (Gimli) .....	1044
Mr. Strickland, Mr. Paulley, Mr. Campbell .....	1045
Mr. Alexander, Mr. Paulley, Mr. Roblin .....	1046
<u>Bills 78, 84</u> .....	1048
<u>Adjourned Debate</u> , re Motor Vehicle Insurance (Mr. Paulley), amendment (Mr. Mc- Kellar), further amendment (Mr. Hillhouse): Mr. Paulley .....	1048
Division on amendment to amendment .....	1050
Main Motion, Mr. Paulley .....	1050
<u>Adjourned Debate</u> , re Deficiency Payments (Mr. Schreyer), amendment (Mr. Alexander): Mr. Wagner .....	1051
Mr. Gray .....	1055
<u>Adjourned Debate</u> , re Permanent Speaker (Mr. Campbell): Mr. Lissaman .....	1057
<u>Proposed Resolution</u> , re School for Handicapped, Mr. Gray .....	1059
<u>Bill 79</u> , re Greyhound Racing, Second Reading (Mr. Hillhouse) .....	1061
Mr. Orlikow, Mr. Guttormson, Mr. Stanes, Mr. Christianson .....	1062
<u>Committee of Supply</u>	
<u>Public Utilities</u> , Statement, Mr. Carroll .....	1063
Discussion of Statement .....	1070

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, July 17th, 1959.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.  
Reading and Receiving Petitions.  
Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees.  
Notice of Motion.  
Introduction of Bills.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that leave be given to introduce a Bill No. 41 - An Act to amend The Real Property Act, and that the same be now received and read a first time.

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

HON. JOHN THOMPSON (Acting Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that leave be given to introduce a Bill, No. 90 - An Act to amend The Municipal Act, and that the same be now received and read a first time.

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

MR. JAMES COWAN (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, that leave be given to introduce a Bill, No. 91 - An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956, (2), and that the same be now received and read a first time.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. E.R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that leave be given to introduce a Bill, No. 93 - An Act to validate By-law No. 59-8 of the Rural Municipality of East St. Paul and an Agreement between the Rural Municipality of East St. Paul and Imperial Oil Limited and that the same be now received and read a first time.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. S. ROBERTS (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to repeat the question I asked yesterday of the Honourable Minister of Health regarding the water supply of the residents of St. Vital who have apparently had their water supply cut off from their wells through the tunneling across the river there.

HON. ERRICK F. WILLIS, Q.C. (Minister of Agriculture and Immigration) (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, this is one which is jointly, I think, the responsibility of the Minister of Health and myself. I'll make the necessary answer and then if further be needed, the Minister of Health is here. The Minister of Health has already assured me that their officers have inspected water in that area and they're looking after all matters concerning health and that that matter is entirely under control. They have been constantly on the job.

The one which I have is from Mr. J.A. Griffiths, Director of Water Control and Conservation. It's dated today. It is in regard to private wells along St. Mary's Road in the rural municipality of St. Vital. It reads as follows: "On the morning of July 13th, 1959, I had telephone calls from residents adjacent to St. Mary's Road at the southern end of St. Vital complaining that water levels in their wells had suddenly dropped and, in at least one case, had dropped to the point where they could no longer pump water with their existing equipment.

"We immediately sent an engineer from this office to inspect this problem and gather as much information as possible, as a result of which we contacted the Greater Winnipeg Water District on the early afternoon of July 13th, discussing with them the possibility of a relation between this sudden loss of water supply in the wells and the tunnel excavation under the Red River being undertaken by the Water District as part of the new aqueduct. During the following day, engineers of the Water District interviewed the people concerned and discussed the matter with the contractors doing the tunneling work.

(Mr. Willis, cont'd.) . . . .

"The tunnel passes under the Red River about three-quarters of a mile south of the Sanatorium and the wells suffering the loss of water are situated about one to one and one-half miles south of the tunnel. The general drop in water level has been about 12 feet and the wells seriously affected have been of a shallow type. Deep well pumps have, apparently, not been affected.

"No one is yet prepared to state that this sudden loss of well water is directly and entirely the result of the tunneling operations. However, it appears that there is certainly some relation in these matters.

"As of today, the Water District advised me that they have supplied storage tanks to seven residents in St. Vital and are delivering water by truck to these tanks daily. It is presumed they will continue this service until such time as the seepage into the tunnel has been cut off by construction operations therein, and an opportunity has been provided for the wells to recharge. It is expected that the seepage will be cut off in about three weeks' time with the time required to recharge the wells being unknown. However, if the loss of water is entirely due to the tunneling operations, the wells should recharge fairly rapidly.

"We feel no further action is required or can be taken by this office until such time as the tunneling operations have sealed seepage at that point and a reasonable time allowed for recharging the wells to their normal level. If this should fail to occur, it may then be advisable for us to investigate further." Signed - J.A. Griffiths, Director, Water Control and Conservation.

Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House I should like to answer a question, I think put by the Member for Ste. Rose in regard to the Sleeve Lake community pasture. I now have a statement from Mr. J.M. Parker, Department of Agriculture, who is in charge of land use in that department. "Re: Sleeve Lake Community Pasture. The Sleeve Lake Community Pasture was constructed in 1954. The fence and corrals were constructed by PFRA, but paid for 100% by the Province of Manitoba.

"The pasture was constructed because of the need for pasture due to high lake levels and wet conditions forcing many ranchers to move cattle onto higher ground. PFRA were asked to assume responsibility for this pasture but would not do so because it does not lie within the PFRA boundaries.

"This pasture has been under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture for five years. The number of cattle pastured has varied from as high as 600 head to a low this year of 175. The reasons for the drop being: (1) Wet conditions this spring in that area gave promise of surplus grass for pasture throughout the area, and (2) The history of considerable troubles with predators in the pasture area.

"Some local ranchers have indicated that more use of the pasture would be made if it could be extended to include a block of much better land to the north. The present pasture is 25 sections in size and an extension of at least 25 sections is proposed. The agricultural representative and the local ranchers have been advised that if the extension is desired, a petition should be signed by several ranchers in the area and the matter would then be brought up for consideration.

"The community pasture has been carried under the community pasture appropriation under the Soils and Crops Branch until this year when, on the advice of the Treasury, the appropriation was grouped with the general VI-3-f-3 appropriation dealing with Pasture Improvement and Fertilizer Trials. The appropriation for the last three years has been in the neighbourhood of \$7,000.00, although this money was not spent last year. It was in 1957 and 1956, as additional fencing and other improvements have been made in the pasture.

"This pasture can, and will, serve a useful purpose in this area and also is very valuable as a reserve pasture area to have in case of severe droughts in the west and southwest parts of the province." Signed J.M. Parker.

MR. G. MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Minister for his very complete statement on this. I understand now that PFRA boundary in Manitoba has been moved further north to include all of the agricultural areas. Would it not be contemplated in that case that the Federal Government would take over the operation of the Sleeve Lake community pasture in the same way as it does other pastures?

MR. WILLIS: I would suggest that this might easily be possible if we could get the necessary petition which I assume would be available.

MR. T.P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Public Works. Is the Honourable Minister aware of the type of dividing strip which is being erected and constructed on a portion of PTH No. 9 from a point north of the Lower Fort to the Selkirk by-pass road?

MR. WILLIS: The Minister is aware.

MR. HILLHOUSE: A supplementary question. Is the Minister of the opinion that the type of dividing strip that is being erected is in the interests of safety? The reason why I ask that question, Mr. Minister, is this, that this dividing strip is just the width of the two white lines dividing the north and the south bound pass. Now it is about 18 inches wide at the base and is about nine inches high and it's rounded. It's made of black top. I understand that that is going to be painted white.

MR. WILLIS: Yellow.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Yellow. The point is this, Mr. Minister. Do you consider that that would be easily visible at night? — (Interjection) — Do you not consider that the height and width will make it a danger trap for vehicles using that highway in view of the fact that it's sloped?

MR. WILLIS: I've not actually seen the construction, although we considered it in the office with our safety engineers. And it was because they desired to make it as safe as possible that this type of construction was accepted. In other words, it was the opinion of our engineers that because of the rounding there would be no great pitch in case a car should strike it. This is a newer type whereas formerly you had the upright sides and I've seen in a number of places, particularly in Chicago, where they spring up out of the pavement, they're about 10 inches high and just on an automatic lever up they come with straight sides which give you a terrific pitch. This one would not, they tell me, give you that pitch, but rather you could roll over it with a slight pitch, but it will be coloured so it can be seen at night. And while it is experimental, this is the approved system for divided lanes as advocated by the leading highway engineers.

MR. HILLHOUSE: ..... question, Mr. Minister. The people down there are quite perturbed over it. They feel that it is going to be dangerous and I would suggest, too, that the Minister take a look at it and let the House know whether it was put in by a contractor or by somebody that belonged to the "wavy navy" because it's just like a serpent.

M. E. PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Avant les ordres du jour j'aimerais poser une question à l'honorable premier ministre et lui demander s'il serait assez bon de se servir de son influence et de demander à CBC Radio Canada au nom du gouvernement du Manitoba de faire placer sur la télévision le championnat de boxe entre Yvon Durel et Archie Moore. Je comprends que ce championnat ne sera pas télévisé et un grand nombre des admirateurs d'Yvon Durel aimeraient bien voir cette joute à la télévision. Peut-être le premier ministre pourrait s'occuper de cette affaire.

(English translation of above):

MR. E. PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to ask a question of the First Minister and ask him if he would be so kind as to use his influence and ask the CBC on behalf of the Government of Manitoba to televise the boxing championship fight between Yvon Durel and Archie Moore. I understand that this championship fight is not to be televised and a great number of Yvon Durel's fans would very much like to watch the fight on television. Perhaps the First Minister would look after this matter.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Wolseley): Monsieur le président, la direction du CBC est l'affaire du gouvernement fédéral.

(English translation of above):

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Wolseley): Mr. President, the management of the CBC is under the Federal Government's jurisdiction.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. W.G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I think it's the first time I've said anything by way of suggesting corrections in Hansard. But last night when we had the spirited debate about whether we should be cool or not so cool, and divest ourselves of our coats, it is suggested here that I made a sort of mandatory order, because after reference had been made by the Honourable Member from Rhineland as to what they do in the Mother of Parliaments assuming putting their feet on the table and so forth, Hansard says,

(Mr. Martin, cont'd.) . . . "Mr. Chairman, members to take off their coats and to put their feet on the table". You will remember I was just pointing out how much easier it is for some members to take off their coats than to put their feet on the table.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister for second reading of Bill No. 35. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, there are only one or two points that I wish to raise in connection with this debate. And the first one is that when I spoke on this Bill a few days ago, I queried the procedure that was being followed. And I stated then that I did not consider myself to be an authority on parliamentary procedure, but I felt that from my little knowledge of that procedure, that this Bill should have been brought into the House by way of a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor. Now the Honourable the First Minister, when he spoke, he never advised the House as to whether or no he had consulted his parliamentary experts on whether or no the procedure followed by him was correct. And naturally I would like to get an answer to that because I wouldn't like to see this House give third reading to a Bill then have the Comptroller-General refuse to allow the government to carry out the intent of the Bill because it wasn't properly passed.

Now, one other matter which I'd like to bring up and that is this. The Honourable First Minister when he spoke the other day referred to the fact that the previous government had on two occasions used a circuitous or devious way of taking money out of Consolidated Fund and using it. Now, it is perfectly true that in 1958, the previous government did take \$1,610,000.00 from deferred revenue reserve. But I'd like to remind the members of the House that that money was used by the government of that day to cut down the amount of capital borrowing. For the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1958, the government was borrowing for education purposes \$1,565,000.00 and for the same fiscal year it was borrowing for highway projects chargeable to capital account \$11,000,643.20. Now, actually that \$1,600,000.00 which the government then took out of the deferred revenue reserve was used for the purpose of cutting down the amount of capital borrowing which the province would then have to do, and in my opinion at least, that was within the spirit of the legislation as it stood on the statute books then.

Now, the Honourable First Minister also referred to the fact that for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1959, the government of the day then transferred \$2,000,000.00 from the deferred revenue reserve. Now, no secret was made of that transfer. When the Honourable Provincial Treasurer delivered his budget speech in this House, on March 26th, 1958, he gave the reasons why that transfer was being made. And briefly the reasons were these, that the Minister of Finance at Ottawa estimated that the amount which the Province of Manitoba would receive from the tax rental agreements for the year ending March 31st, 1959, would be \$35,755,000.00 but the Treasury officials of the Province of Manitoba, and whose judgment turned out to be more right than that of the Minister of Finance, estimated that the most that we could expect from that source was \$33,755,000.00. Now, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, in an Order for Return, was advised that the actual amount that we received from the Federal Government under tax rental agreements for the year ending March 31st, 1959, subject to adjustments that may still have to be made, was \$33,000,577.00. So that you can see that the Provincial Treasurer of March 31st, 1958, and the Treasury officials of the Province of Manitoba, were better estimators than the officials in the Department of Finance at Ottawa.

Now, another point which I wish to make regarding that matter is this. For the year ending March 31st, 1959, that is the year just ended, we did finish up with a surplus in revenue of three million six. Now, under our laws as they stood then, and still stand, the only place that that money could be paid was in the Consolidated Fund. It could not be used for any purpose until it went into that Fund. And that's where that money is now. Now, these are the only points that I wish to make. I want to make it clear that there was no effort or attempt on the part of the last government to conceal these transfers from deferred reserve revenue. The purposes of which they were made — at least were transferred were known to this House, and I still think that it would be far better from a financial standpoint if the laws of this province as they are today, remained as they are today, rather than have this Bill passed enabling the government to treat a surplus at the end of any fiscal year as revenue.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, that the debate be adjourned.

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

#### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Minister of Health and Welfare, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following Bills - No. 39, An Act to amend The Education Department Act; No. 40, An Act to amend The School Districts Debenture Interest Guarantee Act; No. 55, An Act to amend The Hospital Services Insurance Act; No. 57, An Act to amend The Teachers' Retirement Allowances Act; No. 59, An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate the Manitoba Hospital Services Association; No. 78, An Act to amend The Greater Winnipeg Sanitary District Act; No. 84, An Act to amend The Tuberculosis Control Act.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. R. PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, just before you put the motion, I would like to make a statement to the House in connection with the Bills that are going to be sent to the Committee of the Whole House for consideration. I'd like, Sir, to make specific reference to Bill No. 59, An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate the Manitoba Hospital Services Association. This Bill, Mr. Speaker, was considered in Law Amendments Committee yesterday morning. I've had representation made to me today by interested parties that they did not have an opportunity of attending the Committee on Law Amendments to make representations in connection with this Bill. To recall, Sir, the circumstance in this connection was this, that the Committee on Law Amendments met Wednesday morning and did not reach consideration of Bill No. 59. It was then decided at that Committee meeting that a further meeting of the Law Amendments Committee would be held Thursday morning at 10:00 o'clock, which meeting was held. The time element between the first and the second meetings of the Committee on Law Amendments in the opinion of those who wished to make representation, did not allow for them to be informed of the meeting of the Law Amendments Committee, and I intend, Mr. Speaker, to request the Committee of the Whole House to defer consideration of Bill 59 in order that these people may be, who are interested in this Bill, may be heard in the Law Amendments Committee.

MR. M.N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question? Were these parties of whom he speaks, were they notified of the Law Amendments Committee meeting on Wednesday morning? Did they know the Bill was coming up Wednesday?

MR. PAULLEY: I can't answer for that, Mr. Speaker, the only knowledge that I have is that they spoke to me in reference to the meeting on Thursday morning.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we defer discussion until we get to Committee -- decided then we can have a good deal freer go at this thing than we can at the moment, if that's agreeable.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews took the Chair.

Bill No. 39, Sec. 1 to Sec. 8 was read and passed.

Bill No. 40, Sec. 1 to Sec. 4 was read and passed.

Bill No. 55, Sec. 1 to Sec. 19 was read and passed.

Bill No. 57, Sec. 1 to Sec. 3 was read and passed.

Bill No. 59, Sec. 1 . . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: This is the Bill on which I made a brief statement on the Committee -- motion to go into Committee of the Whole House. I think I covered the point at that particular time of my request, and I would ask that the Committee agree that this Bill be referred back to Law Amendments Committee in order that representations may be heard from interested parties in connection with the Bill. I say this because of the fact that they have mentioned it to me that they were not aware of the committee meeting being held on Thursday, and had not been informed accordingly. I might say, in order that there is no doubt of whom I am talking, I'm talking of the representatives of Labour, whom I met this morning -- I might say, incidentally,

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . quite by accident -- and they drew this to my attention, and asked me if I would make this request.

Now, on the introduction of this Bill to the Legislature on Monday, July 13th, in winding up the debate, the Honourable the Minister of Health closed the debate with this sentence: "However, I think that if this could be discussed with these people present in law amendments, it would be best debated at that time". Now, if the Committee recall, during the debate on this particular Bill in the House, I had made some suggestions of an alternative method of repaying the amounts in the total fund, to those entitled to receive them. But one of the reasons that the representatives of Labour desire to meet with the Committee, and of course, in law amendments it's their only opportunity, as I understand, to do it.

The Minister, in presenting the Bill, mentioned that he had met unofficially with representatives of Labour, to consider the matter, and that certain consultations took place with them, and also with other interested parties. And I'm informed, and I'm not suggesting that the information that the Honourable the Minister gave us was intended to be -- implied misinformation, or that it in effect was misinformation. But if I recollect some of the conversation with representatives of Labour this morning, one of their points in the agreement of the disposal of this -- of the fund, was that if a building and if facilities were going to be made for the treatment or diagnosis of cancer, in addition to just the simple building of a building for research purposes, they would have absolutely no objection to it, but they felt that rather than just the fund itself going into a building without any further services of a diagnostic -- treatment -- services, that an alternative should be found to the present proposal.

Now, I must confess, Mr. Speaker, and I do so in all sincerity, that neither myself or any of the representatives of our party were at Law Amendments Committee meeting on Thursday. I confess that quite freely, it was a misunderstanding among us. I had anticipated that some of my colleagues would be there; they assumed that I would be there, so therefore we were not present as the First Minister drew the attention of the House yesterday. However, notwithstanding that fact, I don't think that there is any more onus on us as a group to inform other groups of the meetings being held of the Law Amendments Committee any more than it is the obligation of the Ministry to do so. However, in view of the fact that preliminary conversations had been held on this matter with representatives of Blue Cross, who I understand were also not at the Law Amendments Committee meeting on Thursday morning, and the representatives of Labour. I don't know whether the Minister of Health had informed any of them or not. I think that there was equal onus on the Ministry to give the information as to the holding of the meeting.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I am asking this Committee not to proceed with the third reading of this Bill for consideration of this Bill at this time, but to give to the representatives who made the request of me, to make their representations to the Bill in Law Amendments and, of course, also any representatives of the former Blue Cross Association who may desire to do so.

HON. GEO. JOHNSON, M.D. (Minister of Health and Public Welfare) (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a little bit as to concerning this whole matter and to clarify in the minds of the Committee the events leading up to this, leading up to the Bill. As I indicated, we had many representations to myself by individuals in various walks of life, including some in our own constituency last summer, after the plan came into effect. I was wondering about the advisability of the disposal of Blue Cross funds. Well, the Act of the Legislature had clarified the matter that this money was to go back to the people and certainly it was only after six months in office that in talking this over we, in the department, in wondering, in having heard from so many people unofficially that they wished something done, it behooved me, as Minister of Health, to look into the problem and in my examination of the records, I found that the main problem last year when the funds were to be disposed, was that there was no unanimity of opinion as to what this money might be used for. It was the suggestion of myself that if something concrete could be proposed that possibly those who had objected to the disposal, to the various methods of disposal last spring at Law Amendments, if we could discuss this matter with these people who had objections, if we could talk with Blue Cross unofficially and get their views. The very first thing I did was contact a member of the -- in that view who had -- known him in the Manitoba Federation of Labour, who told me that that is certainly why he had opposed



(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) . . . . it. Now I met this gentleman in a very unofficial capacity and he asked me if I could bring together Blue Cross representatives, some of his representatives and some representatives of the Cancer Foundation, which we did. We sat down around a table and we discussed this matter. Later the Blue Cross Board at this meeting, there was no serious objection to a concrete proposal, the proposal being that this money would be used to construct a building and what monies were left for the purchase of equipment with the pledge from the Government of Manitoba to carry this on in perpetuity. I think that that information was perfectly clear, and following that meeting the Blue Cross board asked to meet with me and unanimously endorsed this proposition and wished to tell me that in their opinion it was a sound one.

There are many reasons why, there were many discussions held unofficially also as to how we could best give the people who felt they wanted their pro rata share returned - how we could best handle such a problem which is a very big problem in the eyes of the Blue Cross officials. And this was the decision as to this is the decision of this Government, that this was probably the most equitable and fairest way in which this could be done. The other proposal that everyone be sent a card proposes the asking to indicate whether they would like to go along with this proposal or not, was ruled out in that it would be almost as difficult as the actual return of all the monies and would not - this would be a lot better method.

Now, I must admit that at Law Amendments when I have had since that last, since that last decision, I conveyed to these groups that I had met that I would recommend to my colleagues that a proposal such as this be presented to the Legislature, that had to be the decision of the government. Since then I have not contacted Blue Cross nor the Labour Federation at all and I will say to the Honourable Leader of the CCF that at Law Amendments the other day that Blue Cross was there, representative spokesmen on their behalf who, with a few very minor amendments just in phraseology largely, told us that they were wholeheartedly behind this Bill. I also took note that there were no other representations at this Law Amendment Committee. Now, I feel from the advertising in the paper and so on, if there was felt in the minds of any groups in the province, surely they would have contacted the office of the government or contacted the Clerk of the House to find out as to when these law amendments would be coming forth. I did not feel, it was -- being a newcomer too, I don't feel this is being endorsed and I understand this is true, that it's not up to us to notify these groups. And certainly this received quite a bit of advertising in the last week since it has been before the people. However, I just want to make those points clear that -- I therefore feel that having had -- gone through in the proper manner from beginning to end and everything equal, that at this stage of the game, especially having met these people by accident I don't quite understand why, if they had serious objections to the problems in this Bill, that they did not make their representations along with the Blue Cross people. However, I am keeping a very open mind on this and I would like to hear any further discussion.

MR. B. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the CCF said that it was an accidental meeting with Labour this morning. Might I suggest that if it was accidental that Labour can't have too strong a feeling on this Bill, or objection to it. I think we've been here quite a while now, particularly in Committees, and in this particular Committee, and personally I don't wish we should hold up the work of the House any further.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, in answer to that, I used the term "accidental". I might say that the representatives were attempting to get in touch with me prior. The actual meeting happened to be accidental because we happened to meet as I was entering into the building this morning. That was the accidental nature of it. Apart from that, I must state, Mr. Chairman, that they had been getting in touch with me and I might say that I believe that they had attempted to get in touch with some of the members of the government, and as I understand it, there was a Cabinet meeting this morning. And I, too, tried to phone the office of the Minister on a couple of occasions during the Cabinet's meeting and was unable to contact him until after we had returned from lunch. So when I used the term "accidental" I want to make sure and clear to the honourable member who just raised on that point, that the actual meeting was accidental, but they had been trying to get in touch with me in this connection.

MR. D.L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition) (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that as far as I am personally concerned I take as matters of fact everything that the Minister has said. I'm sure that he has acted in, not only the very best of faith, but very

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . expeditiously in this matter. And I think that he took the right way to get the people together and to make the arrangements that he did. And I must say that I think the Bill is a big improvement on the one that we passed formerly and it seems to me that it is an excellent compromise, if that's the right word to use. I think it is a good Bill, and I think that it will stand scrutiny, because even though I don't share all of my honourable friend's optimism in some regards, I have a very high regard for him personally. I think that he has done an excellent job in this connection and I think that for the little time that it would take to allow the Bill to go back to Committee that it would be better to do that and let the folks make their representations on it. I'm not going to prejudge what would happen there - I think we should not do that. But I am prepared to say that I think that this is a good Bill the way it stands now and personally I am quite in favour of it - but I still think it would be well to accede to the request and allow the Bill to go back so that folks who feel that they want to make some representations on it can do so.

And then there is a practical consideration, Mr. Chairman, having been a long time in this House and knowing what happens here, my guess is that if the Minister would agree to let the Bill go back to Committee for the purpose of representations that the representations at the Committee will not likely last as long as the discussion in here would last if he didn't so agree. That's by no means a threat so far as I'm concerned, because I certainly do not intend to speak on the matter again. And I am in favour of the Bill, I think it is an excellent compromise. I think the Minister has performed very well in regard to it, and I think it would be better under the circumstances to let it go back and I actually think we would save time by so doing.

MR. K. ALEXANDER (Roblin): Mr. Chairman, there is one point the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party mentioned and that was the fact that he thought that the government should have notified these people that this Bill was coming up for second reading. I think he inferred that, did you not?

MR. PAULLEY: I just said, Mr. Chairman, that the onus was not on us entirely, that due to the fact of the conversations that the Honourable Minister had had with these representatives, there was no more onus on us than there was on the government to do that, but suggested that that could possibly have been done.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Chairman, I don't think the government should set a precedent by inviting other groups to attend Committee because where are we going to stop, and what groups shall we invite and how are we going to assume which groups are interested or not? Now I know, for example in our rural areas, there is a very considerable number of farmers that have Blue Cross and possibly we should, if we are going to invite any groups, we should invite the two major farm organizations to attend Committee meetings. And if we once start on this subject we are going to have to issue written invitations to all groups every time a Bill is coming up for second reading. I think when there is publicity in the papers that interested groups can find out from government members or from Clerk of the House when Bills are coming up for second reading and can have their representations ready. I don't think we should start sending out invitations and notifying groups when Bills are coming up, because where are we going to stop?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that the honourable member - he hasn't been in the House very long - may I suggest to the honourable member that this would not be creating any precedent at all. It has been done on numerous occasions in the past and may I say, incidentally and particularly on Committee meetings of the Committee on Agriculture, in the past on numerous occasions both the MFA and the MFU were notified and I believe that I would be correct in saying by mail of meetings of the Committee on Agriculture to consider matters. So I can assure my honourable friend that this would not be the first time that this has been done and as the length of his tenure as a representative from his constituency increases, this may be done on numerous occasions again.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, there is a very real purpose, of course, in referring legislation of a general nature to the Committee of Law Amendments, that is to see to it that the members of the general public regardless of whether they have to represent a particular group or not, individual citizens of every stamp and sort will have an opportunity should they desire to have their views known. At the same time, the business of the House is so arranged that these matters can be attended to and people can have their say on legislation before it gets

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . beyond the point of no return in such a way that it does not impede the reasonable expedition of business in the House. So that, clearly, while we are having desirous of having the public take advantage of the opportunity to appear before the Law Amendments Committee, there are, I think, very well understood limits as to the steps that will be taken by the Legislature to have that sort of hearing made possible. And I think the limit that one imposes is the limit of fair play. I think what we want to be sure is that people do have what reasonable men would think is a fair opportunity to be present at such a meeting.

Now, I think that we might examine this case in the light of that rule of thought, if you like to call it that. And you will see if you pick up the Votes and Proceedings of Monday, July 13th, that it was listed under Notice of Committee Meeting that Bill 59 would be heard. Incidentally, I think this is an innovation for which my colleague the Provincial Secretary is responsible, or perhaps it is Mr. Speaker, but one of the two gentlemen, in listing the Bills insofar as they are known, under the heading "Law Amendments Committee Meeting", in order to make sure that we improve the notice to the public and to the members of the Bills that come up, though I hasten to add that that does not mean that other Bills might not be present at the same time. But in a sense, at any rate, Bill 59 was clearly shown as up for discussion before the Law Amendments Committee. Not only that, but the people in whose interest my honourable friend speaks today, were present. They were there on Tuesday or on Wednesday when Bill 59 was discussed, so that they were well aware of the fact, I saw them there, I'm pretty sure of that. -- (Interjection) -- I'm not saying that it was, if I did, I mis-spoke myself -- what I intend to say is, that those in whose interests my honourable friend is speaking were aware of the fact, one may presume, that Bill 59 was on the agenda, because they were there. And perhaps it is really not too much to expect that they would take the trouble to inform themselves as to when the next meeting of the Committee might be, so that they might be present. Now, I also would like to say that I received no intimation after the Committee meeting that there were third parties who hadn't had their say. Perhaps they couldn't reach me. I enquire before I come into the House, usually every day, whether there are any phone calls awaiting my reply. I didn't find any at all, as a matter of fact, today. It is not my popular day today.

A MEMBER: Not one from me?

MR. ROBLIN: Not one from you, but maybe I didn't get the full information, but I certainly enquired. I recently checked with my other colleagues here, the Chairman of the Committee in particular, to whom one would think persons would make reference if they were interested in having their say, and I find that nobody spoke to him either. So that one might say, I think with a good deal of reason, that reasonable and fair steps were taken to make sure that people have a chance to be heard, that the people in question knew about it, and surely there is some onus on them to take the trouble to be present when it is before the Committee.

Now having said all that, I'm going to say this. I agree with those who think it is necessary to lean over backwards. I'm not opposed to withholding proceedings on this Bill until the people in question have been heard. But I do want to say that I think we must regard this as an extraordinary thing to do, but we wouldn't like it to be generally thought that we were willing to interrupt our regular and fair conduct of business for this sort of thing, because one could see how this matter could stretch out interminably and one could see how we could remove the very real onus on those who are interested to take the trouble to appear.

So I would agree with my honourable friend, the Member for Roblin who says it shouldn't be counted as a precedent. That doesn't mean that it can't be done and won't be done again, but let us hope that we don't do it any oftener than we have to. I think that reasonable and fair opportunity was given. However, I think that there should be probably agreement in the Committee that we would be willing to let the Bill rest right here where it is. We can then return to the Law Amendments Committee at some convenient time at our next ordinary meeting, hear the representations that are made. If anyone on the Committee thinks they are worthy of being supported in the form of an amendment to the Bill, it can be done in this Committee as well as anywhere else. And in that way I think we shall meet the wishes of my honourable friend. So with some hesitation, but in the interests of leaning over backwards, I would say - leave the Bill here, let's not consider it this afternoon; hear what the people have to say in Law Amendments. If we want to amend it, we can come back and do so.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Honourable the Premier for his attitude in this and also for the remarks of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. I wish to assure the Committee that I am not attempting to establish any precedent in this Committee itself. I can assure my honourable friend, the House Leader, that it would only be on very rare occasions that I would make this request, but one of the main reasons that I am making the request, Mr. Speaker, is because I think, in essence, and I think the Honourable the Premier would agree with me on this, that in effect, in dealing with the subject matter contained in this Bill, we are dealing with a matter of disposing of individuals' rightful money. And I think for that reason we should do this, and I am very, very glad of the co-operation that I received in this matter, and I wish to thank all members of the Committee for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ..... Bill No. 78, Secs. 1 and 2, was read and passed. Bill No. 84, Secs. 1 to 12, was read and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Committee rise and report and call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered certain Bills and desires to report as follows: Bills Nos. 39, 40, 55, 57, 78, 84 without amendments, and No. 59 remains in Committee, and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, that the report be received.

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

Bills Nos. 39, 40, 55, 57, 78, 84 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party and the proposed motion and amendment thereto, the Honourable Member for Lansdowne, and proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Selkirk, in amendment to the amendment thereto. Orders stand.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe I have the adjournment on the amendment to the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, that's right.

MR. PAULLEY: I just want to say a brief word or two in connection with the amendment to the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Selkirk. First of all, Sir, it appears to me that in this amendment to the amendment there's collusion or understanding between my honourable friends opposite and the Honourable Member for Selkirk. Well, I read Hansard just before coming into the House, Mr. Speaker, and I noted reference there that where the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities got together with my honourable friend from Selkirk as to the wording of -- were to get together, let's put it that way, after the wording of this amendment to the amendment that it would be sort of agreed upon.

MR. ROBLIN: ..... it isn't collusion.

MR. PAULLEY: Quite frequently, Mr. Speaker, quite frequently there's a collision between the two particular groups, but I think this time there's a little compatibility, or something of that nature, because of the fact that I think -- (Interjection) -- ..... as recorded in Hansard of July the 3rd, page 522, Mr. Carroll is recorded as saying - "Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I'm wondering if the third paragraph could be amended for clarification to read", and he even goes so far as to suggest the reading in the amendment to the amendment to read - "Whereas claim frequency per hundred insured vehicles has been decreasing in the Province of Manitoba, would that make for the clarification you're seeking here?" So I suggest that they must have got together sometime to figure out the clarification. And then further to that, to sort of I think substantiate my viewpoint on it, speaking the other day, on July the 14th, the Honourable Member for Hamiota who sits, of course, on the opposite side of the House, made a contribution to this debate, and I don't know whether or not he was speaking for my friends opposite or whether he was speaking as an individual. Sometimes, as we know, Mr. Speaker, individuals other than the front row get up and speak on behalf of the government, and they very and infrequently speak as individuals, but however, however, on this particular occasion that I'm referring to, the Honourable Member for Hamiota concluded his remarks by saying - "I favor the amendment to the amendment as made by the Honourable Member for Selkirk". So I think if I figured that there was a sort of collusion, to use the word again, that I'm not too far amiss.

However, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to oppose the amendment to the amendment because I

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . do not think that it is achieving the purpose in any way, shape or form of the intent of the main motion which dealt with the question of compulsory automobile insurance. I think, Sir, that if this amendment to the amendment, or the amendment itself were carried, that it would only add to the difficulties which we have in the Province of Manitoba at the present time. There is one portion of the original amendment with which I am in agreement, and very, very firm agreement with, and that is where reference was made to the commendation of the Motor Vehicle Branch and the activities and programs carried on under the directorship of Mr. R.B. Baillie. I think the government is most fortunate of having a man of his calibre at the head of this department, and also, Sir, that even though the amendment implies this government, meaning the present Conservative Government, they are only carrying on the policies which were enunciated and enacted by the former government, so I think in all fairness, had the commendation -- the commendation should have applied, and recognizing that this is only a continuance of the policies of the former government in this regard insofar as safety responsibility, etc. is concerned, and I would say without hesitation that in that field, both governments deserve credit in respect to the Motor Vehicle Branch -- (Interjection) -- Pardon . . . . . Oh well, yes, you and your group, Mr. Leader of the Opposition.

Now I say, Mr. Speaker, that this does not meet the purpose. In effect, all this amendment to the amendment is going to do is to make it more difficult for those who are not carrying automobile insurance to pay for accidents or to put up bond - financial bond. Now the Honourable Member for Selkirk the other day spoke when he was speaking, I believe, on the main motion, and I intend to deal with that at greater length later - mentioned the case of the people who would be forced into carrying insurance and not affording it. Now I say this, that under our Unsatisfied Judgment Fund or our financial responsibility laws for the Province of Manitoba, at the present time if anyone is involved in an accident, they must show financial proof at the present time of \$10,000.00, \$20,000.00 or \$1,000.00 in respect of an accident, and that in itself is creating financial difficulty to many people who have not, through negligence or otherwise, bothered to take out an automobile insurance policy.

And all that this is going to do, if we adopt the amendment, is to increase the limits under Section 140, but it's going to make it even more burdensome as far as those people are concerned. The Honourable Member for Hamiota, when he was speaking the other day, suggested that the limits should be increased - should be, and I'm quoting him - "I believe if these limits were doubled or possibly raised to \$25,000.00 and \$50,000.00, I believe it would be more in keeping and more liable to have reciprocal agreements maintained between our neighbouring provinces." Now that may be so and it may not be so, but I suggest that it would add a further burden on those who at the present time do not carry insurance, because I know of a considerable number of cases, where drivers who, unknowingly, have got behind the wheel of a motor vehicle which is not insured, had an accident, and they are deprived of their right to drive the vehicle and have had to establish financial responsibility of \$10,000.00 and have been unable to do so. How often and how common is a thing, with us among our friends to turn around and say - "Hop in my car and go down, to the store and get me a package of cigarettes". There's no question asked - "Are you insured" before we start -- our friend may start that journey. We may not be insured and if an accident involving an injury to an individual occurs, then not only has financial responsibility got to be shown by the owner of the car in respect of his plates, but it also has to be shown and put up by the driver who may be innocent of the fact of no insurance before he is permitted to drive a car. If these limits were simply raised, it would make it all the more prohibitive for them to get back in the good graces of the department.

And a further -- my honourable friend, the Member for Hamiota, the other day, and also the Honourable Member for Selkirk inferred -- although the Member for Hamiota was more specific -- suggested that the limits under our financial Unsatisfied Judgment Fund should be increased from the \$300,000.00 to \$500,000.00, and the amount of the fee payable in respect of our licenses from 50¢ to \$1.00 to cover this. Now I think, Sir, that that is an imposition on those people who are insuring their automobiles. We, when we take out our license plates, are requested to put an amount of money into a fund, and if we have insurance for which we are making payment, in addition to that, we're bonusing those who are not insured at the present time. My honourable friend from Hamiota is suggesting that that should be increased from 50¢ to \$1.00 to take care of the increase in the fund, and I suggest this is a wrong approach. I

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . suggest, and have suggested that the -- every motor vehicle should be insured. I suggest that we who are insured in our motor vehicles should not have an assessment made against us to go into a fund which in effect is only there for the purpose of carrying those who do not have automobile insurance or show financial responsibility on the road.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment to the amendment, or the amendment in any way, shape or form will overcome any of the difficulties which we have at the present time in these respects. Certainly it is adding -- adding to the amounts of money available, and I'm sure that my friends in the insurance business would be glad to see that, but I suggest definitely that that is not the proper approach, that the raising of the limits of the fund will achieve no other purpose and make available a greater sum of money in the event of an injury or a death, and the suggestion of my honourable friend from Hamiota of the increase of 50¢ to \$1.00, as the contribution of all operators of motor vehicles into the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund is only a further penalty on those people who do carry insurance. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to oppose both the amendment to the amendment and the amendment.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Ayes and Nays Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is the amendment to the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, which reads as follows: "That the amendment be amended (a) by striking out the first paragraph thereof and substituting therefor the following: 'Whereas the number of insured persons have been continuously increasing but the relative decrease in the number of claims made against and paid out of the Unsatisfied Judgment Claim Fund,' (b) by deleting the last paragraph of the amendment and substituting therefor the following: 'Further be it resolved that the government, after due study, give consideration to the advisability of increasing the maximum allowance payable out of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund and of increasing the minimum requirements under Section 140, subsection (4) of The Highway Traffic Act, provided that in the opinion of the government such increases are deemed advisable and in the interests of justice and humanity'."

A standing vote recorded and the results were as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Boulic, Campbell, Carroll, Christianson, Cobb, Cowan, Desjardins, Evans, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Hutton, Johnson (Assiniboia), Klym, Lissaman, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Prefontaine, Ridley, Roblin, Scarth, Seaborn, Shewman, Stanes, Strickland, Tanchak, Thompson, Weir, Willis, Witney.

NAYS: Gray, Harris, Hawryluk, Orlikow, Paulley, Reid, Schreyer, Wagner, Wright.

MR. SPEAKER: Yeas - 36, Nays - 9. I declare the motion carried. Question before the House is the proposed motion and amendment to the main motion of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne as amended.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the main motion -- resolution by the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party as amended.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if nobody else wishes to speak, I just would like to say a word or two in closing this debate. I might say, Sir, that at first I had thought of adjourning the debate and preparing a detailed rebuttal respecting all of the remarks that had been made in this -- what I think is a very important debate. However, I've decided not to do that, but to just make a general comment or two of the situation as I see it in respect to the whole field of financial responsibility, not only here in the Province of Manitoba, but in every jurisdiction across the country. I think it is a fact, Sir, that more and more we're beginning to find that the toll on our highways is increasing day by day, that the power of our motor vehicles is increasing and that while the accident frequency may be becoming less, as far as statistics are concerned, that the only reason for that reduction is not because people are driving any more carefully, is not because of the fact that there are not more accidents, but simply because of the fact that there are more motor vehicles on our highways.

There is an old saying that liars can figure, and figures can lie, and I think this illustrates that point conclusively. According to any record that I have been able to see, it is a fact that the net number of accidents are on the increase, and in respect of property damage

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd. ) . . . . I can understand that insofar as insurance companies are concerned, due to the higher price of vehicles, due to the higher price of repairs, that the net cost per claim is increasing but coupled up with all of that the objective between our -- in our original resolution, was more of concern insofar as human damage was concerned, than property damage. And while, Mr. Speaker, this resolution has been defeated by this House today in essence, by the amendment, I suggest that you, Sir, and most of the members in this Legislature, will be in the Province of Manitoba when some government, be it a CCF, Conservative, Liberal, Social Credit government or otherwise, will come to the conclusion that is the interest of the citizens of this province that before a license is issued, a permit granted for the driving of a motor vehicle on our highways, that not only it becomes necessary to have a license for that vehicle, that it will also have to be proven before that vehicle or that driver is permitted to drive on our highways, that financial responsibility in the form of automobile insurance will have to be a condition of the privilege of driving on our highways. And we of the CCF have no hesitation whatsoever in suggesting that when that day comes, assuredly as it will come, that the proper organization to handle that insurance is a governmental agency who is interested only in providing the service at cost to those who should and will have to carry it.

I want to thank the members of the House for the interest that they have taken in this resolution and assure them that the resolution, if not proposed by the government we have in the province at the present time, the resolution will be submitted for the consideration of the House again and again until everyone on our highways is carrying the responsibilities that they should have in respect of all of the people in the Province of Manitoba.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Pembina. Order stand? Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan and the proposed motion in amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for St. Vital. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. D. ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I would like the debate to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Rhineland. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead and the proposed motion and amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Roblin. The Honourable Member for Fisher.

MR. P. WAGNER (Fisher): Mr. Speaker, I kind of feel out of place rising to speak on this resolution because, why I feel out of place, this resolution has been adopted by most farmers in western Canada, by the three prairie provinces, and the facts and figures have been proven time and time again. And yet for some reason or other in the House, some of our farmer members do not agree that we should support this resolution as far as deficiency payments are concerned. So, Mr. Speaker, I will be trying to view my own views and I'll try to state facts and figures as close as possible as the Honourable Member for Roblin wants, and possibly while I'll be stating the facts and figures I could stand corrected, but I have no doubt in my mind that he too can stand corrected in his facts and figures.

So, Mr. Speaker, the bushel of wheat has lost its purchasing power. It now takes 170 bushels to purchase the equivalent of 100 bushels in 1947. Western farm costs have risen by more than 50% since 1947, while the farm price for wheat has declined by almost 21%. And I don't need to elaborate this - it has been said in the past and it will be said again. Never in history was our purchasing power of wheat so low except in the thirties depression years. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe the farmers are entitled to deficiency payments on their grain in order to bring them into closer relationship with the goods they have to sell and the goods they have to buy.

I believe it was argued here in this House last March that the prosperous farmers would be the ones to benefit from deficiency payments. As I pointed out in the March session, even the small farmer would have been further ahead with deficiency payments rather on acreage basis. And I wouldn't want to go into the details, Mr. Speaker, as I went last March. Some farmers do not sell grain, I agree. They feed it to the livestock and to poultry. Fine. Under the bushels

(Mr. Wagner, cont'd.) . . . basis they wouldn't qualify under deficiency payments. Well, let's bring the acreage payment to the average bushel payment and what could it be? For example, for easy figuring, 30 bushels to an acre at 20 cents a bushel of wheat, it's \$6.00. Fine - does the Honourable Member from Roblin agree to pay \$6.00 deficiency per acre? I would agree with him. But as far as the big farmers are going to get the most benefit, I have a clipping here from the weekly Free Press dated March 3rd, '57 and this is how it reads: "Farmers not so big as many believe. Most eastern Canadians think that all prairie farmers are big and rich. But the truth is that the great bulk of farmers in western Canada are small farmers. In the Commons last week, Agriculture Minister, Douglas Harkness said that of 250,854 grain delivery permit holders, about 145,500 have lived on 300 acres of cultivated land. Mr. Harkness said, '51,299 permit holders have lived on 100 acres of cultivated land, 63,262 have between 100 and 200 and 51,762 have between 200 and 300. There were only two farms with 7,000 to 7,999 acres.'" So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, there is not so many big farmers that some like to say. In my own opinion, if the Agricultural Department or a segment of one economy is down such an important economy as agriculture, the other fields will follow it. And I quote from a newspaper - naturally the Honourable Member for Roblin will say that West Socialist Leader, if he wishes to use that phrase - January 14th, '59 the Free Press, "Grain farm income dropped for jobless." Regina, Saskatchewan Wheat Pool President, J.H. Weston - incidentally this gentleman is the Chairman of the three western pools and possibly he represents the Honourable Member from Roblin and me on the Inter-provincial Wheat Pool (Interjection) Mr. Speaker, when I will sit down we could resolve the House into Committee as a Whole and have a real good debate. As I was saying that Mr. Weston was the Inter-provincial Wheat Pool chairman of the three prairie provinces. Tuesday he had said that the farm income during the last four years is the chief cause of Canada's unemployment. Addressing the Regina District Association of Rural Municipalities, Mr. Weston said, "Western farmers have been deprived of one billion five hundred million since 1954 because of the cost-price squeeze". If the farmers had this money they would have bought manufactured products and men would be at work producing them. Mr. Weston said he hoped the forthcoming march on Ottawa will resotre the farmers economic position. Deficiency payments, he contended would, benefit the east, would send western farmers back to more grain growing instead of competing with Quebec and Ontario in raising livestock. Without deficiency payments there would be a surplus of livestock and a shortage of grain. Now I have a more recent farm organization - Manitoba Federation of Agriculture of July 1st, support given to deficiency payments - the Manitoba Federation of Agriculture annual convention gave a mandate to their provincial board in support of the principle of deficiency payments. I'm not going to go into detail but I want to quote this one paragraph, "A number of delegates, strictly livestock producers, supported deficiency payments stating that unless the grain producers who are in the worst position today, got some assistance they would be forced into livestock production." Mr. Speaker, that would show that we would be in a surplus production in livestock as well. Take for example, other countries how they carry on with their payments to the farmers of wheat. I have here before me and no doubt every member received this pamphlet - it's United States dollars per bushel. It comes from source, World Wheat Statistics, 1957, International Wheat Council. Australia pays \$1.53 per bushel; United Kingdom, \$1.83; United States \$2.01; Austria, \$2.50; Sweden, \$2.21; Belgium, \$2.50; Japan \$2.64; Germany \$2.70; Italy, \$2.94; Spain, \$2.94; France, \$3.06; Switzerland, \$3.65; Canada, \$1.66; and in Manitoba \$1.16. A drop of 50 cents since 1948. I have a notation from the Western Producers here and I think it would be well remembered. It says like this, January 23, '57, Western Producer; "Canadian Government Please Note. The farmers of Finland may soon be getting more money for their wheat and rye. The Finnish Farm Product Price Committee has recommended that the producer support price for wheat be increased from the present equivalent of \$3.83 a bushel to \$4.17 per bushel. For rye, the recommended boost is from \$3.57 a bushel to \$3.89 - International Federation of Agriculture Producers' News." And under that they have a little reminder and it reads as follows, "Out of the world's 900 million children, two-thirds - or 600 million - lack adequate food, clothing, shelter and protection against disease. All they can look forward to is a short life burdened by privation and debilitating ills." - International Union for Child Welfare.

Now some figures from 1956 Census of Canada - numbers of farms in Saskatchewan - and



(Mr. Wagner, cont'd.) . . . I have them grouped by acreage, 26,496 farms in Saskatchewan where the farms are from 240 acres to 399 acres in size; there is 19,996 farms from 400 acres to 599 acres; 16,553 farms from 560 to 759, and so on. Out of a total of 103,391 farms, there is 87,147 farms under cultivation. Now in Manitoba, there's 14,755 farms from 240 acres to 399 acres; 7,860 from 400 to 559 acres, and so on. Out of a total of 49,201 farms, 31,332 farms cultivated acreage. Now the average Manitoba farmer would get under this deficiency payment \$1,295.21 which the Honourable Member from Roblin quoted. The Saskatchewan farmer would get \$2,207.70. This is less than twice the amount of farms that are eligible for deficiency payment, while there are nearly three times as many in Saskatchewan that would qualify for a major portion of the deficiency payment. There are a lot more farms. Taking into consideration that \$1,500.00 maximum in Manitoba in proportion to the number of farms in Manitoba would be in a much more favourable position than Saskatchewan.

The principle of deficiency payment was first discussed in the MFU - Manitoba Farmers' Union in 1954. In 1955 the Union asked the Government of Canada to provide an equalization payment of wheat. In July 1956 the principle of deficiency payments was adopted at the Farm Union Inter-provincial Board Conference in Saskatoon and approved by the MFU Annual Convention in December. At this time also the issue of deficiency payments was discussed in the Saskatchewan Pool and embodied in the resolution at their convention November 1956, and in Manitoba Pool in 1957. The mass delegation did not represent any organization or political party when they went to Ottawa. That was a mass delegation. The proposed amendment is no better than the telegram which was sent by the Manitoba Conservatives when the farm delegation went to Ottawa. It was proposed to support a delegation but in fact, it did no such thing. This amendment is just as ambiguous - it's almost completely useless.

Now the honourable member asked me whether in my own constituency the farmers would have preferred deficiency payments or acreage basis. May I inform the Honourable Member for Roblin right now that they would have appreciated the deficiency payments than the acreage payments because as I have said before and I'll say it now, that the deficiency payments were not paid, we know that. The acreage payments were paid only on the permit holder. And then through a lot of red tape the farmers had to argue left and right and today I know of some farmers in my area that they did not get paid under the acreage payments because they did not hold a permit book. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, there's very few farmers that farm less than 50 acres of land - for easy figuring - 50 acres, 30 bushels 1,500. The farmer sells a thousand bushels - leave the 22 cents, leave the 20, put 20, 20 time 1,000 that's \$200.00 on deficiency payments. This way, the farmer would have received on the acreage payment, \$50.00.

The Honourable Member for Roblin stated that the CCF is 'making political hay of the Ottawa March and that is a shame'. Is it? I ask, Mr. Speaker, in this House, is it a shame for any political party to support the farmers which is rightly theirs - belongs to the farmer - and if it is such a shame, why did the party - the Conservative Party - send a "wishy'washy" telegram to Ottawa. The Liberal group supported the deficiency payments - the march to Ottawa. (Interjection) In other words, in other words, as the Honourable Member for Roblin said, he too wanted to make some political 'hay' because it was just before the election. He also states that we follow the Saskatchewan leader, but did not all the ten farm organizations follow the leader or the leaders which they elected themselves? If the farmers had followed the Saskatchewan leader as the honourable member indicates he today wouldn't be sitting where he is now because a CCF Member would have occupied his seat. (Interjection) I sincerely believe - and this, Mr. Speaker, is to stress the point that not all the farmers were CCFers that were going to Ottawa - it's just fooling itself. They went for a good cause because if they were all Socialists, this Government wouldn't be sitting here today. I sincerely believe if the farmers had suspected the reaction of the Federal and Provincial Governments, I have very great doubt if this government would be in power today. (Interjection - laughter) And here we have - and here we have - and here we have in our Provincial House farm rural members representing the rural areas and yet they come openly in opposition for the deficiency payments or such like, that they would make the farmers out of proportion distract or distort; in other words, confuse the farmer that deficiency payment is no good, acreage payment is better and yet they don't tell us whether we are going to get even the acreage payment. The farm organization has been questioned whether they presented the facts and figures by our own provincial

(Mr. Wagner, cont'd.) . . . . members in this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is where I feel out of place. The farmers from Alberta, the farmers from Saskatchewan, Manitoba, went to Ottawa to present their case - even the Prime Minister himself does not openly criticize that they presented the false facts, and figures as the Honourable Member from Roblin says that, our group, the CCF group is presenting false facts and figures. I just wonder, Mr. Speaker, how those farmers in the honourable member's constituency feel when they read the newspaper and listen to the radio that their own farm member from Roblin, and I mentioned Rockwood the other day, he mentioned that he was entrusted with their faith that he is going to try and bring them back legislation to the farmers as humanly possible - today he gets up and he speaks that they do not qualify for it. For he's bringing in an amendment which will mean nothing. Mr. Speaker, the fight has to go on. And this amendment to our resolution - is this amendment for 'charity or parity'. As the Prime Minister when in opposition stated, "Farmers need parity not charity". The law had been made before he was the Prime Minister. All right, does the honourable member really believe he can give assistance to farmers with his amendment, and to what amount? I would appreciate, personally to hear the honourable member say, well the farmers are going to get this or they are entitled to this amount and this is what we are going to strive for. Do we have assurance from the honourable member that this amendment is going to bring assistance to farmers equal to the deficiency payments as requested by the farm organization? And I don't care how he pays, but as long as he brings equality. Or is it possibly a false amendment? Generally it has been said that the Conservative Party will bring the farmers out of chaos. A lot of people prepared themselves and I've heard it myself, the "vision" that the Conservatives saw, and what a "vision" sure it is. Surely this amendment is no vision. Possibly a further study with sympathetic consideration could be made of this situation.

I have no intention, Mr. Speaker, to say that this government or Federal Government did not bring in some good farm legislation, but I have great reservation in Legislation. . . And it reminds me of a story I was told when I was a lad. It happened in the Old Country, in the old Ukraine. When the judge sentenced a man who created a murder - sentence period a month from the sentence period this man would be privileged whatever his heart desired. He can ask for good food, good clothes, go out and see the country; whatever he wishes, it was granted to him. Of course, the two guards would be following him. He was granted everything under the sun which he wished for but only his life because it had to end within a month's time. Now, it happens the same thing for our farmers here. We are granted good farm Legislation, that it will help the farmers. But the main source - the main pain - where it hurts the most, we don't get it. We just can't get over it. No, we can't get over it. And we sure have a lot of people defending the farmer. When the farmer is sitting doing nothing, doesn't holler, fine. But once the farmer gets up on his heels and he says, this should be done, the same friends seem to peter away from him.

I have here a little example, Mr. Speaker, when we were on the agricultural estimates, I asked the Honourable Minister of Agriculture if he could tell me why one of the respected farmers was turned down on the loan. That respected farmer's relation has informed me. The Honourable Member for Pembina - he got up and he said, you better get yourself the information. Never mind about depending on the relation's information. Now I wish to ask the Honourable Member for Pembina - here he quotes April 18th Free Press saying "Farmers happy", he says. How impressive! Maurice Ridley, of Manitou speaking at the Conservative meeting here said the opposition was disappointed with the results of the farmers march to Ottawa. "Everything went well", he says. And the farmers were pleased with the deliberation at Ottawa. I wonder from where did he get the information - from which group of farmers did he get this that they were so well satisfied that he stated that they were pleased with the deliberation at Ottawa.

MR. M.E. RIDLEY (Pembina): May I ask the honourable member a question? That is not a release, that's a report from the paper. All things that are said is not right in it.

MR. WAGNER: Fine. I have no argument. I just re-quote from the paper. (Interjection) Now I hate, Mr. Speaker, to say this because I don't know but I . . . . . to the Honourable Member for St. Matthews. He had this to say. Am I out of order, Mr. Speaker? (Interjection) Oh, no, it's all right. (Interjection) And in the same paper of April 18th, 1959, the Free Press

(Mr. Wagner, cont'd.) . . . released this, "Dr. Martin said that for ten years, Douglas Campbell, as Premier of Manitoba did little or nothing for Manitoba. The Roblin Government will see that the farmer is not a forgotten man".

SOME OF THE MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. WAGNER: And it brings to my attention, Mr. Speaker, that here we are - that that group - that that Roblin Government can prove itself that the farmer is not the forgotten man by supporting this resolution, sending it to Ottawa, then it would be a real cause. But what happens? Comes out amendment which will actually peter out and the resolution is not going to get to Ottawa. Now just one more quotation, Mr. Speaker, and I will sit down. Possibly to some members it will be of interest - how much the farmer gets out of a loaf of bread. This is from the Western Producer - January 22nd, '59 "As bigger slice of loaves for farmers". Now, I'll have a drink of water because bread is thirsty. Saskatchewan - it does not come from Mr. Weston either. The annual report of the record of the Federated Co-Operatives Limited says, "Those who manufacture bread make more money from it than the farmer who grows the basic ingredients". The report given at the meeting here, Tuesday, calls for some form of deficiency payments to help farmers caught in the cost-price squeeze." It also says, "Surplus grain that is tying up terminal storage facilities must be disposed of. One bushel of wheat makes 48 loaves of bread, selling at an average of 19-1/2 cents." The report contended only 2-1/2 cents went to the farmer for his grain. If these facts were more generally known, there would be less reluctance on the part of the government to the suggestion of a higher price for domestic wheat than for wheat for the export market. All the westerners have traditionally been opposed to tariff and subsidies, the report said. Present conditions force a more realistic approach, tariff and subsidies were established practice with most governments. Farmers have paid a high price for government assistance to industry, it was time the consumer realized that agriculture needs help.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion as I said before that the Roblin Government and Diefenbaker's vision would be, a farmer not forgotten man. Before I sit down, I take it in the usual manner - leave it to John and Duff.

MR. M. A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, under the matter in question now, I should like to clear myself from an alleged accusation made against me by the Honourable Member for Roblin, who said that I don't know anything about farming . . . .

MR. ALEXANDER: It was the Honourable Member for Brokenhead who said that.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the honourable member if I did say that?

MR. GRAY: In the first place the statement I wish to correct is this, when I mentioned about farmers going to Honolulu, I think I made it very clear, and I had in mind the grain manufacturers and not the grain growers, and I'm not going to take the trouble again to explain the difference. I consider a farmer who lives on the farm, raises his crop, he's got cattle, he's a resident on the farm. I do not consider anybody coming into Manitoba or anywhere else and buy up large acreage of grain, stays on the farm for two or three months and then goes away and that's all there is to it, that's all the benefit we have from him. I like to point out also to the Honourable Member for Roblin that you don't have to be an experienced farmer in order to realize the importance of a settler. You don't have to know how to raise hogs, and I admit I don't know, but at the same time in all my years in here, I have not only defended but I think have done as much for the farmers in the province, whose whole livelihood is farming, as much as any farmer in the House in the last 18 years. I would also ask the honourable member to point out to him that there are very few non-parlour farmers in this House. Very few. Still they take part in the discussion, they're entitled to it; it's their privilege and it is their duty. We discuss health matters; we are not doctors. We discuss socialism; we're only musicians. . . (Interjection). We discuss all other different subjects. I think it is my duty as a member of this House to take part in the discussions. If I'm wrong, I'll stand corrected. I've never abused anybody in my life. I've never accused anybody of misstatement. I never challenge anyone if he does know what he's talking about it. I think all of us in our own limited ways have separate responsibilities and have a certain amount of knowledge and a certain amount of brains to take care of our duties. I have in my 36 years experience in public life, as an elected representative always taken part and if any of the so-called "underdog", the one that carries on under great hardship, the one that's in need, I've never defended anyone else. And I do

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) . . . . know the hardship of the farmer, I do know that a small percentage of his labour which he enjoys as mentioned by the last speaker, the 2-1/2 cents he gets from a loaf of bread which is sold at 20 cents. So I feel quite hurt, I admit, that anyone should challenge my sincerity, my honesty, my purpose. They could quite freely say that I am not qualified to have all the knowledge, but instead to tell us - to try to tell me that I am one that does harm to the farmers, that I don't know anything about it, I think is hitting below the belt and at my age it hurts.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ORLIKOW: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Brandon.

.....Continued on next page.

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Speaker, upon first glance this resolution would appear to merit the study and the unreserved support of all members of this House. However, upon further consideration and thinking of my experience in connection with speakers in this Legislature and a study of the office of speakership in the Mother of Parliaments, the House of Commons in England, I have come to the conclusion that the result was proposed in the name for the purpose of making political hay. Now, no one can dispute the immense popular appeal on the surface of a resolution such as this. When we think of the hurly burly of the election platform and the rather sensational type of reporting we get in the newspapers considering the arguments between political parties, it is rather understandable to realize that the average person probably realizes with what little decorum the affairs of this House are conducted. Now, certainly no one would suggest that any speakers of this House have been partisan or that they have not been unbiased. Now, unfortunately to the uninformed a resolution such as this could leave that very impression in a person's mind. It asks that certain things be done to insure the complete independence of Mr. Speaker. Now, I suggest to the House that when we ask that this be done to insure the complete independence, it suggests that the speaker is presently not independent, and that he may be biased in his decisions. Now, members of this House know that the debates here are conducted with a rather strict adherence to the rules of the House and with proper respect for the rights of the individual. Now, it is the duty of the speaker to see that members abide by the rules of this House; it's his duty to interpret the rules of this House to us; but I believe all will agree that the main duty of the speaker is to assure that the individual and minority groups of the House have always protected for them their very basic right to expression of their sentiments. Now, Sir, no honourable member could seriously propose that any speaker of this Legislature has ever deliberately restricted the rights of an individual or minority group of this House. In my experience here there may have been one or two unfortunate decisions rendered by the Chair. But since the speaker must always be a mortal man, I would suggest that there's no guarantee that such errors would not occur regardless of how the speaker were chosen. But I think we have a very great guarantee that the speaker shall always be as impartial as a human being can be, and as unbiased as any man can be. And that is when you look back at the hundreds of years of tradition that lie behind this office. Stories of impartiality on behalf of the speaker even at the risk of incurring the anger of the crown in the early days. And as honourable members know, that is the background of the little struggle that goes on of a member appearing to be reluctant to take the office when he's dragged out of his chair to take the -- out of his seat to take the Chair. Now, I would suggest that no individual with any imagination or pride could flout the traditions of this office. The long record of the speakership, too, is filled with examples of men who have arisen to the challenge and put aside party and personal bias and have honoured this office with impartial conduct.

Now, let us see what type of man this office should demand. 'Parliament' by Jennings and Encyclopedia of Parliaments by Wilding and Londe, and I will quote from the latter first, -- has this to say: "Much has been written of the personal qualities required for the speakership. But perhaps they are best summarized in a newspaper article quote by Viscount Ullswater who himself occupied the Chair of the House of Commons as speaker, and he says: "The office of speaker does not demand rare qualities. It demands common qualities in rare degree." And Jennings has this to say: "British experience shows that it is by no means impossible for a fairminded man deliberately to cast away his political bias and to attain a state of mind which is almost, if not quite, impartial." Then it goes on to say that he is normally chosen in the first instance, from among the government majority. Now, Sir, the other day the Leader of the Opposition made passing reference to the fact that the speaker was not in the Chair during this debate. I would like to hazard the guess from a personal knowledge and out of respect of a friendship which I value very much with the present incumbent of the office, that I believe his absence here is solely in the interests of permitting wider and freer discussion of all members of this House concerning this debate. And I think it says much for his attitude to his office in trying to further and permit freer expression. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to digress slightly from the office itself and touch on something which I believe directly relates to the speakership, and that is the conduct of the House. Now, you all realize that Rule 27 permits the adjournment of the House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance. I would like to suggest to this House that recent occurrences have placed the office of speakership in this House, in rather a ridiculous position.

(Mr. Lissaman, cont'd.) . . . Now, I know that this precedent really started to grow out of the minority government session, and in the first case I believe if the word 'pertinent' had been coupled with the word 'urgent', we would not have become absorbed in this debate of Newfoundland and Premier Smallwood. But since then, and because in large parts of the Oppositions' protestations and urgings that precedence or custom in this House must also be considered along with the rules, it has aborted the real meaning of Rule 27 in my opinion. You've placed the speaker in my opinion, in a position where he must always allow such debate now upon almost any topic. Now, I would suggest that the cure may be, and this is what makes it so ridiculous in my opinion, that the House may have to challenge one of such speaker's rulings in order to wipe out this custom or precedent acceptance to get back to the meanings of the main rule. And I suggest that behaviour of the House should not at any time place the office of speakership in this House in a position of ridicule. I think that may be what we have done.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to interrupt the honourable member, but would he permit a question?

MR. LISSAMAN: Certainly.

MR. CAMPBELL: Is the honourable member suggesting that the practice in this House was formerly different to the one that obtained in the case of the Newfoundland debate that he mentioned?

MR. LISSAMAN: Well, I think that due to the fact that the government did not have a majority and could not back up the ruling of the speaker, led to this sort of thing. Certainly custom has been at times, as you say, but I think it has been grossly abused since that time.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question from me apropos of the remarks that he's making. Is he suggesting by his remarks that in reference to the moving of the adjournment respecting the debate on Newfoundland that had Mr. Speaker suggested that the debate was in order, that the government would have directed him by voting against him that such was not the case?

MR. LISSAMAN: Oh, no, no, no, it is certainly in the government, and I'm going to come to this point eventually, it's certainly in the interests of any government that the speaker himself be completely unbiased and impartial. And it's also in the interest of the government that the speaker's ruling be upheld. It's in the interest of all members. I'm particularly suggesting here that co-operation of all the members is necessary to maintain the respect due to the office of speakership.

Now Sir, I must state that there certainly is no basis for the implication that the office of speaker in this legislature is not conducted in an impartial manner. Now, I suppose the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would suggest that the main point of his argument lies in his reference to a non-partisan approach to ensure complete independence. Now, this again on the surface looks pretty good. But I would suggest to you that it can only be good in case of complete agreement always, and there never -- not always can be complete agreement. And when there's disagreement, then someone must take the responsibility of selecting -- nominating a speaker, of nominating I mean to say. And that responsibility must devolve upon the government. The government must nominate that speaker. Now, as I suggested before this doesn't mean that a speaker would be chosen who would have governmental bias. It would certainly be in the best interests of the government to have an unbiased speaker. Common sense, if nothing else dictates this. The government with its majority authority is assured of the progress of its legislation, come willy nilly. But from the reaction that could come upon a government who had proposed a biased speaker, the results would be disastrous. So it is no less of value and importance to the government that we have an unbiased speaker than to all members of the House, I propose. Now, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition assumes that we'll always have that unanimous agreement, and as I pointed out, it's likely to be a pipe dream because in the end result, the speaker will be chosen both here as he is in London, England, from the government ranks, and I must remind the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that even in that minority government legislature, the twenty-fifth, the speaker was chosen by majority of this House. The government did not have a majority to enforce its will upon the House. He was the majority choice of this Legislature. Now, when we turn to look at the facts, I'd like to quote a Tribune editorial of June 12th, 1959, in which they say when they make reference to the same thing I refer to this unanimous agreement, "All these are myths, in one of the last five general elections -- in only one of that last five

(Mr. Lissaman, cont'd.) . . . . general elections has the speaker been re-elected by acclamation. When a speaker dies in office or retires, his successor is always a government back bencher. The British parties try to agree on the naming of the speaker, but when they fail, as they have several times, the battle is carried to the floor of the Commons." Now then, the Leader of the Opposition made reference to some sort of fictitious constituency, and this same editorial points out that the British parliament several years ago considered and rejected the idea advanced by Mr. Campbell, that the speaker should represent some kind of a special constituency. Political scientists are wary of this scheme. If the speaker does not represent an ordinary constituency, he stands in the danger of becoming a glorified civil servant. At the worst, the speakership could turn into a political plum with which the government could award its friends. But I think that's not a completely ridiculous comment. I think we know how things tend to grow in that light.

During my reading of the history of the speakership, I ran across one rather amusing incident. All members are familiar with the old comment of "catching the speaker's eye" when you are expecting to arise in your place during a debate. At one time it was apparently the custom that the speaker did not call the member whose turn it was to speak by his constituency, but simply looked at him or nodded; and at one time they had a speaker who was squint eyed and when he looked at a member, another member thought that he was also getting the eye. So since that date the speaker has always called the member by his constituency. Now, I suppose that might be an example of the impartiality to the point of confusion, but there can be no misunderstanding or underrating the great wealth of the tradition which has grown and is growing around the office of the speaker for more than 600 years. And probably nothing else underlines or points out the great responsibility which is placed upon the speaker's shoulders. Now, the proposer of this resolution, in my opinion, had a wonderful opportunity to make a real contribution to this tradition. I would suggest to him that if following that minority government at the next election, he had proposed that the speaker would be unopposed in the general election that followed, he would have really played a part in furthering and greater -- and further honouring the office of the Chair in this House, far more than a resolution of this type would ever do. The honourable member failed to grasp the opportunity, and it would have, at that time removed the speaker from the rough and tumble of party debate and bias during the election; and it would have placed the individual in the office on a higher plane in the minds of all in Manitoba. But it wasn't done. For this and other various reasons, Sir, that I have given, I cannot support the resolution as it is here. So, I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the motion be amended be deleting all the words after 'government' in line 10, and substituting therefore the following: "therefore be it resolved that this House record its opinion that the practices and precedents of the Mother of Parliaments at Westminster offer our best guide in confirming the speakership as a non-partisan and independent office, and that those practices and precedents receive the support of this House."

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution. The Honourable Member for Inkster. Whereas the deaf, blind and handicapped children of this province must, at present, attend special schools outside this province, and whereas this is very undesirable in that these children living in a dark and silent world, who need their parents most, are taken away beyond visiting distance for months at a time, and whereas the government of the province (prior to 1945) did, in effect, promise parents of these children that such a school would be provided once more with the return of peace. Therefore be it resolved that in the opinion of this House, the government should give consideration to the advisability of re-opening a school for the purpose of providing specialized education for these handicapped children.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, before they move the resolution, I would like permission to ask to take out two words from the resolution. One is in the first line the word 'blind' which has nothing to do with this resolution, and on the second section on the second line 'dark or.' My . . .

MR. SPEAKER: . . . . acceptable . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, it could be done another way, but this is quite acceptable.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move seconded by the Honourable Member for

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) . . . Brokenhead that the resolution you have just read - may I please see it, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Inkster seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead and I take it . . . (Interjection) . . . that's right . . .

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief and perhaps have something more to say when I close the debate.

The Province of Manitoba, prior to the war, maintained a School for the Deaf at the location presently used by the Normal School. After the war, I understand the building was required by the Army - during the war, and is now occupied by Teacher-Students.

I am not a child psychologist but I do appreciate the tragedy involved for parents with a child who is handicapped in one way or another. I believe that for emotional reasons such a child should be close to home to receive parental attention and comfort that he or she needs so much. I do believe the children, irrespective of being handicapped, are mentally normal but over-conscious of their inability to hear or speak, and thus they acquire an inferiority complex. The only comfort they get is being close to their parents and their brothers and sisters who are able to, and do, encourage them in every way possible.

There is no question about the training they get at the present time in the school for the deaf in Saskatoon, but I feel that more than one-half of the population in this province live in the urban district. The province should establish a school for the deaf in Winnipeg whereby the children from the urban district will be closer to Winnipeg than Saskatoon. This request has been made to the legislature for many years but for reasons best known to those who have opposed it such a school has not been re-established, although it was promised as soon as the war was over.

May I state once more that this request is made solely -- if I may use the term -- on humanitarian grounds -- and I hope no honourable member in this House will claim that he is not as humanitarian as we are. I am not dealing with it in a psychological or professional way at all. Perhaps those who are blessed by not having such problems cannot understand what heartbreak is going on in the hearts of these parents and their children, and I happen to know personally some of them.

Expense should pose no problem as I believe it would be more economical to establish a school for the deaf here in Winnipeg which would be more beneficial and offer greater possibilities for rehabilitation. In the Annual Report of the Department of Education for the year ending June 30th, 1938, on Page 99, there is a sentence spoken by the Deputy Minister of Education, Dr. R. Fletcher, which reads:

"Parents are hesitant about sending their children away from home." I have, Mr. Speaker, on my desk a number of books which I obtained in the library. I have no intention at this late hour to read at least some sections but I have tried to summarize as good as I am able to do some of the opinions expressed. These books are written by specialists of child training, particularly for the child who cannot hear or speak, by as I understand, writers who know well about the problem. The summary is as follows: Handicapped children are entitled to an education which meets their demands. In all circumstances the residential school with special facilities is preferable. Wherever possible children, who have hearing impairment should be educated in their own community. And it gives thereasons why, but I'm not going to take up the time of the House now to read it. Group participation with classmates in community and school activities gives them the best preparation for their future role as responsible citizens. The companionship of other children must be sought for an only deaf child.

Now, I maintain that some of the children who do not come in this category, normal children, usually do not or are not willing to play with another child. As a matter of fact, they may be very uncomfortable in the playgrounds or in play at home. And the only friends they can get, I say again, is either their close relatives, their parents and their brothers and sisters. A large part of a sense of security in a handicapped child comes from knowing he is loved by his parents and family. The parent can make the handicapped child feel wanted and at ease in his world. A capable parent treats the child's handicap rather than the handicapped child. The warm values of living close to home plus the sense of love and security which contact with one's parents brings provide the ideal basis and background for daily instruction in the classroom. The parents efforts to supplement the work of the speech teacher is vital. That is some of the



(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) . . . . opinions expressed by great men who are fully equipped to express an opinion in this particular case.

So, Mr. Speaker, the child who is deaf and may have average or show intelligence must have the warm attention of a mother as no one else can give it to them. For this reason we are submitting this resolution and as I stated that this is not the first time, we have done it before - and we do hope that the present government who has not yet an opportunity to deal with this problem, or we did not bring to their attention, will give favourable consideration to this project. They are entitled to, they have been promised to have this school back - there is not additional expense, as a matter of fact, it may be a saving. And speaking as a layman, a father, one who meets the situation almost daily, I respectfully ask favourable consideration.

MR. CAMPBELL: Will the honourable member permit a question?

MR. SPEAKER: Was the honourable member asking a question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the honourable gentleman a question arising out of his address rather than the resolution itself. He has stated a couple of times that the parents were promised that they would get the school back here after 1945. Would the honourable member tell us what form that promise took?

MR. GRAY: I was informed by parents at that time, who opposed the moving of their children from here to Saskatoon, that this would only be temporary. If the Honourable Leader of the Opposition wishes to have complete evidence I shall try and get it.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre that the debate be adjourned.

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

Mr. Hillhouse presented Bill No. 79 for second reading.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, this House must pass this Bill within ten minutes, otherwise it goes to the dogs. I understand that the Committee on private Bills is sitting on Tuesday and this Bill must be passed before 5.30 if it wishes to reach that Committee. So to that extent I throw myself on the mercy of the House.

I am not an expert on greyhound racing, as a matter of fact, I have never seen a greyhound race. If a greyhound walked into this chamber right now, if it had spots on it, I might think it was a Dalmatian but for the information of the honourable members of this House if they wish to obtain very authoritative information on greyhound racing in all its aspects, I would refer them to Wee Geordie Barton up in the press gallery whose quite an authority on dogs.

Now this Bill, I'm going to be perfectly frank with you, this Bill is being introduced into this House so as to enable the Red River Greyhound Racing Association, if the Bill is passed to have greyhound racing in Manitoba. But before they can have greyhound racing in Manitoba, using pari-mutuels, they must obtain an amendment to the criminal code. The present section of the Criminal Code dealing with pari-mutuels goes not include greyhound racing. Now, I am asking the members to support this Bill on the grounds that the Red River Exhibition Association merits that support and to allow that association to maintain the progressive trend and to add further revenue to its coffers for that purpose. Now the Red River Exhibition Association was created and maintained and is still being maintained as a community enterprise. It was first started by the Winnipeg Kinsmen Club and is now being continued by the Kinsmen, the Lions, the Optimists, the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce and a number of public minded citizens. Now in 1953, they gave their first exhibition in Winnipeg and that exhibition was so successful that the Winnipeg Kinsmens' Club was able to endow them with \$10,200. The present association is incorporated under Part 5 of the Companies Act and in 1957 it was recognized by the Government of Manitoba as an agricultural society. It has a board of directors of thirty men all responsible Winnipeg citizens and its principal aims and objectives are to establish a permanent exhibition in Winnipeg, to own their own grounds and buildings. And by establishing a permanent exhibition in Winnipeg, they will be able to allow Manitoba agriculture and industry adequate facilities for displaying and exhibiting their products and their goods. Now, the present Red River Exhibition Association has taken a very active interest in 4-H Club work and by having an exhibition in the City of Winnipeg they would have a place where the 4-H Club members could exhibit to the largest portion of the population of Manitoba the work which they are doing and to that extent they would encourage the work of that club. Now as I stated at the beginning, I don't know anything about greyhound racing. I don't know what's involved in it but I do say that the Red River Exhibition

(Mr. Hillhouse, cont'd.) . . . Association through its past efforts and what it has done in Manitoba is entitled to the commendation of this House and is entitled to be provided with the means of raising further revenues for the objects and aims that I have just cited.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, I join with the Honourable Member for Selkirk in his admiration of the Red River Exhibition and the work which they are doing. I have no desire to harm the work which they are doing but what is being proposed here today is something entirely different. What is being proposed here today is another means of permitting the citizens of this province to bet and to lose money. Now I am not one who believes in . . . . . laws, at the same time there can hardly be a member in this Legislature who has not heard and seen of many cases of people who can ill-afford to lose money, who have while the horse races are here lost the money which should have gone for rent, which should have gone for groceries, at the horse races. Now it's true that we can't stop them from betting if they want to bet, but I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there are very few people in this city who find the means, or who have the desire to bet on the horse races when the horse racing is not here in the City of Winnipeg. I . . .

MR. HILLHOUSE: If you are opposed to people losing money, why did you sell raffle tickets during your own election? . . . .

MR. ORLIKOW: I didn't sell anything in my election. Mr. Speaker, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that 42 days of racing is sufficient for this city. If we need to go back on the greyhound races, then I submit we ought to reduce the number of days of racing for the horses. And I for one will not vote for this.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to answer the member for Selkirk's question?

MR. SPEAKER: In a speech, if you speak.

MR. W. B. SCARTH, Q. C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the honourable proposer of the Bill one question? Is there anything in this Bill which could not have been provided in letters patent issued by the Provincial Secretary?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, this will close the debate, I take it.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, I am just rising to a point of order. If my honourable friend does answer this question at this juncture, he does close the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: That is quite correct.

MR. E. GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the member from St. John's. Nobody is compelled to bet on the dog races; nobody is compelled to bet on the horse races. The Red River Exhibition has a carnival atmosphere and betting on dogs is no worse than the many rackets they run there. People take their . . . . . Mr. Speaker — they know what I refer to . . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order!

MR. GUTTORMSON: The Royal American Shows have many games there. They travel all over the country. They attend all the fairs of the west. The honourable members know very well what I am referring to and I don't think it is any worse to bet on the dogs than to play the different bingo games they have there or watch a mouse run into a certain hole and see what colour the hole is going to be. It is no worse to bet on dogs than these other various games they have there. And I certainly think we should pass this Bill.

MR. D. STANES (St. James): I'm in the same position as the sponsor of this Bill in that I know very little about greyhound racing and therefore I look forward to receiving some information about this and what they intend to do with this permission at the Committee stage.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HILLHOUSE: In answering the Honourable Member for River Heights question.

MR. ROBLIN: You are closing the debate. You finally rise again. I think some other members wish to speak, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: It looks like it.

MR. J. A. CHRISTIANSON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to speak to say that I am opposed in principle to any extension in legalized gambling which this appears to me to be and just because we have certain rackets and gyp joints going on at these exhibitions doesn't mean that we all necessarily condone them. I for one do not and I think that we are not taking a step forward in our cultural history, and our cultural development, in our social development by permitting the extension of legalized gambling in every which way. I agree that we have some now and I don't think that just because we have some that we should permit more. I think that is a very poor argument indeed. I am against this Bill as I said in principle as I will always oppose any extension in legalized gambling.

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30 and I leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.