

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, April 10, 1968

Opening prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of the Psychiatric Nurses' Association of Manitoba praying for the Passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Psychiatric Nurses' Association of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery where we have 30 students of Grade 6 standing of the St. Avilla School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Sisson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Attorney-General. We also have with us today 12 of the Kelvin Public Speaking and Debating Club. These students are under the direction of Miss Suderman. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. We also have along today 100 students of Grade 11 standing, from the Grant Park School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Sigurdson. This school is located in the constituency of the Minister of Industry and Commerce. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General, the House Leader. Is the new University Act going to be introduced in this Session?

HON. STERLING R. LYON Q. C. (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, that would be within the province I would think of the Minister of Education. I daresay that if it were to be introduced notice would be given of it in due course.

MR. DOERN: A supplementary -- or maybe I'll direct it to the Minister then. Is the Minister going to introduce the New University Act during this Session?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): It's under consideration at the moment.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct this question to the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs. Is the Minister taking any position on the request of the Indian and Metis people with respect to housing and whether or not they will be eligible for loans to establish adequate housing facilities.

MRS. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): Mr. Speaker, I received the request in the mail today and we will be giving it consideration. I will take your question as notice as to what we might have for an answer to it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. Is the Attorney-General aware of the public sale on the streets of Winnipeg of a magazine called "The Loving Couch Press? Does his department consider it a lawful publication and is his department doing anything about it?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question number one: are we aware of it? The answer is "yes". Number 2: have we formed any opinion upon it? The law officers of the Crown are presently looking at it to determine whether or not it is in breach of any of the sections of the Criminal Code.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Do they need any help?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day. Yesterday during the question period the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition asked me a question which I answered incorrectly concerning the funds for the Historic Sites Advisory Board. I said that the funds were in the estimates of the Executive Council. I was in error. They are in the grants of the Provincial Secretary's Department and are contained there.

Also I would like to table a supplementary Return to an Order of the House No. 24 on the motion of the Honourable the Member for Kildonan dated April 1st, 1968. I just explain that in the Order information was asked for concerning printing done for all departments of

(MR. McLEAN cont'd.) . . . . the government and Crown corporations and in my anxiety to get the Order Return in as quickly as possible we omitted the Crown corporations and that is what is contained in the supplementary Return at the present time.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Health. Page 38 of the Budget has a table indicating that for the Manitoba Hospital Commission fiscal years 1967 and 1968 the federal contribution is going to increase from \$28.5 million to \$35 million. Meanwhile the provincial share is decreasing from \$21.4 to \$21 million. Could the Minister indicate the reason for this decrease in contributions to the Manitoba Hospital Plan by the province?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, we can discuss that on the estimates.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I have a reason for asking for it now. We are in the budget debate and this is part -- some of the information given in the budget and it seems to me that my request for an answer at this time would be reasonable.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, I think we can discuss this at the time of the estimates.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, then I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Health. Has the Minister been conducting negotiations or discussions with hospitals or hospital administrators with regard to changes in the premium structure and the method of collecting premiums and the rate of premiums for the hospital plan in Manitoba?

MR. WITNEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Highways. I realize at this time of the year road restrictions are the usual and that it is important to look after our highways. But as so happens they have put a 250 pound road restriction on No. 4 Highway and a blacktop between Angusville and Russell, and the modern transportation today, everything comes into our area now by truck. There are freight trains. The CPR has stopped their express trucks I understand, the Russell Transfer cannot even go out on the highway with an empty truck, they're overloaded at 250 pounds. I have just arrived from Russell and all the years that I have been coming up and down No. 4 Highway I never seen it in such good shape. I went to see the engineer at Minnedosa on the way in and asked him who had asked for it and he said we asked for it. He said they can go out on country roads and get around this blacktop and if they can go on country roads they're overloaded. The question is, Sir: would you look into it and see -- would you look into it and see if this cannot be raised to 350 pounds?

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iverville): Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell is aware that the maximum allowable is always considered when the engineers place these restrictions. Nobody likes these restrictions any more than anybody else. I'd be very happy to check into the particular matter that he describes at Angusville.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I lay on the table a Return to an Order of the House No. 11 mostly with the object of putting the Leader of the Opposition out of his misery.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted. I do not at this particular time wish to ask a question but draw to the attention of the Assembly and the members thereof a very important event of today. I am not aware, or do not know whether the honourable members are aware of the fact that a great event took place some few years ago, namely the birth of the Honourable the Speaker of this Assembly. I'm sure that all members of the House would wish to join in wishing you, Sir, many happy returns of the day.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable gentleman and also the honourable members and I'd like to assure you that I'm just as hot to trot as ever I was.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities. In view of the discussion which took place during the deliberations of the Committee on Public Utilities respecting a possible increase in Hydro rates, it was disclosed that these rates are not subject to scrutiny by the Municipal and Public Utility Board. My question, Mr. Speaker, of my honourable friend: will the Minister consider legislation directed toward having any new rate structure respecting Manitoba Hydro rates approved or considered by the Utility Board before authority is granted for any alteration in rates?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I would not be correct to say the rates of Manitoba Hydro, or any increase in the rates is not subject to scrutiny of the Public Utility Board because by law any customer of the utility may, if there has been an increase, take the matter to the Utility Board for in effect by way of an appeal or consideration of the rates. That is the existing law at the present time although there is no requirement on the Board to go itself abinitio to the Public Utilities Board. I'd have to answer the further part of the question by saying that there is no legislation in contemplation at the present time.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Is there a facility where a self-declared drug addict could go for assistance?

MR. WITNEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. As I mentioned before he can go to any doctor, he can go to an out-patient department at the hospital, he can go to a health unit or he can go to some of the facilities that are offered by the Attorney-General.

MR. DOERN: A supplementary question. Would he be subject to arrest for declaring that he is in fact a drug addict?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid that would be a legal question to which the Minister wouldn't want to venture an opinion without proper advice.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. DOERN: A supplementary question to the Minister of Health. Would free drugs be a part of any such treatment for a drug addict.

MR. WITNEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Last year when the forest products plant at Sprague ceased operation the government indicated that operations will commence again or resume in November. It is now April. When will this plant be in full operation?

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK Q.C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the plant will be in operation in May. -- (Interjection) -- My understanding is that the plant will be in operation by May.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, a week ago I asked the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs whether the Manitoba Government supports the position taken by the Canadian Federation of Mayors in a resolution calling upon the Federal Government for exemption of interest on mortgages and real property tax from income tax, and at which time the Honourable Minister indicated to me that she will take the question as notice. Is she in a position to give a reply to my question now?

MRS. FORBES: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Hamiota. I beg your pardon. Did you have a supplementary?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes I do, Mr. Speaker, if I may. Could the Minister indicate to this House when she may be in a position to reply to this question?

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, it's a matter of policy and we will be replying in due course.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, I want to direct my question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. On Monday I asked a question regarding the Information Branch and I was told I would get the answer within a day or two or soon. Have you the answer for me today?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I tried to confirm this before the House was called in session to ensure. I believe that the answer is that there was no one from the Information Service but I cannot say that accurately. I hope that I'll be in a position to answer that tomorrow.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Health. If I understood him correctly he stated that he was not conducting any negotiations. Are any people in his department or on his behalf conducting negotiations now with regard to a rate increase or with regard to a change in the rate system for hospital premiums?

MR. WITNEY: With hospital administrators? With hospital administrators?

MR. MOLGAT: Hospital administrators and hospitals.

MR. WITNEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 28 dated 1st of April on a motion of the Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Health. Are there negotiations taking place between his department and the Manitoba Hospital Commission dealing with the increase in premiums of hospital charges?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, the matter of premiums and their levels have been a constant matter of consideration between the Hospital Commission and the Department of Health ever since the Commission was started.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'd like to direct a question if I may, Mr. Speaker, to the -- I think it's the House Leader or the Provincial Secretary. Will it be the practice this year as I believe in previous years of information being given to us of details of grants referred to in the estimates before the actual departments will be dealt with?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, that information has been requested I think particularly of the Provincial Secretary and it should be available in due course. I'm certain before his estimates come up. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, it was agreed that this will be provided and it will be.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister on the subject of payment of hospital premiums. Is the government giving any consideration to raising the increased financing necessary for hospitals around which the discussion of premiums revolves by an increase in the provincial surcharge on the income tax?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I don't think that I can answer all of the things that might be given consideration by the government before the Orders of the Day.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Honourable the Minister of Health. Is it the intention of the Minister and the Government to tie the hospital premiums directly to hospital cost? In other words: are the premiums going up?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, if we are going to make any changes in the premiums a full statement will be made before my estimates. -- (Interjection) -- If an increase in premiums is going to be made a statement will be made in this House in due course at my estimate time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Does the Honourable Minister feel that this should be discussed when we are discussing the budget?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Does he have anything to report on how negotiations are going between the Winnipeg teachers and the Winnipeg School Division?

MR. JOHNSON: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has he authorized or has there been an increase in the interest rates for loans under the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation?

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the Statute under which the Credit Corporation is operating. Just this past week it was necessary to pass an Order-in-Council after finding out the necessary information from the Provincial Treasurer as to the cost of money to the province from which the Credit Corporation of course draws its funds will be, then the level, the interest level that would be necessary for the credit corporation to charge in carrying out its business. I am preparing a statement to be released describing this increase. I would hope that it would probably be available later on this afternoon or tomorrow. This took place just a day or two ago.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is it correct that that increase was approved on Monday of this week and that the House has not been advised of this change, but that the change has already been put into effect on loans that are being negotiated with the corporation?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to check the actual Order-in-Council to verify whether or not the effective date is immediate. It very likely is. I may well have been remiss in not informing the House of that. I intended doing so. This is not an unusual procedure. I understand this happens, is caused relatively automatically. The Credit Corporation has no choice in this matter. It's fixed by statute that the loans made under this corporation have to exceed by one-quarter of one percent -- that is the interest rates charged

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . . have to exceed by one-quarter of one percent the rate from which this money is available to the corporation by the province and annual adjustments of this nature are made.

MR. MOLGAT: Could the Minister indicate what was the previous rate or rates and what are the present rate or rates?

MR. ENNS: The present rates will increase the interest charged to 7 3/4% in the case of applications of farmers 35 years of age and over. In the case of the young farmer category I believe this is 6 1/4. Now I'm speaking somewhat from memory here. I would ask the indulgence of the House, particularly the Leader of the Opposition, if he would not allow me to perhaps later on in the afternoon to bring the specific paper that would have the details spelled out correctly.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the same Minister. Does this increase apply on new loans only or does it apply on loans already written or paper already written?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it applies on new applications only. I don't think any arrangements entered into in the past can be changed - do change.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. Some several weeks ago I directed a question to him about telephone tapping equipment. He promised to get the answer for me and I am still waiting.

MR. LYON: I hope to have it in due course, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the First Minister misunderstood my first question. I certainly couldn't ask him to tell us everything that the government is considering under Orders of the Day. I asked whether the government is giving consideration to raising the increased costs of the hospital plan by means of income tax rather than a premium.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the honourable gentleman would not agree with me that possibly this subject has been discussed extensively. The First Minister has given an opinion as to what he intends to do and I wondered if the honourable gentleman would accept that.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would just like you to recall that I am the only one who . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'm referring to the subject of premiums - the increase of premiums, I believe.

MR. GREEN: I'm the only one who talked about an increase in income tax and with respect, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the First Minister answered me by saying he will not tell everything that he considers under Orders of the Day.

A MEMBER: Point of Order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, may I have an answer from the First Minister as to whether this is being considered.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, the budget has been presented.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it seems to me that under the rules of the House, the only answer of the Honourable the First Minister, if he does not wish to answer the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks specifically, is say that the question is a matter of policy which will be announced by the government in due course. It's not sufficient to carry on the way it has been done.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer.

Does the announcement that has just been made by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture mean that the Province of Manitoba is now paying 7 1/2% interest for money that it borrows?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the Province of Manitoba does not borrow money direct, or has not borrowed money direct in the money markets in recent times. It's an estimated figure that has to be provided by judging what price Hydro and Telephones and other utilities have to pay.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would it be correct to say that the estimate is that Manitoba Hydro and Manitoba Telephones are now paying approximately 7 1/2% for money that they borrow?

MR. EVANS: I don't care to make a guess.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, another supplementary question. Apparently the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture had to get a computation from the Department of Treasury. How was it arrived at?

MR. EVANS: I'll be glad to tell my honourable friend when I find out.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. In view of the fact that the provincial-federal arrangement with regard to the collection of income tax expires in December of 1968, would it be necessary and is the First Minister considering calling a special session of the House to deal with the problems that will arise with regard to the collection of income tax when that agreement expires?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I'm not aware of the necessity for it at this stage of the game.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct this question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Could the Minister tell me how many applications for Farm Credit Corporation loans have not been processed in anticipation of an increase in the interest rate?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I would have no way of knowing that particular question. I could suggest that it may be a matter for an Order for Return.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Has a similar increase in interest rates taken place by the Development Fund as was taken by the Credit Corporation?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, if I am correct, there are provisions in the Manitoba Development Fund Act that would in fact apply here, in answer to this question.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Is the firm commonly referred to as Greb Shoe a debtor of the Manitoba Development Fund?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, it's not my intention to answer questions dealing with any matters, dealing with any possible borrowers of the Manitoba Development Fund.

MR. HANUSCHAK: A supplementary question. I did not make any reference to a possible borrower. I asked the Honourable Minister whether that firm is at present a debtor of the Manitoba Development Fund.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. Has the staff of the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board been reduced?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I don't know that they have been reduced. There has been quite a number of the staff of the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board that have not been replaced and arrangements are being made to provide them with additional help from staff of the Development Authority.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. I understand there is a serious backlog of cases piling up at the Magistrates' Courts in Winnipeg. Is it the intention of the Minister to appoint new magistrates? And if so, when?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'll be happy to enquire into the question of any backlog. The second matter is under consideration.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Returns: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. Did the government retain the services of Hedlin Menzies & Associates Limited to do a study entitled "Transition in the North - The Problem of Re-Location?"
2. How much did this study cost the government?
3. How and when will be or were copies available to
  - (a) government?
  - (b) members of the legislature?
  - (c) the public?
4. To whom and in what quantities were copies of the study distributed?
5. What action has been taken by the government resultant from the study?

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. How many Civil Service positions over \$6,000 per year were filled during: (a) 1967 and (b) 1968. Were neither advertised publicly nor bulletined within the service?
2. List each position, including qualifications and salary.
3. In each instance, why wasn't a public advertisement or bulletin issued?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Leader of the House have an announcement at this time?

MR. LYON: Under Rule 23 subsection (3) it would now be your responsibility to call the adjourned debate on the motion to go into Ways and Means. I understand that there is unanimous consent of all members of the House that you be not required to call that debate today.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. CLEMENT: Mr. Speaker, I only want to speak very briefly with regard to this resolution. The Honourable Leader of NDP says I haven't been around for awhile. -- (Interjection) -- I spent a week in Ottawa where a new song came on the hit parade and it says "We want Trudeau", and believe me I think it's going to hit the top of that hit parade too. However, getting back to horned cattle, this question of horned cattle I think is very important.

I'm rather sorry that the amendment wasn't passed so that it could have gone to the Agricultural Committee so that further representation could have been brought forward with pros and cons in this regard. I personally feel that there was a certain amount of goodness in the Horned Cattle Fund. However, there is some doubt in my mind as to whether it was proving satisfactory and so now that the amendment has been defeated, I have no alternative but to support the resolution and I would hope that within a year or two at the outside, if it hasn't proved satisfactory that perhaps a \$10 fee would be the answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether I'm in order to speak, or close the debate once more. It is certainly not my intention to prolong the discussions we have already had on this. I'm happy to see that the Member from Birtle-Russell, whom I knew all along down deep in my heart as a fellow cattle man would find it in his heart to support this particular bill.

The only other piece of information that I wanted to bring to the attention of the members and particularly to the attention of the Member from LaVerendrye, is the fact that there is of course a considerable amount of carcass damage and what have you of the kind that he described in this debate that occurs in hogs and lambs as well and of course these animals don't suffer the affliction of having horns. What I'm trying to point out is that while the damage is there, there is a great deal of it that can be attributed to rough handling, poor facilities, poor pens, nails in pens and what have you, poor trucking - along with the incidence of horned cattle. I want to just relay any doubts that the -- I can recall the Leader of the Opposition making a point if there was any hesitation in reducing this, the hesitation was simply to agree to the concept that this matter should be looked at after a period of time of suspension. I maintain very firmly that the suspension is necessary and desirable to do away with the principle that's involved -- is the penalty as presently applied effective. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the Provincial Secretary. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, Bill 37 proposes a number of new sections to the Highway Traffic Act and I think there is a number of sections that I take objection to. On others I would like to have more clarification. Right away the first clause, clause (1) has to do with including sidewalks with the highways, and the meaning of highway, and I'm just wondering what this does mean. Does this mean that Greater Winnipeg, the city, will get more grants as a result? Is this a way of bringing in legislation so that more money will be provided for Metro Winnipeg or what is the reason for this amendment that we are having before us?

Then, Section 8 -- and I don't know, Mr. Speaker, how else to deal with the Bill except to refer to certain sections because there are different matters brought in and other members have discussed them in that way, so I'll refer to certain principles which are dealt with in certain sections. The matter of Hollywood mufflers is brought in here and some of the other members have already commented on it. These are apparently more noisy than other mufflers, but as already pointed out by the Member for Burrows I think we can have a similar

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . type of mufflers brought in under a different name and you would have the same situation. Then, too, I think by ruling them out, this would certainly take away a lot of fun from the younger generation. I also note that in the proclamation part of the Bill that proclamation is to take place at some future date. Could the Minister indicate just when this section will be proclaimed or what the intention is of the government in connection with the proclamation of this particular section?

There's a section dealing with the overtaking and using of light signals and apparently this is legalizing a practice that is already in effect. Still I'm just wondering whether this will not be cause for a good many people not knowing of the situation will get caught or get tickets as a result and whether this is such a good idea after all. I certainly question it.

On the following one dealing with overnight parking on city streets, here I take objection to this particular section. I feel that there are already many streets in the city where you cannot park at all and now under this new provision here, this will mean that a municipality or a city can, in effect, disallow parking overnight without people knowing of it, when you have signs on the streets stating that parking can take place during certain hours. Does this mean, Mr. Minister, that these signs will be changed or just what is going to take place and what will be done in this connection in advising people of this province? And here I'm concerned probably more with rural people coming into Winnipeg, staying overnight, than with the city people themselves; although in many areas the back yards of city homes are not large enough to hold many vehicles, especially in quarters where you have renters. I feel that this certainly needs more explanation and I for one do not go along with what is proposed in this particular section. There is too much restriction in my opinion, without notice.

Coming to a further section or principle that has to do with the trailers. We will now make it illegal for anyone to ride in the trailer back of a car. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, if it's unsafe to ride in the trailer, than I think it's unsafe having the trailer back of the car, because what does it make so unsafe for a person to ride in a trailer if the trailer is fastened properly and it it's trailing properly? I certainly fail to understand why it's so unsafe, and as I pointed out, if it is so unsafe, then we should not allow trailers to be towed behind cars at all. Maybe it's probably to avoid incidents of one case that I heard where a lady was driving along a highway and she had to stop for a certain thing and her husband was sleeping back in the trailer and apparently when it stopped he got out of the trailer to find out what was wrong. Before he could get in the wife started up and away she was, leaving him behind. Maybe this is what the Honourable Minister has in mind. I don't know. The reasoning given in the introduction is certainly not valid, in my opinion, because if they are unsafe in the first place to be used, then they're certainly as unsafe in the other case.

We have another matter, that of racing on a highway. Here I go along, that I certainly do not like to see these drag races, as they call them I think, dragging. We have had a number of incidents where people got killed as a result and if this can be avoided I think it's all well and to the good. However, in connection with that, is a certain provision which I certainly object to very strongly, and that has to do with the suspension of licence which is brought about under Section 239 and I think this is the biggest failure of all of this Bill. I think this is the section that should be corrected, that this section and 239, Section (e) has to do with failing to maintain proof of financial responsibility. Mr. Chairman, this has caused a lot of grief to many many people in this province and I feel that it is unjust. If a person buys insurance on a vehicle and he runs into an accident, a minor accident, it just might be \$150.00 or so, as I understand it, his licence is suspended; and not only on that particular unit - on all the units that the driver owns and it can be that he can have a fleet of trucks running and immediately the suspension takes place on his other units. This is what happened to one person in my constituency, and this is bringing about real hardship and I feel it's very very unfair. In fact in this case it was a minor infraction - no one was hurt, no injuries, none whatever, and yet here his licences were suspended. He had to secure proof of financial responsibility and when you go and get this there is a special charge on each one of the units, it's not only on the one that is involved but all additional units that he owns, and as was pointed out in committee, the Insurance Committee, by the Honourable Member for Neepawa, that for some trucks or larger units this can involve a lot of money, as high as \$100.00 I think the figure was given. I feel that this is a matter that should be corrected because if I have insurance and run into an accident certainly that insurance should continue and there should be no doubt as to financial responsibility. This has been taken care of when the person



(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . buys his insurance. I feel this is a section that should be looked at and should be brought in for revision. Certainly that would be of much more importance and of much more value than some of the proposals that we have before us.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong the debate on the Bill. I am not in favour of it because I feel there is more things absent and more things that I'm opposed to than what is really good in what is contained in the Bill.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman, I just want to raise one point with the Honourable Minister on this Bill now and that's the limits that's carried now on the Public Liability Section and the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. The total limit right now is \$35,000 which I feel is very inadequate. If you have two or three injuries in one automobile, this is certainly not sufficient to take care of these people if they have a lifetime injury and if they have families as well. It's quite easy for many people today to drive these fast cars and be able to get a licence with \$25.00 and no insurance. It still doesn't give these people any insurance or coverage at all, and when they do get involved in an accident the total liability is \$35,000 which I feel is insufficient. In most cases the people who are taking advantage of paying the \$25.00 to qualify for the licence is the young people and the percentages of these young people is much greater getting involved in serious accidents than drivers that have been driving for two or three or more years. So I feel that this should be raised, I would say to at least \$100,000 if not as high - it should be raised to 50 immediately but I would like to see it raised to \$100,000.00.

The other point, Mr. Speaker, that I wanted to raise is I feel that Canada is the only country with such a large population that hasn't a Federal Highway Authority to plan highways. I know that quite a few members have talked about signs in Winnipeg and our highway signs and I think that we should have signs that are the same on the highways and in the cities. I feel the main purpose of traffic highway signs is to help the traffic and orderly movement of traffic. We also need warning signs to advise drivers of hazardous road conditions in many areas and I do not feel we have this at the present time. I think because of the increasing range of concentration of traffic it is time that we have started to look and to standardize our traffic signs, because just a week ago we had a - last week - had an opportunity to be in Montreal. They have not just national standard signs, they have international signs and if you go to London, England or Munich in Germany or East Berlin or Copenhagen, I would say all cities right across Europe, even the cities in Russia, I would say all cities now use international traffic signs on their highways and in their cities. Montreal can do it and so can Ontario, so there's no reason why Manitoba cannot do the same and start thinking of making their signs more uniform and probably perhaps for the city adopt international traffic signs. It seems that we don't show any leadership in many fields; we try to follow after many of the other provinces have adopted uniform signs or international traffic signs and finally Manitoba will eventually do this. Maybe it's time for a committee of this House to be formed again and look into the traffic fatalities and traffic problems because the Committee of the House that was formed some three or four years ago in this House I think did a tremendous amount of work, and good work, which resulted in better crosswalks and corridors in many areas.

So I would urge the Minister to really give serious consideration to raising the limits for the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund and probably raising the \$25.00 fee, because with a \$25.00 fee we're making it very easy for people to pay \$25.00 and feel that they have coverage on insurance, which they really haven't. So I would really like the Minister to give consideration to those two areas.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Provincial Secretary.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, if there are no . . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I would think the Honourable the Minister would be pleased with the fact that this has been a very good debate that has taken place on this Bill, Mr. Speaker, and I think that's all to the good. The ground has been so well covered that I have no observations to add except one and that deals, oddly enough, with the explanatory note. The explanatory note with regard to the racing motor vehicle on the highway says that this is new. I just can't believe that that is a fact. I'm sure that section has been in the Act for many years. It may be that some of the provisions under that general prohibition are new but I'd just like to ask the Minister to check on that. Is it not a fact that the general provision has been in the Act for years?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, if there are no other members wishing to speak on this

(MR. McLEAN cont'd.) . . . . Bill, I will perhaps make some comments in closing the debate.

We have prepared some notes which deal with the questions that were raised earlier. Some of them have been raised again this afternoon but perhaps I would just deal first of all with the items that will not be in our more detailed notes and that have been made this afternoon.

With respect to the questions raised by the Honourable the Member for Rhineland, the matter of including sidewalks is only a legal matter which we will be quite happy to explain in detail in Committee. It does not involve any grants. No, it does not enable anyone to get any grants that they're not entitled to at the present time.

He also raised the question about a section of The Highway Traffic Act on which there is no legislation in this Bill, regarding failure to provide proof of financial responsibility which he has indicated he thinks is unjust. I have to confess to him that I was under the impression that most people thought we were not tough enough on this matter of suspensions and that if there are some measures which result in suspensions that we would receive some commendation for that. In any event, I believe that he must be under a misunderstanding because if anyone has insurance they would hardly be put in the position of having to provide proof of financial responsibility since they would have insurance coverage which would, I'm assuming, comply with the provisions of the Act, and that the only time that one is required to provide proof is when one doesn't have insurance in the first instance. So I think there must be a misunderstanding here and we can probably clarify it when the time comes.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I take exception because I've had a number of cases where the individuals concerned did have insurance. They had all the insurance required yet they still had to get proof of financial responsibility. This is my objection.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, my answer would be: if they had the insurance they wouldn't have any difficulty getting a Certificate of Financial Responsibility so there would be no particular problem. They might not like having to do it but it would be proof of the fact.

The Honourable Member for Assiniboia raised the question of the limits in the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund which in effect deals of course also with the requirements of insurance, the minimum amount. I would remind him that of course during the past few years the limits have been raised, I think on at least two occasions that I remember, and what he has suggested of course is worthy of consideration. I think that in principle we would agree that within reasonable limits we should continue to increase the amounts of insurance required and of course correspondingly the amount of the limits on the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. He did make one comment however that I only hasten to correct so that there will be no misunderstanding. The honourable member referred to the total liability being \$35,000.00. Well of course the total liability rising out of any particular accident is not necessarily limited to that amount, it may be much larger than that. The amount of insurance coverage of course would be the limit indicated but the total liability could of course be much larger depending upon the circumstances of the particular case.

The Honourable Member for Assiniboia asks for a Federal Highway Authority. I'm sure there must be something in the Holy Writ that says something about "sufficient unto the day are the troubles thereof." We have enough difficulties here without my launching on any question about the federal highway authority. There is of course some legislation that comes to that and I'll have some comment to make in my other comments that deal with it and also dealing with the matter of the standardization of traffic signs.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside questions the note in the bill concerning the matter of racing. I have to confess to him that I thought there was a prohibition against racing in The Highway Traffic Act but found that even though it may have been in a previous statute it evidently was omitted in the revision of The Highway Traffic Act that took place some two years ago. So that the word "new" is a relative word here. It's new insofar as the current statute is concerned.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, if I may just refer in some detail to my notes with regard to matters that were raised the previous time when this bill was before the members. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition expressed the view that we are not taking sufficient steps to implement uniformity in respect of highway traffic legislation and I confess that statement caught me somewhat by surprise because we spend a great deal of time endeavouring to

(MR. McLEAN cont'd.) . . . . increase the degree and amount of uniformity with respect to highway traffic legislation. An orderly and systematic movement toward greater uniformity is one of the primary objectives of the Conference of Provincial Ministers of Transport. Section 5 of the Bill which is before the members now, the licensing reciprocity section, stems directly from agreement reached at the last Ministers' meeting. The Province of Ontario has already implemented the agreement and other provinces have undertaken to do so.

The new muffler requirements commented on by the Honourable Member for Burrows is another case in point. They were developed almost verbatim from the Ontario Act. Following the Provincial Ministers' Meeting last year, that's in 1967, a committee meeting of administrators from across Canada was convened here in Manitoba to attempt to fix a uniform vision standard. I'm pleased to report that their efforts were successful and that in large measure it was the Manitoba standard which was agreed upon. In addition to the Ministers' Conference Manitoba participates actively in a nationwide administrators' organization known as the Canadian Conference of Motor Transport Authority. A committee of that authority under the chairmanship of the Deputy Minister of Transport for Ontario has been established to further work in this area of uniformity of rules of the road.

Uniformity of highway traffic legislation has in recent years figured prominently in the agendas of the Prairie Economic Council. A proposal for uniformity respecting concessions to non-resident students in the province was submitted for consideration only a few days ago. Section 37 of the Bill presently before us broadens our regulatory powers somewhat to permit enactment of regulations prohibiting the sale of substandard items. This power would be used to implement uniform tire standards and other equipment standards which we fully expect will be coming into operation in the near future.

The Federal Department of Transport -- and here I just interject to point out that the Federal Department of Transport has somewhat wider jurisdiction than had been previously the case insofar as highway transport is concerned -- is attempting to discharge a new role of giving leadership in the field of highway safety and is interested, as all the provincial governments are, in securing greater uniformity. Officers of the Department of Public Utilities -- that's our own department -- will be attending a meeting with staff members of the Federal Department of Transport in Victoria on May 9 of this year and one of the items on their agenda is the question of more uniformity in legislation. I cannot emphasize too strongly and underscore too strongly our active and full participation in all of these discussions and of course our very great desire to implement as many of them as of course will receive the approval of this House and. . .

MR. MOLGAT: Would the Honourable Minister permit a question?

MR. McLEAN: Yes.

MR. MOLGAT: He is telling us about all the interest in standardization. Could he tell us then why it is that we cannot, for example, in Manitoba have standardization on the question of right turns on red lights, within our own province?

MR. McLEAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I can just continue I hope to reach everything that has been raised in the debate. I wanted just to say -- I was thrown off a bit there -- just to say that the Deputy Minister of Public Utilities takes a very active interest in this work that is going on, is quite interested and one of the leaders in it.

The foregoing comments I would hope would convince the honourable members that we do appreciate the importance of uniformity of legislation and are working toward that objective continuously. It must be remembered that uniformity can only be accomplished by persuasion and compromise and while we have already achieved a large degree of uniformity on most of the essentials, achieving 100 percent uniformity is not going to be a rapid process.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition asks why we could not make right turns on red lights in Winnipeg. The answer is that at certain locations such turns are permissible. As honourable members are aware there is some testing going on to determine which is the most appropriate and readily understandable form of signal to give the motorist at such intersections. When that has been determined, doubtless a uniform sign or other traffic device will be required at all such intersections. And if I just interject there - I suppose the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition would say, "Well why not make the law uniform?" For the very good reason that as he very well knows that there are strong differences of opinion within Manitoba, much less elsewhere, about the advisability or otherwise of a right turn on a red

(MR. McLEAN cont'd.) . . . . light and I suppose that when we can agree among ourselves we'll be able to promote agreement elsewhere.

The section dealing with television sets is aimed at portable sets which can be plugged into the lighter socket in an automobile, and it may well be that this wording -- that is the wording in the bill -- should be further examined in Committee to ensure that it does in fact cover the situation or situations that we have in mind. I must confess that in looking at it as a result of our discussion the other night it may well be that the wording is in need of some correction or some further refinement.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition commented on the lack of uniformity in speed laws both within Manitoba and between provinces. There is a high degree of uniformity here of course in the speed differential which has been in existence on the stretches of highway between Portage la Prairie and Brandon, and Brandon and the western boundary of the province have been established for testing purposes.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition also raised a question regarding brakes on trailers. I hasten to assure him that the light utility trailers to which he made reference are not affected by the section of the bill. If you will notice the wording of that section it reads: "equipped with brakes such as are required by this Act." The trailers to which the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition refers are not required by the Act to be equipped with brakes.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition was also critical of the overnight parking provision. Although there would seem to be some confusion or difference of opinion between he and the Honourable Member for Selkirk who as I understand it agrees that the overnight parking restrictions would have to be embodied in a municipal by-law. This is what will be required by the Act and we would expect such by-laws to be given a great deal of publicity in the newspapers and on radio and on television. And of course I have the same concern that other members would have about, and the question arises, how do people know about it? Well of course there are many provisions of The Highway Traffic Act and many provisions of local by-laws that are passed by local authorities that are not advertised by way of signs and as a practical matter it is not always possible to do so. Then of course I'm aware of the injunction of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party who says that we have too many signs as it is already. I should point out however that this matter of overnight parking has been strongly requested of us by municipal authorities and perhaps some of them may come to the committee, Law Amendments Committee, and make their views known in this regard.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition also raised a question concerning the provision dealing with traffic offence notices. The only change here is, as pointed out in the explanatory note, under the circumstances specified in the new subsection it will not be necessary to issue a new and separate summons but the summons portion of the traffic offence notice may be served upon the alleged offender. He will thus receive notice just as effectively as if a separate summons had been issued and delivered to him.

The Honourable the Member for Burrows commented on the muffler provision. I would agree that defining the noise level in some manner would be the most scientific way of accomplishing our objective. Unfortunately a decibel measurement becomes complicated in enforcement. Even a highly effective muffler can be made to produce unreasonably loud noises by abuse of the engine and so forth. Although a standard fixed by reference to decibel levels was considered it was abandoned in favour of the Ontario type legislation after further consideration. Our inquiries indicate that this section is working satisfactorily in Ontario.

The Honourable Member for Burrows also raised a question regarding the visibility standards in connection with the lines marking our pedestrian corridors and he was also dealing with other lines, traffic lines. We would simply point out that after a snowfall these lines are completely invisible but the bright overhead lights, referring to the pedestrian corridors, gives a motorist ample warning of the presence of a pedestrian corridor and we believe that for the reasons indicated we should retain this section in its present form.

The Honourable Member for Burrows also raised a question as to whether the traffic offence notice applied to offences other than those under The Highway Traffic Act. The answer is that the traffic offence notice procedure applies only to offences under The Highway Traffic Act, or under a regulation or by-law made or passed pursuant to the Act and that would refer to local authorities, municipal corporations. If the Crown were to decide subsequently to proceed under The Criminal Code it would have to follow the normal process of

(MR. McLEAN cont'd.) . . . . information and summons or warrant prescribed by The Criminal Code.

The Honourable Member for Selkirk raised the question of uniformity of highway traffic signs. These are not the responsibility of the Department of Public Utilities but fall within the ambit of the Department of Highways. We are confident that the Minister of Highways and those associated with him can enlist comparable efforts toward uniformity in this field as well and indeed I am under the impression that a great deal of work has been done in that regard and many of the new signs which are now visible and used on our highways are the result of the move toward uniformity in the matter of signing the roads.

The Honourable Member for Selkirk also raised a question regarding pedestrian corridors and expressed the view that perhaps some members of the public were not fully conversant with the distinction between the pedestrian corridor and the ordinary intersection. A matter, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, which has given me some concern as well. In our last fiscal year the Department of Public Utilities spent approximately \$70,000 on publicity regarding the pedestrian corridors and intersections; and indeed on one occasion I did a little demonstrating myself, took my life in my hands, and I would simply say that in most locations the pedestrian corridors appear to be working well but we have in mind the very point that he raises and we certainly recognize that this is a matter that has to be watched very closely.

MR. CAMPBELL: You were very photogenic.

MR. McLEAN: I thank the Honourable Member for Lakeside. I don't generally get that commendation. The Honourable Member for Elmwood raised a question regarding the new prohibition against riding in house trailers and this was also raised by the Honourable Member for Rhineland. A great many jurisdictions in the United States adopted this provision a long time ago and it seems to be widely recognized that permitting people to occupy these trailers while they are being towed on the highway is a most unsafe practice. Indeed when the officers in the department suggested this proposal for this bill I was quite surprised because I had always assumed that people were prohibited from riding in house trailers while they were being towed on the highways, but that wasn't the case in our legislation and we are proposing it for your consideration.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood also asked a question about what constituted exceptional hardship in cases coming before the Licence Suspension Appeal Board. There is no hard and fast rule. The circumstances of each case are considered carefully by the Board in all applications for adjudication made before it.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood also raised the question of vehicle standards being detectable only by inspection. This is not wholly accurate. As I mentioned earlier under Section 37, if I may mention a section number of the bill, regulations will be passed prohibiting the sale of substandard items. So far as a motor is concerned it is felt this is the most equitable way of approaching the matter rather than penalizing him for purchasing substandard equipment which he might do unknowingly.

I think that that deals, Mr. Speaker, with the points that have been raised and again I would ask for the approval of this measure by the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Would the Honourable Minister check with his department in connection with the proof of responsibility statement. I am sure that matters have come up where persons had insurance and yet they were compelled to bring in a statement of financial responsibility.

MR. McLEAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bills.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (St. Vital)  
Presented Bill No. 17, an Act to amend the Wildlife Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the changes that are being made in this Act are not major. The principal ones that I might just mention are first of all the definition of the term "officer" has been changed to include regional director and biologist and to exclude the class of chief ranger, which has been dropped. Chief rangers are now called conservation officers and are therefore covered by the term "conservation officer". The whole section has been rearranged for clarity where this is mentioned.

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) . . . . The word "commercial" has been dropped from Commercial Shooting Preserves so that the definition of shooting preserve can be applied to either a commercial or a private undertaking. The words "a forest reserve" have been deleted as this term no longer appears in the Forest Act, same having been replaced by the words "provincial forest". The words "a provincial forest" are now being written into The Wildlife Act so that both Acts will have the same term.

Section 52 has been changed by deleting all reference to fishing. This is the only place at present where The Wildlife Act refers to fishing and it was considered proper that any requirements with regard to guides fishing should be left to The Fisheries Act and associated regulations.

Section 76 stipulates at present that only the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council can appoint an honorary conservation officer; under the proposed amendment this can be done by the Minister. And with regard to Section 9 of the bill I would ask this section be withdrawn at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister says that the matters dealt with in this Bill are not of major importance. I am afraid that the question that I ask is not of major importance either, but to me it is interesting. I would like to know from my honourable friend the Minister, the reason that we adopt these new designations for the Deputy Minister and the Assistant Deputy Minister? Why do we break with tradition and instead of saying Deputy Minister, say the Deputy to the Minister? Why do we say Assistant Deputy to the Minister, instead of saying Assistant Deputy Minister? Now I know that's not of great importance but I would be interested to know just why.

And then I would be interested as well, Mr. Speaker, to know why my honourable friend, the Minister himself, wishes to be an officer of this department. Does he really intend to go out and perform some of the duties that are laid upon these officers? I have never seen my honourable friend the Attorney-General who is certainly one of the most capable of all the Ministers, I have never seen him bring anything before this House that would suggest that he wanted to go out and act as a policeman or even that he aspired to become a Judge of one of the Courts or that he was going to act in that capacity. Why would . . . — (Interjection) -- and according to the reports I have of my honourable friend remaining a conservationist even when he goes duck hunting.

Would the Honourable the Minister just tell us exactly why he wants to be classified as an officer?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, in dealing with amendments to The Wildlife Act, there is one provision within the Act that I wish to draw to the attention of the Minister that I wish he would have given some consideration to. At the outset I do wish to make it clear that I do look upon any action which leads to destruction of wildlife in the Province of Manitoba, as something most undesirable and something which we ought to legislate against — take such action as may be necessary to be taken to minimize.

However, there is a provision within The Wildlife Act -- and I'm referring to section 19 subsection (1) which makes it unlawful to use lighting or reflecting equipment at night for the purpose of hunting, and subsection (2) of the same section makes it mandatory that where a person is convicted of an offence under the subsection that I first referred to, any vehicle, firearm, ammunition, equipment, implement or appliance belonging to that person or used by him in the commission of the offence and that is under seizure--this I take it means that if it has been seized by an officer in respect to the offence--is confiscated and shall become the property of the Crown and the right of Manitoba to be disposed of as the Minister may direct.

On occasion, Mr. Speaker, one finds two or three individuals involved in the commission of an offence against this statute, two or three individuals out on a hunting expedition and they are charged and convicted and the result of it is that the passengers in the vehicle, all they suffer is the payment of a fine. The owner of the vehicle may be fined the same amount but in addition to that he also loses the motor vehicle. Now I'm not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that this section be repealed. My first impression is that it could well be a very stiff and harsh penalty particularly if the vehicle used or that may have been used in the commission of the offence is the vehicle that the owner relies on as a means or to assist him in earning his livelihood. But even if there is justification for the retention of that particular section in the Act, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that rather than have the confiscation of the motor vehicle

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd.) . . . . automatic upon conviction, and then placing the matter within the jurisdiction of the Minister - because I do believe that there is a section somewhere in the Act which gives the Minister the power to review the case and determine whether the confiscation ought to remain or whether the original owner of the vehicle should regain ownership and possession of it - but rather than going through that cumbersome procedure my suggestion would be, that it would be far better if that power were granted to the Judge, to the trial judge who has the benefit of seeing the accused individual before him, of hearing his evidence, and making a decision on that basis as to whether or not the vehicle ought to be confiscated or not, rather than taking it out of the courtroom and placing the decision, or the power to make the decision, into the lap of the Minister who for the reasons that I have just mentioned, neither has the benefit of hearing the evidence or of the presentation of the evidence. I'm not sure whether the Minister would have the benefit of even reading the evidence which may have been given at a trial or in hearing a charge under this section, but even if he does, he is not in the same position as a judge would be to make a similar decision as to whether the vehicle should be confiscated or not.

I would therefore ask the Honourable Minister whether he has considered this matter and if he has, whether he intends to - what his views are on it - and if he is in agreement that the section is in need of amendment, could he indicate to the House whether we could hope to see a further amendment to The Wildlife Act in this session or what?

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before the question is put I'd just like to say a few words. The Act as I see it is not any major change as the Minister indicates. I note however that he is making some further changes in the Bill presented and that he's removing section 9. Now section 9 is the definition of fur bearing animals, adding a number of other animals. Is it the intention of the Minister to bring in a new definition or are we simply reverting to the old definition?

In general terms though, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether or not the Minister has had any consultations prior to bringing in this Act with the Wildlife Federation in Manitoba - that's the successor to the Game and Fish Associations. They are a body of volunteers who I think are very important in our whole approach to wildlife and conservation and it seems to me there's a good deal of value at all time when we are dealing with these various areas of concern in the province, that particularly where there's a volunteer organization people who are not directly connected with the government, not government employees, but who have an outside view of the situation and yet a very keen interest in the problem, that we should at all times take every advantage possible of their knowledge and their interest in the question. I think it's a two-way proposition, that we benefit in making the law and having the advice of other people and furthermore by getting them involved in the process, I think it keeps up their own interest in the whole field in which they are concerned. I think all the members will agree that here in Manitoba the Wildlife Federation has been an excellent group. They have done a great deal of work. They are taking on projects which might otherwise have to be done by government on many occasions at public expense. They are being done by them on a purely voluntary basis and that in every way possible we should co-operate with them. I am not suggesting that the Minister should prepare a bill and present it to a group outside this House for approval prior to presenting it here of course, but I think that in the preparation and the approaches to the whole question that the views should be sought of all of those who are interested. I would hope as well that when the Bill goes to second reading, or to Committee stage that the invitation will be extended to the Wildlife Federation to appear at the Committee and make any representations that they would like.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure just whether I heard the Minister correctly that section 9 is being withdrawn. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon. Because the Bill has been received, it has received first reading and it's up for second reading now. It's the property of the Chamber here and in my opinion it cannot be withdrawn except it go to Committee and is being done so in committee. We are accepting it as a whole I would take it.

My only question has to do with the matter of honorary conservation officers. What is meant by this? Are our wildlife association people being honoured in this way or who is being appointed to this position?

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, if there are no further questions here I'll answer the ones which are at my fingertips.

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) . . . . With regard to the Honourable Member for Rhineland, the section 9 that - I was really giving him notice I think to -- technically this has to be deleted at the committee stage, and was really giving notice that I intended to withdraw it. The reason for the withdrawal is that we discovered that some of these, particularly rabbits, if you put them into varying care, into this category, it was in conflict with another Act which would have prevented the shooting of these on Sunday with a . . . so on. This was discovered after the Bill was printed.

With regard to honorary conservation officers, we have a mutual agreement with neighboring provinces, particularly Saskatchewan, where their conservation officers overlap into areas of Manitoba that are relatively inaccessible, that rather than us having to station a person that would duplicate what he might do from a fairly near station to the Saskatchewan-Manitoba border that we would assign responsibility to some of the Saskatchewan officers and vice versa, where the border overlaps. It is more of a cost-saving feature than anything else. This makes it possible for the Minister to make these appointments rather than having Order-in-Council for it. -- (Interjection) --

With regard to, again, section 9 I think the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition mentioned in regard to consulting the Wildlife Federation, we do keep in pretty close touch with the Wildlife Federation. In addition to receiving their petitions and resolutions once a year, we are in contact with them on a pretty continual basis. I think anybody that is familiar with the Wildlife Federation and with wildlife and with hunting realizes that there are two distinctly opposed interest groups: the Wildlife Federation is very much conscious of conservation and then on the other side of the fence of course we have the people who are not interested in conservation or only interested in the killing of animals and the hunting of animals and don't take any particular conscious action toward their propagation, and this leads into the question asked by the Honourable Member for Burrows with regard to penalties and fines and confiscation and so on. It's very difficult to find dry land in between these two interest groups. The conservation group will emphasize the fact that the fines are not nearly stringent enough; and on the other hand, the person who receives the fine, or has something confiscated, thinks just exactly the opposite. So what you look for here, as I suppose you do in all law enforcement, is middle ground on which you can do what's in the best interests of the people in the wildlife. It does mean confiscation of equipment and automobiles for the cases of nightlighting, and the decision on return of this, although I would indicate here that the disposal is at the Minister's discretion, that in actual fact the proposal is made by the Board of Remissions. It has to receive ministerial approval, but the decisions are made by the Board of Remissions and this actually is I think a good method. You can realize what would happen if it were left entirely to the Minister's desk to make decisions in all of these. You would have a desk full of them at all times and your decisions may not always be as objective and unbiased. You'd have difficulty keeping objective and unbiased whereas the Board of Remissions, I think, gives much more consistent decisions and handles these as their specific job.

Now I think he may have had another question here. If I've missed something, he could possibly bring it up at the time of committee study.

With regard to the Honourable Member for Lakeside's questions, the change from Deputy Minister to Deputy to the Minister -- I must admit I can't tell him why it's changed. It was changed by legal counsel. After he asked the question before, I sent a note down to ask why and I haven't got the answer back yet. But I understand that was the way it was written and I hadn't questioned it, not realizing it wasn't a matter of historical arrangement of the words.

With regards to making the Minister an officer, again I think it was -- I don't really have the answer as to why. There was no conscious decision on my part to make the Minister an officer. It was the way the bill was written and I didn't question it. I assumed it was. I don't know if there's any liability involved in it. I know that under the Forestry Act I think the Minister is liable, and whether liability would crop up in the case of Wildlife Act I would doubt it, and I don't know if there's any particular reason for the Minister being made an officer. I think that was just the way -- he was included with the rest of the staff of the department.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Would the Minister permit a question? Who is preparing the legislation? Is it the Minister or the Civil Service?

MR. CRAIK: Well I think, Mr. Speaker, in answer to his question, that the substantive changes that are made in legislation are made by the Minister. In terms of the terminology and so on and the diction that goes with it, in practical fact the Minister doesn't sit down and write out every sentence.

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



MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 18. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 18, An Act to amend The Manitoba Evidence Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, this brief amendment is an attempt to reduce the time that is required to put in records of evidence in a case. The present Rules of Evidence frequently require a number of witnesses and lengthy examinations to prove the contents, particularly of business records. The amendment would allow this evidence to be presented by a witness who was able to testify that the writing or the records were kept in the usual course of the business under consideration, and how soon after the event recorded the records were made.

I should say that these amendments were enacted in the Ontario Evidence Act in 1966, have been in force in that province and commented upon by the courts in that province favourably since that time, and we thought it would be a useful addition to the laws of evidence in our province.

MR. HILLHOUSE: ... legislation, Mr. Speaker, and I'm going to support it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 34. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 34, An Act to amend An Act respecting Soldiers' Estates, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, this is a very brief amendment to this legislation which confers certain rights upon the estates of those who have given their lives in either of the Great Wars. It was felt in reviewing it that while it has a diminishing effect each year, that we should up-date it to contemplate the present situation of the Canadian Armed Forces with respect to troops that may be serving either in Canada or abroad, and accord to them or to their estate the same privileges that are conferred under the original legislation which dealt with the First and Second Great War veterans.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, just one question, not that I am opposing the Bill at all. I would like to know just how much is involved in a given year, approximately.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if there are no other persons wishing to speak, I'll be closing the debate.

The amount that would be involved here is quite small. It's the waiving of the usual probate fees that is provided and the amount that is involved is quite small. I have no accurate estimate.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 37. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. CRAIK presented Bill No. 36, An Act to amend The Fires Prevention Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, this Bill amends out-of-date definitions of the person described as the Provincial Forester and Fire Guardian, made necessary by the Forestry Branch and Parks and Recreation Branch reorganization. The Bill establishes work permits to provide fire prevention advice, assistance and control for private, corporate and public developments in forested areas. The burning permit described applies only to the use of fire. The establishment of work permits has been done by some of the other provinces to satisfaction and the Bill also provides safeguards in defining the right of appeal against unjustified refusal or conditions of permit issue.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if no one wishes to speak, I beg 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.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 40. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. ENNS presented Bill No. 40, An Act to amend The Dairy Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the basic parts of these amendments to The Dairy Act revolve around the question about how we are to effectively deal with the synthetic milk products. There is a general feeling within the dairy industry that it is not to their interests to repeat on similar grounds what I suppose one could call the battle that was fought on the margarine issue. The dairy people have been consulted. There is presently a meeting going on in Ottawa

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . . by the National Dairy Association of Canada dealing with the same question. My Deputy Ministers and other members from the department have been in contact with other provincial jurisdictions in an effort to provide some uniform legislation across the country that will permit the introduction, or the orderly introduction you might say, of some of the new products that are coming on the market. From the dairy producers' point of view, the dairyman's point of view, he has seen fit - and I believe correctly - that it is to his interests that this be done in this manner. To work for total exclusion is unrealistic in this day and age, and also it's unrealistic and harmful to his very direct interest in the dairy industry in that it simply encourages, or accelerates faster than would normally be the case, the growth of all pure synthetic products.

The Act deals specifically with the measures we propose to take in allowing the combination of both dairy products and edible oil fats, which in many instances produces in fact a product which has demonstrated its acceptability to the consumers.

There are a number of other sections to the Act that clean up some of the situations as they exist today. For instance, the matter of two percent milk which has received fairly wide acceptance on the part of the consumers in Manitoba, I believe a little better than a third to 35 percent of the fluid milk sold is two percent milk, and yet it is illegal in the Province of Manitoba as the statute presently reads other than in those areas controlled by the Milk Control Board, of which at the present there are only three areas - Winnipeg, Portage and Brandon.

We wish to define more clearly what are dairy products and what are imitation products, and then have the necessary machinery in the Act that we can, after joint consultation with the dairy interests, both industry and producers as well as consumers, enable us to orderly introduce these new products as they arrive. The amendments to this Act would allow us to simply accept as legal many of the products that are now on our shelves. I refer to all coffee whiteners and so forth that are presently here. It's, I believe, pretty inconceivable that I should attempt or this government should attempt to remove them from our shelves. One of the hardships that this has created though for our industry is that our present law prohibits our manufacturers, our industry, to be involved. We have a flood of these products coming in from other jurisdictions while we hamstringing our own industries from taking their rightful place in this field.

There are specific regulation changes that have to be made. For instance, the law now specifically prohibits any dairy plant to have on its premises anywhere any edible oil products and so forth that could be used in mixing. This again specifically prohibits the dairy industry from moving into some of these areas, and again I say that there is a concern here that this automatically excludes him from an area of industrial activity which in my opinion, and in the opinion of many of the producers, they would just as soon continue their basic relationship with some of the dairy interests that they have now enjoyed over a number of years.

What we're also doing in the Act, or suggesting, is that such words as "milk", "cream", "cheese", are specifically designated as pertaining to dairy products.

There's a section in the Act that will deal with bringing up to date and enforcing a more rigid control of the labelling of products. This is primarily for the consumer interests. We now have some -- the section for instance dealing with the cream content at minimum levels, and it's the feeling generally that it should be spelled out precisely what is the level of cream or what have you in that particular product.

There are a fair number of housecleaning amendments that again make it -- you know, are in tune with the changing times. Right now at the moment many of our smaller receiving stations -- a receiving station is described in the Act, and the receiving station has to be the station that pays the producer for the product delivered. What's happening in parts of rural Manitoba is that some of these receiving stations, small creameries, are - well, not going out of business, but they're acting as receiving stations for cream and transferring them on to a larger consolidated creamery within the area. This is made difficult at the moment because the Act calls for the receiving station to be the actual payee of the producer.

These amendments come to us from the producers in most of these instances.

I already mentioned what we're actually doing to some extent is copyrighting the words "milk", "cream", and "cheese" under Section 18 of this amendment as words that are to be used only in terms of the whole dairy product.

I don't know if I want to go into too much more detail at this particular time. There are a number of further regulations here that are being brought into line with -- we're updating

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . . them generally. But basically, if I can come back to the principle of the matter, the idea that's encompassed in the Bill is that we want to first of all identify by statute what is a dairy product and what is an imitation product, and then be in a position to - and I should point this out because I know certainly the Honourable Member from Lakeside and perhaps some others will reproach me for this stand - that by the approach of regulations and Order-in-Council be in a position to allow the orderly introduction of products as they come on the scene. I would have to agree with the honourable member that you want to limit wherever possible this kind of approach, but the changing scene is one that in this particular instance, I believe, compels one to use this approach. I refer just again to the situation that really developed with the two percent skim milk in this province. There are changes being brought about all the time, and whether or not one can specifically tie them into the statutes, we feel we can't.

The other point for using the approach of regulation and Order-in-Council is that it is our hope that we can do this uniformly across the country. That is, that if the question of filled milk or some other subject is being considered, that this can be done in consultation with the Canada Department of Agriculture along, we hope, with our sister provinces. This prevents the upsetting - you know, the situation where something is allowed in our sister province and not allowed here. At the moment, most of the legislation that I'm recommending to the House is permissible in Ontario and most of our products that I have described come to us either from Ontario or indeed from across the line. But the feeling here again is that if we can act with some degree of uniformity here we can bring a greater degree of stability to the industry side of the dairy industry and also be able to bring the full influence and pressure to bear of the producers' point of view in terms of a national dairy policy.

I commend the legislation to the House. I have reason to believe that the producers' organizations are in general agreement with most of the amendments. They have been ventilated by them. The Winnipeg Milk Producers' Associations and the Dairy Associations of Manitoba are aware of these amendments; they generally approve of them. They may, of course, take issue with some particular points. I myself find I would really like to take this occasion to commend the dairy producers of Manitoba for looking at this problem in this way, in this particular manner. They see a distinct possibility for them to improve their market outlook in being part of this changing scene as far as dairy products are concerned.

Of course I would also have to point out that the edible oil addition in many of these instances is of course also a matter where our primary producers are concerned. We have a growing sunflower seed business in the province; we look forward to some real developments in the area of rapeseed, if we can get some of the toxic qualities out of it. My honourable colleague the Minister of Education suggests fish oil, but I would have to suggest that we'll draw the line at fish oil in our milk flavouring problems. But I leave you with those general remarks, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to oppose this Bill. I think many of the changes are due. There is more than one principle involved and certainly I think everybody is happy to see the sale of two percent milk legalized. As the Minister has just said, this has been going on illegally.

I see that it permits more than one method of testing milk, and this is one point where I would like to make a few comments. We have been using in this province, for I don't know how many years, the butterfat test and we have used this basis for paying milk. However, it certainly has been all through the years a source of dissatisfaction amongst the farmers, and lately this has been more pronounced since we now have the dairy herd improvement tests that are conducted at the farm level. Both tests are government-supervised, yet most farmers will prove to you that the both are not consistent, that they will not have the same test from one as from the other and still it is the same milk.

This, as I said, has always been a source of discontent, and I know personally I was picking up milk for 11 years every morning in the farmers' yards, and if you ever want to know the farmers' viewpoint, you distribute the cheque to him one day and go back there next day after he has had a good look at it, and he tells you the difference in his tests. I was one who always supported, that I had no reason to believe that the tests were not really conducted honestly, yet they used to come and still do and give you proof that you have no way of arguing that really the test is real, the difference between one month and the other and so on. So I'm just wondering if the Minister has in mind bringing some changes in the way of testing milk in

(MR. VIELFAURE cont'd.) . . . . the province.

Now I know that this is not a matter that can be dealt with overnight. As far as I am aware, and I'm sure he's aware, there is a new test being experimented on in Ontario which is called the Infra Red test I think. It hasn't been accepted yet as a matter of payment for the milk shipped, but what I'm trying to point out is that there certainly is room for improvement on our testing of our dairy products in the province, because even though it's an age-old argument, it stems now more than ever, ever since we have had the both tests conducted on the same product for the same farmer and both government-supervised under the DHI and under the testing going on in the creameries.

I am also happy to see that the advertising of milk products will be more strictly classified - if this is the right phrase to use - that unless it is a dairy product it is not advertised as a dairy product, and certainly this will be a welcome move by the farmers because they are subjected to high advertising by opposition who are quite often selling an inferior product and using their farm product label.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I do not intend to oppose this Act. However, I wanted to make these few comments.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, if nobody else wishes to speak, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that the debate be now adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains -- (Interjection) -- I'm sorry.

MR. EDWARD L. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks on this Bill. The Bill as drafted I think has a lot of merit to it as it is giving the control to the Dairy Industry, but I would like to mention something that affects the area in the southwest corner of the province in regard to a creamery that, due to certain examinations and inspections, has pretty well taken this industry out of the picture.

In 1965, there was a creamery that was doing quite well financially. In 1966, it ran into some difficulty in regard to a certain strike in the City of Winnipeg that reduced the marketing of cheese to a point that they had a loss, a financial loss, and they had some difficulty coming back. In 1967, there appeared in their product a flavour that became quite serious and became a very serious drop in business in the dairy. The provincial government sent out assistance by way of inspectors to try and find out the reason for this particular item in this condition, and after two or three months it came back to two dairymen supplying milk to the creamery and using a substance for sterilization of their machinery and equipment that reflected back into the dairy to make a bad product.

Now my point, Mr. Speaker, is this, that surely if we are going to, and should I maintain, should have the rigid inspections to give a good product to the people of the province, surely there should be some quicker way of curtailing the sale of this particular type of substance to dairymen that can destroy a whole industry. Now this reflects a very serious effect in this particular community, because likely today the licence of this particular industry is in jeopardy of either being turned down or allowed to run, and in this particular town this is an industry that employs 23 people and has a multitude of farmers supplying milk to the dairy for consumption in the Province of Manitoba. While this reflected determinant in the industry was going on, the dairy tried to hold the shippers in the business and bought the milk at a rate of \$5.95 per hundred, but knowing and not having the volume of sale, had to sell it to a processing plant at \$3.50 per hundred. So you can see how quickly he got into financial difficulties.

My point is, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister, surely we could have some system developed whereby we had notices to dairy people as to what they should use in keeping their equipment clean and sterilized, and we should have some quicker method whereby if it gets out of hand we can pick it up quicker. It would look to me that the length of period of two to three months is a little long and this has, unless there is something turns up in the next day or two, has destroyed a very profitable industry, an industry in the dairy area of southwestern Manitoba, something that was very very beneficial to the economy of that part of the country.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on this Bill at this particular time. However, I would like to make a few comments on the matter raised by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. Just this last week in our own community, a local industry is being amalgamated with one of the city dairies. Our creamery was a co-operative back home

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . and it is now amalgamating with the Manitoba Dairy and Poultry. It seems that our smaller industries back home are unable to manage to keep on operating because of the smaller margins and the high cost of equipment that they have to install in order to keep up-to-date, and because of installation of certain equipment their profits were reduced substantially, and I think this last year they were running in a large deficit, and in order to prevent going into receivership this action was taken to amalgamate.

What I'm afraid of is that gradually the manufacturing of certain products, ice cream probably, will be the first one to be centralized in Winnipeg. Next, we will see another item go into Winnipeg and in short order probably we will not have an industry in our town at all. I think this is a bad thing for our local communities; it's a bad thing for Manitoba. I think the Minister of Industry and Commerce should take matters of this type under consideration and try, whether he cannot assist some of these smaller industries in rural Manitoba to stay alive and to stay in the rural area and not have to be centralized in Winnipeg.

I don't want to oppose the Bill that is before us, although I notice that there are a large number of matters that come under the regulations. I notice, for instance, that the matter of cheese-making and the licensing of cheese-makers is one of them. What is involved in this case? What is the cost of a fee of this type, because I think this was one of the areas where the local industry went into high-priced help and as a result they lost out. I do feel sorry for the rural industries to capitulate in this way, especially when we are trying through our development associations and what have you, trying to establish new industries in rural Manitoba and at the same time to see these vital industries go. Mr. Speaker, while it is probably not directly pertaining to some of the legislation, nevertheless it has an effect on the dairy industry and I think this is something that the Minister and the government should be cognizant of and try and do something about.

MR. SPEAKER put the question on the adjournment and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 13. The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. JOHNSON presented Bill No. 13, an Act to amend The School Attendance Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation of the principle involved here, I would point out to the members of the committee that according to The Public School Attendance Act a child must attend school until he has completed the term in which he becomes 16 years of age. This means that if a student becomes 16 between July 31 and December 31, he must remain in school until the 31st of December of that year.

For the last two or three years this matter has been looked at very closely in the department with respect to difficulties in enforcing The School Attendance Act where the odd child simply can't be encouraged to carry on, has no interest in school and is not benefitting from attendance. As I say, there are not many of these cases and one hesitates to bring in legislation for the exception, but in the past year I would say that in Greater Winnipeg about 20-odd, and it would seem that it might be reasonable for the few there are that it would be better to allow them to apply for a work permit rather than force them to stay in school until that 31st of December in that year in which they are now required to remain.

To assure against abuse, the amendment requires that a certificate excusing a student from attending school before normal school leaving age must be signed by three responsible people - the parent or guardian, the superintendent and the school attendance officer, and in those areas where there is no superintendent, the school inspector. The intent of the amendment is not to lower the school attendance age but is an attempt to find a solution to a problem which is not too prevalent but nonetheless is real. It would seem reasonable that once a student has reached 15 and three people have certified he's no longer benefitting from attendance at school, that he should be allowed to seek a work permit.

I would point out to the members of the House, as they know, when a boy like this is in violation of The School Attendance Act he then comes under The Juvenile Delinquents Act. His parents are brought to Court and he is violating -- he's still away from school and he remains constantly under danger of being brought forward again and again for prosecution in this way. I would say that in my time as Minister about four or five times a year I will get a call from a parent who will say, "Johnnie's at home. He's 15 and he's 6 foot 3. He just refuses to go to school. He's lost interest. He's got a good work opportunity but without a work permit he

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) . . . . won't be employed," and so on. We are concerned, and of course we are doing everything in our system to maintain the interest of children with more diverse courses and more sophistication in our system, but there are these small hard core. I have consulted with the superintendents of the province in charge of the divisions and they have recommended this most strongly to us in that they would hope it would -- and they assured me that with the necessity of all three parties having to be in agreement that such a permit be issued, that it would be a reasonable measure to present before the House.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to oppose this Bill. I think in many instances it's a case of necessity. We have to do that. I only wonder how many requests the Minister has had. Is it simply the Department of Education or were there some requests from the different areas of Manitoba who requested this change. And I would underline this, that we must be very careful not to exempt too many children. Of course the Minister assures us that the department is careful that there would be no abuse here, because I can see that if the parent signs and the superintendent or three responsible people sign, they'll consider the case very carefully. If he didn't have this precaution it may be possible that some parents just for personal reasons, maybe even to have a babysitter if both parents are working, would like the child out of school, and if they were the only ones who had to sign that application, probably in their estimation it would be a good enough reason and we certainly don't want this to happen, because at that time the parents probably -- some of them are not aware that they may be hurting the child's future. Later on the child may want to go back to school and it will be more costly in our educational system.

So as long as we have this safeguard that there will be no abuse, I would say that this is not lowering the school leaving age; it will stay as it was. So we are happy to be supporting this providing we are definitely assured that it will not be abused.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Minister that there are cases when it's in the best interests of a student to exempt him from school attendance at an age prior to 16 years of age. However, what does disturb me about this Bill, Mr. Speaker, is that taking a look at The School Attendance Act as it now stands, it seems that this is one piece of legislation that is seldom read by the Department of Education, or at least it's seldom reviewed. In all the years it's been on the statute books, since 1954 and goodness knows how many years before that, but certainly in the last 14 years amendments were introduced only about three or four times and it is now, I do feel, a very antiquated piece of legislation. I feel quite certain that this is not one of the pieces of legislation dealing with education that our Minister of Education is proud to talk about when he meets with Ministers of Education from other provinces. There is no doubt in my mind that if discussions between him and other ministers centre on legislation governing school attendance, I'm sure that he would very conveniently forget to bring this Act along with him. It's not one that he would be too anxious to wave in public.

This piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned, I do feel it is antiquated, and what the amendment attempts to do to it is really nothing more than -- or the logic is about the same as the logic would be in buying a \$35.00 car and installing \$75.00 seat covers in it, because there are many many sections in The School Attendance Act as it now stands which are either impossible to enforce or else they have become completely useless and obsolete with the passage of time, with the changes that have come about in our present school system, and hence the Act in no way - in no way as it stands - in no way reflects the philosophy upon which I do hope our present-day school system is based.

Now one could go through this Act section by section and point to many examples of what I am saying. Even in this very section, this Section 6, subsection (1) and the various parts to it which says: "No parent, guardian or other person shall be liable to any of the penalties of this Act in respect of any child or other person required by this Act to attend school regularly if the following situations exist." And one of them is the reference to distance, the one immediately preceding it, that if a child resides at a distance greater than two miles, if he's below a certain age - below 10 years of age, that's right - or if he resides more than three miles if he's over 10 years of age.

Now it may well be that there is legislation in some other Act which takes care of this situation. Perhaps there is something in The Public Schools Act that takes care of this, but it certainly isn't in The School Attendance Act which is the bible that the school attendance officer presently relies on. Surely, Mr. Speaker, in this day and age with the introduction of the unitary school division system that we now have, the transportation system that we have for

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd.) . . . . students, a provision such as this within The School Attendance Act really has no value or purpose in being there. Or a section such as neither blindness nor deafness shall of itself be deemed to be sickness or other unavoidable cause within the meaning of the clause exempting a student from attending school. Now surely we don't really believe that.

Now I know there is another section of The School Attendance Act which says that a child who is blind or deaf, unless specifically excused in writing by the Minister, shall attend such school or educational institution as he may be required by the Minister to attend. But the very manner in which this is presented in the Act runs against the grain of our general philosophy of the whole school system. Rather than dealing with Section 6 in the manner in which it is now dealt with, that is make it mandatory for students to attend school unless certain situations exist, and then it goes on to section (g) which grants permission to excuse a child from attending school below a certain age as this amendment intends to do, rather than deal with it in that manner I would suggest to the Honourable Minister that in The School Attendance Act, and hence the reason for repealing the Act as it now stands and replacing it with an updated modernized one, it would be preferable if there would be something in the nature of a preamble which would reflect the whole general structure of our school system and what it plans to do. We have a Guidance Department; we have various other services within the school system today; and surely before this subsection is referred to that the Honourable Minister is introducing in this Bill, before this is referred to, surely the school system -- or it is hoped that the school system would resort to whatever other remedies there are, to do whatever else could be done to retain that student in the school or to direct him to such a course of instruction which would be of maximum benefit to him. Now I know that this is done, Mr. Speaker, but the Act doesn't quite say that and this is something that should be in the Act.

There are many other sections in this Act, Mr. Speaker, which have become obsolete with the passage of time, and rather than continue to amend The School Attendance Act section by section year by year, my suggestion would be that the Act as it now stands be repealed and that it incorporate whatever legislation there may be in other Acts dealing with the operation of schools that ought to be incorporated into this Act, and other sections be updated to meet with the needs of the times and to make them such as could be enforceable, as would be meaningful, as would provide for a better education system for the people of Manitoba.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the Bill before us because in my opinion it will bring in some flexibility to this whole matter. When the school leaving age or attendance age was raised some years ago, I objected to it at that time for the same grounds, that it was too rigid and that there should be some flexibility to this. If you have youngsters who do not make any progress and will remain in grades one or two to 14 and 15 year olds, I can't see the purpose of having these youngsters stay in school and this is what you run up against. Certainly there should be some way of giving flexibility to this legislation and I think this is what we are getting here.

It was mentioned here, I think by the Member for Emerson, that this could be abused. I do not accept that at all, because I feel that our parents should have some say in the matter too and that it should not be left entirely up to the state. Parental control is also essential here. There has been a necessity for exemptions so that exemptions could be made. I have had some requests over the years that the new legislation has been in force requesting this very matter for this same thing. And while the Minister says that the intention is not to lower the schooling age, it has the effect though of it in cases where it is essential, and I certainly do support the Bill that is before us.

I'm just wondering -- the Minister also mentioned -- what happens in certain cases where children are of this age and are expelled? Then you have to take certain procedures and I think the Minister pointed some of these up. I feel that this is a situation that is very unwelcome indeed, because you have certain situations arising even in high schools today where certain pupils are expelled, and what happens then? Then they have to go through the means of the procedure as was outlined by the Minister, and I feel this can be overcome in this very way that we are proposing in this Bill.

So I wholeheartedly support the Bill and I would even go as far as lowering that age from 15 to 14, and when we get to committee I expect to amend the Bill to that effect.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Minister when he makes his remarks on this could indicate whether this is in effect a tightening up or a loosening up. In other words,

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . . I know that the age did go to 16 but was there a provision for dropping out with permission - was this at age 14 or was it at age 16 previously? I would also be very interested if he could tell us in general terms what the reasons are that are given for dropping out. I mean if you get so many dozen a year, what general categories do they fall under. I'm quite interested in that.

Also, this question of having permission when you're over 15 years and the question of being expelled. Can a student under 15 be expelled, or if a student is 15, can he be expelled by "having permission" from the superintendent? It seems a sort of a reverse situation. I don't think the dropouts are a bad thing in themselves, depending upon the actual reason for the student dropping out. It might indicate a failure of the system; it might indicate certain personality problems, etc. One of the dangers of not having any dropouts or keeping everybody in the system is that you get teacher dropouts, unable to cope with some of the problematic students.

So I think the principle certainly appears to be reasonable, providing that the Minister can justify the Bill by I think demonstrating that reasons for the dropouts are valid and that they cannot be solved within the educational system.

MR. JOHNSON: If everybody's spoken I'd like to just reply to some of the comments made, in closing the debate, and I'd hope to have any detailed questions possibly answered by my deputy and other members of the staff during the Law Amendments session.

We looked at this long and hard. Many of the superintendents brought this to the department's attention over the past couple of years. There are not many students involved. Very often, when a child is expelled it's a matter of guidance and the parents and teacher getting together, as my honourable friend would be aware. The problem is, it seems to be largely in that 15-year-old group, that hard core who can't be guided or taught or persuaded to continue in school and are very anxious to get into a work situation. I think if this were to lead to abuse in any way I'd be the first to want it repealed within a year. I don't think we can -- however I feel that with the parent, the superintendent of the division, the school attendance officer for the area, all having to agree in concert that this is a situation where the boy or girl concerned just isn't going to carry on and it's going to disrupt the class, that a work permit be given. I would hope that these would be certainly no loophole to lower the compulsory school leaving age which we in Manitoba are extremely proud of, and I know where I'm in direct conflict with the Member for Rhineland. Not even the Labour Government of Britain, in all their history, has been able to raise the school leaving age to the level we've achieved in Manitoba. It's 15 in Britain - they can't afford to put it to 16. And we have surely, by diversifying and enriching our course, I would be very anxious to hear if the Member for Rhineland knows of any case today of a boy or girl who is spending 14 years or whatever it is, seven or eight years in Grade 1 and 2. Lord Harry, this goes back to prehistoric times. When the first Icelanders arrived they had six grades in the first few years of their operations. This is just -- Lord Harry, I can't justify this system if the Member for Rhineland is anywhere near target, because surely our job has been to open more doors of opportunity, to maintain the interest of the child in a more diversified and sophisticated system so that when he goes out of the system he is prepared for today's world. In my day you could be expelled and still go on to head -- well, one of my classmates, a \$150,000 a year man now, he never saw Grade 7. But the world is changing. There's the odd brilliant fellow who can do that but these are the exceptions. I think we must do what we can through our system to make sure that we have offered our boys and girls a real good opportunity to see the further doors of opportunity which education has to offer them.

With respect to the general remarks of the Member for Burrows. You may know, but this Act was written I think in the early Fifties with the Deputy and - in those days - a part-time legal counsel. It's been a pretty good Act. We're in the process now of a general revision of the whole Public Schools Act. We have been for the past year or more, and it seemed we'd like to bring total revisions in, I would think, at one time despite the lack of logic, as the Member for Burrows sees it, in some of the passages in the School Attendance Act. Strangely enough, it's worked well by and large. But the revision, I would hope we would leave the revision -- the intent, the important thing is that the intent of this little piece of legislation today is to look after a very small group. I believe the last time I inquired into this it involved about 20 to 25 children in any one year, but these are cases where right now these boys or girls are in constant violation of The School Attendance Act and are subject to prosecution for being out of school, and the School Attendance Officer in our department,



(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) . . . . working with the School Attendance Officers throughout the province, does what he can to get children back into school, to encourage them to come back and this sort of thing. Where children are expelled, they're worked with by our social agencies, in tough cases where children have been neglected and so on, but by and large they see this circumscribed need in this 15-year-old group.

My Deputy Minister told me that this has been the practice or had been the practice in Winnipeg for many many years and worked very successfully, so I would hope we can have some further discussion at the Law Amendments stage, but I'm going to have to spend more time getting closer to my honourable friend from Rhineland as to the intent of this legislation.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am unable to rebut in the situation because I've exhausted my right to speak, but I think I should refute what was said by the Honourable Minister because I am not one who is not interested in the education of our children in Manitoba, not by any means.

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order, I believe the honourable gentleman has had his privilege of speaking on this matter. The Honourable Minister asked if there were any others who wished to speak and he closed the debate.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 32. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. ENNS presented Bill No. 32, An Act to amend The Agricultural Societies Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, seconded by the Honourable Minister -- the Minister of Health is not in his place. Does the Honourable Minister of Agriculture have a seconder?

MR. ENNS: I beg your pardon. The Minister of Education.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, this Act is fairly well known to the members, I am sure. Basically what we're doing in the amendments is to raise the maximum allowable, the grants that are available to the various classifications of fairs within the province, that is the Class A, B and C. The legislation is permissive. We intend to raise the ceiling at this time, or the reason why it's before us at this time is because some of the fairs have reached their maximum some time ago and we're unable to respond to them in any way to further improve their plant capacity at some of these fairs. I might just point out that there's nothing in these amendments that would in any way curtail the development of fairs, including the smaller fairs. Many of the smaller fairs are of course disappearing from the scene but I'm happy to say that, as members are aware, we have some very active and successful small fairs. The amendments here apply equally to them as well.

Another matter that is in the Act, Part 2 of the Act, is recognizing the Agricultural Museum at Austin as being the official Agricultural Museum of Manitoba. This matter was just recently drawn to my attention and I thought that we should do this. There has been some suggestion, or hesitation on the government from doing this earlier because we recognize in so doing we're aware of the many fine museums in other towns and parts of the province, but the thing that we have to deal with here is the fact that the Federal Government will recognize only one and, that being the case, we propose to do that and there will be specific sums in the Bill with respect to annual grants as well as one time capital building grants that will be equally matched by the Federal Government. It is our hope, of course, by so doing that we will have the funds to really put this agricultural museum at Austin into shape and into position to be one of the finer agricultural museums on the prairies. I'm sure that those of us that are familiar with what they have there firmly believe that this can be done. They certainly have lots of the material there to make it such.

Other amendments are there primarily to up-date the Act with respect to some of the procedures that we have to go through. One particular one is in the dissolution of societies. This is a bit of a cumbersome situation under the old Act and we do get requests from time to time, particularly -- take the last one for instance, that I had was the one just bordering on the city, the Agricultural Society of Headingley. What really in fact happened is that the city over-ran the once verdant pastoral scenes of Headingley and it's now a thriving suburb of Winnipeg, and the Agricultural Society has of course -- (Interjection) -- Assiniboia? Pardon me. The Member for Assiniboia corrected me. These things do take place and it's meant to clean them up.

(MR. ENNS cont'd.)

I don't think there's anything more that I could add, Mr. Speaker, to these amendments. I commend them to the honourable members.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, without exhausting my right to speak, may I ask one question of the Honourable the Minister? Would he comment on the section that appears just before the Agricultural Museum?

MR. ENNS: That is the section . . . You're referring to the Section 1, conducting or carrying on horse racing meets or any other form of horse racing, owning or operating of racetracks? Well, it's our intention to bring about some amendments that have regard to this matter. I think the primary regard to some specific amendments with respect to the trotting races, the harness racing, I would have to check the notes on that specific matter. Right now, as you know, they are tied specifically to the fair days that are held by the agricultural societies, and while I don't have the details before me, it is my understanding that we've received some requests for some additional flexibility to be allowed in these instances. I really must apologize, Mr. Speaker, for not being able to elaborate more fully on this particular aspect of the Bill. I'll be prepared to do so certainly at the committee stage of the Bill, and bring to the honourable member's attention, perhaps even prior to that, if he wishes to speak on the second reading of the Bill.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, the Agricultural Societies Act amendments that are proposed here I think are very far-reaching, and in my opinion change the purpose of agricultural societies as such, because if we're going to bring in horse-racing into agricultural societies, this is what people end up with - horse-racing tracks. And in my opinion this is a complete change. Is it just because of Red River Ex that we are doing this, or are there other fairs such as Carman where they have that horse trotting and so on? I think we should have had a much fuller explanation on this first section before we, as members in the Opposition here, have to speak on it because now we're exhausting our right to speak on the principle of it when we do not have all the details.

I certainly object to only having one organization, one museum recognized here in Manitoba. They're setting up one in our own locality and I think they're just as deserving and that certainly some support should be coming forward to them as well. I do not mind supporting the Manitoba Agricultural Museum as such, but I think there should also be provision for other museums as well.

Under Section 5, where we have the different classes of fairs and the amount of grants that they will be earning, the way I read it past contributions will be deducted from this. Am I right? I would like the Minister to give an explanation on this whether this is so and how much, under the proposal, can the various fairs expect as contributions.

The section dealing with arbitration, or with dissolution, this seems very arbitrary to me. How many of the fairs that are presently in existence are on the black list? How many are to go? To me, it seems that there's no provision for boards of the various fairs to indicate whether they want to be dissolved. It is up to the Minister to decide. If they are not entitled to a grant, if he doesn't want to give them a grant, he can just dissolve them, and I feel that the powers here should be somewhat less than what is provided for under Section 43 under the dissolution section. Mind you, certainly there must be provision for those that want to dissolve as to how this is supposed to be done, but I feel that there should be more leeway here so that fair boards can indicate as to what their wishes are.

Certainly I would like to have a fuller explanation on the first section dealing with racing meets and making our agricultural societies just horse track meets occasions.

MR. DOW: Mr. Speaker, I wish to adjourn this debate, and if anybody else wishes to speak I would . . .

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, there is only one thing that I want to raise and that is this, and in raising it I hope I'm not placing myself in the position of having members believe that I'm opposed to parimutuel betting. I'm not. But what I want to know is, under Section 1 of the Act which gives an added power to conduct or carry on horse racing meets or any other form of horse racing, or owning or operating race tracks, would the Minister advise us when closing the debate, whether or no, by virtue of this power being given to this Society, the various societies created under this Act would have the rights to operate parimutuel machines? It is my understanding that the Federal Government only gives that right to a racing association or society which is created or established by a private Act of the Legislature, and this could

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd.) . . . . not be construed as such an Act, but I would like to have clarification on that point.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if my colleague intends to adjourn, I just wish to say a few words and I'm strictly interested in that portion regarding the horse racing aspects that my honourable friend is bringing in. I read this and was wondering what it was my honourable friend had in mind. I listened to his explanation and I gather he's not quite sure himself exactly what the clause is intended to do. I wondered if it had anything to do with the situation in Winnipeg here and the discussions that have been going on between my honourable friend and the thoroughbred problems in Manitoba and the demands for a change in the tax structure, and I was looking forward to an explanation from my honourable friend on this occasion on the situation which has developed in the past little while and thought that he might take this opportunity to inform the House as to the discussions that he has been holding. These have been outside of any public body and they have been private conversations with the Minister, and it seems to me that this would be an ideal occasion, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister to tell the House exactly what's going on and is there in fact going to be horse racing in Winnipeg this summer or not; does he intend to reduce the tax in order to permit this and has he made any concessions and if so, what. It would appear to me that this amendment can only be interpreted as an extension of horseracing and therefore that a full report at this time from him would be most welcome.

MR. DOW: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would inquire from the Honourable Member from Selkirk, whether he would care to proceed with the second reading of Bill No. 47. If so, I would be willing to call that now or, in the alternative, to adjourn the House.

MR. HILLHOUSE: . . . objects to my moving it, I'm prepared to move it.

MR. EVANS: Very good. In that event I think it would not be our intention to call the Committee of Supply this afternoon.

MR. HILLHOUSE presented Bill No. 47, an Act to amend The Land Surveyors Act, for second reading.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would care to call it 5:30.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of other private bills and it certainly would suit us perfectly if the Minister wishes to ask those who have other private bills if they can put them through, so that they can be . . . I'd be prepared to give consent.

MR. EVANS: My honourable friend is speaking about Bills No. 42, 45, and 51.

MR. MOLGAT: Right.

MR. EVANS: I think we should put forward all the business we can. Mr. Speaker, perhaps you would care to call second readings of Private Bills; No. 42, at the end of the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Second readings. Bill 42. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre) presented Bill No. 42, an Act to amend, revise and consolidate An Act respecting the Congregation Shaarey Zedek, for second reading.

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

MR. DESJARDINS presented Bill No. 45, an Act to amend an Act to Incorporate Les Chanoinesses Regulieres des Cinq Plaies, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I may have leave of the House to ask the Clerk to read that on my behalf.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion, as read by the Clerk, and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon) presented Bill No. 51, an Act to amend The Brandon Charter and to amend An Act respecting The City of Brandon and to Validate By-law No. 3930 of The City of Brandon, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think there are largely three main items covered in the bill. The first one is in connection with private works under streets in the City, and I enquired as to whether anything new was being contemplated under this section and they said no, rather it was to clearly define responsibility. There are some of the older stores in the

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd.) . . . . downtown district which have basements running out under the sidewalk area and naturally this could raise the question of liability if any accident were to happen and largely it is to definitely locate the person who could be assumed to be responsible, and it defines the liability for damage by reason of public works on the street.

Another section, the main idea within the bill, or the problem, is that of creating park-ades or parking structures or lots and assessing the cost as a local district improvement. The by-law is pretty largely a matter of -- members are no doubt aware the City of Brandon contributed in the past to the Brandon College and now will be contributing to the University of Manitoba one mill. This has been growing over the years and since Brandon College now has become Brandon University this, in the simplest language, just simply changes the name so that the grant from the mill rate can be made to the University of Brandon.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I merely have one question to ask of the mover. I notice that a portion of the Bill makes the by-law retroactive. If it is merely for this one mill, to make it payable, that's fine. I just want to be sure that there are no other aspects of the retroactive feature of the by-law. I am always concerned when I see bills with retroactive features that they may have other effects that we may not be fully aware here in the House. I'm not going to oppose the Bill. I will support it on second reading, but I would hope that when we reach the committee stage that it is very clear to members of the committee that there are no side effects of which we may not be aware at this time.

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Speaker, if I might be permitted to reply to that. I will -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster; did you have a . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to know whether, if the Honourable Member for Brandon speaks now, he will be closing the debate because if so I would like to have the debate adjourned.

Then I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30. I'm leaving the Chair and the House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning.