

Name	Electoral Division	Address
ALEXANDER, Keith	Roblin	Roblin, Man.
BAIZLEY, Obie	Osborne	185 Maplewood Ave., Winnipeg 13
BJORNSON, Oscar F.	Lac du Bonnet	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
CAMPBELL, D. L.	Lakeside	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARROLL, Hon. J.B.	The Pas	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
CHRISTIANSON, John Aaron	Portage la Prairie	86-9th St., N.W., Ptge. la Prairie, Man.
CORBETT, A. H.	Swan River	Swan River, Man.
COWAN, James, Q.C.	Winnipeg Centre	512 Avenue Bldg., Winnipeg 2
DESJARDINS, Laurent	St. Boniface	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
DOW, E. I.	Turtle Mountain	Boissevain, Man.
EVANS, Hon. Gurney	Fort Rouge	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORBES, Mrs. Thelma	Cypress	Rathwell, Man.
FROESE, J. M.	Rhineland	Winkler, Man.
GRAY, Morris A.	Inkster	141 Cathedral Ave., Winnipeg 4
GROVES, Fred	St. Vital	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
GUTTORMSON, Elman	St. George	Lundar, Man.
HAMILTON, William Homer	Dufferin	Sperling, Man.
HARRIS, Lemuel	Logan	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
HARRISON, Hon. Abram W.	Rock Lake	Holmfield, Man.
HAWRYLUK, J. M.	Burrows	84 Furby St., Winnipeg 1
HILLHOUSE, T.P., Q.C.	Selkirk	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
HRZHORCZUK, M.N., Q.C.	Ethelbert Plains	Ethelbert, Man.
HUTTON, Hon. George	Rockwood-Iberville	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
INGEBRIGTSON, J. E.	Churchill	Churchill, Man.
JEANNOTTE, J. E.	Rupertsland	Meadow Portage, Man.
JOHNSON, Hon. George	Gimli	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg
JOHNSON, Geo. Wm.	Assiniboia	212 Oakdean Blvd., St. James, Wpg. 12
KLYM, Fred T.	Springfield	Beausejour, Man.
LISSAMAN, R. O.	Brandon	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
LYON, Hon. Sterling R., Q.C.	Fort Garry	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MARTIN, W. G.	St. Matthews	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
McKELLAR, M. E.	Souris-Lansdowne	Nesbitt, Man.
McLEAN, Hon. Stewart E., Q.C.	Dauphin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MOLGAT, Gildas	Ste. Rose	Ste. Rose du Lac, Man.
MORRISON, Mrs. Carolyne	Pembina	Manitou, Man.
ORLIKOW, David	St. John's	179 Montrose St., Winnipeg 9
PAULLEY, Russell	Radisson	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
PETERS, S.	Elmwood	225 Melrose Ave., Winnipeg 15
PREFONTAINE, Edmond	Carillon	St. Pierre, Man.
REID, A. J.	Kildonan	561 Trent Ave., E. Kild., Winnipeg 15
ROBERTS, Stan	La Verendrye	Niverville, Man.
ROBLIN, Hon. Duff	Wolseley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SCARTH, W.B., Q.C.	River Heights	407 Queenston St., Winnipeg 9
SCHREYER, E. R.	Brokenhead	Beausejour, Man.
SEABORN, Richard	Wellington	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
SHEWMAN, Harry P.	Morris	Morris, Man.
SHOEMAKER, Nelson	Gladstone	Neepawa, Man.
SPELLIE, Robert Gordon	Birtle-Russell	Russell, Man.
STANES, D. M.	St. James	381 Guildford St., St. James, Wpg. 12
STRICKLAND, B. P.	Hamiota	Hamiota, Man.
TANCHAK, John P.	Emerson	Ridgeville, Man.
THOMPSON, Hon. John, Q.C.	Virden	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WAGNER, Peter	Fisher	Fisher Branch, Man.
WATT, J. D.	Arthur	Reston, Man.
WEIR, Walter	Minnedosa	Minnedosa, Man.
WITNEY, Hon. Charles H.	Flin Flon	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WRIGHT, Arthur E.	Seven Oaks	4 Lord Glenn Apts. 1944 Main St., Wpg. 17



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Thursday, March 16th, 1961.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Chairman, before we proceed with the Attorney-General's estimates I would like the privilege of introducing to you Sir, and the rest of the members of the Legislature a group of young ladies sitting in the gallery to your right, Sir. They are 20 in number; they are here with their President, Miss Ellen McCaw, and they are members of the Elmwood and East Kildonan Business and Professional Womens' Club. I hope, Sir, that after they have watched us for a while that they do benefit something from our discussions.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I might mention to my honourable colleague that I've been informed that some of the charming young ladies up there are ex-school mates of mine and I want to add to the welcome given by the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. CAMPBELL: I might add, Mr. Chairman, that it's a remarkable thing if they are ex-school mates of my honourable friend the Leader of the CCF Party that they all look about the age of his daughters.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I undertook just before we adjourned at the dinner hour to make to the House a general response from the enquiry concerning the progress of the three Constitutional Conferences which have been held since this House last met.

I think honourable members will appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that the conferences are held in the form of a sub-committee actually of Ministers of Attorneys-General of all of the provinces of Canada with their respective advisors. The meetings have all been in-camera. This is a procedure that was unlike the procedure followed in 1950 when my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition last discussed this matter on Manitoba's behalf. The detailed discussions therefore have not been made public, but nonetheless I think I can indicate in a general way to the committee tonight what has been transpiring and give some general indication with which, I am sure the honourable members opposite will agree, Manitoba has been approaching this problem.

Conferences on this subject, Mr. Chairman, were last held prior to the recent meetings in 1950. No agreement was reached on methods of amendment although there was agreement on some preliminary matters. A very large part, although not all of the Constitution of Canada, is contained in the British North America Act, 1867, and subsequent amending acts. These statutes can at present be changed only by the Legislature that enacted them, that is the Parliament of the United Kingdom. The Minister of Justice summoned a meeting of Attorneys-General in October 1960 to discuss the matter of amendments to the Constitution of Canada. Honourable members opposite will appreciate that this was consequent upon certain statements that were made at the first of the Dominion-Provincial Fiscal Conferences that were held in Ottawa in July. I should say that prior to attending the first conference, Mr. Chairman, I was fortunate enough to gather about me a small advisory committee who have been assisting in the preparation of material for the conferences since they have begun. The members of the committee are Mr. G.S. Rutherford, Q.C., our Legislative Counsel, Mr. A.A. Moffett, Q.C., who was a former Deputy Attorney-General of Manitoba and who was formerly engaged as one of the chief advisers by our predecessors when they were in office, Professor Murray Donnelly of the Department of Political Science of the University of Manitoba and Mr. Ross Munro, the Publisher of the Winnipeg Tribune. I should offer most sincerely to these gentlemen on behalf of the government and, indeed, on behalf of the House, our sincere thanks for the amount of time and effort they have placed at the disposal of the government giving us the benefit of their views on this very, in spots, very complicated subject which we now have before us. At that meeting in October each province made a preliminary statement setting forth general views. It will be realized this initial statement was in response to a proposed outline of conference procedure which had been distributed to the members of the different delegations by the Minister of Justice prior to our arrival in Ottawa.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, was the Minister of Justice the Chairman of the meetings?

MR. LYON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Justice has been the Chairman of all of the meetings. I would, if the House would permit, Mr. Chairman, I would read to the House and onto the record now the preliminary statement which I made on behalf of the Province of Manitoba at the opening of the Conference in October of 1960. I may say that these statements

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) . . . . were all given to the press immediately after they were given and this was the first viewpoint that Manitoba expressed to the Conference with respect to the subject at hand. My statement went as follows: "At the outset may I express Manitoba's appreciation at the initiative taken by the Federal Government in calling together the Attorneys-General of all provinces to this Conference. To say that we enthusiastically welcome the opportunity of discussing and, we hope, achieving the aim of domiciling the Canadian Constitution in Canada is an understatement. The time for this step we consider to be long overdue. Ten years have now elapsed since the last Federal-Provincial Constitutional Conference in which time areas of disagreements which then prevented realization of this goal, have surely been diminished. We are, therefore, optimistic that we can achieve this measure of national self-determination which the people of Canada most surely will welcome, and which the times demand. At the meeting in January of 1950 the position taken by Manitoba was the same as that taken at the 1935 meeting, namely, that: (1) The Parliament of the United Kingdom should no longer be retained as the instrument for effecting legislative amendments to the British North America Act 1867. (2) There should be established a procedure by which the British North America Act 1867 may be amended under legislation enacted by the Parliament of Canada in which procedure special provision should be made for legitimate provincial claims throughout autonomy. The Government of Manitoba still subscribes wholeheartedly to these principles."

"I gather from a letter of 19th September, 1960, written by the Minister of Justice that it is his suggestion that we proceed here and now to consider only the first stage that he proposed in that letter, namely, a method of domiciling the Constitution in Canada. This is broadly speaking, the first of the two parts of the position of Manitoba to which I have already alluded. The Minister of Justice in making this suggestion has thereby demonstrated his confidence in our ability to take the second step. Namely, that of devising a satisfactory amending procedure for the British North America Act. We of Manitoba share this confidence to the full. The omens for complete success seemed to us favourable. In the past 20 years Canada has gone through a remarkable development, in a spiritual as well as an economic sense. National unity which used to be such a delicate creation is now firm and secure. On the international scene the name Canada has become a symbol of integrity, reasonableness and tolerance; a country where many races live together in harmony and well being. The experiments begun nearly 100 years ago have turned out a complete success. Dealing then with the Minister's proposal, let me say that in principle, Manitoba approves the first stage suggested by the Minister of Justice with, however, this rider or condition: "means must be found to insure that the proposed amendment to the British North America Act if made by the United Kingdom Parliament would not then remain the permanent and sole method of amending the Constitution, but would be effective only for the purpose of subsequently adopting a comprehensive amending formula as suggested by the Minister. We realize that there may be divergent views as to just what provisions of the constitution should be so entrenched as to require unanimous consent for their amendment. Possibly some provinces would prefer to have a very large number of provisions so entrenched; and after the proposed amendment had been enacted by the United Kingdom Parliament these provinces might, on reconsidering the matter, decide that they were of opinion that the amendment enacted was satisfactory and that nothing more was required. The result would be that all of the provisions of the British North America Act would be entrenched, subject possibly to the rights acquired by parliament under the British North America Act No. II, 1949, - which rights are now embodied in Class 1, under Section 91, of the British North America Act. I'm referring there, of course, to the amendment made by the Federal Government in 1949. I say possibly, because there may be a possibility that the Courts would hold that the new procedure had impliedly repealed the 1949 amendment. That is, Class 1 of Section 91. There are some matters, including some which concern only the Dominion and one or more provinces, on which in 1950 there was a considerable measure of agreement that unanimous consent of all provinces would not be required in order to secure amendment thereof. Even these would be entrenched if the proposed amendment to the British North America Act were enacted and not followed by the adoption of a comprehensive amending formula. Manitoba believes that it would be dangerous and unsatisfactory from the point of view of Canada, and of each and every province, to run the risk of entrenching the whole Constitution so as to require unanimous consent for its amendment. I realize that what the Minister of

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) . . . . Justice had in mind was that the first step would soon be followed by the second, the enactment of an amending procedure. However, Manitoba is of the opinion that something should be done to insure that we are not left for an indeterminate period with the first stage only. We have, therefore, a suggestion to make."

"We suggest that if the Act proposed by the Minister of Justice as a first stage is enacted by the United Kingdom Parliament it should come into force only upon proclamation. It would then be necessary to have a binding arrangement between the Government of Canada and the government of each province agreeing that no request would be made by the Government of Canada to the Government of the United Kingdom for the issue of a proclamation bringing the Act into force until such time as the Government of Canada and the government of each province were unanimously agreed upon a comprehensive amending formula, and that upon such an agreement being reached, the Government of Canada would make such a request to the United Kingdom Parliament. With a safeguard such as this Manitoba would be willing to proceed as suggested. Let me emphasize, however, that we are quite willing to consider alternative proposals that may be brought forward. The suggestion that we have made, that we have put forward, has only been made as one means of overcoming the obvious fears which we foresee might arise. Manitoba does think, however, that something more could and should be done here than merely agreeing to the first stage. We assume that we all agree that the amending procedure should be domiciled in Canada and that the Minister contemplate a joint address of the Senate and the House of Commons to the United Kingdom Parliament requesting the necessary legislation. This joint address can be made any time during the next session, and this gives us several months before the action need be taken. We therefore propose that a committee of Ministers and advisors be now struck to prepare the amending formula and express confidence that the whole process might be completed by July 1st, next." -- We were operating on an optimistic note -- "I do not propose now" -- and I would stress this part of my opening statement, Mr. Chairman, to the members of the committee -- "I do not propose now to re-enunciate the traditional stand of Manitoba on the second category, the amending formula itself, to which Manitoba still subscribes. That discussion can best await a later occasion in this or subsequent conferences. I hope the proposals we have made will be found constructive and will merit the Conferences consideration as one means whereby agreement may be expedited." That concludes the opening statement that was made at the first Conference.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Chairman if the Honourable the Attorney-General is prepared or has available copies of that statement? May I suggest if he hasn't got it for all of the members that the Leader of the Official Opposition and myself may be given a copy of that statement.

MR. LYON: I'll be quite happy to give this to the Clerk and see if he can have somebody run off copies right now. I don't know if there is anyone available to do it; perhaps one of the typists could run it off for use, but I am quite happy to have that done.

Coming back to the Conference procedure itself, Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned the Minister summoned the first meeting of the Attorneys-General in October 1960 to discuss the matter of amendments to the constitution and I have just now given you the opening statement that Manitoba made at it. He suggested that the conference concern itself at first only with deciding on a method whereby amendments could be made in Canada and without resort to the Parliament of the United Kingdom. It is well understood that there would be no difficulty with that parliament which is more than willing to rid itself of this duty. I think that that is understood by all people. Meetings of this conference were held again in November, 1960 and then again in January of 1961. It appeared that the consensus of the Attorneys-General was that the method of bringing amending procedures into Canada should be discussed along with the amending procedure itself -- much along the lines as my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition mentioned this afternoon, and that in fact is what happened. The emphasis was changed from the method of domicile back to the old discussion of the amending formula and the conference proceeded after the first meeting to pay most of its attention, if not all of its attention, to the amending formula.

It is to be noted that in 1949 the United Kingdom Parliament at the request of the Government of Canada amended Section 91 of the British North America Act that confers powers on the Federal Government by giving that parliament full power to amend the Constitution except as regards (a) Matters, rights and privileges assigned or granted exclusively to Provincial

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) . . . . Legislatures and Governments; (b) Schools; (c) English and French language, (d) the requirement for an annual session of Parliament and that the House of Commons is elected for a maximum of five years. Discussion then has largely centered on the method of amending provisions assigned to Provincial Legislatures and Governments, mostly found in Section 92. It should be noted that there seemed to be general agreement as to the suitability of the categories into which different provisions could be grouped as formerly adopted in 1950. These are as follows: (1) Provisions which concern Parliament only; (2) Provisions which concern the Provincial Legislatures only; (3) Provisions which concern parliament and one or more but not all of the Provincial Legislatures; (4) Provisions which concern parliament and all of the Provincial Legislatures; (5) Provisions concerning fundamental rights, as for instance but without restriction, education, language, solemnization of marriage, administration of justice, provincial property and land, mines and other natural resources, and the amendment of the amending procedure. We start to get into a rather complicated field there. (6) Provisions which should be repealed. The greater part of the discussion has been with respect to groups four and five, that is provisions which concern parliament and all of the Provincial Legislatures; and (5) provisions concerning fundamental rights. That is the discussion has centred around which provision should be in group five, that, entrenched or requiring consent of all provinces to amendments or (b) as regards provisions not requiring unanimous consent, what number of provinces must consent. When the subject of entrenchment was discussed another proposal was brought forward, namely, that a wider measure of entrenchment might be considered if correspondingly wider powers were given to parliament and the legislatures to delegate powers one to the other.

Finally I can say that a draft -- one of a number of draft proposals -- was considered at the November conference and subsequently at the January conference, and at the present time as a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the government is considering still a further draft proposal which has been sent out by the Federal Government for consideration by all of the provinces to which we must give them response within no stipulated time limit, but as soon as possible. At the conclusion of the last conference in January I think it can be said that agreement between the provinces and the Federal Government was closer than ever before. Detailed proposals are now being considered in the light of the discussions of these three conferences and Manitoba is currently in the course of reviewing these proposals preparatory to submitting views on them to the Federal Government. Once these proposals have been reviewed by all provinces and their expressions of opinion thereon gathered together, it will then be determined whether or not the calling of a further meeting will be necessary to effect agreement. That is still an unknown quantity because the replies are coming in very slowly. I only know of one province that has responded so far to the last federal draft. In any case I can assure honourable members of the committee, Mr. Chairman, that an agreement reached by the committee of Ministers working under the chairmanship of the Minister of Justice will ultimately be submitted to this Legislature for your consideration and discussion. While therefore, I am not at liberty to discuss in more detail the proposals presently under review, because these of course are in correspondence between the Federal and Provincial Governments, I can report that agreement along generally acceptable lines to Manitoba and other provinces --and I stress this -- who have traditionally shared our views toward this fundamentally important matter seems to be within our reach. I am sure that all honourable members will share my hope and the hope of this government that this last measure of our national self-determination can be accorded to Canada and of several provinces in our time.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the statement that the Honourable the Attorney-General has given us because I think it does give us a basis of understanding of what is going on that we wouldn't otherwise have had. I wonder if the Honourable the Attorney-General is at liberty to disclose the letter that was sent by the Chairman of the Conference? Yes.

MR. LYON: If I may just interrupt Mr. Chairman, I have no specific authority from him. I will seek that, I know of no reason why that shouldn't be given, because as I recall I think it was given to the press. I would require his specific authority of course; but I will certainly seek it.

MR. CAMPBELL: The Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party was kind enough to show

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . . me some material that he has from the Province of Saskatchewan. It's not as usual for the Honourable Leader of the CCF Party and me to be in coalition as it is for my honourable friend and the Leader of the CCF Party, but on this occasion he took me slightly into his confidence and I appreciate the courtesy, and it seemed to indicate something that I also thought I inferred from the statement of the Honourable the Attorney-General, that a rather definite line of procedure had been suggested in that letter -- (Interjection) Yes. It was subsequently changed, was it? I think even to properly understand the statement of the Honourable the Attorney-General it would be helpful to have the letter before us. So if he could do that I would appreciate it.

I wonder if the Honourable the Attorney-General could tell us why it was thought wise to have all the sessions in camera -- did I understand him correctly that all of them were in camera? The usual procedure I think, at both federal and provincial financial conferences and Constitutional as well, was to have the opening session, and perhaps the concluding one, what might be called the formal brief at the opening session, and then perhaps the expressions of mutual regard and affection at the closing of the conference in public, but what might be termed the working days in camera. I wonder why was the procedure changed in this instance because it seems to me that there is something of advantage to have at least that much of it in the open. I'm not like some of my honourable friends, it might be that my honourable friend the Leader of the CCF and I will not agree on this -- I'm not one of these who believes that all sessions should be open, because I think that applies to a good many realms of discussions that I think there are frequently times where you are just bound to make more progress if you do not have everything that is said and done reported and speculated on and everything else -- and goodness knows there is always enough reporters around that they get a good bit of information beyond the official statements that are issued from the in-camera session -- so I'm not in any way criticizing the fact that some of the session is held in camera, I believe that to be necessary, but I was wondering why the whole session on this occasion was in camera.

I think I perhaps should put on record something that I'm sure my honourable friend the Attorney-General is familiar with and that is the statement that -- sort of a general statement that we made, and it's very brief, in this regard back in 1950. I believe I should acknowledge at the time of doing it that this expression which I think rather epitomizes the general view of our province -- the wording of it I believe was borrowed or appropriated from the Province of Quebec, and I've always thought that it was particularly good even though we can't claim that it was original with us. Here is what we recommended in general terms that the procedure for amendment of the Constitution should be: (1) elastic enough to meet the needs of a growing and developing nation; (2) difficult enough to discourage indiscriminate tampering with our Constitution; (3) rigid enough to provide ample safeguards to protect minority and fundamental rights and the Federal system under which we have developed so satisfactorily during the last 83 years -- and that of course was 11 years ago or practically 11 years ago. (Interjection) Yes, I think that is a good statement. I wish we could claim authorship of it, but I believe it was Ontario rather than we, and we certainly endorsed it. I think it still is a good statement of the general principles. I agree with the fundamental rights that the Honourable the Minister has mentioned. I can't recall them all off hand, but certainly there was the question of the guaranteeing of the two official languages; there was the question of education; there was the solemnization of marriage; there was the continuance of free trade between the provinces and some others dealing with revenue and that sort of thing. We, I think did not recommend that the question of property and civil rights, which I suppose everybody would expect me to recommend, for being in the entrenched sections; we didn't do that, we thought that there were occasions where even that one should probably not be in the entrenched category. I am encouraged to hear the Honourable the Attorney-General say that he thinks there has been definite progress made. I had that feeling back 11 years ago, and when the second of the two conferences that I attended was held in the City of Quebec, I thought that the spirit that was exhibited there and the progress that seemed to be made was so good and so great that it would be pressed along quite quickly. But as the Minister has mentioned, there was never another conference held until 1960, a lapse of a full 10 years. So it does seem that even with the very best of good feeling and the apparent desire of all the delegates to get along with the job that this is a rather slow moving procedure. I think that the thing that we need to remember, those provinces which are inclined to go pretty

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . . slowly on this, I think they should remember that if my assessment of the situation is correct, that in their own interests, they would be wise to decide upon a method and agree as far as possible, on a method of amendment of the Constitution here in Canada, because I think the fact remains -- and if this is not the case in law, I'm sure it is the case in practice -- that the United Kingdom Government will definitely amend the BNA Act at any time and every time that they are requested to do by the Federal Parliament. Those of us who think that we have our proper sphere of responsibility in the provincial arena or area and that we might sometimes be at variance with the view of the Federal Government, we should be the quickest to be ready to get some satisfactory method of amendment, because in the meantime the fact remains that the Federal Government alone can get an amendment if it wishes to.

Now I think that it's unlikely that any Federal Government -- and perhaps I'm not inclined to give quite the same full measure of confidence to the present one as I would have been to some of its predecessors -- but I think I could even go so far as to say that I don't think that any Federal Government would recommend either a method of amendment in general or a particular amendment that it honestly felt was too far at variance with any of the provincial views. I think it would try first to get agreement. But the fact remains, as I understand the situation, that if they decided to do either or both, the United Kingdom Parliament would pass the amendment. So I think it's essential that those provinces which are the most jealous of their own rights and privileges in this regard, are the ones who have the most to gain by agreeing on and arriving at a satisfactory method of amendment just as soon as possible. I don't know whether my honourable friend agrees with that or not, but that is my assessment of the situation up to date, and I think it's essential for all of us, not just as a matter of pride, although that's important too, but as a matter of good working relations. And to later on, after having agreed on the method to later on, and not too much later, move along into bringing the Act itself up to date because a great deal of it does not apply any longer and we might as well get that job finished up as well. Well, Mr. Chairman, if it's possible for the Honourable the Minister to place that letter before us as well, I think it would be helpful to us in connection with the statement that he has just made.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to respond just to one or two of the remarks made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The sessions were in camera; I think I described this group as being a committee of Ministers. The decision actually to embark upon this matter was taken at the Dominion-Provincial Fiscal Conference in open session. I think there was general agreement there that the Federal Government would take the initiative to call together this, for want of a better word, working committee -- I hope we deserve that appellation, I don't know -- of Attorneys-General to clear out some of the underbrush and see if it was possible at that level to bring forward to perhaps the larger groups and senior groups -- senior gathering -- a uniform and an agreed upon amending formula in the method of amending the Constitution. The honourable member will appreciate I don't think that there was any sub rosa motive at all in having in camera sessions. It was generally agreed upon though by all those participating that they should be such. The negotiations right now are at a very ticklish stage. We've gone further, I think, than ever before and we are now more or less at the last draft. While I know what the responses going to be from a good number of the provinces, there are two provinces whose response we are particularly interested in, and I may say that Manitoba is not one of them. This actually is the witching hour so to speak now for the outcome of these meetings and I do hope most sincerely that the view that the government has, and I know it's the view that's shared by honourable members opposite, that some agreement can come out of this, that this hope will be achieved, because then we will be able to bring back, I would hope, to this Legislature a document which we could say has general agreement right across the country including the Federal and Provincial Governments. And then discuss in full debate that document, as I think it must and should be discussed in this Legislature, before our final approval is given; debate that document and see if we all agree that this is the best method whether it be a compromise method or what -- the best method to affect this measure of self-determination that we are embarked on.

Now the second point as to bringing the Constitution up-to-date, that in itself would be a vast problem but certainly that is not being relegated off to the side. The initial concern, as I think was the case in 1950, the initial concern is to agree on these other goals which are more



(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) . . . . readily within our grasp, namely the amending formula and the method of domiciling the constitution. I think that once we agree on such a formula - all provinces - once we agree on a method of domiciling, once we bring the Constitution in effect back to Canada -- although it never really could be said to have been here -- once it is within our power to effect these amendments then we will be in a much better position to start a long term consideration of revision of the whole Constitutional fabric. I can say to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that the viewpoint taken by Manitoba in 1935 and again in 1950 have been subscribed to by this government as being sound and I think reflecting accurately the opinion by and large of the rank and file of our citizens of this province. We are hopeful that -- naturally some compromises are going to be required here and there to effect agreement with other provinces -- but we are hopeful that the main broad stream of our traditional Manitoba approach to this question can be seen to be effectually accomplished in the final draft that is approved by the conference.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, if I may just complete this part of the statement. I think the Honourable the Attorney-General has put the matter correctly because the difference I'm sure is that I was thinking of conferences where the heads of the various provinces were present, and I believe on recollection that in former times the ones where the working committees were in labour, that this same procedure was followed. I believe that is correct.

MR. LYON: In August 1950, Mr. Chairman, I may be wrong in the month but it was in 1950 between the two Dominion-Provincial Conferences, there was a meeting of Attorneys-General and to the best of my knowledge there is no record of that meeting, no written record of it. I know when we were going over the material we were attempting to find it. Subsequently at the meeting of the Premiers the documents that had been agreed upon at the in camera meetings of the Attorneys-General were brought to the Premiers' meeting and made public at that point.

MR. CAMPBELL: That is correct. As a matter of fact on recollection I think that is about the procedure that was followed before and I was thinking of the other conferences of course. I have not had the opportunity of reviewing, although I went to the trouble of finding my copy of the reports of 1950, I haven't had the time to read it up, but my remembrance is, and I may not be clear on it, that a couple of provinces -- I would rather not name them -- but a couple of provinces, two at least, rather insisted that what I think should be the second stage, be considered first. My honourable friend will have read the proceedings of that conference since I have, but it seems to me that there were a couple that wanted to deal with the actual revision of the Constitution itself rather than the amending procedure at that very conference. I hope that was not the general view or even a partial view this time.

MR. LYON: I can assure the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Chairman, that while the initial suggestion, and that's all it was, from the Federal Government was that we might consider the method of domiciling the Constitution before we moved into the worked over field of the amending formula, that that actual approach was abandoned at the first meeting and we went straight into, from that point on, the discussions of the amending formula. The question of revision of the constitution in toto has been mentioned certainly, but this is something that will follow subsequently.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the Honourable the Attorney-General and I can appreciate too, that a number of the first meetings of this Conference of Attorneys-General was held in camera, and I can understand it as to why that should be so. I appreciate too, the fact that the Honourable the Attorney-General of Manitoba has given us a statement today of the position which he took as the representative of the Government of Manitoba. I join with the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party in making a request for a copy of the letter, and if possible the subsequent letters that the Attorney-General referred to where there were some changes apparently dealing with the matters from the original letter. But I question somewhat whether or not we here in the Province of Manitoba, should have to wait for any period of time before we have under consideration in the Legislature itself the position that we in this Legislature should take. I must confess, Mr. Chairman, that I haven't had a chance to analyze some literature I received just this morning from the Province of Saskatchewan -- and I don't want anybody to think simply because of the fact that it came from that province, and I being a CCFer as well as the majority in Saskatchewan -- at least a

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . . majority in government -- because of affiliation of political interest that I draw this to the attention of the committee this evening, Mr. Chairman. But I do note that in the Province of Saskatchewan the Attorney-General there, Mr. Robert Walker, has proposed a resolution for consideration already, of the Legislature of Saskatchewan dealing with the question in the constitutional amendment to the British North America Act and also the domiciling of the Constitutional rights here in the Dominion of Canada. I think possibly that that is a proper thing and express my regrets that we haven't had a similar resolution on behalf of the government before us for our consideration at this stage in our deliberations at this session. Now it may be, I don't know, of course, I can't talk for my friend the Attorney-General as to whether or not there will be before the House rises, an opportunity to debate a resolution of this nature here. It may be and I gather from his remarks this evening that it may not be until some subsequent session that we have the opportunity to discuss what in our opinions are the best methods for us in the Province of Manitoba and the Dominion of Canada to consider this whole very, very important subject. Now it's my understanding that in the preliminary meetings that have been held that there was an understanding or an undertaking between the respective Attorneys-General that the position of one would not be argued within the confines of the jurisdiction of another, but in view of the fact that a resolution has now been placed before the Legislature of Saskatchewan, and of course in so doing their position becomes public knowledge, and I would suggest because of that action becomes debatable even here in the Province of Manitoba.

Now I'd like, Mr. Chairman to -- for the consideration of the committee -- to read out for the record and for the information of all members of committee the resolution which has been proposed in the Province of Saskatchewan; which as I say is now public property, it is no longer necessary to keep this in confidence. And here is the resolution which was proposed by the Honourable Robert Walker the Attorney-General of the Province of Saskatchewan in connection with the power to amend the Constitution of Canada, and I quote from the information which I received just this morning: "That this Assembly (1) expresses the hope that agreement can be reached among the provinces of Canada and the Government of Canada whereby complete powers to amend the Constitution of Canada may be transferred to this country." Now I don't think that there is much disagreement with that ultimate objective. Secondly -- the resolution goes on -- "That this Assembly believes that any amending procedure which is adopted must be as flexible as possible while protecting certain fundamental matters from ready change, and in particular that: (a) provisions in the Constitution relating to the use of the English and French language, education, and the new amending procedure should be subject to alteration only by the unanimous agreement of the provinces; (b) that a Bill of Rights should be added to the Constitution and this should be amendable only by the unanimous provincial agreement; (c) all other provisions in the Constitution concerning all provinces should be subject to amendment by a vote of the majority of the Parliament of Canada and the consent of at least two-thirds of the provinces representing at least 50 percent of the population of Canada. And thirdly that this Assembly opposes the adoption of any new procedure for the amending of the Constitution unless the proposed amending procedure is approved by the Government of Canada and all of the provinces." Now that to me, Mr. Chairman, without attempting to elaborate or discuss the merits, is a statement of the position of our sister Province of Saskatchewan. I'm sure that there will be a considerable amount of debate if it's not already taken place in Saskatchewan on those points of the position of the Province of Saskatchewan, and my appeal to the Attorney-General is that I for one, and I'm sure my friend the Leader of the Opposition would appreciate an opportunity to fully consider the position of the Government of the Province of Manitoba. I've said on one or two occasions in debates in this House that I am not, and do not profess to be, one of the learned gentlemen at law, but I have a keen interest in matters of this nature, and I think that we should have a clear cut and concise statement as to the position of the Government of Manitoba.

Now then just glancing over the correspondence I refer to, I note that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition mentioned the question of meetings being held in camera at least for the offset. I would like to refer to the remarks of the Attorney-General of Saskatchewan on the introduction of this resolution in reference to the question of as to whether or not the procedures should be confidential, and I quote from this statement: "That at this series of

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd.) . . . . conferences beginning last October it was agreed that the proceedings should be confidential. Saskatchewan took the position at the beginning that the proceedings ought to be at least in part open to the public. We, however, compromised and abandoned our position in the interest of harmony. We did reserve the right to release after each conference a full statement of Saskatchewan's position taken at the secret conferences. Therefore, we did at the end of each session release a summary stating out Saskatchewan's position. Now a little further on the Attorney-General of Saskatchewan elaborates on that particular point, and I think quite correctly, when he said speaking in the Legislature of Saskatchewan, and I quote: "Mr. Speaker, I hope there will be a good deal more discussion about this matter. I hope that other provincial governments and the Federal Government can be urged and induced to disclose to the people of Canada their positions on these questions. I feel that the Canadian people have a right to know what is being prepared for them behind closed doors. I think that in fairness to their constituents all governments ought to be frank with the people who in the final analysis are the sovereigns in our nation. If that is done I'm sure that some progressive means of amending our Constitution will be worked out. If it is not done then I'm afraid that some sinister influence at work in trying to thwart the future progress of our country will succeed in tying down every possible avenue of progress for Canada. This can be done on an unsuspecting public by tying down the power of amendment of the Constitution and I hope that the members of this Legislature" -- which of course was Saskatchewan -- "will see that this subject is thoroughly discussed and that the members of this Legislature will present to Canada a unanimous spirit of determination to keep our face in the direction of progress and to keep our Constitution in a condition so that progress will be possible within our time."

I quote that merely and principally, Mr. Chairman, to draw to the attention of the Attorney-General of the Province of Manitoba. I concur in the sentiments expressed by Mr. Walker in Saskatchewan that it is our right here in the Province of Manitoba, and in this Assembly, to be placed in a position of knowing what our position is in all of its aspects, whether it be dealing with the questions of the retrenchments in certain parts of the Constitution of Canada and otherwise, and I earnestly and respectfully suggest to the Attorney-General that if it's at all possible by resolution be placed before this Legislature an outline of the position of the Province of Manitoba in respect to the Constitution of Canada, which of course in large manner then becomes part of the Constitution of our province. It gives to us an idea of those things which become our constitutional right as provinces and the duties of the federal authority at Ottawa, and if we had before us a clear cut resolution from the Government of Manitoba I'm sure that we would be able to give a thorough analysis of that position and possibly offer to the government what I would hope to be constructive criticisms for their consideration.

Now again, Mr. Chairman, I say that I appreciate the remarks of the Attorney-General. It does appear to me that on this matter he is a little bit under wraps, and to me if he is, that is understandable at this stage in the deliberations, but I would, respectfully again Mr. Chairman, ask from him if at all possible at this session, that we receive a clear-cut statement of policy of the Province of Manitoba. In saying that Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact as the Honourable the Attorney-General has said, that the matter is still under discussion with the respective provinces across Canada, but I'm of the opinion that notwithstanding that, that the position of Manitoba could have by this time been thoroughly assessed, and that they could be in a position to give to this assembly a statement of principle similar to that which is under debate in the sister Province of Saskatchewan.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I regret that I will be unable to meet the request of my honourable friend the Leader of the CCF Party. I do not propose in this committee, in this House, to make any comment about our sister Province of Saskatchewan. I don't think that that would be fair; I don't think that would be proper. I only call to the attention of the honourable member who has just sat down that to the best of my knowledge that is the only province in Canada which at the present time is discussing this matter by way of resolution and open discussion in their Legislature. Now I could be enticed into saying more -- I won't. I merely make the statement that that is the situation so far as I know it. I have certainly nothing to hide from honourable members here.

I rather regret that the suggestion was made in the remarks that my honourable friend has quoted from the Saskatchewan debate, that there was something sinister about a working

(Lyon, cont'd.) . . . . committee meeting -- trying to reach agreement without the floodlight of the press and other news media being on us. I was rather surprised that that statement was made but I offer no further comment upon it. I merely say and undertake most definitely that if and when this working committee is able to come up with a proposal -- and that's what we're aiming for, we want to come up with a proposal first -- then I assure my honourable friend that we will have the greatest of pleasure in bringing that proposal before this House for the fullest most complete debate. But at this stage of the proceedings I can't -- speaking on behalf of Manitoba -- I can't see that we would be doing our cause, that is our provincial cause, or indeed the cause of unanimity and agreement among the provinces, any particular good by debating something which is still under discussion, and by saying that I'm merely advancing a personal opinion -- I think that this is the case, and I cast no reflections upon anyone else at all, I advance that as a personal opinion here.

There is very little else I can say in response to the honourable member. I think Saskatchewan did avail itself of this usage of making statements to the press after each conference. I don't know that there were too many other provinces that did. Unless my memory fails me, the statements that I have given tonight, the opening statement that we delivered, was the only formal statement per se that we really have made at the conference. There has been considerable discussion in which we have participated but in terms of formal statements I think that the one that I read to the House tonight is the only formal statement of that nature that we have given. I think our position is much the same as most of the other provinces -- there have been few formal statements, there has just been negotiations back and forth. But I can assure the House that the minute we have something of a concrete nature to bring back to Manitoba and to say; "Here is at least the basis for agreement among the provinces of Canada," that we will hasten to bring that before the Legislature for the consideration and approval, or perhaps the improvement, and that's very possible, from debate that will arise in the House on a proposal. I don't believe there is anything else of a useful nature which I could add to the debate at this time.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether I misunderstood the Honourable the Attorney-General in his last remarks or he misunderstood me in reference to a working committee. I mentioned the question of a working committee continuing on this; I got that from your remarks and not from any statement that is contained in the information of literature which I received from Saskatchewan. I also want to assure the Honourable the Attorney-General that insofar -- and I'm not defending the Province of Saskatchewan and its Assembly -- that nowhere within any literature which I have received from them did they take any position in respect of the stand of any of the other provinces, and I am sure that he would agree that they would adhere to the general agreement that the position of one would not be debated by another until the matter became public. But the reason -- the only reason that I made any reference at all to the Province of Saskatchewan is because of the fact that the matter is under debate in the Assembly, and of course at Saskatchewan, and when it becomes under debate in any Assembly then it becomes public knowledge.

Again I want to assure the Attorney-General, and I'll be glad, if he hasn't already received this information, to allow him to have what I have here for his perusal. But my main point again, Mr. Chairman, and my request -- the Attorney-General has outlined his position -- but my request is that as soon as possible that we have a full and ample opportunity to discuss Manitoba's position. I'm not concerned principally whether the position of Saskatchewan is the correct one or the position of Ontario or any of our other sister provinces. I'm not too concerned -- well I am concerned, I shouldn't say that, I'm concerned with them -- but I am primarily concerned with the position of the Province of Manitoba. There are numerous aspects of this important question that only can be considered by us within the confines of our own Legislature without consideration of those of other jurisdictions, and that is my appeal that we should discuss here on a full and frank and free basis by -- preferably by a resolution of a statement of policy by the Government of Manitoba's position.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I think that the position that the Honourable the Attorney-General must take in this regard though is bolstered by the fact that even after this working committee on which he represents the Province of Manitoba has concluded its work -- and even supposing that they come to unanimous and complete agreement -- it still will be the

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . . case I would expect that those conclusions, and even full agreement must be submitted to a plenary conference at which the Premiers of the provinces will be present as well; because this one is actually a working committee, a sub-committee of the general committee and I would expect that after they have completed their work that their conclusions are to be reviewed by the whole committee and at that time there is at least the possibility of further negotiations and discussions. In connection with that might I ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman -- I think it is a fact, is it not, that there was some further discussion at the meeting in the Province of Quebec when the Premiers of the different provinces got together for a sort of a provincial conference of their own on various matters. I believe this one among others was at least to some extent taken up there as well. Is that correct?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I was not at the Quebec conference, the conference called by Premier Lesage of Quebec. I believe, unless I am mistaken, believe that that conference was by and large in camera. I could be mistaken, although not being there I would have to refer to the Honourable the First Minister on that point. I have had no report of any substantive discussion about the Constitution at that meeting. I should make the point clear Mr. Chairman, that it was my expectation that any agreement arrived at by the working committee of Attorneys-General would be referred to at plenary conference. That, however is only my expectation -- I would advance that suggestion to our committee, but to date the committee has not formed any definite plan on this; they're working rather toward the agreement first before they decide what they are going to do with the agreement after they get it. That would be my expectation, and in the normal course of events what would happen then would be that each province could then be free to go back to its own Legislature and have a full dress debate on the proposal that is enunciated, but I can't say with any authority that that is the practice that will be followed -- that would be my supposition along with the supposition of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, might I ask the Attorney-General who is working on the working committee at the present time or is it still the Attorneys-General who are members of this working committee?

MR. LYON: The committee itself consists of the Attorneys-General of all provinces with the exception of the Province of Quebec which has been represented throughout by the Minister of Youth, the Honourable Paul . . . . . Each delegation has its own advisers; correspondence does occur between the Deputy-Minister of Justice and the Legislative Counsel who takes correspondence here on our behalf, but there is no continuing committee as such. It's a question now of correspondence back and forth to determine whether or not final matters can be agreed upon by correspondence or whether or not an actual full meeting of the Attorneys-General will be required again.

MR. PAULLEY: Have you any idea when there might be another meeting of the Attorneys-General . . . . . ?

MR. LYON: No I haven't Mr. Chairman, I have no idea at the present time.

MR. J. M. HAWRYLUK (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, I wish to deviate a bit in regard to the discussion that took place yesterday and today. I wish to commend the Attorney-General and his government in the progress they have made in the field of rehabilitation, some of the officers that they have hired to deal with juvenile delinquents. There is no question in my mind that more can be done, and in all likelihood will be done, but I wish to deviate on a subject that I discussed last year, and to date I haven't heard or seen any report by the government regarding a very, very serious matter. It's something that I -- as I said, I've broached on it on two occasions -- and that is to set up car and truck inspection stations in Greater Winnipeg and other major centres in this Province of Manitoba. In this country of ours we have certain provinces that are operating inspection stations most successfully for many, many years. In the Province of British Columbia, I had occasion to be there this past year . . . . .

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, doesn't that item come under utilities?

MR. HAWRYLUK: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . . . It comes under the Utilities Branch.

MR. HAWRYLUK: I thought it came under law enforcement.

MR. LYON: No. Actually it does come under Public Utilities. If I could offer an constructive comments after my honourable friend has finished, I was going . . . . .

MR. HAWRYLUK: I'm not quite sure under what department it came Sir, because I

(Mr. Hawryluk, cont'd.) .....believe you have a department under law enforcement.

MR. LYON: Yes, but I don't have the Safety Division or the Registrar of Motor Vehicles under me.

MR. HAWRYLUK: Well that's fine, I'll wait for the honourable member -- fine --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 1 (a).

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, each year thousands of dollars are being collected by civil servants and civic employees in fees. These fees are bail granting fees when accused persons are released on bail, and to me it's wrong that civil servants should be in a position to collect money on a commission basis and even more wrong not to have to account to some authority the amount of money they collect. For instance in the Greater Winnipeg area in the different courts during the daytime the rates vary from perhaps \$2.00 in the daytime to \$5.00 per person, and the evening the rates go as high as \$8.00 and \$10.00 per person. Any of these Justices of the Peace or Magistrates who release these accused persons on bail and collect this money account to no one and the money they collect is estimated into the thousands of dollars. As I said before, I think it's wrong that any civil servant should be able to collect this money without accounting, I think, to the Attorney-General. I think it's also wrong that a civil servant, who is being paid a salary, should collect commission during his regular working hours. I can understand a civil servant or a J. P. collecting money, or getting some compensation in the evening hours, because he's being brought off his regular hours; but certainly I can't see that they should be entitled to collect any money during his regular working hours. I was just wondering what authority the Attorney-General has in this matter, and if he hasn't got the authority, if it means an amendment to the Criminal Code, I would suggest that he perhaps make a recommendation to the Federal Government in this connection. It's known that some Justices of the Peace have collected as much as \$175 in one night.

MR. LYON: Oh no.

MR. GUTTORMSON: To me this is wrong, and I still say they should get some compensation but certainly not that much money. I would urge the Attorney-General to take some steps to correct this situation because it certainly isn't right.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, is my honourable friend referring to civil servants? Is he calling Justices of the Peace civil servants? Is he referring, or should I say this, is he referring particularly to staff of the City of Winnipeg Police Magistrate's Court?

MR. GUTTORMSON: In part, but there are other courts as well as those. That's one court that I'm referring to and there are others. There is the court over in the Law Courts; the Provincial Police Court; and there are other courts in the country.

MR. LYON: Of course no civil servant is on staff at the City of Winnipeg Police Office with the exception of the two Crown Attorneys and the two Police Magistrates, who are civil servants. Other staff, the Clerk of the Court, the Deputy Clerk of the Court down there, are appointed Justices of the Peace. The Clerk of the Court is, I believe, a magistrate, and is entitled under the Criminal Code of Canada to certain fees for bail services and so on. These are fees that are laid down in the Criminal Code of Canada. I think night work, and I'm subject to correction here and if I'm wrong I will bring the proper information back, but I think that where a civil servant such as the Clerk of the Provincial Police Court is operating during the day, certainly he does not, to the best of my information and recollection receive a fee for bail bond given during his regular business hours. However, when he's called at 11, 12, 1, 2 or 3 in the morning to sign bail papers and to permit persons to leave custody on bail, I believe that a fee is paid there. But I stand subject to correction on this, and if I'm wrong I'll bring that information back.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I can tell you right now that he does collect money during the daytime.

..... Continued next page

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to get into a verbal wrangle with the Honourable Minister, but I don't think that his flattering remarks of this afternoon should go unacknowledged anyhow. He was in pretty good shape; good form; and he followed his usual style. I don't know whether that trade mark is anything to be too proud of, but he did very well. But he missed the meat of our criticism here altogether. Mr. Chairman, there's no question whatsoever that crime is on the increase, and seriously on the increase, especially among the younger members of our society. When it is brought to the attention of the Honourable Minister that something more will have to be done than is being done in this regard, it is brought out in all sincerity. It wasn't a matter of anything to be laughed at or to be ridiculed or anything of that nature. I'd just like to remind you, Mr. Chairman, that yesterday I pointed out that, during the last three years of the former government's regime, we established what the experts considered were programs absolutely necessary for penal reform. The two most important of these was the probation services and the after-care agencies, namely, the Elizabeth Fry Society and the John Howard Society. Now there's no question that in the beginning this government did take forward steps insofar as these associations are concerned in these programs, but we pointed out, and rightly so, that for the current year and for the coming year the estimates are at a standstill. In fact, in the most important branch of this work, in the juvenile branch, the estimates for the coming year are \$9,000 lower than they are for the current year. In spite of the Honourable Minister's concern, and his philosophy -- I understand that his heart is in the right place -- he thinks these programs are good and they should be expanded, but he's just not expanding them. In fact if anything, he's ready to spend less this coming year than he is at the present time. That is our criticism, and I think rightfully taken, because we cannot allow the present trend to continue without doing something about it. One of the answers is a greatly increased expenditure in the probation field.

Well the Honourable Minister saw fit to say that they're spending considerably more than we did, and that is as it should be. That is as it should be. No doubt, immaterial of what government was over on that side, or what party was in government, that they would be spending more and more as the circumstances demanded. He mentioned something about his budget being increased by one-third since they took over, but I'd like to remind him that the revenues have increased by about a third since then too; and all our programs are governed by revenues. He made mention of the fact that they had done so much in 32 months, or about as much in 32 months as we did in 32 years. Well that of course is, I wouldn't say, a very intelligent remark, because there is good and sufficient reason for the differences. If you go back to the time he takes under consideration, the provincial revenues of that time were not even half of what we spend on education today. Furthermore, quite a number of these programs are new programs. They haven't been with us all this time. As time goes on there are always new things coming up that have to be adopted; have to be looked at; and if satisfactory, adopted and carried on.

Now I'm not altogether satisfied with his explanation of his rehabilitation program that he has been talking about for the past two years. In my humble opinion, Mr. Chairman, I still think that they're nothing but work camps. I do not think it is a rehabilitation program within that sense of the word at all. This afternoon he said that what they were doing in the way of rehabilitation was learning to work; that they worked eight hours a day. Well it doesn't look as if that teaching is taking very firm hold because he told us, if I remember right, that 25 percent of these have returned to crime after they were through. Well that 25 percent certainly didn't learn to work; and I think that the remaining 75 percent were men that have worked eight hours a day and probably more all their lives. They don't need this type of discipline to teach them discipline. As I said, I don't want to get into any wrangle with the Honourable Minister, but at the same time I would like to see him call a spade a spade and base any statements he has to make in the House on fact.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of reviving any dispute that my honourable friend may feel that he has with me. I think that it is perhaps a basic philosophical difference between the two of us as to what rehabilitation means and as to what rehabilitation is as it's carried out at the rehabilitation camp at Falcon Beach. I suggest to my honourable friend, with great deference, that the figure that he has used a number of times, 25 percent, as the rate of recidivism is an exceptionally fine figure. As I mentioned I think yesterday, if

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.)....the figure doubled to 50 percent it would still be a good figure, because the average rate of recidivism in our gaols is around 70 percent or 75 percent. I can't argue anymore on the point. I merely say that we in the department consider that the present rate, and I stress again that these are only first year to 18 months estimates, but the present rate is certainly satisfactory to us.

I've got here a -- I suppose this will bring back echoes of days when our late friend the Honourable Member from Rhineland used to sit in the House, and I've been told that on occasion he used to read the odd letter that he received. Well I didn't receive this letter, Mr. Chairman, but I think I should put it onto the record because I think it's an interesting letter. This is a letter that was written by a former trainee, and I won't mention his name, who went through the rehabilitation camp at Norquay Beach I believe it was. He wrote back -- I have no objection to tabling it, but I don't think I should put on the record his name -- he wrote back to one of the instructors at the camp, and here is what he wrote back. The English isn't too good but I think the spirit is pretty good. "Hi friend, how are you and the rest of the staff coming along? I hope the best. As for myself, I'm fine too. I'm working for the C.N.R. as a bridgeman for the last three months. The wages I get is \$1.59 per hour, which is not too bad. Better than 75 cents a day. Oh yes, when will you have a job for me out there? I mean not for six bits a day, I mean a good job so that I can be closer at home. This part of the country is too far from home. If you have a job, let me know. I would like to work with you. Who is your cook at present? And are you all out at the new camp already? So far I have been in no trouble, and I think those four months at Portage Camp have done me more good than anything in the world. So thanks to all you instructors at camp for treating me so well and I hope many more trainees will accept your instructions and find the way to happiness as I did. So that's all and thanks again, and I hope you will answer my letter. From a friend."

Now perhaps my honourable friend can say that that letter is significant of nothing, and probably we couldn't put up too much of an argument with him. But here's the indication that we've had from at least one man who passed through there, and all he did was work eight hours a day or nine hours a day; and he seemed to think it was a pretty good program. He said that he hadn't been in trouble again and he hoped that lots more trainees would be able to go through that camp. I think that this, by and large, epitomizes the attitude of the prisoners who become trainees and go to these camps. It epitomizes the attitude, Mr. Chairman, of the guards who are staffing this camp and who tell us that the atmosphere, the life, and the spirit of the prisoners cum trainees that they now have in their jurisdiction, is one altogether different from that that is found in an institution. They have freedom, yes. It's a minimum security set-up. They have freedom. They have a chance to engender some self-respect for themselves through hard work. They have a chance to make a small bit of money, not very much, but enough to have two or three \$10.00 bills in their pocket when they leave gaol. As we all know, this means a bit to a man when he is getting out of confinement. So I can only suggest to my honourable friend that we like the rehabilitation camp project; we're all in favour of it; we hope that it will continue to flourish as it has in the past; and I say that the more of these that we can set up the better will be the correctional program of Manitoba.

MR. GUTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, at the present time the liquor agencies in the country close at six o'clock in the evening and I've had requests from people in the country to bring to the Attorney-General's attention the fact that they would like to have the hours changed, particularly on Saturday night -- that is lengthened to roughly nine o'clock or ten o'clock -- particularly in the summer months, people are working out in the fields or in the hay field and they come to do the week's shopping in the evening, and if they wish to make a purchase at the liquor store it's just impossible because the store is closed. They feel that a service could be done by letting these liquor agencies remain open to a later hour, particularly on Saturday nights, because if they want to make a liquor purchase it means a special trip into town whereas this could be avoided if the agency was allowed to stay open later, particularly on one night a week.

MR. LYON: I have had no indication from the Chairman of the Liquor Commission that the request of which my honourable friend speaks is widespread in rural areas, Mr. Chairman. Certainly it's something that the commission might well look at however. The hours are not set by the act. They can be set by administrative decision of the commission and it's certainly



(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) . . . something that they could look at. I would suggest that my honourable friend's informants would be well advised to pass this information on to the chairman because I think they try as much as possible, with respect to hours, to meet the reasonable needs of the community which the outlet is serving; and certainly I know the commission would give them a very careful hearing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I have the attention of the committee for just a moment. We have spent over seven hours on this No. 1 item. It's been thoroughly discussed and the Minister has spoken twice at length and dealt in detail. So I would suggest -- I would like to get this administration item out of the way -- if there's anything that we're going to discuss that comes under any other item, we leave it until we come to that item so that we could get this one. . . .

MR. ROBERTS: I wish to make brief reference to the liquor commission, Mr. Chairman, and I think this is the only item under which I can do it. The commission appears to be having difficulty locating stores. Last year, or two years ago, the problem was the Donald and Ellice store, which is still a headache and a problem to the traffic people in Winnipeg and to anyone who wishes to make purchases at the store. I understand that there's been a change in the parking regulations around the store but there's still a bottleneck, still a tie-up, and I would like to ask the Minister if there is any intention of providing for a proper parking lot in this area or else moving the store. The second question of course concerns the River Heights Liquor Commission, or proposed liquor commission, which I understand the commission itself appears to have washed its hands of and left it to the Attorney-General or this government for a decision -- (Interjection) -- well there appears to be a glorious "passing of the buck" at the present time on this particular store and I wondered if the Attorney-General would like to comment on the intentions.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't expect my Honourable Friend from LaVerendrye to have any other views than that there is passing of the buck, because that's his traditional view no matter what the government does over here. But I can assure him that this is not the case. First of all, coming to the Donald and Ellice store, the parking situation has been ameliorated tremendously by co-operation with the city traffic authority. The latest report from the commission on this subject would indicate that the following has happened: 15 spaces on Donald Street north of Notre Dame were earmarked for 15 minute parking between 6:00 p.m. and midnight, and this has essentially solved the parking problem for store customers in the evening. They show us a table attached -- a survey that they have done on different nights shows that of these 15 spaces plus the five unrestricted spaces on the west side of Princess Street that were not occupied on each hour and half hour during the evenings of the week of February 3rd to 9th, on only ~~four~~ four of the 78 occasions checked were all of the spaces occupied. If this evening parking were still not adequate, the city authorities could restrict to a similar 15 minute parking limit more of the now unrestricted spaces nearby, but my information is that they do not feel that this is required. This procedure, according to the commission, provided adequate evening parking and has largely eliminated the traffic congestion at the bend of Donald Street that was formerly caused by double parking, sometimes on both sides of the street at the bend. The commission are of the view, Mr. Chairman, and I lay it before the House for your consideration, that they should not in that particular area provide free daytime parking for this downtown store. Their argument -- and I must admit that it is persuasive when they give it to me -- their argument is that no other business, not even Eatons or the Hudson's Bay store does this, and that this commission, they feel, would be open to considerable criticism if it were to either buy or lease -- (Interjection) -- well I don't know, I haven't seen Eaton's books. I've only seen the commission's. No other business in the downtown area does this, that is at a free rate, and I think there is a valid point to their argument that the commission might well be criticized for buying this tremendously expensive land or leasing the tremendously expensive land down there to provide free parking. Now the alternative that they have worked out, I think, is a very reasonable one. They provide, with the co-operation of the city authorities, the short parking meters in the near vicinity of the commission and, by and large, that seems to be solving the problem. Now if it isn't, I ask the honourable member to let me know when it isn't being solved and we'll certainly try to do what we can to get more parking space. But the fact remains that, in the commission's view and apparently in the view of the city traffic authorities, this situation is now very well in hand.

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.).... Now coming to the proposed River Heights Liquor Store, the commission have been seized of this problem at all times, and I think if the honourable member had been following the press releases that I saw in the paper, he would know that the present attitude of the commission is this, that they are searching at the present time for an alternative site. Their latest report to me was that they were hopefully optimistic that such a site might be in the offing. Now I think I've surrounded that by sufficient ifs, ands and buts, but I think that that is reflective of their attitude at the present time. Certainly the commission, as they have expressed it to me, have no desire to jam something down the throats of people if they don't want it. It's a question, I think, of site rather than any moralistic philosophizing about whether or not the area should be dry or wet or anything like that. I think the attitude of the residents in the nearby vicinity to the proposed site at Niagara and Corydon, I think they expressed the views that probably most of us would express if we lived in near location to a store site. I think it's well, however, that if a store were -- and I'm speaking only hypothetically now -- if a store were established there that they would find very shortly after its establishment that a lot of their fears would be unfounded. But in any case, that is the attitude of the commission at the present time. They're looking for another site and we can all hope that they have success in their search.

MR. GRAY: I don't think you should have interfered with.....in this House, particularly this session so far, but I don't think I will continue this same system. My question is, is the government's policy to render all comfort and convenience to sell more liquor or is it the same policy as being a liquor control commission. He has taken some time to explain and apologize that there's no parking; apologize there's no liquor stores. Yes he did right now, this minute. And for God's sake we have so many outlets, so many liquor stores, so many beer parlors, and your duty is to control liquor and not serve the public with everything possible for them to sell more liquor. I don't think this should be the policy of the government.

MR. J. P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, I won't be long. It's the first time I get up -- (Interjection) -- I don't know. I would like to cover it a little. I'll be very brief anyway. It will be in a lighter vein. We have had a change of government now for almost three years and too long -- somebody says yes. The government likes to call itself progressive. Now to me the word progressive suggests providing or improving our standards of living and providing a safer place for our citizens to live in. Now I'll deal only with the latter -- a safer place for our citizens to live in. It has been mentioned, and I think it's quite correct, that crime in Manitoba, according to our newspapers and news on the air, has been increasing, especially in the last two years. Just this week an article in the Tribune quotes that juvenile crime is the highest in the history of Manitoba at the present time -- (Interjection) -- Tribune, an article in the Tribune, day before yesterday. That article was quoting another gentleman saying that. I must take it therefore that .....

MR. LYON: Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, was this a quote taken from the Chief Probation Officer?

MR. TANCHAK: No, no. Just a quote from another gentleman speaking. But I take it as true. Not only judging by this quote that the Tribune quoted a certain gentleman, I'm not mentioning his name at the present time, but even judging by what the Minister had to say in 1961, if I'm correct, he said that there's an increase in the gaol population -- a certain percent in 1961 up to the present time -- but even discounting that, studying the problem in south-eastern Manitoba, 1961 was a year in which south-eastern Manitoba was plagued by break-ins and robberies never before experienced in their history. It has become so very bad that the residents are afraid even to retire at night. Some, for protection, have trained dogs; some have to resort to firearms. I'm sure that the Honourable Minister knows what I am referring to. I should really say the majority have to resort to firearms, because in many homes their shotguns are always ready, in different place. Especially the women in that area, they're terrified; and I'll have to say that we have reason to believe that it isn't some of our own local artists that are responsible for these break-ins. We have reason to believe that they are experienced people the way that they handled some of those break-ins -- coming from larger centres.

Recently in the village of Ridgeville, one resident was obliged to make use of a shotgun, probably you have seen the headlines: "Cowboys and Shotguns." He had to resort to a

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.) . . . .shotgun to mark the prisoner, to mark the criminal; and I wish to report that this system brought results because the victim had to seek the aid of a physician to probe the pellets out of his rear-end, I might say, and consequently he was brought to justice. -- (Interjection) -- Never mind where they were. I've mentioned where they were. He was brought to justice after that. In this particular village of Ridgeville there are eight operating businesses. In this one year, 1960, there were seven break-ins and robberies. Only one of them was apprehended and that's the one that was marked by the shotgun pellets. There was considerable loss to property and monetary loss. Some money had been stolen -- plenty of blood too. Some of the farmers in that area are even afraid to leave gasoline in their tanks because these people who come from farther out, probably their tanks are empty by the time they reach the area and they have to replenish their gasoline and they do it just by helping themselves to the farmers' gasoline.

I have also had complaints, and I think the Honourable Minister remembers the time I spoke to him about it. I'm not going to actually point fingers at anybody, but some of the residents there seem to be under the impression that some of the juveniles are not being treated -- the cases that have come up -- severely enough, and they asked me to bring this up. They think that probably instead of having a suspended sentence, two or three in a row, that they should maybe have a little stiffer punishment of some kind, so that it would act as a deterrent. I would say that probably -- my own conviction would say that the other method may be better since they're younger people -- give them a chance to rehabilitate themselves and improve. I am convinced that the time has come for the Attorney-General to get together with our RCMP to consider the advisability of better protection out in rural areas. The RCMP -- I'm not blaming them -- they're trying their best but they are handicapped by distances and also by insufficient numbers. I don't think the different stations are adequately staffed. The government prides itself and takes the credit for building larger and better gaols, homes, hostels and other institutions and evidently not hoping -- I wouldn't say hoping -- but expecting to keep them filled. I would suggest that we lay more stress on building larger and better recreation centres to keep our young people happy and healthy, bodily and mentally, and so reduce the population in the gaols and hostels and other institutions. At the present time in my constituency there is an RCMP detachment at Emerson. The next one is some 70 miles away farther east, and I would suggest that the Honourable Minister look into this and I would suggest an RCMP detachment at the little town of Vita, which would be about half-way between the present two. That's all I have to say at the present time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, first of all, that I certainly do not agree with the statement made by the Honourable Member for Inkster. I think that definitely it is the responsibility of the government to provide stores and facilities for people that wish to purchase liquor. Now I think there is enough of this -- (Interjection) -- just a minute you had your chance, you just wait a little later if you don't mind. I feel that that is a bit of hypocrisy for people that are talking about spending money and talking about one of the best revenues that we have in the province. Now the liquor commission, to my knowledge, has never tried to push the people, to force the people into buying liquor. There is nothing wrong with liquor. There is nothing wrong with liquor at all, it's the abuse. There is a lot of good things and liquor is one of them. It's the abuse of liquor that hurts. Now I think that's wrong to come here and make a statement in this House that it's a shame to worry about liquor stores to service a certain area. Now I'm certainly not choosing sides to say where that store should be, but I think that it is the responsibility of the government and I don't think that it is anything to be ashamed of. Now if people abuse liquor, that's a different thing.

Now Mr. Chairman I would like to bring this to the attention of the Honourable the Minister. It has been claimed a few months ago that the liquor board had been unfair. Now claiming this and proving it are two different things of course. Nevertheless, in view of the publicity that this has received and I haven't seen anybody refuting this, I think something should be said here because if what is being claimed by the manager of a certain restaurant, if what is being claimed is right -- (Interjection) -- well it's wrong, so if you don't mind I would like to, with the permission of the Chair, read just two short paragraphs and I think that would make it clear and refresh the Honourable Minister's memory. "Now a Winnipeg restaurant owner says he has had his liquor license suspended for serving minors. After being assured

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . by the liquor inspector that he was not to blame and had nothing to worry about, the liquor licenses of the Holiday Restaurant were suspended by the Liquor Control Commission from January 9th to January 23rd for unsatisfactory operation in serving minors. Dave Pollock, the manager of the restaurant, said the minor's charge followed the arrest and conviction of two girls, age 18 and 19, who had produced false birth certificates to obtain service. Mr. Pollock said the present suspension of the board meant that, in future, operators could not accept birth certificates but were still responsible whether or not such certificates were produced." Now Sir, there is some people that look a little older than they actually are and some that probably look a little younger. I think if this is the case-- mind you this is one side of the story -- if this is the case, it's not quite right to put all the blame on the operator of this restaurant and I wonder if the Honourable the First Minister -- God you spoke so much like him this afternoon that I'm lost -- the Attorney-General, if he would remember the case and if he would tell us something about this.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, referring back for a moment to the remarks of the Honourable Member for Emerson, I'm happy to report that the condition of citizens being armed with shotguns, and having to take unto themselves other weapons of defence, is not prevalent across the Province of Manitoba. As a matter of fact, it's the first direct information that I've had of such a situation in my honourable friend's constituency. Naturally we would be concerned about it and I am sure the RCMP are concerned if, in fact, this type of activity is going on. I noticed he was careful to say that it was probably some "hoods" out of Winnipeg who were causing this trouble.

MR. TANCHAK: I didn't say that.

MR. LYON: At least they weren't from southeastern Manitoba. I can assure him of this, that the situation of which he speaks must be unique to that particular town, because certainly it is not prevalent across the rest of Manitoba. I am glad that he has mentioned this to me and I will certainly ask the RCMP for a report as to whether or not they can give us any information; whether this may be an organized ring that is doing this work, as very often is the case; or just what their attitude is towards the matter. As I say, the main concern of the RCMP, as indeed of any police force whether it be municipal or city police force, is to arrest and apprehend just as quickly as possible any wrong-doers in the province. I suggest that that in itself is one of the greatest deterrents to crime that you can have and I think that this province, over the years, has gained a very enviable reputation in that respect, arising largely from the activities of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and largely as well, I think, to the activities of the City of Winnipeg Police Department, neither of which forces need take a second place to any other comparable force in Canada. So I can assure the honourable member that his words of concern tonight will be passed on to the RCMP. I am just as sure, of course, that they already are aware of this situation, but I will endeavour to find out if they have any particular information which might assist my honourable friend when he goes back to discuss the matter in his constituency.

He raises the point of course that juveniles -- he suggests the allegation is made that juveniles are not treated severely enough. Well there we are in the middle of the age-old problem again. Some would say that juveniles are treated too severely, others say they are not treated severely enough. That, of course, is why we have courts, because it is up to the discretion of the individual magistrate, on the basis of the evidence brought before him on each case, to determine how a juvenile is going to be dealt with, whether it's going to be a suspended sentence or a fine, or probation or whatever it may be, or incarceration in one of the refuge homes.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Chairman, that information I gave you, I told you it wasn't my own. I was asked to pass that on and I did speak to the Attorney-General previously, some two months ago, regarding this matter.

MR. LYON: The question of a detachment at Vita -- certainly that can be considered. The establishment of detachments -- the RCMP of course lay out a system of police areas throughout the province, and they advise us at least once a year, sometimes more often, as to where they think additional men may be needed or where new detachments may be needed. To the best of my recollection I don't recall anything on Vita at the present time, but I can assure the honourable member that this matter will be passed on to them for their consideration.

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.)....I should mention of course, that the matter we will come to in the estimates, that the RCMP force annually is increased. This year you are going to be asked to expend even larger sums under the present RCMP provincial contract, to increase the size of the force in Manitoba. This is a continuing process that goes on. In our time at least I know that they have never been refused any request for increase in strength, and certainly we don't intend to refuse them these requests because we realize that the burgeoning population, with some of the complications and complexities that this population and increased urbanization brings with it, that additional police forces are required in order to maintain law and order in the community. I would like to suggest again the main deterrent in this field is an active, well-trained police force who can go out and affect quick arrests; have good dispositions of these cases in court; and that I think is as salutary a sign as any law enforcement body can present to any who may have a propensity toward crime; to warn them off and to deter them from entering into this field at all.

I must say to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that I have no personal knowledge at all of the situation about which he spoke, the suspension of a licensed premises. These matters are always dealt with by the commission on receipt of reports or after a conviction has taken place with respect to the serving of minors in a restaurant. I can tell him generally that the types of considerations that they review are whether or not there has been any repetition of this activity in the past; what the record of the operator is in this regard; whether or not this same type of occurrence has occurred before; and I'm not suggesting here that it has. I don't know. I don't know the facts of this case at all.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well would it be possible to find out then because I don't think it's proper to have this kind of publicity if this is not the case, and if it is the case, I think something should be done. It shouldn't be too difficult to find out if you have the name of the restaurant.

MR. LYON: I'll certainly endeavor to find out what I can about that. I think the honourable member will appreciate though that the commission doesn't issue a counter-press release every time somebody makes a statement about it. They can't do it. They just carry on according to their own lights; according to what they consider to be a practical reasonable policy for enforcement; because remember, after all, that the problem of the juvenile drinker, that is the person under 21, going into licensed premises is one that's prevalent every day and it's a problem where the onus must be placed on the operator of the licensed premises. Who else are you going to place the onus upon? He is given a license to operate and one of the conditions of this license is that he must not sell to persons under the age of 21. Granted there are going to be probably, on many occasions, borderline cases; but I think the general rule that the licensee must observe in this respect is this, if in doubt, don't serve. The act is clear, the act passed by this Legislature in 1956, as amended from time to time, that the onus does remain on the licensee; and I don't know where else it can be. Certainly penalties are provided for the juvenile offenders who go in and who consume but, nonetheless, the onus must remain with the man whose door is open to any person to walk in and he must keep a close watch to determine that the customers who come in to his licensed premises are over the age of 21 and thereby legally entitled to drink. I know it's a vexing problem for all licensees in the field, but I think, by and large, they carry out their responsibilities exceedingly well. The numbers of cases such as my honourable friend mentions are, fortunately, rare. As he will see from a review of the Annual Report of the Liquor Commission, the number of suspensions for this cause or for other related causes is not great. So, by and large, we have a good body of licensees, I would say, in Manitoba. They are working under vexing conditions but I don't know of any way whereby we could relieve this onus that is presently upon them.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I certainly wasn't suggesting that this should be changed. There is no doubt that the onus has to be on the owner, but I'm talking about this particular case. Now a girl 19 and so on, could be made to look an awful lot older, and if she brings in a birth certificate -- maybe this story was written by my honourable friends in front of me -- but I think that in this case we certainly should be careful. I'm certainly not advocating that the door should be wide open, but it is quite a penalty, quite a way to penalize these people; and I would say to the Honourable Minister, what would you do if you ran one of those

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . places and a girl came in, she might be 19, she has a birth certificate and so on -- you can't throw everybody out. She might look like -- I wish I could say what I'm thinking right now, Mr. Chairman, but I'd better stop.

MR. LYON: The honourable member can't say what he's thinking, because I think he might be out of order. I may just say in that regard that the fact remains again, that if he's in any doubt at all, he must refuse to serve. It's that simple, and birth certificates or no birth certificates, he's got to respect the law. I know they try to, but if he's in doubt he just shouldn't serve them.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the exchange between the Honourable Member for Emerson and the Attorney-General regarding juveniles and the crime wave as it was called down in southeastern Manitoba, perhaps points up the need for more case workers, as we have been arguing, for pre-sentence reports for the magistrate in cases of this sort.

To get back to the liquor problem again, I think the River Heights case points up the need for surveying an area before the introduction of a new store. I know that most communities, throughout rural Manitoba in particular, if being surveyed would gladly accept the store. I suggest that if the River Heights area had been surveyed in the Corydon-Niagara area that it would not have shown the desire for a store, otherwise I'm sure there wouldn't have been 800 signatures on the petition. There's another problem with our liquor legislation which I'm sure I don't know the solution for, but I would like to present it to the Attorney-General for perhaps some reference. I'm sure this occurs in all parts of Manitoba but I'm familiar with an area in the southeast of Manitoba, where our liquor laws allow Indians, Treaty Indians, Reserve Indians, to purchase beer and alcoholic beverages off the reserve. It allows them to drink it in the proper establishments but it does not allow them to take it to their homes. The federal law concerning Indian Reserves prevents Indians from bringing alcoholic beverages on to the Reserve. I think maybe the Attorney-General is aware this has created a rather serious problem, that is becoming perhaps more serious as time goes on rather than less serious. This beer, which can be purchased but cannot be consumed at home, generally is therefore consumed in some place where it shouldn't be consumed, and this has created considerable difficulties that are rather serious. It has all the bad effects of the consumption of alcohol, that is the consumption in other than the proper places, either the parlors or at home. Would the Attorney-General have anything to say on this?

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I have. If the honourable member will recall, I think it was a year ago, we made the amendment to the Liquor Act whereby Treaty Indians were allowed to purchase liquor for consumption off the Reserve. At that time there was an inter-lacing of the provisions of The Government Liquor Control Act with the provisions of The Indian Act of Canada, whereby under that federal statute votes could be held pursuant to the provisions of the federal statute, to permit liquor to be taken on to the Reserve. Now I'm the first to admit there have been some problems. Of course there have. Certain towns in Manitoba have brought them to my attention and we have had surveys made. We've had extra RCMP assistance go out occasionally to help these towns. By and large, the reports I have from the areas that have reported to me on it, the situations have settled down considerably. I think the honourable member will appreciate, and I think members of the House will appreciate, that the question that we are facing here is not one of an Indian having liquor. The question we are facing is one of a long period of education actually. The Indian, according to the best advice we receive and I believe this to be the fact, cannot be discriminated against any more than any other segment of the community. The Indian is a citizen of this country and has rights, as a citizen of this country. So long as we continue to treat him as something less than a first class citizen, say to him; "you can't do this; everybody else in Manitoba can but you can't because you can't handle liquor." This by the way has proved always to be, by and large, to be a fallacy. The Indian's consumption of alcohol or his tolerance to alcohol is no greater or no less than anybody else on a physiological basis. But so long as this bar was in the road of Indians, there was no chance of the Indian trying to integrate into what we would consider to be normal social drinking habits or perhaps no drinking habits at all. And so on the advice of our experts in this field, we proposed this amendment last year and it was passed by the House, as I recall, without any considerable debate at all.

Naturally we anticipated that there would be some troubles with it, and there have been.

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.)....I'm the first to admit that but none of these troubles, Mr. Chairman, would lead us to believe that the action which this Legislature took was wrong. I don't think it was wrong because we are finding now that the Indian Agents are advising the different bands in Manitoba of their right to have a vote, within the band, to determine whether or not liquor can be taken on to the Reserve. I don't have the paper in front of me, but I had a recent communication as to the number of Reserves that had voted "wet", shall we say, and I think one or two had voted "dry" when offered the opportunity to have the members of the band take liquor back on to the Reserves. Those that are voting wet, I think this will see an end to the problem of street corner drinking which may have been occurring in some places and a bit of rowdyism in some of the towns. But let me make this point clear, Mr. Chairman, that prior to this amendment to the act, our Treaty Indians were getting liquor anyway. But where were they getting it? They were getting it by and large from bootleggers; in some cases in some areas getting it from taxi drivers who operated as bootleggers; they were getting it from other sources, we know not where, but they always managed to get the liquor. Now they get their liquor legally, and a good proportion of the Indians who are getting the liquor are consuming it legally in residences of friends off the Reserve and so on. A number of them are still resorting to behind-the-signpost-drinking, but this is no better or no worse than they were doing before. That was why the point that I stressed is one of education; and I think, may I say so, one of tolerance on our part. I'm not trying to talk down with respect to the Indian population in this regard at all, but I do think that we've got to give our Indian Canadian population a chance to prove themselves. We've got to extend these rights to them and let them show us that they have within themselves all of the qualities of humankind, whereby they can absorb these rights and observe the laws of the country. Now we anticipated some reaction and we've had some reaction, but by and large I think it is settling down. The votes are taking place. We're not pushing votes; the commission isn't, the government isn't. This is a matter for the Indian Agent and for the band and when these bands, in their own wisdom, determine that they want to have liquor on the Reserve, they can do so with approval from the federal authorities and then they can purchase liquor at the commission the same as you or me and take liquor back on to the Reserve.

Now there have been a number of suggestions made to us that we should be firmer with Indians; we should, when a liquor vendor in a store is approached by an Indian to sell him liquor, that he should make the Indian take some special affidavit that he's going to drink it at this place or at that place or some other place. I don't think we can do this. How can we place an Indian in a different category from anybody else? He isn't. How can we ask him to do something we don't ask the rest of the citizenry to do? I don't think it's right that we should, and we don't. We have resisted the number of suggestions that we've had along this line because we think that we must let the Indian himself respond to this new freedom that he has, and it's only by this response, with no fetters on him, that he is going to adapt himself to this condition. And so we think that by and large the policy -- it's going to be a long haul it's probably true, it may take a generation, who knows, and there's going to be evidence of some -- I remember in one town in particular, there was a complaint came in to me and they said the number of Indians drunk on the streets was terrible. Well we went out and checked the town through police eyes and found out that there was some drunkenness on the street, but by and large it was white drunkenness not Indian drunkenness; and that it changes the attitude of the people when they find out that certainly Indians cause trouble, but white people on occasions also cause trouble from time to time. All I can say is that we are working along with this; that we have faith in the Indian population and we feel that they will be able to live up to those responsibilities or these new freedoms that have been given to them, and at the present time we have no intention of changing the policy that was started last year.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure I should raise this point but maybe the Minister can advise me. Last May there was a story in the paper to the effect that the government -- with a head on it that said "Government may probe Insurance Cancellation case". It was a matter, that was raised I believe by the Leader of the CCF. I haven't heard the matter discussed at any time and I'm just wondering where it should be raised, if in this department.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, it comes under the Provincial Treasurer. I have no direct knowledge of that case.

MR. HAWRYLUK: Mr. Chairman regarding the location of the new liquor store in the River Heights area, it appears that the Liquor Commission authorities decided to choose that particular site because of the large purchase of liquor . . . 13 percent of it . . . 6 percent of the liquor purchased were of people living in the River Heights area. I think the Commission decided to buy this property at the corner of Corydon and Niagara Street and you made a statement today that they are looking around. What I was wondering, Sir, is the fact that mention was made in the paper that the property cost around \$50,000 and I'm just wondering what's going to happen. I believe the Commission will be stuck with it, and I'm just wondering if it's easier to lose \$50,000, look around for something for which you'll have to pay as much. The River Heights people have every right to protest, but nevertheless I just wondered where the fault lies. It appears they took it on good report that the people wanted service rather than come to town; that they bought this property and it was ideally located. But if they decide to buy something else, I'm just wondering exactly what will happen to a bit of property that cost quite a bit of money.

MR. LYON: I wouldn't say, Mr. Chairman, that there's a question of fault in it anywhere. The Commission, and I should mention this point with reference to the remarks of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, the Commission make very very careful economic surveys as to geographical locations to where their purchasing power is coming from and so on. This is a business operation that they are running, not a peanut stand, and they have to assess all of these factors particularly in an urban area when they're deciding on location. Geography in the urban area is very important because they site their stores so that they can draw up in concentric circles and show that they cover different areas of the City and so that everyone is within say two or three miles at the most, or whatever the figure may be, that's just out of my head, so that everyone has reasonable service. That's what they try to give. Now as to the question of the Commission being stuck with the property, I don't think from the advice that I have had from them, I don't think that this is a concern. I understand that they probably would have no difficulty in disposing of the property if, in fact, they find a suitable alternative site. Meantime, they haven't sold the property for a good cause, because they haven't found a second site. They're still hanging on to what they've got, but they are looking around for another site. Sir, it's true there was a petition signed by 800 residents; I've made some comment about that. Their other figures indicate there are some 40,000 people however, in River Heights. My honourable friends opposite, as I recall, some years ago had somewhat similar trouble in Elmwood I think it was, and there was quite a ruction over the thing at the time. But as I recall I think the Commission went ahead and put the store in. Now that may be indicative of nothing, but these things happen from time to time and I don't think it's a question of pull. I think it's a question of neighbourhood people for one cause or another expressing their opinions on the subject and I think it's a good thing that they do. It doesn't do anybody any harm at all.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, I was going to ask some further questions of the Honourable the Minister but I notice that there's very little interest in the estimates of this Legislature by the honourable members on the far side. There are only three members of the cabinet in the House so I move that the committee rise and report. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Chairman, the motion is not debatable. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Chairman, will you put the question to a vote please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion before the House is the Committee rise and report. Those in favour kindly stand.

MR. CLERK: . . . Twenty-one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Member for Kildonan was not in his place.

MR. PAULLEY: He was in the House Sir . . . proper in Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those opposed please stand.

MR. CLERK: Nineteen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion carried.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman I believe the proper course now is to call in the Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: The motion was Mr. Chairman that the Committee rise and report and I understand it there were a majority in favour of the committee rising -- then the proper procedure would be for the committee to report to Mr. Speaker.



MR. CHAIRMAN: The committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

MR. LYON: members opposite are enjoying themselves, now. That's a real joke.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker.

The Committee of Supply has been considering a certain resolution and have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion standing in the name of the Honourable the Minister of Health and Welfare.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Minister is not in the House this evening. I wonder if the House would permit this order to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion standing in the name of the Honourable Member for River Heights. Adjourned debate on second reading of Bill No. 20, the Honourable Member for... The Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Order stand.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker I rise on a point of order in this case. The Honourable the Minister has not got his notes with him. I think that others who are prepared to speak should go on with this debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The next motion on the order paper is one that I was directed to take under advisement and I'm not prepared to deal with it right at the moment. So if we'll pass to the next motion. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. GROVES: Mr. Speaker, if it's in order I could speak on Mr. Gray's motion. -- (Interjection) -- Well, we'll find another one.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: This amendment requires considerable thought and I haven't been prepared to give it that thought. I ask that it stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): I beg leave of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate, the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker I beg leave of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Johns, the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. GROVES: Mr. Speaker I haven't the adjournment of that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan, the Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker I would like a little further time on this and beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I left my notes on this resolution in Transcona and I am not prepared to go ahead this evening.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead the Honourable Member for Roblin. I believe I called that one before. Adjourned debate standing in the name of the Honourable, the Leader of the CCF Party, the Honourable First Minister. Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. John.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, I beg the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I have an order for return given... I expect some information from the Minister of Health and I cannot get on without that information.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Leader of

(Mr. Speaker, cont'd.)...the CCF Party. I might say that this is the resolution I was .... yes, to have stand. I have a ruling on it but I don't have it with me at the moment. Adjourned debate the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Speaker, this comes a bit unexpectedly but I think I will break this perfect record and say a few words on this particular resolution. Personally this matter of sweepstakes which the honourable member raises is one which I feel I would rather support if it were tied to something other than the support of hospitals in this province. I think it may not be a good thing to have the hospitals depended upon money which would be raised from such a purpose. However, I feel if it were in the support of cultural organizations and charitable organizations which normally come to the government for grants, and in which some fluctuation of revenue would be of little consequence I would support it with better heart. However, I have read a bit of material on both sides of this matter and devoted a considerable amount of my own thought to the question. The objection is always raised that this is an immoral way to raise money. Personally Mr. Speaker I can't subscribe to that particular argument because in the business in which I am employed, there is a great deal of hazard and chance involved at all times. A contractor, a building contractor, much as a road contractor, is first of all gambling on the weather a great deal of the time; then he takes a chance on labour, takes a chance on delivery of items, and even a board of this government which sets the wages in the spring, offers him a hazard. If he has estimated or figured a job early in the spring then the fair-wage board come out with a recommendation that the wages go up all along the line, he's faced with certainly a hazard of extra wages on things which are out of his control. I think that Mr. Speaker, in almost everything we do there is so much chance involved that one can hardly take this particular matter of lotteries and say that it is immoral. Certainly there is that element of chance, but we have that chance in almost everything we do, and it may be, Mr. Speaker, that the very fact that games of chance, bingo, for example, are enjoying such a tremendous growth right now, may be due to the fact that we are in various ways reducing the natural hazard or chance in our way of living and I believe that individuals need some chance or hazard in their life and if they don't get it one way they'll seek it in other ways. Actually again I must say on the argument of moral grounds I can only see this probable objection and this can be applied to all the other elements of life and that is if moderation is not used; if gambling or taking chances involves hazarding the normal rights of the family to a decent living why then certainly gambling to those extremes could be considered immoral.

Now then there has been the argument advanced in this House that we shouldn't encourage people to believe that they can obtain something for nothing. Well Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Creator made a lot of things available to us for literally nothing. If we lived in the South Sea Islands for example, we could practically reach out and get our food just for the reaching, and it is because we live in the Northern Hemisphere that we pay so much attention to discouraging people from getting this something for nothing attitude. And it's very sound and reasonable, but it springs from the fact that in the Northern Hemisphere we have to be industrious, scrape and scratch to provide for ourselves against the winter. So that actually when you consider these things I can't see that we can object to it on the grounds that it is encouraging people to look for something for nothing. The Free Press to my mind had a rather unique argument, or appeared to be an argument to me, in addition to say that this was an utterly immoral way to raise money, they point out that only one-eighth of the money collected for sweepstake count actually goes to the hospitals it is supposed to help, and the rest of the money is devoured by prizes and administrative costs. Well I can't look at that as an argument against, because in effect this would be saying: "well, eight to ten percent is no good, but if we take 90 percent then it would all be to the good". So I must pass that over as an argument.

Now Mr. Speaker a rather interesting set of figures I ran across in my reading, that in the Irish Sweepstake from a report given in 1938, the Irish people themselves only purchased 3.73 percent of the tickets for their sweepstakes; the Americans bought 57.87 percent of the tickets, and Canada, 8.49, so that this North American continent bought 66 percent of all the tickets sold at that particular time. In fact one report claims that about a million dollars came from "Toronto the good" alone -- so that members can see that there is a definite feeling on this continent to have that extra chance. Now you may say, we shouldn't be in this

(Mr. Lissaman, cont'd.)...business, but here we are in the horse racing business -- we're allowing betting on horse racing. Now I'm not going to say for a minute that two wrongs make a right, but certainly governments don't object to this -- there is 20 percent about -- the take as I understand it from horse racing of the money bet. And if you want to consider government taking, I won't say advantage of, but playing to the weaknesses of the human being, we're also in the liquor traffic and much of this money goes to very good purposes: for education within the province, for welfare work. Some of this money may even go back to the Temperance Organization to fight the sale of liquor. I have heard the objection that this wouldn't support the hospitals in Manitoba. Well Mr. Speaker I don't believe the member who moved this resolution thought for one minute that it would support the hospitals of the province, but certainly no one would turn down a million or two of revenue towards the hospitals, in my opinion.

Now there is a further argument against it that I have read. This same report that I referred to earlier said that: "in the Irish Sweepstake 3,094 persons lose their investment for everyone that wins anything". Now Mr. Speaker this is a unreasonable type of argument. No one would consider a chance, a hazard ticket on a lottery an investment -- it is ridiculous to look at it so. But there is this little lift that it can give people in rather dull circumstances of living. I can see nothing wrong for example with the housewife, she's managed to save a few pennies out of the normal household budget and she buys a lottery ticket -- and I can see her getting a lot of anticipatory fun out of wondering and getting a thrill out of wondering what will happen with the draw, the sweepstakes. And I would suggest to this House that probably this would give her as much enjoyment as an evening out for the same amount of money. In my opinion I am not speaking to justify gambling to excess at all. In fact it has always been my own attitude toward gambling that no one should gamble anymore than they can afford to take out in the street and throw it away; and then within that limit I would say that you are gambling or taking chances within moderation; and certainly this is no cure-all. I am not voting for this resolution on the grounds that it offers a cure-all. I am voting for this resolution on one ground only; that in the past I have from time to time bought a ticket on the Irish Sweepstake and I can't honestly see how in good faith I can say that, "well I have done this, but I can't grant this right or privilege to my neighbour". So for that reason Mr. Speaker I intend to support the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you wish to ask a question?

MR. HILLHOUSE: No I wish to move an adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe Mr. Gray was up first.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I am expressing my own personal opinion and for a time I was wondering whether I should support the resolution or oppose it. I am opposed to the resolution, but I must say that there are so many members in this House that vote the opposite to myself, so I wasn't sure whether I should support it -- then it will be carried -- or if I oppose it -- it'll be carried again. However, I am definitely opposed to sweepstakes. I am also opposed to horse races, but this has been going on for a while -- they say it's a King's sport. I was opposed to lengthening the time if you remember a year or two ago. Now those who attend the horse races and particularly those who buy sweepstakes are not the men or women who can afford it, irrespective of how small the amount may be -- it couldn't be less than \$2.00. And when they are short so much money every month in thousands of homes in Winnipeg -- \$2.00 is a lot of money -- they put \$2.00 here, \$2.00 on bingo and \$2.00 on something else. Then there is the morale of it. Why should anyone want something for nothing? If you want money work for it. And why should 30,000 or 40,000 people lose their money for the benefit of one getting a sweepstake -- there are not very many. -- (Interjection) -- I might be the one, I don't want it. I might be the one but what about the other 30,000 who lose money? It isn't a question of the one getting it. I feel that no one should take a chance of making money either in cards -- you play cards for the fun of it but not in big gambling or in other way of gambling, and even in gambling in stock; because the rich people don't need to gamble, they have their money, and if they gamble it's just for the sport and if they lose it doesn't mean anything. But when you see waitresses getting a low wage, running away during the races -- running away from their employment and going down to the horse races -- and how many win there? If they win, if they gain, half of it is taken away either by the government or by the promoters; so if there is \$1.00 profit for the winner it isn't a dollar, it's probably only 25

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.)...cents. This is wrong -- particularly sweepstakes. They have no control over it at all, and it's too bad that people have to spend money in order for a hospital to get something for it.

In the first place the hospitals are the responsibility of the people of this province and not of the so-called purchaser of sweepstakes; and secondly, we don't know what the rake-off of the promoters is going to be. Now I was told that in bingo less than ten percent goes for the purpose the bingo is organized, and then what do we see in a bingo night? Well I was told, I don't know, I don't attend bingo, but I do know that every wife -- not every wife goes to bingo -- goes away at five o'clock to get a good seat and because it takes time to go down to the arena she leaves her husband and children without supper because she wants to take a chance at the bingo by spending \$2.00, carfare, a taxi or what have you, and then get a few cents out of it. I think Mr. Speaker that we should definitely defeat this resolution. I don't think we should worry about how to make an easy dollar; let's work for it if we have to. I think that morally it's bad; financially it's worse and as now we have all the vices in this province already profitable. We have 240 or 283 outlets for liquor and beer. The province is spending \$60 million a year for liquor -- the people in the province. The government gets about \$15 million a year profit. Surely to goodness we have enough to drain the people, the average who live on \$2,000 or \$2,500 a year. I'm definitely opposed to it and as I said I'm speaking for myself, and I'll vote against it.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose that the debate be adjourned.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker I wonder if the honourable member would permit his motion to stand and let anyone else who wished to speak, speak on this motion.

MR. HILLHOUSE: That's quite satisfactory, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EVANS: I think I would like to say a few words on this question and leave on record my views. I am opposed to the resolution and I am opposed to it as a matter of principle. I think it has been handed down to us through ages of experience that gambling, excessive gambling, undoubtedly is a bad thing for society. I think it has been pretty firmly established through investigations by Senator Kefauver in the United States and others, that there is a very considerable connection between gambling and organized crime of various kinds in the United States, and that was made amply clear at the time of the crime investigations conducted by that Senator. But I oppose it, I think, on this occasion at least, without trying to summon massive evidence as to a connection between gambling and crime and gambling and other forms of social vice. I oppose it as a matter of principle. I think I put it to myself this way that what example do I want seen held out to my own children as they grow. I do not want to see my children begin to gamble at an age before they can handle it. I want to hold out to them that there is some danger in following that course. I want to hold out to them that they have to be pretty mature and pretty well established and have seen something of the value of money; have had to earn it; have had to save it and have had to try and spend it wisely before they take a chance in trying to gamble it away or to increase it by that means. They have to have experience, and in my opinion, moral stability before they're in a position to know how to handle it. So I don't want to see it held out to them that this is officially endorsed by their government -- the people who are running the affairs for them.

Now my honourable friends many of them will have adduced this: that horse racing is officially recognized, gambling on it is officially recognized, controlled, taxed and we have some of the revenue in the state. I like to believe that the original excuse for the horse race was something other than the gambling itself. I think in the beginning certainly there was the understanding on the part of sportsmen that they were breeding lines of horses and breeds of horses which would have value to the farms and for other ways of breeding horse, or would enliven people's interest in horses as an animal that was of extreme use on the farm and certainly was a matter of pleasure, if not a business to other people. We have a continuing interest I think in horse racing in another way in the province and that would be in harness racing, where it might well be a recreation and perhaps a profitable endeavour for farmers, if they did have harness racing and they were able to raise horses and to race them at country fairs and perhaps even with a central track in the capital city. There is some object in all that well beyond the gambling itself; I suggest that there is no object in the present proposal. The attempt

(Mr. Evans, cont'd.)...to tie it to hospitals I think forms rather an excuse than a reason. I think it would be merely a means of raising money for the state than making it the responsibility of the state to provide money to hospitals or to some other cause once the money is raised. So I have come to the conclusion for myself at least, that it does not have a practical worthwhile cause behind it to offset the damage, which in my opinion, would be done by holding forth to at least a rising generation and to other people, the example that this is a practice which is condoned by the state and is used indeed by the state itself, to raise money for its own purposes. And so I wish to place my own position on record as being firmly opposed to this resolution on the grounds that it does give official endorsement to something which I am sure history has taught us, and that is that a society which begins to gamble turns by that much against the principle that you must perform useful work or create something valuable to gain a practical reward, and that it does in fact endorse the principle of something for nothing -- or of sudden riches for a very little gain.

Now anyone would be foolish to try to deny that there is in fact a good deal of gambling -- there is in human nature some wish to have -- you play a golf game and you have something on each hole as you go along and it seems to add piquancy to the game. You play bridge or gamble at poker or play pennyante, and I am sure that we have all done that. And I recognize in speaking to this motion as I do now that you hold out a very good chance that you may be accused of being a prig. It's a risk that one must take in taking this side of the case, and I'm willing to take it. At the same time I hold out the risk to myself, I feel quite sure of being called a hypocrite, because I am speaking on this side of the case, and yet I do these things, I play for a little at golf and I play for a little at cards, and so -- (Interjection) -- I am a very poor golfer and generally it costs me money as well as, but I do hope that I retain the friendship of the people whose incomes I augment by that means. -- (Interjection) -- Yes. All right then this will be an occasion and we won't tell anybody whether we will have a little money on the side on the game or not. But I think that, this is the point that I'm discussing, isn't it? That here is a point where I think we all admit that on occasions and in the ordinary way, there are probably occasions when money does change hands, resting on the result of a game of skill or chance or something of the sort. But I do think there are degrees in the matter. I think it's very difficult to push anything to an extreme. I think it would be an extreme to say that all gambling must be stamped out; that all gambling is extremely bad no matter what its size, or what the purpose is. And it's an engrained part of it and we have to acknowledge that and we have to acknowledge in speaking on this side of the question that there is some risk of either being called a prig or a hypocrite, or both. Well I have to run that risk. So, perhaps in a little rambling fashion, Mr. Speaker, but nevertheless with sincerity, I felt called upon to declare my stand on this particular matter as being opposed to the resolution.

MR. CORBETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks on this subject matter. I'm afraid the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce took a few of my words out of my mouth when he said that he was a bit hypocritical in this matter because I am opposed to this legalized sweepstakes. In some way or other the matter of these sweepstakes naturally cast your thoughts back to the Republic of Ireland where the big sweepstakes in this world are conducted. And it would seem that as tomorrow is St. Patrick's Day, there's a little Irish twinge about this whole matter which is -- whether it's complimentary to the Irish people or derogatory, I do not know. But as I have a slight trace of Irish blood in me I thought I would bring that matter up and I wish for this whole house not to think this matter because we're discussing it on the day before St. Patrick's Day that it's any reflection on St. Patrick or good old Ireland. But as far as the gambling is concerned I've gambled all my life when I had any money and usually lost. I cannot say that my family suffered exceedingly through that, but it was pretty touch and go a lot of the times, and therefore I don't approve of the younger people having any more gambling problems put before them, or anymore temptations put before them. It took me seventy years to get a little sense, because I started gambling when I was three years old and they do it still with dubs and alleys, so the instinct for gambling is strong in all of us.

I hate to think of keeping you gentlemen here. It hurts me terribly to think of keeping you gentlemen here who made such a noble effort to get home early tonight. But my conscience would not allow me to depart without saying a few words on this particular subject. Now to get

(Mr. Corbett, cont'd.)...back -- I think you've all heard that song; "Don't Play Bingo Tonight Mommy, Stay Home with Daddy and Me". I thought, that's a very touching thing. There's another thing: I play bingo regularly when I'm home and my chief objection, I've two objections to it -- one that I never win and the other one I think the people running the bingo game take too big a cut out of it even for the ones that are fortunate enough to win. And that's what I say if we try and legalize this matter, put it under the auspices of our government or any other government, we're probably making, we might make the cut a little less heavy than it is at the present time, because I'm sure under the system which allows bingos and such for charitable purposes, the cut is much heavier than it should be and the people that are playing it are suckers. But, of course, there's one born every minute and the world is full of them. But to get back to my objections to this bill -- what were they now?

I'd like to talk more about the Republic of Ireland but that would be altogether rather digressing and I'm afraid you could call me out of order, Mr. Speaker. I'm terribly interested in seeing that we all get home tonight in good time, and I don't want to take up any more time but this is a very important subject. I regard it as an ex-gambler; I would hate to see the younger generation of this world debauched, and encouraged to be debauched by any government. I don't think we've got the kind of government here that would pass any legislation or appeal to the Dominion Government to pass legislation that would encourage mommy to go out playing bingo every night and leaving poor daddy at home crying in his beer. It's really a serious matter. I intend to vote against this resolution because as I told you before just because my forefathers came from Ireland and they're supporting these sweepstakes, I can't see that is any reason I should support sweepstakes. My that time passes slowly. But, ladies I was going to say ladies and gentlemen I thought I was at a clerical meeting for a minute. If the honourable members of this House will bear with me for a little while longer I will bring good proof, direct proof, irreputable statements to show that this bill should be thrown out on its ear.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Will you permit a question please?

MR. CORBETT: Yes Sir.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Will you change your mind after 11 o'clock?

MR. CORBETT: I think that's a leading question. I don't think I'm supposed to answer that. I hate to not oblige the Honourable Member for Selkirk of whom I have a very high opinion. I could give you quite a little eulogy of the Honourable Member. But it would interfere with my time on talking on this subject, so you'll excuse me if I do not answer your question. I'm sorry. To get back to the subject in hand. Just a minute now. What was that subject. My notes here say, "closely connected with the Republic of Ireland" but I think I've gone through that already, haven't I? Oh yes, and that song, that's a very nice song. The music, I think you can get it at an old lady's store just across from the Hudson Bay Company that handles that "Don't Play Bingo Tonight Mommy, Stay Home with Daddy and Me". It's a touching thing and I think there would be a lot more of them would be singing that song if we introduced legalized sweepstakes in this country -- in Manitoba. It's a country too. I'm hurried a bit tonight. I'm a little hurried tonight. It's kind of upsetting me. But -- (Interjection) -- I try to be an honest speaker and I do not like to deal with anything that is irrelevant or immaterial to the subject at hand. I must say that I would like to tell you about the leprochauns of Ireland but actually I don't think they have much to do with legalized sweepstakes. I don't think they run in them in those days. Pardon?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Will the Member permit a question?

MR. CORBETT: Yes, certainly.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Do you intend to send a copy of this speech to the Swan River Diamond Star.

MR. CORBETT: Not this week. But you know, to get back to my notes here. St. Patrick was supposed to have run the snakes out of Ireland. Well when done, that you know, that was really a gambling proposition. He didn't know whether he could clean them all out or not. But I think he did according to all reports there's never been any snakes in Ireland since. But that is slightly. Mr. Speaker, a little irrelevant to the subject in hand. I wish you wouldn't distract me by putting me off my subject. I'm very easily distracted and I cannot confine myself to absolutely inane remarks unless I receive a little encouragement. I think there's one more matter on the order of paper that might take up a certain little time and maybe I've spoken long

(Mr. Corbett, cont'd.)...enough on this subject to show you that I'm definitely opposed to legalized sweepstakes. I'll go out to the horse races and I'll spend my money. But I spend enough there. I don't think I should add to it by buying a lot of sweepstake tickets. My wife kind of objects to me gambling -- she did once. -- (Interjection) -- I'm opposed to it. I'm going to vote against it. I explained that fully in the first place but I have to give some reason for it, don't I? I can't just get up and vote on any of these things without giving good reason for them and I'm sure that you gentlemen all understand that I've done my best in a reasonable and proper way to give you good, sufficient and binding reasons why I should vote against this resolution, and I'm going to vote against this resolution because I don't approve of it. I think I said that before, didn't I? But anyhow, Mr. Speaker, irrespective of all the frivolous statements that some of the other members may make about this matter, you will understand that I have spoken from the bottom of my heart with no frivolity and no levity concerned and I must say that I intend to vote against this resolution.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Do you think it would be safe now, Mr. Speaker, to move the adjournment of the debate?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe it is.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I move that the debate be adjourned, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

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

MR. EVANS: I move that the House do now adjourn seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Friday afternoon.