

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Thursday, April 7, 1966

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions

MR. CLERK: The petition of the Brandon Community Chest Praying for the passing of An Act to incorporate The Brandon Community Chest.

The petition of Leon Glassco and Others, Praying for the passing of An Act to incorporate The Manitoba Institute of Registered Social Workers.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews) introduced Bill No. 120, an Act for the Relief of Tjitske Medgyes, Feikje Bosma and Tina Stuve.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 66, an Act to incorporate The Manitoba Conference Corporation of the Seventh Day Adventist Church.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris), in the absence of the Honourable Member from Brandon, introduced Bill No. 77, an Act respecting The Diocese of Rupert's Land.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill), in the absence of the Honourable Member for St. James, introduced Bill No. 96, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the St. James Scholarship Foundation.

MADAM SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation)(Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution standing in my name.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole House with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution, recommends it to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The resolution before the Committee: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to establish The Manitoba Agricultural Productivity Council, to appoint the members thereof and to pay remuneration and out-of-pocket expenses to such members.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, the proposed council will have to have at its disposal the means to consider the many sides of agriculture, and in order that they can have at their disposal the assistance that they may need in carrying out their responsibility, provision is being made so that the expenses of this kind can be met. Also, the members themselves, if they are going to be able to make any kind of contribution at all, must be rewarded in some way for the time and the energy, etc., that is taken.

I think that it's a pretty well established precedent in Manitoba that for the calibre of men who serve on these types of boards, their remuneration is more of an acknowledgment than it is of an attempt to actually pay for these services. I would anticipate that the kind of work that this committee or council will have to do is going to take considerable of their time, and if they're going to do a good job at all, they will require assistance in the preparation of materials and in the consideration of programming and the analysis of information and data and the like pertaining to the agricultural industry.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate how many members they expect to have on the council and whether these will be representatives of any particular groups; and also, whether any decision has been made as to whom the members are going to be and who the chairman is going to be.

MR. HUTTON: The statute will provide for up to twelve members. I cannot at this time indicate who the members will be, but they will be representative of the entire spectrum of industry, that is producers, processors, the distributive trade, service industry, research in agriculture, and possibly government itself. Beyond this kind of general information, I am

(MR. HUTTON cont'd)..... in no position today to name the people who will serve on the council.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask a couple of questions of the Minister. I wonder if the Minister could indicate to us what this particular council is going to do that isn't at the present time being done within the Department of Agriculture at the provincial level, or within the Department of Agriculture at the federal level. I think that, by and large, the present government is the most "councilist-creating" government we've ever had, and it seems to me that just by the wording of the council that the government proposes to set up, that the work of productivity in the field of agriculture is being considered by both his own department here in Manitoba, and the Department of Agriculture at the federal level. We have at the federal level not only the Department of Agriculture but we have the Department - I believe it's under the Ministry of the Minister of Natural Resources dealing with questions of ARDA; dealing with productivity of land - or on the land; and agriculture generally.

Now the Minister made mention of the fact of dealing with the question of remuneration to members of the council in order to obtain information. May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that at the present time we have here in Manitoba a group of qualified individuals, in my opinion, who are doing this very job, and I refer to the Menzies-Hedlin group who are producers of invaluable documents in the field of agriculture and productivity of agriculture. As a matter of fact, during the consideration of the estimates of Agriculture, reference was made on a number of occasions to the information contained in booklets which Messrs. Menzies and Hedlin have already produced insofar as agriculture in Manitoba is concerned. In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, the Manitoba Consultative Board in its recent edition had laid before the House many of the requirements in the field of agriculture for the well-being and the future of the Province of Manitoba.

Now I would like to hear from the Minister, at this time, more specifically what areas in agriculture and productivity of agriculture will this council cover that is not being covered at the present time by some other agency, either of government or some qualified group, such as I say, the Hedlin-Menzies organization.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister gave us some items as to what the committee would consider. Could we hear from him just what functions will this council have, and will it only deal with making recommendations to the government or will it have any other functions?

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my honourable friend a question, too, on this very very important subject, because not only he, but I think everyone in the province, recognizes that agriculture is still the backbone of our economy and that it isn't doing quite as well as it might be doing according to this famous document that was laid on our desks one day last week. On Page 51 it points up that during the period from 1941 to 1961, the physical volume of Manitoba's agricultural production increased by nine percent as compared to 28 percent for Canada, so that isn't a very encouraging report and I suggest that it is time that we had a look at it to see in what direction we are going.

But I have always been concerned, Mr. Chairman, as I indicated when we were discussing the estimates of my honourable friend, about the philosophy of my honourable friend in regard to agriculture, and you may recall that I asked him whether or not he endorsed what Menzies-Hedlin and Wood and some of the economists had to say, and Alvin Hamilton, and I have not yet found out whether he has or whether he hasn't. And then again ARDA, the federal

MR. CHAIRMAN:to this resolution.

MR. SHOEMAKER: We're discussing the future of ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Productivity Council, that's what ...

MR. SHOEMAKER: Right - and this is a very very important matter. What I want to know is, Mr. Chairman, is my honourable friend going to give terms of reference - will there be terms of reference handed to the committee, or to the 12-member council. I would like to know that specifically. Will there be terms of reference? Would my honourable friend be able to tell us whether Menzies-Hedlin or Wood, or any of the economists - noted economists in this field - will they be members of the council? And/or who will determine the qualifications necessary for the members of council. Will it be the government or who will decide this?

MR. HUTTON: If there are no more questions - some of the matters that have been raised by the honourable members I think can best be answered at second reading, the principle behind this and the purposes and so forth, in more detail. I have this detail but it's in my office. I thought we were going to deal with the financial implications at this committee stage. --(Interjection)-- Well, the expenditures to create a body which, by its very designation, we hope will contribute to our effort to increase the productivity and to realize the potential of productivity of which we are capable in Manitoba.

I'd like to remind the Honourable Member for Gladstone that when he talks about the period 1941 to 1961, that his party was responsible for 16 of those years and we were only responsible for four, and if he wants to give a little more detailed examination of the statistics on which that statement was based, he'll find out that it wasn't until the last four years that we even had a nine percent gain. But I don't want to get into that can of worms. --(Interjection) My honourable friend from Gladstone raised it.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is an attempt to create a new initiative where the combined experience and knowledge and understanding of agro business, with all that term covers, where the combined experience, knowledge and know-how can be brought to bear to create an influence and an initiative which will contribute to a greater productivity from the agricultural industry as a whole. This very report that the honourable member has referred to, recommended that such a body be established to carry out a running assessment of our accomplishments.

This would be one of the functions of the council, but certainly we need more than a thermometer or barometer to give us graphs of where we've come; what we need is a compass to give us direction as to where we should be going in the future, and to act as a catalyst for all the different forces and initiatives in the various areas that are represented in the over-all agricultural industry. I will deal with this matter in greater detail at second reading, and when the honourable members have the bill before them, I think that in the statement of objectives and purposes that they will more clearly see why we feel that such a council would add impetus and momentum to our drive to realize more out of our agricultural industry in Manitoba than we have to date.

I want to make it clear that I don't think that the fact that we are looking for new initiatives and new methods and new techniques is in itself a criticism of the past. I think that it's just a recognition of the circumstances that we're in today and the need to meet those circumstances.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution passed?

MR. PAULLEY: No, not as far as I'm concerned at this stage. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister somewhat suggested that we didn't have rights or shouldn't be asking questions at the resolution stage as to the broad policy behind his resolution. May I point out - I didn't ask for any details. I might point out to my honourable friend that is the reason behind the resolution, why we have a resolution asking for an expenditure of money to deal with a certain matter.

Now then, surely the Minister should give us credit that we want to find out whether or not the expenditure - even though he may not have the details - whether or not the expenditure is justified. I want to hear from the Minister justification for the resolution that we have before us, justification for the expenditure, and that's why we're here in Committee of the Whole House. I don't want details from my honourable friend as to the inner workings of this particular council, but I think that I'm entitled to hear from my friend why - why are we going to become involved in the expenditure of setting up another council on agricultural productivity when we have the resources of a full department in Manitoba, the Department of Agriculture, and while there is available also, as I mentioned, the facilities of the Department of Agriculture at the federal level and other agencies as well. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister should, even though he may have left his details in his office - and this is understandable - but I do think that the Minister should answer more precisely the areas that this council is going to cover that is not being covered at the present time.

I've heard my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture for a few years now tell us what is required in the field of agriculture to increase productivity in this field or that field - he's already done this - but I want to know why are we going to expend money for the setting up of another council on top of the councils that we have in order to achieve this. This is all that I'm asking for, not the details. I'm sure my friend appreciates the fact that on second reading, introduction of a bill, we cannot - other than state our stand in regard to the principle of the bill where we stand - we certainly cannot discuss the inner workings of the bill on second

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . . reading. This is all I'm seeking - justification for me agreeing in committee for the approval of additional expenditure in this field.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I think that it has been established that there is a need for some movement to get agriculture back where it was even 25 years ago, and I don't want a lecture from my honourable friend in accusing me of failing to do something in 1941 because I never sat on the other side of the House and I don't see how I can be accused or be blamed for the state that agriculture is in today. I asked a couple of questions and my honourable friend up to now has not answered me. Perhaps he feels that he is not required to answer them upon the introduction, but I asked him specifically whether there would be terms of reference given to the council by the government; who would determine the qualifications of the members of council; how would they be selected; and then I would like to know another one, will there be a member or more than a member of this House sitting on the council.

--(Interjection)-- Pardon?

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Another plum.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, another plum my honourable friend says and I'm not looking for any plums in this field, but if he feels that these answers should be given on second reading, find and dandy, but I simply asked the questions now. I didn't expect to get accused for the state that agriculture is in today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution passed?

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I am intrigued by the terms of the resolution, because all the information that we seem to have on it in the resolution is that it is expedient to bring in such a measure to establish the productivity council to appoint the members and to pay remuneration and out-of-pocket expenses.

Well now, this doesn't really give us very much information as to what is going to be done. It's true it tells us that we have to spend some money, but as to what's going to be done - and I don't want to take the time of the committee by repeating the arguments that have already been used - but isn't this really the job of the Department of Agriculture? Isn't it what's been done for a long time? Haven't we been having more people, experts and all the rest, working in this field? Isn't it the job of the University of Manitoba - the Faculty of Agriculture, isn't it their job; and isn't it the job of the people of the Department of Agriculture Federal that are located here as well?

Years ago, Mr. Chairman, I think it used to be assumed that in the field of agriculture in Manitoba, or any other province, that the Provincial Department of Agriculture would be expected to concentrate on those matters that dealt with production and that the federal department would concentrate on those matters that had to do with marketing. Those lines have certainly been obliterated in a great many areas recently because the provincial sphere now operates to quite an extent in the field of marketing, and I'm not blaming them for that because I have always held and I still hold that the production efforts depend to a great extent on the marketing situation. I still maintain that the farmers can do a grand job of production and I'm not criticizing that development too greatly, but throughout the history of the Department of Agriculture in Manitoba, the philosophy has been I think to make two blades of grass grow where one grew before and to raise two head of livestock as cheaply as you raised one before and to make them a better quality and so on and so on.

I simply ask my honourable friend, isn't this the job of the department and of the university and of the ag reps and all the agricultural organizations, and not in detail but in broad philosophical terms, what can this council do - what will it propose that hasn't already been the job of these people to propose. Then we have in addition to the council - that my honourable friend read a report from - we had this famous COMEF report of three or four years ago where a great huge amount of money was expended, and some attention at least was paid to agriculture and we got their recommendations. Now what is proposed that is new or different?

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I suppose we are not proposing anything that is new or different. As the Honourable Member for Lakeside has said, we have the Manitoba Department of Agriculture; we have the Faculty of Agriculture at the University of Manitoba; we have the Federal Department of Agriculture. It is true we all have our functions and our function is - certainly that of the Department of Agriculture here, and this applies to the Faculty of Agriculture at the University - by means of friendly persuasion to influence the agricultural industry in the direction that research and information - that the best research and the best information available to us indicates we should be going, but the situation in respect to agriculture in the world scene has changed dramatically in the last two years.

(MR. HUTTON cont'd).

It appears now that the great race is not going to be how we are going to solve our surplus problems, but indeed the continent of North America in the next twenty years faces the problem of how are we even going to feed ourselves let alone meet our commitments overseas. Scientists are now saying that some of our meat products - some forms of our meat products that we have today and think are an everyday right of the individual to consume, may well prove to be luxuries in the future because we won't be able to use our cereal grains in this way.

Now we face new opportunities today and in the future. We can go along the way we are or we can recruit the combined skills, knowledge, experience, of the agricultural industry. Now I go for leadership, because you know farmers don't always believe everything the Minister of Agriculture says or his representatives in the field say. I don't blame them for being a little skeptical sometimes; I think it's a natural thing. But here we believe that if we bring the accepted representatives of the producers to a common forum, and we bring other representatives of the other areas of agriculture, and we put at their disposal all the information that we have, that we will add a further ground swell to the initiative of greater production in Manitoba.

There are certain inter-disciplinary problems and obstacles between the various sectors of agriculture, and they can much better be resolved where the representatives of these various disciplines have an opportunity to sit down and consider their problems. We have done a lot of this on an ad hoc basis and our results, our achievements by doing this, by sitting down together, have been such that we are encouraged to make a permanent practice of this, and yet using all the information from the Faculty of Agriculture and all the services of the Department of Agriculture in Manitoba and the services of the Federal Department of Agriculture. We take all these services and we simply make better use of them by providing a forum for the whole agricultural industry, and sit down together and work for greater productivity of agriculture in Manitoba.

Another very important thing, especially for the rural members, we know that the agricultural rural influx in Manitoba in shifting to the urban industrial commercial areas and it is so important that we have an articulate well-informed voice speaking for agriculture, not because I want to see the farmers of Manitoba looked after in the future, because if there is misunderstanding, if there is misrepresentation, if there is lack of appreciation of the role of the modern farmer and the modern agricultural industry in Manitoba, not only rural Manitoba and the farmer is going to suffer but every man, woman and child in this province is going to be poor.

I believe that by providing for such a Council that we can make sure - not make sure, but we can contribute to more leadership and to a more articulate and a better informed force for an initiative to build our agricultural industry in Manitoba, and that is the reason that we are asking you to support the establishment of this council with public money.

MR. CAMPBELL: Then I assume, Mr. Chairman, from what the Minister has said, that the proposal will be to put on this council - I recognize the Honourable the Minister doesn't want to name the people at the present time, but I assume that what he is suggesting is that he will put on this council some actual farmers or farm representatives; some representatives of the commercial organizations; some representatives of the market - people who purchase supplies; representatives of the consumers; and representatives of both the department and the university, and likely the Department of Agriculture.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution -- passed. Committee rise. Call in the speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Speaker, I wish to report the Committee has adopted a certain resolution and requests leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. HUTTON introduced Bill No. 108, an Act respecting the Establishment of the Manitoba Agricultural Productivity Council.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 27 Grade 11 students from Eden Collegiate under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Small and Mrs. Goodwin. This school is situated in the

(MADAM SPEAKER cont'd).constituency of the Honourable the Member for Gladstone. There are also some 48 Grade 11 students from the Neillin and Brandon Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Swayze and Miss Davidson. This collegiate is in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Brandon. We have 25 Grade 9 students from Edmund Partridge Junior High School under the direction of Mr. Porteous. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks. On behalf of all Members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you.

MR. MARTIN: Madam Speaker, as Chairman of the Manitoba Committee of the Canadian Save the Children Fund, I received a telegram which I would like to read to the House. "If serious flood develops, please advise if we can provide financial assistance through our Manitoba Division. Finance committee assures your committee of interest and support." Signed "Kenric Marshall, National Director of the Canadian Save the Children Fund."

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary)(River Heights): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to advise the House that May 12 will be Manitoba Flag Day. That's the day that our new flag will be flown and that flag-raising ceremonies will be held throughout the province on that day. Ceremonies will be held in schools, municipalities, local government districts, towns and villages, as well as the ceremony at the Legislative Building. Shortly, the Pages will be passing out a typical program that will be held in the various schools and a similar program will be held in the municipalities. I would encourage all of our members to take part in at least one of these celebrations and to encourage others to do the same.

While I'm on my feet, Madam Speaker, I would like to table at this time the letter of transmittal as well as the report of the Commissioner on the Grand Rapids Water Haulage Enquiry Commission by the Commissioner, the Honourable George Eric Tritschler.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, as a fellow sufferer, may I, on behalf of I think our group and I'm sure for all of the opposition, welcome back to the Chamber the First Minister of the Province of Manitoba. We are glad that he is able to take his seat and I'm sure that the sparks will really be flying now that he's recovered from his illness.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): Madam Speaker, perhaps the House will allow me to thank my honourable friend for his kind thought, and to say to all who were good enough to send me a remembrance on my sickbed that it was very sincerely appreciated. I took especial note of the fact that it came from members on all sides of the House and also from those who help us in the performance of our duties here, the members of our staff. It was very kind and I'm indeed touched and I thank all sincerely.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I want to associate myself with the comments of the Leader of the NDP insofar as the Leader of the House. I wonder if I can ask a question now of the Honourable Provincial Secretary regarding the Tritschler Report. Will copies be available for all members of the House?

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, the Pages will shortly deliver a copy to all members of the House.

MR. MOLGAT: I'd like to ask some questions as well, Madam Speaker, regarding the flag, design and ceremony, and suggestions which were given to us. Will all the schools in Manitoba be supplied with this flag by the government or will the schools be required to purchase the flags?

MR. STEINKOPF: A flag will be given to all the schools and to all the municipalities, and to the smaller children, little individual flags.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the First Minister. Is it correct that a news blackout has been imposed with regard to the flood and the developments in the valley, that is that all information must come directly from the Premier's office?

MR. ROBLIN: No, I know of no such news blackout, Madam Speaker. I assure my honourable friend there is no such thing.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, a subsequent question. I have been advised that the phone calls that were being made to people in charge down at Morris and so on, they have been told that they could not give any information. This is not correct?

MR. ROBLIN: I don't believe that is correct, Madam Speaker. The situation is that the officers-in-charge at Morris and Emerson were being deluged with calls from many news media with respect to what was going on. So in order to save their time and energy, it was arranged that one member of the news media in the private radio field would collect the

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd).....information daily from the persons concerned and then make it available to the other news media. That is in connection with private radio only. There is no arrangement of a similar character with respect to other news media. They are still at liberty to ask any questions they like.

We do however, and we have made it very clear, that there is a daily press conference in which full information is given out and which they're all invited to attend. If they wish to visit the scene of action for themselves and have a look at it, they're perfectly welcome to do so. My only observation would be that we are anxious not to have too many sources of information because then it becomes twisted and you get several answers out and the public become confused. So our desire is to make the fullest information available, but we hope that the daily press conference will cover most of the ground.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I thank the Minister for his reply. Insofar as the daily information, I think there are a lot of people who like to get the information first thing in the morning, when possible, through the radio stations. Is there a possibility of having a very early news release so that people, before they go to work, can find out what the situation is, and if they have to change any plans, can do so?

MR. ROBLIN: Well if there is anything of an urgent nature, we certainly intend to see that that is made available to the public. We have looked into the question of the timing of the press conference, which is the point my honourable friend raises. Unfortunately, we cannot collect the data, the overnight readings and the data and compile it in the proper form earlier than about 10 o'clock in the morning. So we see it at 10 o'clock in our daily flood meeting; then as soon as that is over, we make the same information available to the news media. We tried on several occasions to speed this up but we find that dealing with the United States as we do for almost all our basic data, that we have to content ourselves with a 10 o'clock deadline.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Provincial Secretary. Is there a shortage of sandbags in the Greater Winnipeg area - at the provincial level that is?

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, there has been no change in the situation since I reported yesterday, other than there is the predicted rush on sandbags that I predicted yesterday would happen today and tomorrow and over the weekend because of the holiday coming up. We have received actually more sandbags than we anticipated that we would today, but as I said yesterday, the priorities have been given to Emerson and points in the valley south, that for today -- all of their needs will be completed by noon tomorrow and then that part of it will be over. But by the time that the sandbags are actually required, they will be available.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I may direct a question to the Honourable the Provincial Secretary regarding Manitoba's flag. Mr. Minister, will flags - new Manitoba flags be obtainable by the general public prior to May 11 in the usual commercial outlets in various sizes? I have had a number of enquiries regarding this. This is question No. 1. No. 2 - Could the Minister indicate sources of manufacturers where the flags are being manufactured - our new Manitoba flag - where are they being manufactured?

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, there are three or four flag manufacturers of this type in Canada. Unfortunately, none of them are in Manitoba. Most of them are in Ontario and one in Quebec. I can get the names of where they're available. We have asked the manufacturers to try and have a good distribution of them in the province prior to May 12 so that people can get them. The little flags that are being made for the children will be made by Skills Unlimited, an organization here right in the City. I don't know whether they will be able to supply any more or not, but they are making the ones for the children.

MR. PAULLEY: I thank the Honourable Minister, Madam Speaker, and I am glad of his last statement of the smaller ones being made by Skills Unlimited. I think this is good. Will the Minister assure us that the red - if indeed that is the colour - will not fade out like it did with the new Canadian flag when it was first exhibited?

MR. STEINKOPF: If it does, you can bring them back with the sandbags, and we'll

.....

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Utilities who just said that there was no shortage of sandbags. Does he know that today the Municipality of St. Vital received only 20,000 sandbags? Does he know there were all used in the Elm Park dike that they build themselves? Does he

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd), know that not one sandbag was given to any citizen of St. Vital that asked for it? Does he know that in the period from 8 o'clock to 2 o'clock this afternoon, 125 people were at the office to put in a written application for sandbags and they couldn't get any. Does he know that the only information they get is that they have no idea when they'll get the sandbags?

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, I am pretty well aware of all of those facts with the exception of the number of 125, and they are pretty well as stated. But I am also advised that -- we have advised the Mayor of St. Vital that he will be receiving 100,000 sandbags tomorrow. That's the quota that he will have and these will all be available for citizens and that there will be none of them used on the primary dikes tomorrow, so this should be quite a -- and he was perfectly happy with that amount.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, does he know that the citizens of St. Vital -- and I was one of the 125 -- are not getting that information at all?

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, it's our job, as you know, to give it out to the various municipalities and all the towns in the valley, and that we have to rely on the good offices of the municipalities in order to give the information out the way it should be. I think the honourable member knows that I told him yesterday that I would be meeting with the Mayor today. I thought that I'd go out to St. Vital to meet him, but fortunately he was in the building and he came into the office this morning and we had a meeting with him here. For that reason I didn't get out, and I hope that he does pass that information on to the citizens of St. Vital.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. On March 24, the Manitoba Medical Service made it public that they had offered themselves to the Provincial Government as a fiscal agent for the Medicare Plan. They announced at that time that they had presented an elaborate brief to the government. I am informed that they have not heard from the government and they have to -- on short notice -- know what plans they have to formulate, and it's based on the decision of the government. Is the government going to reply to this offer and do they plan to accept it?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health)(Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, the Manitoba Medical Service forwarded a brief to the office. There have been negotiations between the Department of Health and the Manitoba Medical Association who accepted a formal invitation from the Manitoba Medical Service Board to visit the Manitoba Medical Service's premises, and that has been done since the time that that brief was received.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation. Is the Minister aware that while so much attention is being given to the threat of flooding in certain areas in Manitoba, that there are other important communities which are not getting the same attention? Now to clarify, I am referring to the serious threat posed by the Roseau River which enters Manitoba from Minnesota, where there is serious flooding at this time. Is the Minister aware of the fact that the Roseau River is now flooding Arbakka, Stuartburn, and that Reeve Hunter is very very much concerned about the threat of serious flooding at Dominion City and Arnaud?

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, we are aware of the situation. Our engineers have been gathering information on the flows in that area. We despatched one of our most seasoned and proven ag reps to St. Pierre yesterday, Gus Arnell from Ste. Rose --(Interjection)-- Yes, sir. You can't get them any better. We sent him down to St. Pierre, so he will be able to carry out the co-ordinating function in that area as our men at Emerson and Morris have been doing. I think that there are some very urgent problems. We are trying to attend to them as quickly as possible. We haven't had a report, a detailed report on the situation as yet, but we are aware of the general problem and the general threat, and we will be doing everything in our power to give these people the same assistance as is being given in other areas.

Of course this applies to areas that are -- as a matter of fact, some of this area that is threatened by the Roseau is in the 1950 flood plain, and the same thing is happening there now as happened before. So not all of these points that the Honourable Member for Emerson has named lie outside the area which was being serviced by the flood-fighting plans, but that area has been extended as a result of the information that we have on the Roseau River.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, a subsequent question. My information was that there wasn't sufficient diking done around Dominion City. Now I would like to ask the Minister whether he will alert his department to give these people full co-operation in diking and any other protection that is necessary because they need help very seriously. I had a telephone call from Reeve Hunter on that.

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder why people have to come here to the House before the Orders of the Day to bring these questions up. We have an Emergency Measures Office in the front of this building where people can bring these questions up. Is this for political reasons or are they really concerned?

MR. TANCHAK: We are really concerned, not like the honourable member here.

MR. MOLGAT: Before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has he had any reports of a serious disease or an outbreak of cattle disease in certain parts of the province?

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I expect that the Leader of the Opposition is referring to the outbreak of -- what's the word again? --(Interjection)--

MR. MOLGAT: Yes, and I would like to know from the Minister what it is and how serious it is and what the repercussions might be.

MR. HUTTON: You know I studied Latin for about 10 years but I still have trouble with some of these medical terms. They didn't seem to be in the vocabulary that I took. It's the salmonella organism; Salmonellosis is the disease. I'll describe it. It's characterized by a very high fever. If the animal is diagnosed and treated at this stage, they can be saved. The next stage, the fever drops and then a very mild diarrhea which kills the animal. Well, once that happens the animal is beyond treatment. This disease has been diagnosed. The Plants Products Division and the Health of Animals are on to it and it's associated with -- it appears to be traced to a feed supply. They believe that they have located the feed supply and measures are being taken to stop any further distribution of those supplies. It is under very close observation and supervision by the federal departments that are concerned. That's about all I can tell you to date. I think something like 65 animals have died; some 15-odd birds have been affected.

MR. MOLGAT: The report that I have had is exactly what the Minister has told me, that it is very sudden and the animals die very quickly. Is the disease contagious, and is there a likelihood of it spreading in that way or is strictly a question of feed? --(Interjection)-- Well I'll be very happy to have the Minister of Education in his capacity as a medical doctor, and I will not refer veterinary cases to him as a result, but I would be happy to have his information.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): My limited knowledge in that branch - salmonella organism will cause an acute food poisoning tantamount to acute food poisoning in humans and is not contagious.

MR. HUTTON: If I may say so, the good Doctor Johnson came into this House as a medical doctor; he now seems to have graduated to being a veterinarian.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Minister who has the information, could this be allowed to stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Could this matter be allowed to stand in the same way?

MADAM SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House. The Honourable Minister of Public Utilities.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following bills: No. 5, No. 2, No. 3, No. 4, No. 14, No. 17, No. 28, No. 32, No. 57, No. 59, No. 15, No. 21, No. 51, No. 52, No. 60, No. 61, No. 65, No. 68, No. 73, No. 7, No. 40 and No. 72.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole House with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 5. When the Committee adjourned yesterday, we were considering a motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition with regard to the 15 mile per hour zone around schools and playgrounds. Is there any further discussion?

MR. PETERS: Mr. Chairman, I was a member of that committee, but unfortunately when this part of the bill was dealt with I was not there because -- (Interjection)-- I didn't want to play politics - no. I'm not playing politics, because I am in favour of deleting the 15 mile an hour speed zone. But what I want to say is this, Mr. Chairman, that we had advice from people that I thought were very capable people, and my understanding at the last meeting that I was at of the committee was this, that before this would be put into effect there would be signs and lots of notice given to people to let them know that we are doing away with the 15 mile an hour speed limit but you would be liable to lose your licence if you weren't driving carefully in a playground or school area, and this what I hope that the Minister will do before they proclaim this part of the Act, that they will go out and put up these signs. I know that we went out one day and the signs that they put up didn't prove to be very effective because there were cars parked in front of the signs and you couldn't see the signs. So I'd hope that before they do proclaim this, that the signs will be suitable and that there will be a lot of publicity on radio and TV.

As a matter of fact, this morning while I was sitting at home I was listening to two different radio stations because my kids have two transistor sets, and they were publicizing this fact that you're going to have to be careful when you get into a school area or a playground area. This is what I'm concerned about, and I think the Honourable Member for Assiniboia will have something to say on this also, that before this is proclaimed, we want to make sure to let all people know that we're not taking anything away from anyone, that we're not going to harm anyone, but actually what we're trying to do is better than what we have.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman, I was also a member of this committee and I'm sure that the Honourable Minister will recall that this is one point that I really did stress to him, that we would have to do quite a bit of education, quite a bit of publicity before we could accept the 15 mile speed zone. I also listened quite carefully to the presentations and the briefs submitted by all those that were for retaining the 15 mile speed zone, and at the same time you could not ignore or deny the experts in this field who you'd also have to listen to who were for doing away with the 15 mile speed zones. When I say experts, I mean that because they spend most of their time enforcing law and surely they know which is better, to retain it or not.

But there's also another point. It seems that law enforcement people had a problem of enforcing the 15 mile speed zone, and this point I'm really concerned about. It might be even somewhat more difficult when you remove the 15 mile speed zone completely and just the ordinary speed limit will apply, be it 35 miles or 40 miles an hour. I think the law enforcement people will have just as difficult a time to say who is driving dangerously and who is not unless we have more law officers to enforce this new law that is proposed.

It's very seldom I would agree with the Honourable Member for Elmwood, but I have to agree with him at this time because this is what was proposed in committee, that there will be big signs erected before every school at a certain distance. There was also discussions of publicity, of education, and I don't think I'd be able to support the abolition of the 15 mile speed zone unless these other conditions are met.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't a member of the committee but I feel that the committee has made a wise decision and that I would certainly support the committee's decision in this respect. I don't want to go into the pros and cons of this thing, but I think it's logical and a good step to take. However, there are necessary precautions that we should take and which have been outlined by the members who have already spoken.

There was just one other matter, and this was raised by the Honourable Member for Lakeside yesterday in connection with the arrests without warrant. Here I think we have not done the right thing and I am rather leary about the decision made in letting the section stand as it does on Page 131, Section 212. I know that we have passed this item so I won't continue discussion on it, but I have reservations about passing this one.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, as a member of that committee, I favoured the abolition of the 15 mile zone because I felt that the 15 mile zone in a school district gave to people a false sense of security. Under this present section I think it's much more restrictive and it imposes a far greater duty on the motorist than the old section of 15 miles

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd). . . . per hour.

I have occasion twice a day to come down a main highway. Now there's a school building up a side road which is not on the main highway, but the children that go to that school have to come down the main highway both from a southerly direction and a northerly direction and they do it four times a day. Now those children, under the present law of 15 miles an hour, have no protection at all other than the general protection afforded them under The Highway Traffic Act, but with this amendment, those children will have protection because it is a highway in close proximity to school grounds, but under the present law your highway must pass by the school grounds or the school buildings.

Under the present section, subsection (a) of Section (3), it says, "Where the presence of a child on or near the highway, whether or not he is in close proximity to the grounds of the school building or a playground, dictates, in the interest of safety, a slower speed or the temporary stopping of a vehicle; or (b) any factor exists in the face of which failure to reduce said speed, or to stop the vehicle temporarily, constitutes a danger to any person or property visible to the driver."

I think that amendment is an excellent amendment, not only insofar as it relates to playgrounds and school buildings and school grounds, but insofar as it applies to the general public. I think it is much more restrictive than the old section of The Highway Traffic Act which said that at all times you must have your vehicle under control and must drive with due care and attention. This is an excellent section and I think that the children of Manitoba are going to get much more protection under this section than they did under the old, but I will go along with the Honourable Member for Elmwood and I'll go along with any other member who suggests - and I'm quite sure the Minister has this in mind - that there should be a good campaign of education put on before the new Act is proclaimed so as to acquaint people with the provisions of this new section. I think it's an excellent section and I think that the Legislative Counsel, in drafting it as he did, should receive from this committee its commendation.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I wish to say only, in addition to what I said yesterday, that I agree completely and entirely with what my honourable friend and deskmate has just said regarding the provisions that we have in the Act in that manner. I think this is the right way but I would like to have the 15 mile school zone - public playground zone and the zones near institutions of the Blind and such like, retained as well.

Now I would like those to be retained because I think that they have a salutary effect on the driving public generally, but with the sections that my honourable friend has mentioned and with which I completely agree, because that is the right basic system I'm sure. With those sections operating in this Act, then a person passing school grounds or any other place mustn't even drive 15 miles an hour if that's correct, if the traffic conditions, the people and other things make that necessary, so I want to have those provisions but I'd like to retain the 15 mile speed limit as well around these areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question - the amendment of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition with regard to putting back into the Act the 15 mile per hour zone.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. STEINKOPF: I'm sorry to say that I have one more amendment. Apparently this Act has got wheels and keeps on getting away from us. The longer we are at it probably the more amendments there'll be, but yesterday the Honourable Member for Lakeside brought up a matter which was a definition of a "centre of intersection," and on reflection after he spoke - well last night we decided that probably it was so confusing, even the new amendment, that we'd be better to drop it from the Act entirely, and on checking with other jurisdictions we find that it also has been dropped and now there's no definition in most of the Acts that has to do with the centre of intersection. So with the leave of the Committee I would like to move that Bill 5 be further amended by: (a) striking out subsection (1) of Section 112 thereof; and (b) by renumbering the subsequent subsections accordingly. --(Interjection)-- Subsection (1) of 112 which is the definition of the centre of the Highway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Strike out subsection (1) of Section 112, and they will all be re-numbered accordingly.

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

MR. STEINKOPF: . . . suggested amendment - I think that's it, Mr. Chairman - and this too was brought to our attention by the Honourable Member for Lakeside and has to do with Section 167, sub paragraph (2). You will recall he brought to our attention that that section had a minimum speed restriction of 20 miles per hour whereas the next section said that they

(MR. STEINKOPF cont'd). couldn't go more than 20 miles per hour, and we are now suggesting that Section 167 be amended. Do you want to strike out all subsection (2) or just (b)? --(Interjection)-- Yes, Clause (2)(a) be struck out completely and that is, "On a highway on which there is in force a minimum speed restriction requiring vehicles travelling thereon to be driven at more than twenty miles per hour." Strike out clause (a) --(Interjection)-- Yes. There is no need for (a) and (b) then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Strike out clause (a) and strike out the letter (b).

MR. MOLGAT: Tractors will be able to travel on that section of No. 1 highway or any other highway which later may have a minimum speed designated. There'll be no exclusion anywhere.

MR. STEINKOPF: If they are permitted on the highway at all and there is no speed limit on it, they can't go more than 20 miles per hour.

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

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I think there was one other matter that we were - certainly one that I wanted to bring up and I thought we were still holding this question of the dimensions of vehicles on Section 61. I had some discussion last night and again this morning with some of the members of the committee, because it came to my attention, actually just while the bill was being considered in committee yesterday, and some of us discussed it this morning, that in Section 61 we should have an exemption for a type of trailer. Has my honourable friend an amendment?

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, I haven't got an amendment because when we looked into this thing, it is just fraught with all kinds of other problems and it's something that would require a lot more time than we have right now to look into, and I would just like to suggest that we look into the matter before we make any decision or make any changes at the present time.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the difficulties are and I do realize the problems of amending legislation just as we are going through it in this way, but on the other hand, I would like to point out to the committee that in (b) of subsection (2) of Section 61, there is an exception for implements of husbandry temporarily propelled or moved upon a highway, and with that I'm in favour. I'm in favour of that provision, but the suggestion that I was trying to get incorporated was that lowbed type of a trailer which is capable of having those vehicles mounted upon it be exempted, because there is no question at all, Mr. Chairman, that that type of a trailer with the vehicle mounted upon it is much less of a hazard on the road than the implement itself.

The case that I have in mind is one of a farmer who has a seed drill that is actually in the neighborhood of 30 feet wide or thereabouts. Now he is permitted under this Act, and I'm glad he is, to pull that implement on the highway. He should have proper signs and all this sort of thing, but he is permitted to pull it. Now if he is allowed to have this lowbed type of a tractor, he can load the whole implement onto it, and the width instead of being 30 or 33 feet will be ten feet or a little bit more perhaps. This is definitely, in my opinion, a safety measure and it certainly is an accommodation to the farmers who have these trailers.

Mr. Chairman, even at the risk of taking some time to draft such a section, I certainly would suggest that we delay passage of this. After all, we have several more bills to consider in Committee and I don't suppose any of them will take the time that we have here, but this is not an academic question. These trailers exist. There is a firm in the constituency of either my honourable friend the member for Rhineland or my honourable friend the member for Dufferin that is manufacturing such trailers and people in my constituency own those trailers. They want to use them. They are prepared to put all the proper lighting and sign devices on them that are necessary. They are not only a convenience to the farmer, they are actually in the interests of safety on the highway, and I do think we should prepare an amendment during the time that we are in here, even though it means holding the bill up while some others are being considered.

I might just as well mention while I'm at it, Mr. Chairman, that I have a further suggestion to make and that is that a truck, as well as a tractor, be allowed to tow these trailers that I'm speaking of. Keep them down to 20 miles an hour if you wish - make that provision apply - I have no objection to that, but I do suggest that this be incorporated while we are at it.

Then, Mr. Chairman I have one other matter to mention to the committee and that is that I notice that this Act is to come into force on proclamation. Could we have the assurance of the Minister that it is intended to proclaim it in the very near future, because I really do not

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd).....see the point of spending all the time that both the committee has spent -- the special committee and this committee has spent unless we are going to proclaim it reasonably soon.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Chairman, on proclamation, as I stated earlier, I hope that the abolition of the 15 mile zone will not be proclaimed immediately, that the proper signs will be put up, let the people get used to them, let us get television and radio and newspaper coverage so the public gets used to it; because as I said in committee, this is not a very popular step to take but it has to be taken, but let's educate the public before we do it.

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, on the proclamation, on the main part of the Act, as I said before, we are just as anxious to get this Act proclaimed as anyone else, and all the pressure will be on the department as soon as the Act is passed. They can get ready for it. They said it would take a matter of weeks, six or eight, or maybe at the most 10 weeks before we can get the bulk of the Act proclaimed. It will take a little bit longer before the 15 mile per hour speed zone will be proclaimed, and any other section that will take that long -- it is our intention to proclaim the Act with the exception of certain sections.

The matter of the size of the trailer, the reason that I think we need more time is not the actual drafting of the section itself - this could be pretty tricky but I think it could be done and I agree with the Honourable Member for Lakeside that if it could be done we would be wise to hold up the bill until we got it - but it's a much broader question than that. There is some suggestion that if a farmer owns one of these trailers - the lowbed - and he uses it only for transporting his implements and then it in itself might be considered an implement of husbandry and therefore it would be possible to put it on the highway without any further legislation being required. On the other hand, once a change in the Act is made and the permit is -- well first of all, he can at any time get a permit for the use of this, under the present Act and under this Act, get a permit for the use of the trailer to transport his implements, and I understand that that permit could be good either for one trip or for a week or for a month or whatever would be required, so that it would cover the situation. That permit is not too hard to come by. But the problem arises that what happens when he's not - or when that trailer is not being used, or the lowbed is not being used for farm implements. We then have just put aside all of our width regulations which would change the whole set-up of our highways, would change the whole concept of traffic, and it poses a major problem. And for that reason, that was why I suggested that we can't look at it now because it requires a lot of going into and makes a lot of different changes in the Act necessary, not just the drafting of this one sub-trailer, and I don't think that we'd be prepared to pass a general section that would permit sub-trailer lowbeds to be used by farmers at any time that were wider than the provided widths in this section now.

.....continued on next page.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is saying that the difficulty is that it might be used for other purposes? As far as I'm concerned, I have no objection at all to its use being limited in the same way that the limitations now is to implements of husbandry. In other words, I'd be quite prepared for the amendment to say that this exemption applies only when the lowbed implement trailer is being used for that purpose. These folks who are purchasing them have no intention to use them for hauling grain or hauling other produce or anything of that kind. It's purely for the purpose of hauling these large implements and it's because it's quite usual now, with the growth in the size of farms and the widespread nature of some of those farms, that it's quite usual for these implements to be transported 15 or 20 or even more miles. And the people who buy an implement of this kind intend to use it for that one purpose only. They are quite prepared to have it equipped with lights or these slow-moving vehicle signs or anything of this kind, and as far as I'm concerned I'd be quite prepared to have it limited to that use and that one alone. But, as I said before, this is not an academic question. The farmers have these vehicles now, and while it may be true that permits can be obtained, yet this business of moving these large implements, as all the farmers in the House are aware, goes on the season through now. And not only the seed drills in the Spring, the harvester equipment in the Fall, the cultivators during the summertime, hay-making equipment --all of them are wide, very wide, and they are much more - many times more - of a hazard on the highway than to have them mounted on these lowbed trailers. This is the only purpose for which they wish to use them, and I really urge that their plea in this connection should be given serious consideration.

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the argument, and really there is little fault I can find except that I would wonder, not being a farmer, whether or not the wide trailer isn't more dangerous than taking a great big implement that takes up the whole road, whether that wouldn't be more dangerous than the wide implement. Because if the implement was right across the road, usually it's preceded by another car or by somebody else there with a flag, or something to pay attention. But on the present width of our highways, the narrow highway, a car coming down the highway isn't expecting a trailer that is two feet or four feet wider than what is normal, and could be clipped on the side going by without really being conscious of what happens, because the front of the trailer would look the same size as an ordinary vehicle, and I think that the safety element is being preserved at the present time by making sure that if these people are going distances of 20 or 30 or 40 miles, that they do get a permit or get a permit for the week; and at the time that they're getting the permit, they also are cautioned that they must have the safety devices and signals on the sub-trailer and from the lowbed, that the safety would be better protected if this was left the way it is now. And then, I think that the problem of trying to police these type of vehicles when they're not being used - say they're coming back empty from having delivered their implements - might be a pretty difficult thing to do; and they may just be carrying something on the way back that isn't a farm implement and they'd fall afoul of the law. As the honourable member said, there are lots of these trailers now in operation and nobody seems to be suffering, so that another six months or another year to give us time to look at it isn't really going to be a hardship on anyone.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I didn't say that there are lots of them in operation and I didn't say that nobody is suffering. I said exactly the opposite. There are only a few of them in operation; they are quite new. They have been developed to meet a need. The huge implements and the great distances between farms are not a recent development, but manufacturers decide to create something to meet that need; and they are quite new. They are being manufactured; they are a local industry. The Minister of Industry and Commerce should be glad to see this local industry develop. It will continue, Mr. Chairman, because the need is there, and I would challenge my honourable friend to find one single safety expert in the country that would agree with him that they are not a safer machine on the road than the wide implements themselves being transported that way. I know that they are going to be used and I don't want to put the farmers to the inconvenience of having to find some way around the Act. These people are quite willing to put on all the safety devices, lighting equipment, anything that's necessary. The people that have these big farms and these big implements are the progressive people that are ready to do what is right. All they want to do is be within the law in using it. So, once again, Mr. Chairman, I urge the Minister to reconsider.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I would have to go along and join with the Honourable Member from Lakeside in that we should give consideration to this item. After all, these lowbed trailers are not nearly as wide as the implements that are being drawn along the highways if

(MR. FROESE, cont'd) . . . they're not loaded and transported. Because, take a seed drill, especially a press drill, most likely will have steel wheels and you can't travel more than four or five miles an hour, so this means that a person probably has to travel along that highway for ten hours instead of using that highway for one or two hours at the most for the same purpose. You have not nearly as wide a load either, because the normal drills are 13, 15 feet wide, whereas your lowbed trailer would at the most be 10 feet wide, so that there is definitely an advantage of having these units loaded onto trailers and transported in that way. Further, as already mentioned, we have smaller industries going up in these local communities and we certainly wouldn't want to retard their sales in any way, and this is exactly what we would be doing. If we are not allowing these lowbed trailers to be used for this purpose, I think we are doing a disservice to these communities and certainly not helping them along with their small industries. Certainly let's give some consideration to this, and I think the sooner the better. I think now while we're discussing the Act and passing the new legislation, let's take care of this item right now.

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to belabour this, but if someone is taking a seed drill for four miles at 10 hours, that's 40 miles, then I would suggest that most of the farmers would be using a lowbed trailer or something. There is not many who've got that time to put in in just delivering a seed drill. It isn't part of a big farm any more if it's 40 miles away. I've just checked with the Minister here. The average -- the width of our highways is 24 feet, our major highways; and it would depend on the extent of the use of these lowbeds. If they were permitted at 10 or 12 feet, you can imagine what would happen, say, if two of them were going to pass one another on a highway, and you are creating a problem that I think is infinitely greater, and if you think it through, that there is a greater safety hazard in a truck coming at you that you expect to be 8 feet in width and it's 10 or 12 feet in width and you don't know it until you're right on top of it. Particularly at night time, even with its lights on, it creates a double or triple hazard. And I think that until we have a chance to really think this out and see where we're going, we should go into it, take a look at what these trailers are; what the extent, what the use is; how extensive is this going to be? Is it going to be a major -- is every farmer going to have one? Are they going to be running up and down our roads all the time? In the meantime, I don't see how we're going to handicap the manufacture of these. I, too, am very much in favour of encouraging local industry, and I understand that by being able to build it this extra width he is able to sell them a little easier, because he can load some of these implements on that otherwise couldn't be put on. But I would think that for the time being farmers using them with implements would not be bothered by anyone, and if they're going to use them empty or for something else, they would have to get a permit for a period of time to cover them, and this would be the best safety feature that we could get. I'm sorry but I don't think we should tamper or touch it at this time until we can really go into it and see what we're really getting into.

MR. DONALD M. McDONALD (Virden): Mr. Chairman, I feel that we're kind of stumbling around on this because actually we're encouraging manufacturers to build a machine that some people are suggesting, like the Member from Lakeside, that would be for one specific use. I don't think that any efficient farmer can afford to have a trailer like this sitting around for just moving machinery back and forth. This doesn't make sense. And I think we should encourage our machine companies, our trailer manufacturers, to build a standard trailer 8 feet wide with probably wings on it a foot wider for special machines, and he could get a permit. Then he could use this trailer for stones, hauling grain, or whatever he might want to use it for. I was in the implement business and we had a trailer of this type and we had a wing that we put on the side, as the Member from Rhineland knows -- lots of us do -- and we were never stopped. I don't think farmers will be bothered, but if we have hundreds of these trailers on every side road and on highways eight to 10 feet wide -- and we are the people in this House that are encouraging these manufacturers to build them, and I think it's foolish.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, if my honourable friend from Turtle Mountain may not think that it's efficient farmers that have such a piece of equipment, I can guarantee to him that they are. They're very efficient farmers, very efficient farmers. My honourable friend would find that they didn't take second place to him in efficiency at all, and it's not foolish. They have them already, and Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid that for some reason or other I haven't yet made my point clear. It is within the law as this bill is drafted that they can do this. My honourable friend says it's a hazard. It is in the law that they can do it now. They can use these. They can use them to haul these machines. The only time that they will be breaking the law is

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) that having hauled the one seed drill down that 10 miles or whatever it is, when they unload it and start back to get their second drill - and this is not unusual in these times; lots of people have two drills and operate them in pairs - when they unload the implement and go back to get the next one, this bill doesn't allow them to pull it empty. Now for goodness sakes, having admitted the position that we're in, don't strike out the part that you've already got in there, because this bill allows it now. What it doesn't allow is them to transport these trailers empty. Now, if you won't agree to this, if you're not going to agree to it, then the farmers, being more efficient than my honourable friend from Turtle Mountain thinks they are, being much more efficient and being much more resourceful -- do you know all they need to do? All they need to do is keep some little light implement there at each place and they just run it onto this trailer and then they are quite within the law. And if you want to put them to that inconvenience, if you want to make them get a permit, then we'll find a way around it all right but it just isn't sensible to do it that way.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (LaVerendrye): Mr. Chairman, I just have one question on 61. I realize I should have brought it yesterday probably, but do I read right that no vehicle shall have a width greater than 102 inches; that would be 8-1/2 feet? Would this permit trucks to have an 8-1/2 feet box or am I not reading right? It just struck me now. Not that I'm against it but it used to be 96, if I'm right.

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, there has been no change in this section of the Act and the width is the same. I think if you read all of the Act you'll find that there are certain exceptions to the Act and special permits are issued too under certain conditions. You're reading what section - 61? There's no change. There's no change in the Act.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, did the Minister say he will not make this change?

MR. STEINKOPF: Yes, I don't think we should make the change now but I still suggest that where farmers are using these trailers and they have the implements on it and they're within the law, if they are going any distances away from their farms such as 10 miles, it is suggested that they get a covering permit and they'll have no trouble at all. Then we'll study the thing and see what we can come up with. I don't think an Act this size can be passed without certain amendments coming before the House in the next year. The same thing happened, you will recall, with our Companies Act. It took a little time to get some of the bugs out, but we're certainly not putting anything in this Act that is restrictive in a way that would hinder industry or agriculture in any way, or something that wasn't there before.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, will the Minister give an undertaking then that a permit that will cover the whole season, like from seeding time to the completion of harvest, will be available?

MR. STEINKOPF: This is a pretty broad undertaking to make and I don't think if the honourable member were on this side he would stick his chin out that far, but let me say this, that any reasonable request that is made, and if that is a reasonable request that the farmer wants a permit and he's only going to use it for this, that if I were the man who had the authority to issue the permit I would certainly issue it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Because I'm not acquainted with every section of the Act in its entirety, is that permitted under the Act and who has the authority to issue it?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): The Department has the authority and I'll ask them to co-operate in any way that they possibly can to look after the situation while it's being investigated, to see whether there should be a change in the statute or not.

MR. HILLHOUSE: the application, Mr. Chairman, have to be made to the department in Winnipeg or could it be made locally?

MR. WEIR: For the most part, Mr. Chairman, there are stations locally. It's distributed as finely as they can, to be able to give this type of permit.

MR. CAMPBELL: a local engineer or district engineer, or someone of that kind, that would be giving it?

MR. WEIR: That's right, Mr. Chairman. It's the overweight permits and the overwidth; they're all tied in together. And oftentimes they're conditional permits which would require, oh, maybe daylight moving or something of that nature, and they're handled as locally as possible.

MR. CAMPBELL: The same type of thing as moving a building or unusual structure. Well, Mr. Chairman, I have just the one other matter that I would like to see further considered, and that's dealing with the Peace Officer. Has any further consideration been given to

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) . . . that request? I just don't like the Act to be finally disposed of without another comment on this fact of a Peace Officer which seems to me to have a very wide designation to being able to arrest without warrant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Legislative Counsel points out that it only applies to -- that a Peace Officer is one who can enforce these traffic bylaws by making arrests, so it limits it to constables and police officers in the ordinary way.

MR. CAMPBELL: It isn't very limited, Mr. Chairman. It's the RCMP and any other police officer, police constable, constable, or other persons employed for the preservation and maintenance of the public peace. Now some other person . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . the definition of a police officer . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: . . . this "other person" could be somebody without very much training, in my opinion; then "any person lawfully authorized to direct or regulate traffic or to enforce this Act or traffic bylaws or regulations by making arrests for violations or otherwise." Or otherwise. Or otherwise. There's an "otherwise" in there. Now, that's the one point. I do not like the wide definition, and while I have a great deal of respect for the law in general, some of the people who enforce it have not, in my opinion, the full qualifications to be given the authority to arrest for what seem to me to be pretty minor offences, and when you get into the Section 212 some of these seem to me to be very minor offences, and I would suggest that it be given further consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Bill No. 5 was read and passed, and Bills No. 2, 3, 4, 14, 17, 28, 32, 57, 59, 15, 21, 51, 52, 60, 61, 65 and 68 were read section by section and passed.)

Bill No. 73; sections 1 to 7 (1) were read and passed.)

There's a new 7 (2) which reads as follows: (2) Vacancies on the Board of Trustees of the Foundation shall be filled in accordance with the provisions of the Bylaws of the Foundation. New subsection 2 passed.

(Sections 7 and 8 of Bill 73 were read and passed.)

9 is amended by numbering the clause in the bill as (1), subsection (1) passed; new subsection (2) added to subsection 9 reading as follows: "The bylaw of the Foundation shall not become effective until it has been approved by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. (The remainder of Bill 73 was read and passed.)

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): Is this Bill 40 you're discussing?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 73. (Bill No. 7, sections 1 and 2 were passed.) Section 3 in the Bill has been deleted and the old section 4 is now called section 3.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, was there not an amendment in . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: New section 3? 10 (1) is amended.

MR. CAMPBELL: Was there not an amendment in subsection (3) of 2?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. CAMPBELL: I don't think I was in the committee when it was considered but I believe there's a wrong spelling of a word there, isn't there, or a wrong word put in in line 4. Shouldn't it be "were paid" instead of "where paid"? We are on Bill 7, aren't we?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. CAMPBELL: Isn't, in line 4 of subsection (3) of section 2, shouldn't the fourth last word be "were" instead of "where"?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: . . . not made in the Committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. Moved by the Honourable Member for Lakeside that the word "where" in the fourth line of subsection (3) of section 2 be changed to the word "were". Motion carried.

Subsection (3) as amended passed; 2 passed; and section 3 in the bill has been deleted and the new former section 4 is now numbered section 3; and 10 (1) has been amended by striking out the words in the first and second lines of subsection (1): "and no previous conviction is proved against him," and the same subsection is further amended by inserting the words after "minimum" in the 7th line of that subsection, "or mandatory".

10 (1) (a) passed; (b) passed; (1) as amended passed; and a new subsection (2) has been substituted for subsection (2) in the Bill. The new subsection reads as follows: "A court that suspends the passing of sentence on a person under subsection (1) may prescribe such condition of recognizance as it considers desirable in the circumstances, and may from time to time change the conditions and increase or decrease the period of the recognizance but no such

(MR. CHAIRMAN, cont'd) . . . recognizance shall be kept in force for more than two years." New subsection (2) passed. (The remainder of Bill 7 was read and passed.) Bill No. 40.

MR. STRICKLAND: Mr. Chairman, . . . that Bill No. 40 be held in committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed (Bill No. 72 was read section by section and passed.)

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, we have now completed the bills before the Committee. Madam Speaker will not be able to resume the Chair for the rest of the afternoon sitting and I therefore suggest that the Honourable Member for St. Matthews might take the Chair of the Committee thus enabling you, Mr. Chairman, to substitute for Madam Speaker. So if the Honourable Member for St. Matthews would take the Chair of the Committee, we can then move that the Committee rise. I move the Committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House has considered certain bills and directed me to report as follows: Nos. 5 and 7 passed with amendments; Nos. 2, 3, 4, 14, 17, 28, 32, 57, 59, 15, 21, 51, 52, 60, 61, 65, 68, 73, and 72, without amendments, No. 40 to be held in committee, directed me to report same and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading . . .

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, may we now have the third readings of the bills that have been reported? We'll proceed with those that have been amended. I am just a little curious about that, if we have the leave of the House. Is there any objection to proceeding with the ones that have been just through the committee?

MR. PAULLEY: I haven't any personally, Mr. Speaker, but I was just pointing out the rule of the House regarding third readings, that no bill from Committee of the Whole which has been amended shall be given third reading on the same day in accordance with our rule book. If there's no objection and if it is done by leave, well then we are able to proceed.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I certainly have no objection but I would like to have copies of the amendments that were passed, just for my records.

MR. SMELLIE: Copies of the amendments, Mr. Chairman, will be in Hansard, I believe.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . with all deference to the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs, it is rather difficult to pick out from Hansard the amendments to the different Acts.

MR. ROBLIN: We needn't detain the House on this point, sir. We'll be happy to provide the copies of the amendments.

MR. SMELLIE, in the absence of the Provincial Secretary, by leave, presented Bill No. 5 - An Act respecting Travel on Highways and Operation of Vehicles thereon, for a third reading.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to delay the passage of the bill but I would like to once again express my disappointment, disapproval of the fact that we were unable to get the consideration of the department for what I consider to be a most reasonable request in the interests of certain farm operators of this province. I further wish to say that I disagree in principle with the extending of the authority to a large group of people who are designated as peace officers, to arrest without warrant motorists on charges that I believe to be not serious enough to warrant such drastic treatment.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, I missed part of the dealings with this bill by the Committee of the Whole House, and this question that I have may have been answered. The bill comes into force on proclamation. Now we were told yesterday by the Minister that that part of the bill dealing with speed zones at and near schools and so forth, would not be proclaimed until considerable time was spent in educating the public and putting up the necessary signs and so forth and so on. Is it the government's intention to withhold the proclamation of all of this bill or until that particular phase of it has been attended to?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, before we pass the bill on third reading, I too would like to voice my reservations on the same point that was raised by the Honourable Member for

(MR. FROESE, cont'd) . . . Lakeside. I think we're giving too much authority to these people who are probably not even well versed with the law and who will have the power to arrest in many circumstances, and I personally have great reservations on this.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Speaker, I have spoken to the chairman of the Highway Safety Committee after we had finished dealing with Bill 5 in the Committee, and he assured me that as far as the speed zones in the school areas, it would not be proclaimed immediately. He told me that the rest of the bill would be proclaimed but that he would not, or that the government would not - this is what he gave me to understand, and I just want to pass that along.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. ROBLIN: I thank my honourable friend. He's done my job for me. I was just about to answer the point raised by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, and I think the information given by my honourable friend is correct. I do not share the fears of some members about giving too wide a power in connection with the enforcement of this Act. I think we have to recognize that in dealing with the automobile these days we are dealing with a killer in many respects; we are dealing with a modern contrivance which we're finding great difficulty in satisfactorily and adequately controlling with respect to the safety of the people in the province, and these various measures are brought in in an effort to improve that situation. It's true that some may regard some of the areas to which this power is extended as being minor. Well that's a matter of opinion and it depends on the case. It may very well not be minor in very important and significant matters, and I think we are well advised to give some trial to these new proposals that have been placed before the Legislature. I don't know of a piece of legislation recently that's received more attention than this one has. This has been discussed at great length, not merely by members of the House - and that's important in itself; in fact it's the essential part of our business - but the preparatory work by which this Act and the various new proposals that were brought in was put forward, indicate that it received great care from people who are expert in this field in all walks of life in our province. And while I think I would hesitate to claim that it's a perfect piece of legislation - I am sure that it is not - I think that it is a well-considered piece of legislation, and I think that the innovations which have been placed in this statute ought to be tried. We may find when the statute has been in operation for some time, I am certain we will find that we'll be back to make more changes. We make them every year. But it seems to me that we ought to give the proposals that are contained in this piece of legislation a reasonable trial and if we find, in the event that they need to be modified or changed, the government will certainly not be backward in accepting suggestions for improvements, but as things stand at the present, I think the House can vote for this bill with a good conscience.

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

BILLS NOS. 2, 3, 4, 14, 17, 28, 32, 57, 59, 15, 21, 51, 52, 60, 61, 65, 68, 73, 7, and 72 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on second reading of Bill No. 37. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I have read the bill and looked at it from various angles. This bill deals with the matter of corrections and juvenile and adult offenders. I note that from other speakers who have spoken before me in this debate on this bill that there are different views being held on whether it should be passed at this Session or not.

I took great interest in what the Honourable Member for St. Matthews said the other day and I would more or less agree with him that we should allow it to go to Committee and have full discussion on it, and also invite other organizations to make representations, such as probably the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry Societies and other organizations that have the welfare of our people at heart and who are doing certain work in this area. I think we need their assistance and their guidance and advice on matters of this kind and we should definitely invite these people to ask them to attend our committee meetings and hear their views.

The bill has several sections - one dealing with probation, another one dealing with a Family Court that is to be set up, and there are a number of sections under the second part and I note that we will be dealing with -- children 12 years old and over will come under the Family Court Section and I hope that - I don't know whether the government has in mind setting up a new Corrections Institute of some kind or what they have in mind once the bill is passed - but I certainly would like to see something else done for these youngsters so that they would not be in probably the same type of prison that our other adult offenders are.

(MR. FROESE, cont'd)

There is an article in the Saturday night of the March edition and Arnold Edinburgh has a write-up here on prisons headed, "Stone Walls Do Too a Prison Make." And then there is a heading, "It seems as impossible for our authorities to escape from their stone and steel thinking as it is for the people locked up in it." He gives an account of the various jails across this country and the different types of inmates and the rate of people held under the minimum security and maximum security and so on.

He also mentions the various commissions that had been set up in prior years. There is one in 1938 - the Archambault Commission reported very strongly in favor of rehabilitation rather than mere incarceration, and many of the recommendations it made were repeated by the Fauteux Committee which reported in 1956. Then another one was set up just last year and which still has their work to do - at least I haven't heard that they have made a report. This one is headed by Mr. G. Arthur Martin, Q. C., of Toronto, and others members on this committee are Mrs. Dorothy McCarten of Winnipeg and Mr. W. T. McGrath of Ottawa. Their scope or terms of reference are indeed wide. They are mentioned here: To study the broad field of corrections, in its widest sense, from the initial investigation of an offence through to the final discharge of a prisoner from imprisonment or parole, including such steps and measures as arrest, summoning, bail, representation, in court, conviction, probation, sentencing, training, medical and psychiatric attention, release, parole, pardon, post-release supervision and guidance, and rehabilitation. So once that report is out, most likely some new ideas will come out and no doubt a number of recommendations will be made by such a committee. So that probably if this bill were held in committee till the next Session, that report would probably be out by then and certainly could be looked at and taken into consideration before final passage of the bill that is before us.

There are various sections, and I don't want to discuss the particular sections, but I know too that the director that will be set up under this bill will have wide discretion, and while there are certain precautions set up such as the appeals that can be made and also the Board of Review, I still feel that the bill, regardless of these, that we should take a very careful look into as to what we are doing and what the final results will be.

Surely after having left this in abeyance until now, it wouldn't hurt for it to be left a little longer and given the necessary attention. This would be my suggestion, that we follow also Dr. Martin's suggestion here that we pass this on to committee and then have the various organizations make representations and, if necessary, hold it over.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, may we have a slight variation from our order and take Bill No. 9. I shall not be able to be present in the House tonight and perhaps it should be introduced.

MR. ROBLIN presented Bill No. 9, An Act to amend The Income Tax Act (Manitoba), 1962, for second reading.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, this is one of those bills that are proposed to us by the Federal Parliament consequent on amendments to The Income Tax Act of Canada, and under the tax collection agreement, we have undertaken to see to it that our law conforms with theirs. We usually do this substantially after the fact which is the case in this instance. We are being asked here to make a slight amendment to our income tax statute to make it conform with the federal Income Tax Act in respect of certain provisions respecting foreign tax credits. As far as I have been able to ascertain, this has nothing to do with any taxpayer in the Province of Manitoba; it is purely a formal change in our statute in order to bring it into line with theirs so I propose that such a bill be enacted.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declare the motion passed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on second reading of Bill No. 71. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker - I'm sorry - Mr. Speaker - it's a force of habit - Bill No. 71, as we all know, deals with establishing universities in the Province of Manitoba.

(MR. TANCHAK, cont'd). . . We know that our present University of Manitoba is a corporation that was established by an Act of the Legislature and we've had other amendments to it and so on, but I believe it was the first established in 1870. It was deemed then advisable to establish an institution of higher learning by the members representing the various constituencies of the Province of Manitoba - and I stress the words "by the members"-the members had the opportunity to discuss it and to figure out where the university should be and whether it was necessary, and since all of Manitoba is asked to support financially any university within its boundaries, not in total but in part, therefore the members of this Legislature should assume the responsibility whenever such a university is established in Manitoba; but this Act would make it possible for the government by Order-in-Council to declare certain institutions universities. It seems to me that we are diverging from the former practice in this. This government wants to change this. I do not think this is the right procedure, that a university should be established by Order-in-Council.

Our group has supported the theory of another university in Manitoba when and where necessary. Brandon has been mentioned as one, and we do not object to it. There could be others and we on this side never objected to this, that universities - new ones could be established. If the members will recall, last year our group introduced a resolution asking that a Council of Higher Learning be established in the Province of Manitoba. This was one reason for that, because we believed that the time will come when new houses of learning or institutions of learning would have to be established.

True, there was a Council of Higher Learning established last year. We discussed it in here but it is not the type of council that our group on this side recommended. We visualized a body - a permanent body which would continually study the problem of higher learning and deal with higher learning and all post-high education in the Province of Manitoba, and this Council of Higher Learning would then recommend its findings to the government and maybe subsequently it would come before the members of the Legislature of this House.

We said all along that there should be a grants committee to deal with such problems as this. The reason for that was we did not believe that there should be political interference in education. We have a Council of Higher Learning now - as I said it was established last year - but this council is not a permanent body and to the best of my knowledge I understand that they haven't even offered their report yet, a full report on their findings. I may be corrected on this but I haven't seen the report. I am not criticizing the present Council of Higher Learning, I'm only saying that it does not meet with our expectations. We had expected it to be a permanent body.

Now awarding of university status by Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council could be very dangerous - very dangerous politically. It could be used by an unscrupulous government to the advantage of a certain party. Now the present government in this Session has been accused of placing the welfare of the Conservative Party before the welfare of the people of the Province of Manitoba. It has been accused of that and rightly so. There were a few examples pointed out where the government actually did it, and we have a few more coming in an Act that's introduced, and I think that education is not a subject with which to play politics. That's my reason for objecting to the way this bill, or this Act if it becomes force, the way that these universities would be established. Too much is being done now by Order-in-Council.

Even today we got a bill before us which is going to establish a council in agriculture, and it would be the Order-in-Council who would name the people and who would even give them their salary - their remuneration on that. When I say too much is being done by Order-in-Council, my objection to that is this, where any problem is settled by Order-in-Council which could be settled other ways, the people of the Province of Manitoba have no - they have no chance to express their own opinion; while if it was done by the Legislature, all the people of the Province of Manitoba could make presentations - be heard - but they could not be heard when it is done by Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

Again I would say that we have no objection to establishing more universities in Manitoba where and when it is desirable, but we object to the method proposed by this bill that the universities should be established by Order-in-Council. It could be used politically.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PETERS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill 75, An Act to Amend the Municipal Act. The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Do Members wish to call it 5:30? I call it 5:30 and I leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.