

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



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, March 16th, 1961.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees.

Notice of Motion.

Introduction of Bills.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge) introduced Bill No. 51, An Act to amend The Civil Service Act.

HON. GEO. HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville) introduced Bill No. 52, An Act to amend The Noxious Weeds Act.

MR. HUTTON introduced Bill No. 46, An Act to amend The Credit Unions Act.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St Boniface) introduced Bill No. 53, An Act to amend The St. Boniface Charter, 1953.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James) introduced Bill No. 60, An Act to amend The St. James Charter.

MR. F. T. KLYM (Springfield) introduced Bill No. 56, An Act to validate By-Law No. 1659 of the Rural Municipality of Springfield.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin) introduced Bill No. 55, An Act to provide for the Incorporation of the Village of Inglis.

MR. A. H. CORBETT (Swan River) introduced Bill No. 54, An Act to validate By-Law 109 of the Village of Bowman.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 43, An Act respecting the Practice of Speech and Hearing Therapy.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the proposed resolutions standing in my name and in the name of the Minister of Labour.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: The First Minister.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions, recommends them to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 1: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Loans Act by providing, among other matters, for the issue of securities of the Government of Manitoba: (a) redeemable in advance of maturity with or without payment of a premium; (b) payable at maturity with or without payment of a premium; (c) payable in advance of maturity on demand, with or without payment of a premium or at a discount.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of these amendments is to make clear the authority of the government to issue securities which are redeemable in advance of maturity as is the case in the Manitoba Savings Bonds.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition) (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, it's quite clear, I think, that it's the intention of the government to introduce a bill founded on this resolution, and I suppose that the proper time to discuss the matter is when the second reading of the bill is reached rather than now, and so I think I would, as far as we're concerned, agree with that procedure, and I would ask the First Minister only, I'm sure this question has already been considered and the advice of the experts of the department is that such a bill is necessary in order to issue these savings bonds.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, I think I can say that Mr. Chairman. It's due to the fact that there is this redeemable in advance at a premium aspect of it that leads them to think that it might be advisable to specifically have this covered by legislation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution to be adopted? Resolution No. 2: Resolved that it is

(Mr. Chairman, cont'd.) . . . . expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Fires Prevention Act by providing, among other matters, authority to the Provincial Treasurer to advance from the Consolidated Fund moneys to meet temporary deficits in The Fires Prevention Fund caused by expenditures made in any fiscal year before receipts from the tax on insurance premiums for that fiscal year are received; such advances to be repaid from the proceeds of the tax when received.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Labour) (The Pas): Mr. Chairman, this bill enables the Treasurer to advance moneys temporarily to the Fires Prevention Fund. Up until this year we've had an accumulated surplus from which we were well able to meet all charges out of the fund. However, this year our reserves have reached the point where some temporary advance will be required in order to tide us over until the revenues are received from the collections from the insurance industry, which normally come in about this time of year.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, as far as I'm concerned I have not changed -- I suppose I don't need to tell the committee that. I haven't changed my opinion from a year or two ago that this is a branch where the increase in personnel, increase in activity of the department is not wholly justified, because I believe that this is a job that the various fire insurance companies themselves can do better than the government department can do it, but inasmuch as it's a fait accompli that we're into this position then I suppose that this kind of legislation is necessary and I have no objection to it being proceeded with.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the CCF Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition has stated his viewpoints, and stated the fact that they haven't changed. I think it would only be proper for me to do likewise. I agreed with the legislation when it was introduced, to increase the contribution from insurance premiums in order that we can have more inspections and better inspections in regards to the possibility of fires in the Province of Manitoba. I haven't changed my opinion either in respect of this. I still note that from time to time here in the Province of Manitoba, as elsewhere, there is loss of life in respect of fires within the province, and anything that can be done to increase rather than curtail the services of fire prevention in the Province of Manitoba in my opinion is all to the well, and I endorse this resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has adopted certain resolutions and has asked me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN introduced a Bill, No. 48, An Act to amend The Loans Act.

MR. CARROLL introduced Bill No. 50, An Act to amend The Fires Prevention Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. N. SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Legislature, a group of students from that great institute of learning, the Neepawa Area Collegiate. It is the largest high school in the Beautiful Plains School Division, and included in the group are 40 students of the History and Guidance Class, and their principal, Mr. John Voth, and their teacher, Miss Barbara Gray. I hope that their visit here today will prove of some value to them, and make it easier for their teacher to get across to them some of the things that happen in this Legislature.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure this afternoon of substituting for the Honourable Member for Morris, who unfortunately is not here today, in that I would like to introduce to you, Sir, a number of pupils, some 24, in Grade VII and Grade VIII from the school in Starbuck, Manitoba, accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Ethel Houston. We're very glad to have these boys and girls with us this afternoon, and I know that I speak for the Honourable Member from Morris in welcoming them to the Assembly.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention and the attention of members of the House to the gallery to the left of the Speaker's Gallery, in which are 39 students from Nordale School in Norwood, which district I am privileged to represent in this House. They are here with their teacher, Miss Marion Staple, and I would like

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.) . . . . to extend to them a warm and cordial welcome to our sitting of the Legislature this afternoon. These students are from Grade V, and I think Grade V is the time when they are beginning to prepare themselves for Junior High. They are reaching the age when they are starting to think about the world around them, and to think that some day they will have to take our places. It's a good thing, Mr. Speaker, that they have shown enough interest to visit us and to see, here assembled, members of the Legislature from all parts of the province are doing our best to make good laws for the Province of Manitoba. I welcome them and I sincerely hope that they will at a later date visit us again.

HON. GEO. JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Public Welfare) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to your attention and to the attention of the House the group sitting in the Speaker's Gallery. These children are from the Grades VII and VIII class of the Winnipeg Beach Public School accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. N. Isfeld, and two of the good ladies from Winnipeg Beach, Mrs. Sawyer and Mrs. Pritchard, along with six of the progressive young businessmen of the town who have taken the day off to bring the students in to visit the Legislature. They have looked around the buildings and have been quite impressed, and were looking forward very much to seeing the Legislature in action. I believe that they're at this stage in their studies at school. Next year, or as these children go on, they will, of course, be attending the Evergreen High School in Gimli in the future, but it is a very real pleasure for me to introduce these children to you and to the House, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that their visit will be both profitable and enjoyable. And if they can get another day off from their teacher, I welcome them any time.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, as Winnipeg Beach used to be in my constituency, and as a number of the people who are here today from that school no doubt still live in my constituency, I would like to join with the Honourable Minister of Health in reciprocating his thoughts. And I would like to point out to them, too, that although they were last to be introduced to this House, they are not the least.

MR. EDMOND PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Monsieur l'orateur, je desire dire un mot en francais de bienvenue a tous nos visiteurs de'aujourd'hui. Nous avons des gens de Starbuck et je suis certain que plusieurs de ces jeunes garcons et de ces jeunes demoiselles comprennent bien le francais et je voudrais leur dire dans la seconde langue officielle de cette enceinte qu'ils sont les bienvenus et ces mots vont aux gens de Neepawa, de Nordale, d'un peu partout et qu'ils prennent une lecon d'histoire en meme temps.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word of welcome in French to all our visitors today. We have people from Starbuck and I am certain that many of these young men and women understand the French language. I would like to tell them - in the second official language of this House - that they are welcomed and the same goes for the people of Neepawa, of Nordale, etc. At the same time let this be a history lesson.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the children how fortunate they are to have a Minister in this House so they could sit in the Speaker's Gallery.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to ask leave of the House to introduce a motion putting the name of the Honourable Member from Rhineland on the Law Amendments Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have leave?

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that by leave of the House, the name of Mr. J. M. Froese, the Honourable Member for Rhineland, be added to the list of those comprising the Standing Committee of Law Amendments.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Committee of the Whole House.

MR. ROBLIN: Order for Return, if you please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing: (1) The number and qualifications of all accountants employed by the Public Utility Board; (2) The number and qualifications of engineers employed by the Public Utility Board; (3) The

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd.) . . . . number and qualifications of other technically-trained people employed by the Public Utility Board.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Attorney-General - (b) (1).

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word or two in connection with the estimates of the Honourable the Attorney-General's Department. My colleagues from St. John's and Inkster yesterday drew to the attention of the committee many points in connection with the department, and I'm sure that the Minister has them under active consideration and will be replying in due course. However, there are one or two other items that I would like to draw to the attention of the committee. Some have been touched upon; others I don't think have been mentioned thus far.

May I first of all, Mr. Chairman, join with the Honourable Member from Selkirk relative to salesmen and the methods of salesmanship in the province, particularly transient salesmen who are going door-to-door and throughout the province. Now my honourable friend, the Member for Selkirk, mentions specifically the question of interest rates and credit in respect of rural Manitoba -- he emphasized rural Manitoba -- I would suggest this is also true in the urban areas of Manitoba. And I want to touch on a little different aspect of this problem. I have had, and I'm sure that all members of the committee have had from time to time, complaints from people who have been interviewed by very smooth-talking salesmen into buying different pieces of apparatus that are necessary, or deemed necessary, in the home. And not only until after signing a contract for the purchase of some of these articles have they quietly sat down and considered the results of their actions. I had a case in particular just a month or so ago, of a party who had listened very, very intently and quietly to one of these very glib-talking salesmen, in respect of the purchase of a water softener. And after listening to the great benefits of a water softener which they didn't require themselves, because we have soft water, signed a contract to purchase the same, and after the salesman had left, looked at the fine print on the contract and found that they were hooked, legally at least, for an expenditure of some \$350.00. An approach was made to the Better Business Bureau to see whether or not something could be done about it, and the Business Bureau, I think properly, took the attitude, "Well, the contract is signed; that's it. Unless you can prove that it was fraudulent in a court, unfortunately there is no escape for you."

I can appreciate that, and I appreciate the position of the Better Business Bureau, but I'm wondering whether or not that it may be advisable for us in the Province of Manitoba -- I don't know, and I don't profess in this instance to be a railroad lawyer -- but whether or not it may be possible that there could be a period between the signing of a contract of this type of thing and it becoming an absolute fact. Because on a lot of these contracts I'm sure, as members know, the fine print is never read, either by the salesman attempting to make the contract or the person making the contract, and it may well be perfectly true that the onus is on the individual who puts their "John Henry" on a statement, to read all the intricacies of the statement, but I'm sure that all of us have found cases where this has not been done. It not only happens in water softeners, it happens so far as encyclopedias and books and vacuum cleaners and many other appliances. I know that we, as politicians, often talk glibly to people to try and get them to support us, and quite frequently after that is done the day of awakening comes and we're rather sorry for it. We have a recourse, of course, within a period of a year or two, to get out from under, but these poor unfortunate people who are talked into these purchases do not. So I seriously suggest to the Attorney-General that his department might give consideration to some method. Now the method of a period of delay that I suggest may not be a feasible one in law, but I do suggest that something could be done. One thing that might be done is an insistence that on these contracts that are sold by the people who are the potential purchasers, that the fine print become magnified particularly to those pertinent clauses which deal with interest

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd.) . . . . rates and conditions of sale. So I respectfully suggest that to the Minister.

Now I want to say a few words in connection with the question of our courts. First of all, may I preface any remarks which I make with the firm belief that we here in Canada, in the Province of Manitoba, following the British tradition have the finest judicial system that there is anywhere in the globe. I question sometimes, however, whether the due process of law undertakes the proper protection of individuals who may be brought before the Bar. I sometimes wonder whether or not that it should not be an onus on the law enforcing, or the law itself, to draw to the attention of those who are charged with criminal offences, to inform them of what may be the consequences of a plea of guilty before the courts, or even without the coming to court. I made this suggestion before and I repeat it again, in respect of violations of our Highway Traffic Act. It's become too easy for us, Mr. Chairman, to simply go down to a police court or a police cashier, and pay over a \$3.00 fine for illegal parking. Actually as far as illegal parking is concerned and a \$3.00 fine it's inconsequential; it can't lead, I don't think, to any great damage being done. But once we get into a case of where it may be a charge, which if a little more grave could be considered one of driving to the common danger, I'm wondering whether or not it shouldn't be an onus on those who are prepared to accept the fee to say to the person, "Now be very, very careful before you pay this fee, because eventually if enough of these are paid, you may be placed in a position where all of these offences will have very serious consequences as far as you, as an individual, are concerned." What I have in mind, Mr. Chairman, is this: supposing for instance you, Sir, are charged with speeding on a couple of occasions, and it's just a simple charge of speeding; you pay your fine; a record is made of that. Then a little while later in a similar circumstance there is added to that a question of property damage, or it may be injury to a person; the very fact that you have been convicted in effect -- or pleaded guilty, by the payment of the fine in the first couple of instances, affects your record insofar as your third case is concerned. And I suggest to the department that this should be given very, very serious consideration. I would suggest this, in respect of the considerable number of tickets that are issued, say, by the City of Winnipeg Police Department, that on the back of the ticket where -- the front if I recall -- I had one to pay, not for myself the other day but for one of my friends; I paid out \$3.00 for a parking violation -- on the front of it it said that if I went down to the office between certain hours, then I could pay my fee and I'd be home-free, and that was all, without the court. But, I'm wondering whether or not, in these cases, it might be a good idea to have on the reverse something to the effect of drawing to the person's attention, that while this is a convenience to you we draw to your attention what might happen if this continues, or what is likely to be the consequence of similar charges in the future.

I was very much disturbed, recently, with a case that was before the courts in respect of a woman charged with vagrancy, and the case was appealed to the County Court. When the case was before the Appeal Judge he drew to the attention that, in his opinion, this person was charged unjustly with vagrancy, because the court itself had not established the fact that the woman concerned was in fact a vagrant. And the Judge at that time suggested, the Appeal Judge suggested, that as an alternative for this case reaching the Appeal Court, that the time possibly has come when in the interests of justice to all, we may have a system of public defenders in our courts. I think, Sir, that this is a question which has to be given very, very deep and serious consideration. It seems to me that as I note the cases which are going, or being heard, particularly in our Winnipeg courts, that there is not time nor opportunity for true consideration of the cases. It seems to me that the time between arrest and sentence is altogether too quick. I read of cases where a person arrested at 5 o'clock in the afternoon, the following morning may be sentenced to a year or two or three, either in Headingley or in Stony Mountain. I think many of these cases, and I think that it has been well established, that if proper legal advice was available for the person, or if there was a reasonable amount of time between arrest and conviction, that many cases would be dealt with quite differently. Now I appreciate and realize that as far as the Law Society of Manitoba is concerned, that it does provide legal aid for indigents. Well, all to the well, but there are many who are in between who are not indigents. Many of them are not aware of this. It seems to me that it is only in the so-called serious cases, which may carry years of commitment to a penal institution, that our

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . . lawyers of the Law Society are called in for defence. I don't think that it should be necessary for the Law Society itself to provide public defenders. I do think that it is an onus on the law-enforcing side of the picture, as part of its duties, to make sure that nobody is convicted without at least a review of the particular case at the time. I also understand, Mr. Chairman, that while the Law Society does supply this service in the Greater Winnipeg area, it's my understanding that outside of Greater Winnipeg the service is not provided; that in our rural areas if an indigent is called before the courts, the provision is not there insofar as legal aid is concerned. Unless friends or somebody else are prepared, in the case of a person who hasn't the wherewithal to have legal aid, then there's none forthcoming. I'm not positive whether that is so or not but it is my understanding.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Chairman, occasionally lawyers do go out or volunteer from the local area.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, I understood, Mr. Chairman, and I thank the Attorney-General, that on special request it is given, but in the ordinary run-of-the-mill cases, if there is such a thing as a run-of-the-mill case, such is not done, but it has to come from here to go out there, that's the point that I am raising.

Now, Sir, that leads me up to a question that I think we should be giving more consideration to, is, after a person is convicted, I suggest first of all that everybody should be entitled to adequate legal advice. Now I suggest that after that is done, that we should be giving more consideration to advising both the convicted and their family after the conviction how they stand with society. As far as I am able to ascertain there is no consultive services, outside of the Salvation Army on occasion, to inform the wife or family, or husband and family as the case may be, of any convicted person, as to where they may seek aid or how they will be able to take care of themselves after conviction. Now one can well imagine what must go on in the minds of both the family who are left outside of the prison walls and the individual within the wall. You might say to me: Well, after all, he wasn't very considerate of his family in committing a crime, and as a result must pay the penalty. I have no argument with that, but I do say this, Mr. Chairman, that after an individual has been convicted and has time for quiet reflection, it must trouble him and worry him insofar as the position of his family is concerned. As bad as he may be, whether he was bad, I'm sure that this must come into their minds, but even worse than that, worse than that, as far as I'm aware there's no service being rendered to the family to say, "Now, your husband's in prison for a year or two; he's paying his penalty to society; society is not going to penalize you, and we're going to suggest that you will be taken care of this way or that way." I know that as far as the Minister of Health and Welfare is concerned he has this under consideration for an expansion of The Social Allowances Act. It is not yet, as far as I am aware, being proclaimed, where a person whose husband or breadwinner has been sentenced for a year or more will come under The Social Allowances Act of the Province of Manitoba. The thought is there, Mr. Chairman, insofar as a year or more is concerned, but I suggest that nothing has been done about it yet, and this is something that should be seriously considered at the present time. I also suggest too, considering the prisoner and the family of the prisoner, and as far as I'm aware there's no concentration of this being done at the present time, that prior to release from the institution, be it Headingley or be it Stony Mountain -- of course we have no jurisdiction over Stony Mountain, I appreciate that -- it appears to me that there isn't any period in which the imprisoned is given any instructions or any education which will better equip him for a return to living once again in society. I appreciate the fact that there are some counsellors that may go and see him on the day of his return to society and say: "Well now, look Joe, you've been with us for six months or a year." -- whatever the case may be -- "You're going to go home tomorrow, now you just watch yourself or else you'll be back here the day after." That isn't the type of counselling that I'm suggesting. I think there should be a greater emphasis on a retraining within a reasonable period of time of the inmate in the institution so that he would be better equipped for a return to society.

Now many other points, Mr. Chairman, have been covered by, as I mentioned, by my colleagues and others on this side of the House. I do want to draw the attention of the committee and the Minister to a news report of Monday of this week, wherein the Chief Probation Officer for Manitoba spoke to the Bar Association at Portage la Prairie. I think that he did make



(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . . a number of good suggestions such as the establishment of a Borstal type institution in Manitoba, and that the Unemployment Insurance Commission should establish a youth training branch, and a few other things like that, and I also am in sort of agreement with his idea that in some cases a short shock treatment for youngsters may be a lot better than a period of two years in the Detention Home at Portage la Prairie. I think sometimes the case arises where, in a home where there isn't a very good environment, the judge, -- juvenile court judge -- figures that it would be a good idea because of the home environment that the youngster should be sent away for a couple of years, and then after a year out there is turned over to a probation officer, but of course has to go back to the same type of fine family living which they left. But I would suggest -- and this is along the line of social work -- that in the interim period, while the youngster or juvenile, as the case may be, is confined away from the home, that during the period, if it's the case of where a youngster is committed to a reform institution, because of family environment we should have a greater concentration during the period in which the youngster is away within the home itself, to make sure that the individual on his return does not go back to the same family environment. But I was a little disturbed, Mr. Chairman, by an inference -- and I trust and hope that it's only an inference -- in the news report of Mr. Halliday's speech at Brandon, when he indicates, according to the newspaper, and I quote: "The result of this trend," Mr. Halliday said, "is all who enter social service work want to be specialists. They do not want the job of walking into the streets and getting into the slums." Now I'd like to know from the Attorney-General whether he feels that that is a statement or whether the Minister himself feels, as far as our social workers are concerned, they all want to be specialists and not do any real basic groundwork. I simply raise this because I have found insofar as any social worker that I have come in contact with, that they are seriously concerned with all of the aspects of it, and are not afraid of getting their feet dirty if necessary, and I'd like to hear a comment from the Minister on that.

Now then, there's one or two other points that I would like to just raise with the Minister. He did indicate to me some time back that he was going to give us a statement on what transpired at the recent Constitutional Conference of the Attorneys-General of the provinces and the Solicitor-General of the Dominion of Canada, in respect of amendments to The British North America Act. I note that in our sister province to the west this matter has been the subject of a resolution and a debate within the Assembly, and I would like to hear from the Minister what position he took as the Attorney-General of the Province of Manitoba, or what is the position of the Government of Manitoba in respect of this great question of the independence of Canada and the amending of The British North America Act.

One other and final point that I have to make at this particular time, Mr. Chairman, I would draw to the attention of the Attorney-General a matter which has been brought to my attention, that deals with the question of The Judgment Act of this province, Chapter 129 of the Revised Statutes. It seems to me that it is time that this Act was revised, at least to the degree of the amount of property which is exempted in favour of those who the judgment may be against. At the present time, a farmer is exempt for 160 acres, and persons other than farmers are exempt their actual residences where the value does not exceed \$1,500.00. Now it's my understanding that that \$1,500 exemption was originally placed in The Judgments Act in order to prevent the person from losing their home, or at least they'd have some place in which to live if the judgment was pretty heavy, they'd at least have a stake in there; I understand that this was set some 20 or 30 years ago, and for \$1,500 today, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that you couldn't buy any more than a couple of tents such as the Honourable Member for Rhineland put in the corridors a couple of days ago. So I suggest to the Minister that when he's reviewing the Statutes that he might take that into consideration. Now that's all that I have at the present time, Mr. Chairman. There will be others of the committee, I'm sure, that have other comments to make, and any other matter that I have I can bring up on the individual items.

**MR. CAMPBELL:** Mr. Chairman, my remarks on this occasion will be mercifully brief, I believe, and it's not usual that I attempt to speak to a text, but if I had one today it would be one word -- rights; and then because I hold, as a great many people do -- and I think correctly -- that rights always impose or have corresponding responsibilities and duties, I intend to dwell very briefly on responsibilities and duties as well. But I have three matters of rights to

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . . mention in the general discussion on the estimates of the Department of the Attorney-General: First, the rights of an individual; then second, the rights of our province; and third, the matter that was just mentioned by the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party, the rights of our country. Starting with the rights of an individual. I was quite concerned to notice less than two months ago in one of the daily papers, The Tribune, and it may have appeared in the other one as well, an article -- well this was in the form of a letter; there was also I believe, a news article; it's a letter that I have here -- that is headed: "Says Police Ignored Principle of Law", because I consider this to be so important and so fundamental in connection with the rights of the individual in our society that I intend to read the short letter right into the record. It's possible that a reply has already been mailed. If it has I haven't seen it, but if it has it's likely that the Honourable the Attorney-General will know of it, and if it hasn't he'll know if his department has taken any steps in this connection. This is the letter: "A news item regarding one John David Mitchell reported by the city lawyer, had stated Mr. Mitchell had been arrested on a charge of vagrancy and that this charge was completely unfounded. This claim was termed ridiculous by the police who suggested the lawyer read Section 164 of the Criminal Code. I am familiar with Section 164, and upon re-reading it cannot find a single phrase in it which so much as hints that the police were within their authority in apprehending Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Mitchell was apprehended in his place of residence. He was sober; he was with funds, and he had not disturbed the peace in any way. Any authority of the police in this instance was not contained in the Criminal Code and it is hoped it was not based on practice. It is also interesting to note that the police chose to stay proceedings, not however before holding Mr. Mitchell for four days. During this time Mr. Mitchell stated that he was served with bread and jam for breakfast and supper, a bowl of potatoes and vegetables for dinner, was not allowed to bathe or change clothes nor permitted to brush his teeth until the last day; slept on boards without a mattress or blankets. One individual has unjustly been apprehended and put to an unpleasant experience. This may seem of little concern to the rest of us who are too busy worrying about our own lives. However, in the meantime, a principle of our legal system has been cast aside. We pride ourselves and have fought for a rule of law which protects the freedom of the individual by a number of safeguards. When a man may be unlawfully put in gaol our civil liberties are being threatened and violated. This cannot be allowed to happen." The letter is signed by Mr. W. Martens and this appeared in the Winnipeg Tribune of January 19th, 1961.

And just a short time ago the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party was talking about some safeguards that he thought should be guaranteed to people who appeared before the courts. Well, I don't disagree with him in what he says, but I'm inclined to think that, generally speaking, the people who get to the courts have a great many safeguards and are fairly and usually very justly dealt with there. But if the facts contained in this letter are true, then here is a case where the violation of fundamental principles begins before a person comes to court and, as a matter of fact, the indignities are perpetrated upon him and he, in this case apparently, never went to court. Later on the action was stayed. Now I am not aware of the facts of this case at all. I just saw the letter. I don't know what the background is. I don't know what has happened since. I have not seen any reply but it may be that there is one. I suggested to the Attorney-General it's something that all of us have a responsibility in because the rights of the individual against wrongful arrest seem to me to be absolutely fundamental, and certainly the Attorney-General's Department has a great responsibility in this field, and while I think that, generally speaking, the police too are quite fair and reasonable, yet this does appear to be a case where the Attorney-General's Department has responsibility -- responsibility to see that the freedom of the individual is safeguarded unless due processive law has been entered upon, and that the police, while encouraged to do their proper job, must not be allowed to trespass unduly upon the rights and freedom of the individual.

Insofar as the rights of the province are concerned, I just want to ask the Honourable the Attorney-General the question that I gave notice of when the agricultural estimates were under discussion, as to his advice, or his action, or lack of action, recommendation, etcetera, with regard to the feed grain issue. I enjoy, I admit it, I always enjoy checking up on the lawyers, because I have found through long experience that they invariably disagree with one another, and consequently that gives the layman almost a certainty of having one or the other

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . . of them on his side. And so I make the statement here, not a suggestion but a statement, that I first and foremost believe that the rights of the province are such that in its respective field it has just as much authority as the Federal Government has in its field. And I maintain that in this case, the statements that have been made publicly indicate that the Federal Government did not get in touch with the province with regard to the province's legislation on coarse grains, and that in so doing that that action by the Federal Department-- and actually I believe it took place through the agency of the Canadian Wheat Board rather than the Federal Government directly -- that that action ignored the province's position and its rights in this regard. And as far as the responsibility is concerned, I think that the province should not allow the Federal Government to tread upon its preserves. In the other field of responsibility -- I don't want to quote the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation wrongly; I almost said the Minister of Agriculture and Conversation; after the exhibition here awhile ago perhaps that wouldn't be too inapt -- (Interjection) -- Yes, and there's some of the rest of us, some of the rest of us share his predilections in that regard. But I understood the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and Conservation to agree with me that the dealings in coarse grain between businesses, business firms such as automobile dealers, machinery dealers, hardware dealers and others, dealings in coarse grains between such firms and the farmers directly was at least a contributing cause -- and I think he agreed that it's a major factor -- in the difficulties with regard to the enforcement of the coarse grain legislation. And I hold, Mr. Chairman, this is where the lawyers, we lawyers, may differ -- I hold that our act is specific and definite and prohibits those transactions, and that if they were a major factor, if they were of considerable amount, affected considerable quantities of coarse grains, that then it was the duty of the Department of the Attorney-General to take action under the provincial statute in order to see that the act was observed. I would be glad to hear from the Honourable the Attorney-General in that regard.

Then so far as the rights of our country are concerned, I come to the same matter that the Honourable the Leader of the CCF Party mentioned just a moment ago. We have been represented at the Constitutional Conference by the Attorney-General -- I'm not sure whether the Honourable the First Minister also attended at one of the Constitutional Conferences, but certainly the Attorney-General did according to press reports, and I too would like to have a report on those conferences, and if there was a brief, an actual brief from which the Honourable the Attorney-General conducted his statements, I would be very glad if we could have a copy of that brief. I think that the responsibilities in this regard are upon the various provinces of Canada to do two things. First and foremost in keeping with the fact that Canada by due process has now become an independent nation; that it's correct that we should move along toward having -- I place this first -- the power to amend our own constitution, and then perhaps, also in due course, the next step of actually domiciling the constitution in Canada and perhaps, at the same time, revising it and bringing it up-to-date. But I must say that so far as my observations, my interpretation of the discussions at the couple of Constitutional Conferences that I attended were concerned, it seemed to me that there was a tendency among certain of the provinces to put the second of those two objectives first. I repeat that I think the right way is first of all to try and agree on a method of amending the constitution rather than doing the, what I think is the bigger job first, although they're both big enough, of actually revising the constitution and, to use the term that's so often used, domiciling it in Canada by actually writing it here and passing it as a statute of the Federal Parliament and the various provincial parliaments. And then I should say this as well, that I think we also have a responsibility to not only do the things that are necessary to assert our sovereignty, but in doing that we want to be very careful that the ties with the Commonwealth are not only not broken but are not even strained, because I think these things should be done with due regard for the feelings of the Mother Country and the other parts of the Commonwealth, and perhaps even more important, that we should be sure that the relations between the various provinces of Canada are kept in complete harmony; that we should never, even if some provinces should show a disposition so to do, that we should never try to get the so-called entrenched rights in any way either dissipated or watered down, because I think those are so important to nearly all of the provinces, that we have to be prepared to take a pretty broad attitude in that regard. So it always seems to me that it is less important to stick and hang and argue for the relegation of

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . . this or that right or responsibility or jurisdiction or authority, into a particular category where the line of demarcation may be comparatively narrow in any event, that it's much less important than it is to get, as far as possible, complete agreement on the general methods of amending the constitution and then, later on, be prepared to move into what I consider to be the wider but still less important field of the two. Now, I would be interested in the position that the government of the day has taken in that regard, because I think it's in keeping with the times that we should be working closely with all the provinces of Canada to move along with all deliberate speed toward accomplishing these very desirable ends.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Chairman, when the Throne Speech came out I was rather surprised and a bit disappointed that the government then made no mention of a change in the laws governing liquor advertising. To me the present laws on this particular subject are absolutely ridiculous. I know that it may well be argued on the other side of the House that they were ridiculous before this government came to office, and I would have to agree with them, because they were then and they are now. On more than one occasion the former Attorney-General and I were at loggerheads over this subject, and I don't think he's changed his views and I haven't changed mine. As a result of the present laws, the Province of Manitoba is losing thousands of dollars worth of revenue because weekly newspapers and commercial printers, radio and television aren't allowed to use liquor advertising in Manitoba. If we can use the statistics provided by newspapers in British Columbia, every weekly newspaper in Manitoba is losing between \$3,000 and \$4,000 in revenue a year. To me this seems ridiculous because we've now a form of liquor advertising but we won't allow the advertising that is allowed in so many other periodicals. I know of some commercial printers in this province who have lost a lot of revenue because they had to turn down jobs for printing for companies outside this province because of the present law. There was one instance where we had a national publication in Winnipeg; they were forced to pull right out of the province because they weren't able to use liquor advertising here. Another matter, I think it's just rank discrimination, because we've got periodicals such as Life, Readers' Digest and many others coming into this province competing with our local periodicals and weekly newspapers, and they are allowed to have liquor advertising here. If our local weekly newspapers and dailies, radio and television were allowed to use liquor advertising, they could put out a better product, and they would be able to compete on an even footing with the magazines coming in from the United States and the other provinces such as Ontario and Quebec, where the laws on this matter are much more liberalized.

The Department of Industry and Commerce tells us how they're trying to bring industry into this province. What chance have we got of getting a distillery into this province if we won't allow them to advertise their products? I'm told, and I stand to be corrected, that one distillery that planned to come into this province, one of the reasons they didn't come was because of the liquor advertising law. There's no doubt that some of the ads might be regarded as objectionable, but I think that the intelligence of the different weekly newspaper editors and the TV and radio people is such that they will only use advertising which is fitting. I would strongly urge the Attorney-General to consider changing the law so that the newspapers and other periodicals in this province would be put on an even footing with periodicals and magazines from outside the province, and in doing so, they would bring in thousands of dollars worth of revenue which we are now losing. One small example, we have a television station located just south of border. I don't say they are using liquor advertising because I have never seen the picture on that particular station, but if they so desire they could use liquor advertising in competition with the two local TV stations, and I don't think this would be fair. As I say, I'm not in the position to say whether they are using liquor advertising, but as I say, there's nothing to stop them from doing so if they so decided.

When the Attorney-General came to office I recall that he took issue with the previous government for some of the handlings of matters of the A. G.'s department. He accused them of being tardy in the handling of the Crown Prosecutors; they lost a number of good men, which is correct, because they hadn't paid them enough. I think the Attorney-General will agree that in the past year he has lost some good men. I have one man in particular who was outstanding, in the person of John Scollin who went into private practice. Now, I'm not going to blame the Attorney-General for losing this man, because he can't help these things, but I well remember that he found ways of fault with the previous government for losing their good

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd.) . . . . men. But I would fault him for this. Mr. Scollin, I'm informed, notified the Attorney-General's Department three months before resigning from the department, that he was going to go. It is now nearing the end of March, six months hence, and the Attorney-General hasn't made an appointment.

MR. LYON: . . . . . honourable member, I might as well correct him while he's on his feet. The shock of it may knock him back into his chair; I don't know. But that position has been filled. I don't know if he's covering police court these mornings but Mr. Enns is now the senior Crown Prosecutor and a new prosecutor has been taken on staff by the name of Mr. Mitchell.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Well, his appointment must have been made very, very recently then, isn't that correct?

MR. LYON: Yes.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Well, maybe it's over five months then, because I made enquiries the other day -- I'm no longer around that part of the city -- but I've made enquiries, and there was considerable dissension in his department over the delay in making the appointment because they didn't know what was going to transpire. And at one point, I'm told, and the Attorney-General will no doubt deny this, but I'm told that a number of the boys were considering resigning because they didn't know just where they were going in the department. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, it wasn't so wrong. I was out maybe a week. The other occasion was when the province had the misfortune to lose the late Charles, Magistrate Tupper -- there was no appointment announced for nearly two months after that, and the man who did replace him immediately after his death was the man who eventually got the appointment. I think that there was considerable consternation in the department over the hesitancy of the Attorney-General in appointing a successor for Mr. Tupper.

Another problem that I would like to bring to the attention of the Attorney-General is that of the situation in St. George over the courts. At the present time they have a session, I believe it's the second Wednesday of every month, and this is far from satisfactory because on that particular day the cases are piling up and it is conceivable that a man could be arrested on the day after the court was held, and he won't be able to have his case at trial for possibly a month later. I'm told that the situation is very similar to that of Fisher Branch where there's only one court session a month. The area is very large now; the court sittings are held in Eriksdale and the detachments from both Lundar and Ashern bring all their cases to this particular court, and the docket is getting exceptionally heavy because of the expanding area -- the Ashern Detachment, I believe, goes all the way north to Grand Rapids -- and as I understand it -- this may be wrong too -- but there's no detachment yet at Grand Rapids. And if this is the case, this is far too big an area for the detachment at Ashern to handle. It's approximately 150 miles to Grand Rapids from Ashern, and certainly the detachment can't do the job that they would like to do and should be doing.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the honourable member will appreciate the information again while he is on his feet, that a detachment staff member is going in to Grand Rapids very shortly.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Well, it still hasn't been done, but I appreciate the announcement that it is going in.

Two years ago, I made a suggestion to the Attorney-General -- he never replied to me; maybe he didn't think it was worth replying to -- and that was a suggestion that in the Headingley Gaol he consider using, or putting in the Dale Carnegie Course, which is now being used to great advantage in Stony Mountain. I've had the opportunity, every year, to be invited to the Stony Mountain Penitentiary where they put on the Dale Carnegie Course, and the results are exceptionally good. Just the other day, a member of the government and I attended a function where the chairman was a graduate of this course, and the people there didn't know that he had been a previous inmate of the penitentiary and it was surprising to hear the number of remarks about the manner in which this chairman handled himself. It's a course that would cost very little, if any, money and it would better help the individual being released from the penitentiary to go into the outside world and make his living rather than be a burden on society. This course at the present time is being operated on a voluntary basis in Stony Mountain, and I am sure that the same thing could be done in Headingley, and I'm going to make it my business

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd.) . . . . to see that the Attorney-General gets an invitation to Stony Mountain the next time they hold their graduation classes there so he'll see that what I'm talking about is correct, and he may see fit to put it into his own prisons.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Chairman, I wonder when the Attorney-General is replying to the question would he tell us what progress has been made in the implementation of the recommendations of the Fauteux Report.

MR. A. J. REID (Kildonan): Mr. Chairman, I'm not versed in the law, but I'm going to criticize from a layman point of view, on a section of law that concerns thousands of Manitobans every year. We have heard that if a person is convicted of violation of a Highway Traffic Act they have recourse of appeal through the Department of the Attorney-General, and so forth. Now, Sir, when I look at the estimates, his staff is large and increasing. In my humble opinion their services should be available to the people of Manitoba. The point I'm getting at, Sir, is this; I have a legitimate complaint, not from an individual, but from a group of citizens, so naturally you would have more than one opinion in this case, but the majority of opinions were unanimous. Here I have a signed statement -- the Attorney-General knows all about it -- quote: "Last Sunday morning, August 14th, at approximately 2:00 a. m., when I came home the police stopped me. They asked me for my name, address and if I intended to park on such a street. I replied: "Yes." Then he left me for his car without telling me that the road was supposed to be closed to all traffic. I think it was a duty, his duty to tell me not to park there seeing as the road was supposed to be closed. Next morning I discovered I had received a ticket for doing something which he, as a respectful law officer, should have warned me. Incidentally, Sir, the fine was \$27.50 and seven people paid it." The case was investigated by the Attorney-General's Department, and here's what he replied: "You recall that we spoke about this matter at the beginning of last week and that the police had advised that all parkers had been previously warned with respect to this area." Well, Sir, I think in a case like that both parties involved should have been consulted, not just the police. Now, Sir, I'm not suggesting that the police department of Manitoba misconstrued a truth, but two sides of the story should have been heard. After I enquired again I was told that these people could bring their cases to the Provincial Court by hiring individual lawyers and fighting the Crown. Well, Sir, these people, as I have mentioned, had already paid a fine of \$27.50 which they couldn't afford, and this just knocked the wind out of them. More additional expenses to try and fight the Crown. In cases such as this, Sir, I believe the Crown should listen to both sides of the complaint at no expense to the individual, because the average citizen is just mortified of the law and especially in violations of The Highway Act to try and fight the Crown, so in the average case they say: "What's the use, we can't win anyhow." besides the expense they have had so far. So you see, Sir, there may be recourse to appeal your case and apply for refund but in looking through Public Accounts for last year I don't see where one penny has been rebated to anyone, so everyone under our law has a right to appeal, but personally, Sir, I don't think this right is very practical or feasible for the public as a whole in all parts of Manitoba.

MR. STAN ROBERTS (La Verendrye): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a few remarks on the department. I don't envy the Minister his responsibility, for he has the responsibility of maintaining law and order within the province but also the responsibility of the huge, enormous, human potential which may be lost to us each year through the courts, and as to whether or not it is restored. His responsibility is comparable to that of the Minister of Education where the future course of hundreds of individuals depends on his department. Will the minor offender of today's courts be tomorrow's criminal, or will he be a productive citizen? The Honourable Minister appears to be very aware of this responsibility. However, I think, as all members of the Legislature have noticed, the Minister appears to have lost a great deal of his spark. I'm sure we're all aware of the -- (Interjection) -- Well, two years is not that long a time. I remember two years ago this terrific speech by the Honourable the Attorney-General when he introduced his estimates, full of enthusiasm, full of ideas; reform was on its way; the recommendations of the Fauteux Report were going to be implemented; a great enlightened speech, inspired in penal reform and corrections, and with a great deal of criticism of the draggy feet of the previous administration. Then last year while the Minister brought in a new statement from the Attorney-General's Department with considerably less enthusiasm, still maintaining that quite a number of new projects were under way, that a large number of new probation

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) . . . . officers were going to be taken on, and that he expected practically immediately a take-over from the federal department of some of the responsibilities of our gaols. And this year I think we've all noticed that the Minister has been extremely cautious and careful in his remarks, and this statement has been, rather than an inspiration, it has been more of a careful assessment of the assets and liabilities within the department. And I suppose there have been a few assets this year. The rehabilitation work in the camps, I think has been a step in the right direction. I notice there is one camp in my constituency at Whiteshell. With reference to the camp at Whiteshell, in passing I would like to note that there has been considerable disharmony created in the community in which the trainees are at work, not over anything serious at all, it's simply because not too long ago the Attorney-General invited a Press group into the community to see the work of the trainees, and these people reported that the trainees had constructed a curling rink with their own little hands. This was of great annoyance to the people in the community for they had just finished building it, and the trainees were only there to help with the last pieces of the roof.

MR. LYON: On that point, Mr. Chairman, never to my knowledge was it suggested that the trainees had built the curling rink. I think the trainees had assisted the local residents in some respect in building the curling rink, for which assistance they were then accorded the right to curl in the rink. That's the statement I recall being given by the Camp Superintendent to the Press. Now, what the press printed after, I don't recall it being that the trainees built it, but certainly I can deny that fact, and I can only tell you what I heard at the time of the briefing.

MR. ROBERTS: You're quite correct, of course. What I was saying was what had been reported and the terrific blast that I heard every time I went into the community and the number of letters to the editor of the local press saying: "What's going on? We build something and somebody else gets credit for it." This is just in passing, of course. In addition to the rehabilitation camps I think the Minister deserves credit for the introduction of the extension course in corrections at the university, and I'm pleased to hear that it is being continued another year. I think the centralizing of authority in the Corrections Branch, and the fact that the Director of Corrections is now also the Inspector of Gaols is a step in the right direction. And I note by Hansard this morning, although I was unable to hear the Minister's speech yesterday, that improvements in facilities at Dauphin are under way. But there are a number of liabilities, and I think I would like to make some suggestions on them. I know that the Minister's hands are tied to some extent regarding the failure of Ottawa to come forward with a concrete proposal on its take-over. I think it's been a long time coming. I think that the Minister should make a statement on this. I think that surely he must know more about this take-over than he's saying. Is it coming, and when is it coming? Because, to say year after year, we cannot plan long range until we know how Ottawa is going to take over, and where they're going to take over, I think is poor organizing.

But there are plenty of things that can be done in the meantime, and as the Honourable Minister himself said two years ago, he had terrific plans in the field of probation. It's disappointing to note, as the Honourable Member for St. John's so well pointed out yesterday, that no new probation officers have been taken on this year. The only addition was one who replaced another man. And so this great expansion that was forecast in the field of probation two years ago just has not taken place. I think that this is a terrific waste of time. I think the terrific work that can be done by probation officers, as we can see in studies of other countries, as the Honourable Member for St. John's pointed out, in Britain and in Wales, as we can see right here in Canada, in Ontario and British Columbia, I think this work can be so great and can be so advantageous to the community both in terms of the community itself and to the good that it can do to the prisoners and to the offenders that are thus treated. But also the economic benefit must be pointed out, and I think that surely the Honourable Minister can convince the Treasurer of this problem that the addition of probation officers will actually serve as an economic saving to the province, because apart from all the savings, the social savings, there is also the immediate saving in the fact that it costs anywhere from 10 to 20 times as much to keep a person in gaol as it does to keep them out on probation. And the record of probation here in Manitoba, as the Minister I believe pointed out as being 13 percent, I think is so good that this must not lag any longer. I would like to read a quotation from this booklet, saying:

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) . . . . . "In any consideration of the goals of a good correctional program, the advantages of the further expansion of the probation services cannot be underestimated. While it is true that in this province as well as in some other provinces, probation services have been greatly expanded in the past few years, there is still room for a great deal of further expansion. We are still committing far too many juveniles to our training schools, and far too many adults to our adult institutions. I venture to say that if our present staff of juvenile probation officers were doubled and we were able to maintain our present ratio with at least 50 percent professionally-trained staff, the population of our training schools could be reduced at least one-third to one-half. When you consider that the cost of keeping three juveniles per year in our training schools would more than pay for a probation officer's salary, it is not hard to see that a probation officer could very soon earn his keep and save the taxpayer money. This then should be a goal towards which we should be striving in our services to the juvenile offender and the community. Insofar as adult probation services are concerned, a goal not out of reach of the citizens of this province by any means would be to have on probation as many offenders as are now committed to our provincial adult correctional institutions. This would mean a total adult probation case-load of approximately twice the present size of something over 300 probationers. This could be done in three years, by increasing our staff of adult probation officers by three each year so at the end of three years we would have twice as many probation officers in Manitoba, exclusive of the Greater Winnipeg area, than we have at the present time." I think the Honourable Minister recognizes the author, Mr. Kitchen, the Director of Corrections in the Attorney-General's own department.

I think that a recent article dated January 14th, in the Free Press covering the probation service in British Columbia points out the terrific work that is being done in that province. It says, "After the expansion of British Columbia's probation services in recent years -- now has about as many convicted lawbreakers out on probation as there are behind prison walls." And then further on it says, "The cost represents \$7.33 per day for each prisoner. The probation service budget equals 54 cents per day -- per prisoner a day." I'd like to know what the proportion of offenders out on probation is compared to those in confinement in Manitoba. And I would also like to know the proportion, comparatively, between juveniles and adults. I think while we wait for Ottawa to make a move regarding the further take-over, or the take-over of some of the responsibility of our goals. I think that a great deal of work can be done towards assisting to solve one of the most difficult problems facing the correction treatment of young persons in Manitoba. We have an institution at Portage la Prairie where boys are kept up to the age of 18 years old, where boys 18 years old, who -- many of them are quite hardened in criminal ways -- are kept in the same institution as youngsters 15, 14, 16 years old. And we have at the same time -- we're keeping many over 18 years old in the gaol at Headingley, and both the Headingley Gaol and the Portage Home for Boys are overcrowded. Now surely a logical solution could be found for a location for keeping boys between the ages of, shall we say, 16 or 17 years old and 21 years old separate from those who are very young, and those who are over 21, and in many cases more hardened in criminal ways. I think that the Honourable Minister should give a great deal of consideration to this particular age group where such formation in a child's mind, or in a boy's or girl's mind, can take place towards their attitude to society. From the same quotation as the Honourable Leader of the CCF Party was quoting today, from a newspaper story of a day or two ago: "It was noted by the Chief Probation Officer for Manitoba at Portage la Prairie that in Canada today more youngsters in the 16 to 21 age group are being convicted of serious crimes than at any time in the nation's history." And I think that this is one field in which the Minister could very well be taking action while he is waiting for Ottawa to make its . . . . .

I think some further suggestions I feel of importance in the field of corrections, I would like to see the department appoint a statistician. I think that regardless of what kind of work you are doing, whether you're in the field of business, whether you are a farmer raising live-stock, or whether you are a governmental department dealing with human beings, then I feel that you should have some knowledge of where you have been and where you are going. Now, without someone to keep some form of records as to whether your program is a successful one or whether your programs are running in the direction which you do not realize, the only solid way of determining how you're doing is by keeping records. And I understand that there are no



(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) . . . . such records being kept. Quoting again from Mr. Kitchen, the Director of Corrections: "Relatively speaking, there has been very little actual research done to determine the effectiveness of modern correctional measures in accordance with the rigorous criteria of the scientific method. We may be able to maintain punitive measures of crime control do not work, but can we honestly say that our so-called modern treatment methods work any better, or even as well, unless we undertake to establish some scientific means of measuring results? To be sure, we think they do; to be sure, we stoutly defend treatment methods against those who advocate a return to strictly punitive methods used in the past. To be sure, we decry those who want to build bigger and more secure custodial institutions, but it's not one of the requirements of the scientific method, a rigorous, ruthless, scientific scrutiny either to substantiate the validity of our present methods or, and what is even more important, as a basis upon which to establish future goals." And to continue the quotation from Mr. Kitchen: "To do this job of rigorous scientific scrutiny statistical data must be compiled. Obviously a very close relationship exists between statistics and research. A good statistical system can facilitate the doing of research in corrections in a way nothing else can, and in fact it can safely be said that correctional research projects cannot be done without the assistance of a sound system of correctional statistics. This being so, then should not one of the practical realistic goals of every correctional program be to include a statistician on the staff of every Attorney-General's Department, or whatever the appropriate department in other provinces. In this manner, at least, a beginning could be made in the compilation of facts and figures from which research projects could be undertaken. A statistician would centralize responsibility for collecting, classifying, analyzing and interpreting the needs of the province's correctional program".

And a further suggestion, Mr. Chairman, in the same field. We from time to time, and quite regularly in fact, make a great deal of fun of the Department of Industry and Commerce's informational branch, and we find that they are extremely busy publicizing the government, but I think that the informational services of the Department of Industry and Commerce could be put to an extremely effective use if they would release one of their men from the steady program of projects of publicizing this government, and release him to undertake a publicity program towards the assistance of those who have been offenders of our society. There is a great deal of misinformation; there's a great deal of bad information; there's a great deal of ill-feeling which will take a great deal of time to overcome, within our society, as towards those who have offended the society. And I think that it is extremely important that a plan should be undertaken to educate the public, first of all in the advantages and the possibilities of correction, and to educate the public towards the economic advantages as well as the social advantages of probation. But, further, a public education on the need for acceptance by those released from prison, I feel would be extremely important. I think that it would be a great deal of assistance in adjustment; I think it would be a great deal of assistance in finding jobs for those who are released from prison, and in the after-care necessary. And through these methods I think it would be of a great deal of help towards the probation work and the after-care work that is being done.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Leader of the CCF Party has mentioned public defenders, particularly those in rural Manitoba, and I would like to add my support to his request that this be given serious consideration. I think that when the Minister answers the remarks of the Opposition, which he no doubt will do today yet, I would like to hear his references to the problem of court recorders. I think that there has been a great deal of publicity given in the past year to one or two cases of an injustice being done to individuals because of the fact that a court recorder apparently was not available at the time, and I would like to hear the remarks of the Attorney-General on this.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, if nobody else wishes to make any general remarks at this stage, perhaps I might be permitted to make a response to some of the speeches that have been made from the other side of the House. First of all, going back to yesterday and to the remarks of the Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains, I should like to say, Sir, that I appreciate the spirit of co-operative advice that he is tendering to me now. Perhaps he was capable of generating the same advice in his own time when he was holding this portfolio, but very often he didn't follow it, and of course now it's quite easy to give advice when you don't have to carry it out, and all I can say now is that I'm happy to hear him commending the things that we are doing,

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) . . . . and I'm very happy -- even though he didn't do them -- and I'm very happy indeed to hear that he agrees with our program but we're going too slowly on it-- not enough and not soon enough. This seems to be the message that is being conveyed to us now by the Official Opposition. I don't mind hearing this from the CCF. I don't mind that at all; I think it's fair game for them to stand up in this House and tell us that we're going too slow, but I am really shocked, Mr. Chairman, when I hear members opposite telling this government in the field of probation, paroles, or the whole correctional system, that we're going too slow. Well now, I think that some of the remarks that we have heard are utterly fantastic when one compares the past record of achievement, if I may call it that, of those who went before us. I wondered if I heard aright -- I wondered if I heard aright when the Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains unloaded himself of the statement yesterday to the effect that this government had taken too long to complete the Home for Girls -- this government! Well now, Mr. Speaker, where was my honourable friend when the Home for Girls, when the great clamour was being made for the Home for Girls back in 1956-1957? He was sitting in my chair. He was sitting in my chair, and was in a position in those years to do something about the Home for Girls when the action was needed. Not that it wasn't needed when we came in; it was badly needed; it was overdue. There had been tremendous outpourings in the press from all interested organizations, and so on, and indeed in this House, that something should have been done about this Home, and nothing was done. Well, I shouldn't say nothing was done; I think I should be charitable, Mr. Chairman, and I should say this; they sold the old Home for Girls in 1957, that's the first thing they did. They sold the old Home. Mind you, they stayed on for a few months in that old Home after February 12th, when they sold it, but they sold it first before they had any place to relocate. Then subsequently later on that year they moved out to Dynevor, the old abandoned Federal Indian Hospital out north of Selkirk. They stayed out there for some considerable time; as a matter of fact they stayed out there until this government came into office, Mr. Chairman, and saw the conditions at Dynevor and decided to make better arrangements for the girls while we were trying to repair the mess that we had been left with. They voted \$350,000 in the 1956-57 estimates. They did that, and I give them credit for it; they voted the money in 1956-57 but they never spent a cent of it on a new Home for Girls, and yet they have the audacity to stand up in this House, and I'm sorry that the honourable member is not in his seat, the audacity, I say, to stand up in this House and complain to this government that we acted too slowly on the Home for Girls. I'm glad to see that the honourable member is coming back to his seat.

Now, what is the story about the Home for Girls? We came into office on the 30th of June, 1958, and let me preface my remarks now that the honourable member is here, by saying this: I've often made this statement in the House, "I don't like to thresh old straw." I don't think it serves my honourable friends opposite any useful purpose when they do, all day, day after day, thresh all this old straw. But I can't sit here, I can't sit here and take the type of criticism which says to us that we acted too slowly, too slowly with respect to the Home for Girls, without going back and reviewing their record slightly as I'm doing now. It doesn't please me to have to do this, believe me, but I must set the record straight. We came into office on the 30th of June, 1958. My honourable friend says the plans were already assembled for the new Home for Girls, that a site had been bought. Yes, the site had been bought on the 9th of May, 1958, just approximately five weeks before the election. Well, we came in and we found plans all right, but no co-ordinated plans. There were certain sketches that had been made for a potential Home for Girls, to accommodate approximately 90 girls, but I think these sketches had been made some considerable time before my honourable friends, I think quite properly, had made an arrangement with the Home of the Good Shepherd to take Roman Catholic girls into that institution. So obviously we didn't need at that moment a 90-bed institution. Well, what did we find? We found that these plans were unsuitable; we referred them to architects, and by doing this, we were able to consolidate and reduce the size of this cottage type of institution which we now have, and in so doing -- I mention this only in passing -- I think we managed to save the taxpayers something like a quarter of a million dollars by a revision of these very rough plans that were left to us. Well, now, I make no apology. We had to take a little bit of time, this is true, to refer these plans to the architect. We got the plans back finally; we had some of the money that my honourable friends had voted back in 1956, still

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) . . . . lying around unused -- Thank you -- so we took that money and started digging on this site in, I think it was April, 1959. We had been in office at that time, some nine months, and we started digging after being in office nine months, and as things transpired it took practically a year to build the building. It was a \$450,000 building and it took a year to build it. Well, the building was built. I make no -- if I must, I would apologize for taking a year to build, but that's what the contractors tell us, it takes some considerable time when you're spending money on a plant of that size.

So there's the delay that my honourable friend complains about on the part of this government. After a record of "Do nothing" for many, many years, after knowing, I would say, for at least a decade that the old establishment at West Kildonan was ill-fitted for its purpose, my honourable friends now have the audacity to stand up and say that because we didn't get one built until we had been in office two years, that we acted too slowly or too tardily. Well, I don't think that any reasonable person needs any further comment on that statement, Mr. Chairman. I think that our record speaks for itself. I think if anyone who goes into that Home will take a close look at it and at the program that's being conducted there, that this type of criticism will just fall flat about half way across this Chamber right into the carpet where it belongs, and it will be swept up when the chambermaids come along to clean up the room, as trash. Because that's just what it was. Well, now I didn't intend to digress on that point, and I assure my honourable friend I wouldn't have brought it up had he not forced me to. But he made this comment about our taking too much time to build the new Home for Girls.

Now getting down to some of the other things that he mentioned. He mentioned that the new camp program, while he certainly gave some approval to it, he didn't feel that it was the type of rehabilitation that was needed. He said that we should be giving trade training, and so on and so forth. Well, I would tell my honourable friend, and I don't think he needs to be told this, I think he will realize it on reflection, that rehabilitation is a many-sided picture. Rehabilitation in very many cases vis-a-vis prisoners means learning to do a day's work, and that is in fact what our trainees are doing down at the Norquay Camp, or formerly were doing there and now are doing down at the Falcon Beach Camp. They're learning to do a day's work, and I'd suggest with all deference to him, that this has a tremendous rehabilitative effect, because there are very many unskilled types who come into our penal institutions, do not have training in any trade, and perhaps do not possess mental faculties that would permit them to become too proficient in a trade. But these men can still do an honest day's work of the type for which they are suited physically and mentally. I think that by and large the people we are sending down to our Falcon Beach Camp are benefitting tremendously from it. You need only look at their physical condition for one thing; they take a pride in their work for another thing, and they will, on release, they'll be able to go and take their families back to this camp and I think, with some sense of pride, say that we played a part in the building of this facility for the people of Manitoba. So I think that there is a tremendous rehabilitative effect in this camp program. If I didn't believe so, we wouldn't be carrying it on. I only regret that we haven't had it going longer in this province, and I suggest, again with deference to my honourable friend, that that is something that he might have well undertaken in his time, but I don't try to make any point on that score at all. I just mention it in passing.

Well now, he mentions to us that the type of work projects that are going on at Falcon Lake are projects that might well be done by men in the labour market. I suggest to him that this is not the case. We have been extremely careful to select work projects which really would not be done otherwise at all unless they were done by trainees. We have no desire whatsoever to deprive anybody, particularly in times such as we have now, of a day's labour for a decent day's wage -- that's not the case at all. But we are doing that type of manual work at Falcon Beach that has to be done in due course, that's true, but which, I can assure you, just would not be done at the present time were not the trainees doing it, such things as forest sanitation and so on, cleaning out the right-of-way for 99 or 100 feet on each side of the highway to give more of a park appearance to the park area. So I can only assure him on this point that we are being very careful to choose projects, and I think we have a vast backlog of them, upon which our trainees can be kept busy for a good number of years, projects which would not be done because they are of a nature which would not attract the type of manual labour, perhaps, that my honourable friend is referring to, in the free market.

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

He says that the work camp reduces the population pressure at our institutions. Mr. Chairman, he's absolutely right! If you have 10 apples in front of you on your desk and you take two apples and put them over on somebody else's desk, you reduce the number of apples on your own desk. I subscribe to this theory; I think it's quite proper; I think it's quite proper mathematically. Of course it reduces the number of people. You can't take people from one place and put them in another without reducing them. But it's not being done -- I challenge him on this point -- it is not being done merely to reduce the population at Headingley, and I would mention for his consideration this fact, that the population figures given in the annual report, the Superintendent's Report from Headingley Gaol, the figure that I gave you yesterday, the estimate of 456.5 average number of prisoners in Headingley Gaol, these figures include the trainees at the Falcon Beach Camp. I'm not trying to say that you add 30 to those and you get the actual population; that is not the case. These figures include the population at Falcon Beach Camp. I'll be quite frank with my honourable friend. As he well knows, population in the institutions varies from day to day. As I understand it, the total population as of yesterday in Headingley was somewhere around 490. Now there may have been 10 or 15 discharges today, I don't know, or there may have been some more admissions. But we're talking about averages, because that's the only figure we can use with any degree of certainty because of the great fluctuations that we have from day to day. But I want to assure him that the camp program was not started primarily at all as a release to the pressure at Headingley, because of course as my honourable friend should know, Mr. Chairman, when we came into office, within a month of being in office we had, by special order, to authorize an expenditure of \$100,000 to increase the minimum detention facilities at Headingley, and we did that. We now have facilities at Headingley for some 484 prisoners -- beds for that number of prisoners in the minimum detention wing and in the main building itself. So I'm well aware of what Headingley's capacity is; I'm well aware that it's an institution that from time to time does get crowded. I have, to some extent, the same problem as my honourable friend had in his time. The only difference is that we've added to this institution, given extra space, because we anticipated, we were told by our people that the population would be getting greater.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Would the Minister say that we didn't add to it also?

MR. LYON: Pardon?

MR. HRYHORCZUK: You just made the statement the difference was that you added to it; the first minimum security building was there before you came in.

MR. LYON: Oh yes, the first minimum security building was there. I'm not trying to deprive my honourable friend of anything, because he has so little to crow about. I wouldn't want to take anything from him.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: As long as you stay with the facts, I've got no objections.

. . . . . Continued on next page

MR. LYON: My honourable friend built the first minimum detention wing. We built the second one within a month of being in office because of its absolute necessity; and we're very happy today to have it. It serves a very useful purpose for us. Well now, what were some of his other criticisms? He talked to me about probation. Well, I don't mind being spoken to about probation. I don't mind being told by my honourable friends opposite or by the members of the CCF Party that probation is an excellent service because, in large part, they're rehashing a speech that I gave in this House two years ago and I'm glad that they subscribe to my theories on correctional reform. My honourable friends opposite, the Official Opposition, they are the ones that I am particularly happy to hear now resounding what I have documented in this House before as the philosophy of this government on correctional reform; namely, that an accentuation and a great accentuation must be placed on probation. But my honourable friend the Member from Ethelbert Plains, what does he say? He says you're not going far enough or fast enough in probation. Well now, Mr. Chairman, again I don't mind hearing that type of criticism from the members of the CCF, and I think they're entitled perhaps to give it; but not my honourable friend from Ethelbert Plains or anybody who sits on that side of the House as a colleague of his, because they had -- you name it -- 10, 25, 36 years, I don't care what, to implement their present day new-founded theories on probation.

MR. ROBERTS: At the rate you're going right now, you won't be any further ahead either.

MR. LYON: They had all of that time, Mr. Chairman, and what do we hear today? We're not going fast enough or far enough. Mind you, we hear a different story in estimates than we hear at the time of the Throne Speech debate; we hear a different story on estimates than we hear at the time of the budget debate, because just as certainly as we're sitting here this afternoon, my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition is going to stand up at budget time and he's going to say the public debt; he's going to say the taxes are being increased; you're expanding the Civil Service too much; you're jumping too far ahead into all of these things; but it's all right for his honourable friend from Ethelbert Plains to say to us quietly in estimates, "you're not going fast enough on probation." Well now I, wish the two of them would get on the same horse, or at least look in the same direction on the horses that they're riding, because I don't know what to believe. I'm looking for a consistent policy. Do you want us to spend more money or do you not want us to spend more money?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, just to point out from a clipping of the newspaper report of the Attorney-General himself, which I have here, saying that it cost 20 times as much less to keep an offender on probation as it does in prison. Now does it cost less or does it cost more to have probation?

MR. LYON: I thank my honourable friend for his irrelevant interruption but I'm glad that he, too is learning.....

MR. ROBERTS: But you say one says spend more and the other says spend less.

MR. LYON: I'm glad too, Mr. Chairman, that is he finally beginning to learn something about corrections. This is a new-found interest that I think he has acquired. Perhaps since he allowed his name to stand for the leadership of a certain party he's becoming interested in more of these departments -- now I don't know, but in any case, my honourable friends opposite don't have to preach to me about probation. I'm in favour of probation, but what I think is more important, Mr. Speaker, this government is doing something about probation. This government has expanded adult and juvenile probation to all parts of Manitoba. When our honourable friends were in office, what did they have? They had juvenile probation in Greater Winnipeg; they had juvenile probation in St. Boniface; they had juvenile probation in the City of Brandon; and that's it. That's what we found when we came to office. We've extended it now, as I outlined to them yesterday, if they would listen, we've extended it now to all of Manitoba. Perhaps my honourable friends can say that it needs more extension, and I agree with them, and I haven't got money this year for more extension because we're consolidating our position now. A lot of these people are just going out for the first time, finding out what the market is going to be in probation. But as I said yesterday, and I underline it again, the inevitable move in this field will be, must be for more extension of probation services. I make no apologies to my honourable friends opposite at all because we've done more in 32 months of office in probation than they could have thought of in 32 years in office.

My honourable friends complain, and I love to hear this in estimates because I love to, as

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.).... I pointed out before, I love to hear the other speeches when they come to Throne speech or budget. We're not spending enough money; the Land Title services aren't being increased; you're not extending probation fast enough; you're not doing this; you're not doing that. What short memories those people have, Mr. Chairman. I took the trouble to look back to the last set of estimates that my honourable friends passed when they were in office and had the responsibility for these things. In our department they voted \$3,191,515; not a small sum at all. Our estimates today, somewhat three and a half years later, are for just \$1 million more, and I don't think that you can equate this program entirely on money at all. I merely point out that one factor, that our estimates in that short period have gone up one third, but still we're not doing enough -- still we're not doing enough according to my honourable friends opposite. Well you know I'm somewhat inclined to agree with my honourable friend from Ethelbert Plains when he speaks in this debate because I want to do a lot more, and we're going to do a lot more in the many years that are going to be allotted to us in this government. All I ask him to have is a little bit of patience. His government was in power for a good number of years. We've been in power for what -- 32 months, and I think while we're not perfect we're moving in the right direction and we're moving, I think, with good speed in the right direction. I only tell my honourable friends that the people of Manitoba can see what's being done with these services. We know what is being done with them and I know personally the good, quite seriously, the good that is being wrought by these services; and while I sincerely appreciate their concern and sincerely know that many of them are voicing this concern because of the interest that they have in this subject, still I want to assure them that we are proceeding very rapidly, very rapidly indeed to do just exactly what we said we would do, to expand probation services. My honourable friends will recall the Fauteux Report. That was the greatest recommendation in that report, that the focus of attention of all provinces of Canada should be on, first of all, a greatly intensified probation plan; and that's just exactly what we've done. I don't think that money figures alone, as I've mentioned before, are indicative of anything; but from 1957 till 1958 there was only \$108,000 in total voted under this item. This year there is \$251,585 voted in total under this item, of which some \$128,655 is for probation alone. My honourable friends I don't think even broke it down. Their last figure that I have in '58-'59 was \$83,000 for the first year that they broke it down, so I think that they must give us credit for having taken some forward steps in this field; and I can assure them that there will be many more. I hope that we just don't dazzle them too much by what we're doing in this particular field.

Well now, I don't think that there is anything else. My honourable friend interjected this afternoon to ask about the Fauteux Report and its implementation in Manitoba. Sometimes I wish I were sitting in the House of Commons. Perhaps that's where the call that my honourable friend from La Verendrye should answer when he is so anxious today to do something about it, because he could do a lot more for correctional reform in Ottawa, I think, than he can in this House. And I'm not making any excuses at all. We have been told that it's going to be some considerable time, probably a good number of years yet before we will see physical plants in this province to implement the Fauteux meeting that was held some years past; to implement the agreement that was then reached among the provinces and the Federal Government. I regret that as much as any honourable member opposite and so does every Attorney-General in Canada, be he Liberal, Conservative, CCF or whatever, but we know that it's coming and we know that this in itself is going to mean one of the greatest transformations in the correctional system that this country has ever seen. I think in the meantime, if my honourable friends in the Liberal Party or if my honourable friends in the CCF party were in office, I think that common prudence would say to them that this is not the time to embark upon a huge capital construction program in the provincial gaol field. Really I think common sense would commend that point of view to all of them. Certainly it does to this side of the House. I think that we have every expectation -- we can have every hopeful expectation that this agreement among the provinces and the Federal Government to implement the Fauteux Report will come in and, as I say, when it does come, it will be one of the greatest boons that this province has ever had in the correctional field.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, for the information of my honourable friend the Attorney-General, as far as my group here is concerned, we would agree with him insofar as

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . . expenditures of any great amount of money for capital expenditures. We certainly might criticize other aspects of it, but I would agree with him as far as capital expenditures are concerned.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, there were some other remarks made yesterday by the Honourable Member for St. John's, and may I say to him most sincerely, Mr. Chairman, that I do appreciate the amount of time and study that he puts on this subject. I know of the work that he does as the Director of the John Howard-Elizabeth Fry Society and I think that he is to be commended for that work, and that the interest which he displays in this field is genuine and deep; and I commend him, Sir, for the many very good suggestions that he makes from time to time. I think that they're all suggestions which will bear consideration by the department and certainly some of them in due course whether soon or late, perhaps not as soon as my honourable friend would like to see, but sooner or later I think that a lot of the things that he espouses are going to come true. I should perhaps qualify it to this extent and say not because he alone espouses them, but because he reads from fairly authoritative documents and he is familiar with these documents and I appreciate his knowledge in the field. I can assure him that such things as in-training program for staff; such things as greater segregation; and Heaven knows we can all stand improvement -- our system can stand improvement in this field, these things certainly are coming. Maybe too slowly for my honourable friend but certainly they are coming, because I don't think that his philosophy or the philosophy of this government in the field of corrections diverges too far at any point at all because I think he shares the general philosophy laid down in the Fauteux Report, namely, that the function of a correctional system is to prevent people -- the function is to prevent people from going back to gaol; to try to reform them while you've got them; or to put them on probation and keep them out of gaol in the first place. That is the basic philosophy which has been laid down by that esteemed committee and one certainly which this government, and I think all right-minded governments across the country share.

Now there were one or two points that he raised. He was disturbed, he said, about the number of juveniles in adult institutions. Well I think, Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend should realize, probably he will as I mention it, that the juvenile age in Manitoba is 18. In Saskatchewan to the west, in Ontario to the east, the juvenile age is 16. I'm not making any reflections upon either of those provinces, but the fact is that a person of over 16 years of age in Ontario or in Saskatchewan is treated in the same category as an adult; treated in the adult court; sentenced in the adult court; goes to an adult institution where he may very well be segregated into a young offenders unit, if they have such a thing, but in essence he is treated as an adult. In Manitoba this situation does not obtain. Any child up to the age of 18 years is treated initially as a juvenile delinquent, unless under the pertinent section of The Juvenile Delinquents Act and after the juvenile court judge has exercised his discretion in this regard, he may be transferred from the juvenile court to the adult court. I think my honourable friend is aware of the fact that, I would say roughly on a one-third -- two-third basis, those juveniles who are transferred to adult institutions in Manitoba, about one-third of them roughly are sent to adult institutions because they were transferred from juvenile to adult court and dealt with as adults on serious offences, some of them of course ranging up to murder. There can be offences of that kind. The others are dealt with as persons who have escaped once, or more often, from juvenile detention homes; or are dealt with under the incorrigibility section of The Prison and Reformatories Act, where the superintendent must come before a juvenile court and show that the keeping of this juvenile in a juvenile institution is not beneficial necessarily to the juvenile or to the balance of the institution and that he should be transferred to an adult institution. Now that's the only way in which a juvenile can get into an adult institution in Manitoba. He does not get in ab initio as he does in provinces with lower age limits -- into adult institutions. There is a special procedure set up in the two cases. Certainly it's true we have some, a very small number I'm happy to acknowledge, but they are there, as I have mentioned, either by transfer from juvenile to adult court or by having been transferred from a juvenile institution to an adult institution because of their inability to accept the behaviour codes and so on that are applied to them in the juvenile institution.

He talked to us about educational leave and bursaries, and I appreciated his words on this point. Perhaps he is not aware of the fact that we do have educational leave in Manitoba. It

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.).....applies equally to all departments. I think he will notice from the answer to the question that I gave him, that two members of our staff at the present time are on educational leave taking further studies at the university. Bursaries is a very good point. I can point fingers at my colleague the Honourable the Minister of Health, but he has more social workers than I have, and when you start counting heads, he's the one who seems to get the lion's share -- and that's a L-I-O-N-S -- the lion's share of the bursary money. This is not to say though, Mr. Chairman, that we are unaware of this fact. We are aware of it and certainly we are looking at it now to see if it can be remedied in any way.

He mentioned the question of pre-sentence reports being made mandatory. Of course, as I pointed out to him at the time, insofar as the Federal Criminal Code is concerned this would require a federal amendment. We're approaching the subject, not from the standpoint of making it mandatory, but we are approaching it in the manner that is recommended in the Fauteux Report; namely, that of having regular conferences of sentencing justices. By that I mean, by and large, the police magistrates in juvenile court and judges of our province. We have had two of them since this government has been in office, the first two that they ever had. We find that this is a splendid occasion for these justices to get together to hear addresses or lectures given to them by the chief probation people in Manitoba; to hear lectures given to them by the John Howard Society and the work that that group is doing; to have their own internal discussions about sentencing policy and what they do in particular cases. Through this whole flux of lectures and swapping of problems and ideas there emerges, I think, a more consistent and, I would hope, a more enlightened sentencing policy in our province. More important, and following again what the Fauteux Report tells us we should be doing in any proper correctional program, we take these magistrates, when they are gathered in conference or sometimes separately if they request it, to our institutions; show them our institutions; show them -- if they are sentencing a man to Headingley Gaol they should see Headingley Gaol. If they are sentencing a girl to the Home for Girls or to the Home of the Good Shepherd, they should see the Home of the Good Shepherd and know the facilities that are available there, so that they can give a more enlightened sentence when these juveniles or adults are brought before them. I know from the comments that they have made, from time to time at their two meetings, that they appreciate this and that certainly they respond tremendously to these conferences. The work that we are doing in that direction, I think, is tremendously important to the overall field, tremendously important to a closer melding of our correctional program without sentencing justices so that the two are working not against each other but the two are working one in harmony with the other. Not perfect -- I'm not claiming perfection at all, but I think this again is a long step in the right direction to properly integrate your overall sentencing and correctional program for the benefit of those persons who come before the courts.

The Honourable Member for Selkirk, or was it the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains who made some comment about Land Titles' fees. I think both of them perhaps alluded-- the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains I think alluded to it in his remarks, and I do have some figures here that would be of interest to him. He wanted to know, I think, how much of the Land Title fees were going into the Consolidated Fund as revenue. I'm quite happy to be able to give him those figures, but I would go back a piece and point out these facts to him; that the Land Titles' fees, I think, were adjusted right after the War in 1945. There was then another major adjustment, as I recall, in 1950; and I have here a statement showing the revenue and expenses -- revenue derived from the whole Land Titles system and expenses of that system for a comparative period, showing the relationship of expenses to revenue. In other words, what proportion did expense incur of revenue. My honourable friend will be interested to know that, going back to 1945, the revenue was \$310,645; expenses were \$130,424. The relationship of expense to revenue was 41.9 percent expense for that ratio to revenue in 1945. In 1950 it had worked up to the point where expense to revenue was \$385,552; expense was \$209,700; and the ratio or relationship was then 54.3 percent. Then there followed a fee increase and in March 31st, 1951, revenue increased to \$515,857; expenses were up slightly, \$224,734; to bring back the ratio to 43.5 percent. Now from that point on, just to give these quick figures, the ratios varied as follows: in 1952 the ratio was 46.7 percent; in '53 it was 58.9 percent, getting higher; '54, 61 percent; '55, 61 percent; '56, 53.9 percent, it dropped a bit; '57, 53.4 percent; '58, 62.4 percent; '59, 56.4 percent; and then following, and these are estimates only,



(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.)....following the fee increase it is back down now, as I say this is an estimated calculation, to 42 percent -- (Interjection) -- I don't know if it's quite -- these are estimates of revenue and I don't know if this is the stage to give them. I would be quite happy to give them later on in the budget address. I don't know whether it's proper to .....

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Instead of giving us the estimates, could you give us the revenues for the year ending March 31st, 1960? That will give us an indication.

MR. LYON: Yes -- oh no, pardon me. Yes, that figure was \$924,000 and the expenses were \$395,450, for a ratio of 42 percent.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I take it that the new fees went into effect August 1st, '59, so the difference there would only be for 8 months.

MR. LYON: Yes, part of the year. I think these figures will indicate to my honourable friend, Mr. Chairman, that the policy that is followed is the periodic adjustment of fees that the ratio of expense to revenue now is practically the same as it was shortly after my honourable friend's government last increased the fees in 1950. I'm sure that this information will be of interest to him.

Now my Honourable Friend from Selkirk mentioned that I should have a new theme song and thought that it should be "High Hopes." I was thinking when I sometimes sit and ponder and consider the problems of correctional reform, that perhaps a more adequate one might be the "There's a Long Long Trail a Winding." I don't know if any of us are ever going to see the end of it let alone reach it, but it is one of these social welfare problems that we are faced with, quite properly, and all I can say to him is that we are trying our best. We may not be perfect in all respects but we're trying our best, and the criticism that comes from that quarter of the House usually, and I'm referring to the Honourable Member for Selkirk, is criticism that I listen to with a great deal of care because I know thereto it comes with sincerity and with experience; and certainly I hope that another year that we will commend ourselves perhaps slightly more to the honourable gentleman than we did this year. But I ask him to have a bit of patience and, after he's given us maybe 10 or 12 years in office, I think he'll be ready to admit that his criticism was perhaps a bit premature on this occasion.

Now he mentioned the speech that was given by the Chief Probation Officer and asked the particular question as to what I thought about certain recommendations or statements made by the Chief Probation Officer. I would say to the honourable gentleman that I have a very high regard for the Chief Probation Officer of this province. He's certainly an outstanding member of our staff and an outstanding civil servant. Fortunately, or unfortunately, I don't know, it is not given to the Chief Probation Officer to reflect policy of the government; and while perhaps it won't be as articulate or as expert, my honourable friend will have to rely upon me to reflect government policy. He said what about a Borstal institution? What do we think about a young offenders unit? We think it's a very good idea. We think it's an excellent idea, and I think that in due course, I'm not suggesting this year next year or the year after, but I think in due course that there will have to be a young offenders type of unit in this province. He asked me did the magistrate make any recommendation to me after they concluded their last conference in January, and the answer is "yes". One of these recommendations was this: That there should be this type of institution in Manitoba. The second one was that the juvenile age in Manitoba should be reduced from 18 down to 16, but not until the institution of this type was built. I think that that reflects the type of thinking that is going on among our justices of the provinces, indeed going on in my own department. And I think that while certainly no one can commit themselves to future policy, I think that in the long run we must contemplate in this correctional field an institution of that type; because it has seemed to prove itself in other jurisdictions and certainly, if that is the case, there is room to consider it seriously in this province.

He made an interesting suggestion concerning The Itinerant Salesmen's Act in Saskatchewan. I had seen that Act before and I must say the one thing that struck me about it, and I thank him for giving me the reference volume for it today, the one thing that struck me about it, Mr. Chairman, was the large number of commercial agents, as they are defined in this act, who are exempted from the provisions of the act. It defines a commercial agent as any person who goes from house to house selling or offering for sale or soliciting orders, or selling or offering for sale a contract or agreement, including the right of privilege to the

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.)....person solicited, of purchasing goods, wares or merchandise; but does not include, and then there follows -- I won't burden the House with this long description-- but there follows a very extensive list of people who are exempted from the application of this act: persons selling bibles and books of a religious nature, newspapers, magazines, field petroleum products, binder twine, lightning rods, pianos, organs, typewriters, adding machines, sewing machines -- we've had trouble with sewing machine salesmen or parts thereof-- computing scale fire extinguishers, tombstones, nursery stock, persons selling lumber or coal, a farmer selling products raised in Saskatchewan on his own farm, a person selling motor vehicles or farm implements provided he resides or has a place of business in Saskatchewan. Now this act has been in force I understand, since 1958. I would be quite happy to consult with our friends in Saskatchewan and see just what the response has been to it. I noticed that they had to make this very broad exception, and I think quite properly so, because we must remember this, that while there is always a small number of people who are willing to go out and to bilk or to defraud the public, we must remember as well that there are perhaps 90 or 95 percent of our door-to-door salesmen who are honest law-abiding citizens; who are fulfilling a need in the community; answering a demand in the community; and by and large, doing an honest job of salesmanship. I don't think that one of my honourable friends opposite would want to suggest that we place any undue burden upon these people. I'm the first to admit that we have the other kind, and the law enforcement authorities in the province try to catch this other kind as much as they can, with assistance from the Better Business Bureau and other people. But before we contemplated legislation of this type, I would like to hear how it is working out in practical application in Saskatchewan; to see whether or not it affects the other 95 percent, or should we say 98 percent, who are doing an honest job in the door-to-door sales field.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, if the Attorney General takes a closer look at that Act he'll find out that there is a discretion invested in the provincial secretary there regarding bonds, but they all have to be licensed excepting the ones excluded. Did you exclude tombstone salesmen?

MR. LYON: Yes.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Well, even in Manitoba we've had tombstone salesmen who have gyped the public.

MR. LYON: I'm aware of that, but I think it's a point well worth looking at, as is his suggestion concerning standardization of Conditional Sales Contracts. I think that's another very valid point that should deserve some consideration. I know that there are people within hearing of me now who are taking note of the fact that I make this statement, and I hope that we can perhaps have some information, if not at this session at another time, to present to my honourable friend on that subject.

My honourable friend the Leader of the CCF Party made some comments today. His suggestion concerning the drawing to attention of accused persons of possible consequences of Highway Traffic Act convictions, certainly is worthy of some consideration. I don't necessarily agree that the public are always quite as innocent and quite -- and I mean that in the true sense of the word, I don't mean guilty or anything -- innocent or unknowing of the processes of law perhaps as would be indicated. But -- naive -- that's the word I'm looking for. There might well be the odd case where a person is completely unaware of by-product effects of a plea of guilty to a common danger charge or something like that. Of course, at the present time if he has any question about it, all he has to do is ask the police officer or phone the Public Safety Branch of the department and they could tell him. But that I know is not necessarily the answer. Some people perhaps might not even think to do that. But certainly we could give some consideration to his suggestion. I don't see that there would be any wrong in it at all. I don't see anything wrong in it, I just wonder how great is the area of population that we're trying to reach by this mode of news.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, while we're dealing with the question of traffic convictions and violations, I'd like to suggest to the Minister, in conjunction with the Minister of Public Utilities, that at the time of the issuance of licenses, in order to acquaint the public with violations in the Highway Traffic Act itself, that the government should give consideration to giving a condensed version of The Highway Traffic Act to everybody at the time of the

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.)....issuance of the plates, in order that they are acquainted with many of our traffic laws. There are so many in there that we are not aware of, or people aren't aware of until the time of conviction. I just make that suggestion in order that the people become acquainted with violations in The Traffic Act itself.

MR. LYON: That might have some merit too, but I wouldn't want to be assigned the job of condensing The Highway Traffic Act. Perhaps the Honourable Member for Selkirk could take that one on, but it would be a pretty tough one. He mentioned in the field of after-care that there were no consultative services -- I think he said other than the Salvation Army. If I misunderstood him, I stand to be corrected. I know that he didn't mean to overlook the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry Society which, of course, with the Salvation Army, is one of the most active groups in the after-care field.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that they are taking care of the field at the present time, of channelling people affected into knowing what they can have in regards to aid after their conviction.

MR. LYON: The counselling service, and I could stand to be corrected myself by one of the directors of the organization who is sitting behind you, but the counselling service of that society, as I understand it, they will respond to calls -- I know they've placed a limit -- the man must be serving the last three months or two months of his sentence and they will respond and meet this man and consult with the prisoner in the gaol and so on.

MR. DAVID ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, if I may interject here, the Honourable Leader of the CCF is talking about people who have not yet been sentenced, and those people do not have the assistance of the John Howard Society.

MR. LYON: This is an area -- I'm wrong and you're right -- this is an area in which there is some onus, I think, probably on the probation people. If they come in contact with those persons who are sentenced, but this is an area where that might well take place. You're thinking of something like the prisoner's friend before court and just after court, that idea? I think that in some cases there is a feeling by some, they're being taken away from their families and they have concern for their upkeep and so on and so forth.

He mentioned the question of youngsters being sent away to juvenile institutions because of family environments. I presume he meant by that that youngsters who had gotten into trouble with the law in which family environment might have been a contributing factor. There is a section of the Child Welfare Act, of course, under which children can be declared neglected children if the home atmosphere is not proper and if they're wanting for some of the basic needs of life. These children, of course, can be sent to foster homes, but they are not sent to our homes unless they get into trouble with the law and commit -- (interjection) -- Yes, I know that attempts are made to ascertain just what type of environment the child is going to go back into. Sometimes it's pretty hard to say to a child, "you can't go back to your parents," but in some cases I know the superintendents realize as well that going back is not going to assist this child particularly. There are, of course, the other agencies which come to play here. We have the Roslyn Home for Girls which is used somewhat for this purpose when a child leaves an institution, or the child can be initially committed to that institution if the home environment is not good and the child is of an age where he or she is willing -- or she in the case of the Roslyn Home -- is willing to start out on a job of work. They can go there and have refuge in that Home and break, in effect, the tie with the family home. The same, of course, is true with the Hugh-John MacDonald Hostel and with the Dawson House connected thereto which are institutions, both of which take in children originally committed by the court, or can take in children on departure from our institutions. So there are these facilities made available in the volunteer field of our community.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I might just interject. I appreciate that very much, but my thought was concentrating in the home from which the juvenile came from, to see whether or not the situation at home could be changed to create a better environment for the person to go back to.

MR. LYON: Well, we could have quite a talk about that one -- how we can correct the home situation sometimes. This, of course, is the area in which the Family Court tries to do some work, that is, if the disagreement between the parents, if there is a disagreement, has manifested itself to the point where they are going to separate or coming continuously to

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.)....blows and so on. But that is a vast field, of how you build up a better family environment.

My honourable friend mentioned The Judgments Act, and the question of exemptions. I would be quite happy to take a look at that. I think the point is well worth considering. The Judgment Act is not used, I would say, extensively, but there may well be occasions when hardship could be rendered as a result of these exemptions; although if such is the case, they have not been brought to my attention. And I'm coming back -- I'll leave to the end a few words about the constitutional meetings.

Going on to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, he mentioned a particular case rising out of a letter to the editor. I do not have the complete filed information in front of me. I can only say to him this, on the basis of preliminary information, there were other factors involved in this case. There was the factor of deportation -- wanted in another jurisdiction. Deportation was involved in the particular case so I'm led to believe, but I would not make any categorical statement on it until I've actually seen the report myself. But I would say this, that no one could agree more thoroughly with the Honourable Leader of the Opposition than myself, that if there is any propensity or tendency on the part of the police forces, be they in the City of Winnipeg or in any part of Manitoba, to use the powers of arrest that are given to them under the Criminal Code for purposes other than proper law enforcement, then I think that not only myself but this whole Legislature should be very very concerned about it. Fortunately, such instances come to our attention extremely rarely. In the case, I know, of the City of Winnipeg Police Department, the Police Commission there keeps a very close eye on the activities as does the Chief Constable, on the activities of their individual members to ensure that this type of activity or this type of arrest does not occur. It's bound to happen from time to time and I'm not, Mr. Chairman, referring to the case mentioned by my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition. I'm speaking now in a broader sense. But I can assure him of our interest in it and our sincere concern that no such instances should happen in this province. There are, of course, several remedies available for false imprisonment, false arrest and so on, but this isn't the answer. The answer, I think, is to cut it out before it has any chance to start, and if ever the head of this monster appears in the province, I will have a great deal of pleasure in trying to cut it off right at the ground as soon as we see it. But fortunately, as I say, it does not occur except on extremely rare occasions and usually on those occasions the police officer concerned is dismissed or he may well be called into court for his actions.

The rights of the province vis-a-vis The Coarse Grains Act -- The Coarse Grains Act is certainly a provincial statute. I wouldn't make any categorical statement as to its constitutionality. I think by reading of it, that it's probably intra vires, but I don't know if my opinion would be any better than the Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains. We might disagree and maybe we'd need a referee in the person of the Leader of the Opposition to thaw off, or the Honourable the First Minister. But I can say this, that the Act, as it reads, is quite clear in its text and advice has been given -- I, of course, can't tell my honourable friend the advice that is tendered by one department to another, but I can tell him that advice has been given to the Department of Agriculture as to the effect of the present act and as to how it can be amended to conform to activities that are occurring. I think the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture advised my honourable friend that certain things were under consideration, and that's about as far as I can go on it. Now, I wouldn't want to pledge my reputation as a lawyer, whatever that may be, to the constitutional validity of the act; but I do say that presuming that the Act is intra vires of the province, certainly the procedure laid out is quite clear -- quite clear.

He referred also to the rights of the country. I like speeches such as my honourable friend's, where they're easy to follow. He is consistent in what he says and he's one of the few, I may say, who didn't tell me to spend more money. I appreciate this -- he comes from a good source so I can't criticize him on that score at all. Insofar as the rights of the country and the Constitutional Conference are concerned, I'll make some reference in a few moments to that subject.

My honourable friend from St. George had some comments to make about liquor advertising. A very interesting subject and one upon which there is considerable speculation from

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.). . . . time to time. I suppose in due course there might well be further debate at another time, not necessarily in this session or in future sessions, but who can tell? It is a very interesting subject, and one at which the Chairman of the Liquor Commission has been looking at for some time. Members will appreciate that the new National Code, or a form of the National Code, was brought into force in Ontario over this past year; and I think all provinces in Canada are probably taking a look at this code in Ontario and its application in that province. Beyond that I can enlighten my friend no further, except to repeat again that it's a very interesting subject. He wants to have a distillery in the province. He suggested that there were no distilleries here because there was no liquor advertising. Well, that's a subject that perhaps my colleague the Minister of Industry and Commerce is better equipped to speak upon than myself. That information has not been conveyed to me.

He made some passing comment, I know not why, about the appointment of a new Police Magistrate for the City of Winnipeg to succeed the late C.W. Tupper. That man, of course, is Mr. Isaac Rice. The moment Mr. Tupper passed away very suddenly, Mr. Rice was called in to take over that court. He was subsequently appointed the Police Magistrate and I know not the point of my honourable friend's remarks that there had been delay in the filling of the vacancy. If there had been only one magistrate operating I could understand some purpose to his remarks, but otherwise they leave me querulous as to what he's getting at. He talks about the court in his own constituency. The whole rural system in the Eastern Judicial District -- we are looking at. We had some discussion, I think, last year and perhaps the year before on the question of full-time magistrates and the problems that are involved there. I have had no indication, as I expect I would from either the court or the staff, that there seems to be an undue build-up, but certainly I'll look into it. If my honourable friend feels there should be more regular courts in his area, certainly that's a point that is well worth considering as we don't like to see people having to wait long if that, in fact, is the case.

Dale Carnegie -- well perhaps I suppose my honourable friend and I should be the first two to take that course: "How to Win Friends and Influence People." I have some knowledge though of the volunteer work that is being done in this field at Stony Mountain and I certainly concur with him that, from reports I have heard from some of the instructors, that the response to it is good and well worth looking at.

The Member for Kildonan mentioned some cases that he brought to my attention sometime last year concerning some parking tickets which were handed out by the East Kildonan Police in his area. I can say to him members of the staff undertook to investigate these matters for me. and, as I recall, and I'm only speaking now from memory and I hope the honourable member will appreciate that, as I recall the report came back from the police officers that notifications had been given to these people prior to any tickets being issued. In any case, that was the essence of the report that I got. I must admit, as I think I told my honourable friend at the time, I didn't investigate it personally although I may have spoken to somebody in East Kildonan, although my memory escapes me on the point. In any case, I would say this, that where there is a conflict between evidence that may be submitted by the Crown and evidence that may be submitted by the accused, the Crown sometimes can say to itself well this is a case that should not go to prosecution because undoubtedly the accused's story is proper and would provide a proper defence to this case if it came to court. But there are cases where the evidence is equally strong on both sides and in those cases, by and large, I think the attitude of the Crown over the years with which I've been connected with it has been, if in doubt, let the judge decide. The Crown very often does have to act as the judge in some of these borderline cases but when you get down to the traffic ticket level, and I'm not trying to say that it's a small point to the person who is fined \$27, but when you get down there I think you have to leave it pretty well to be decided by justice as to just what the facts are of each particular case.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, is there any other word in the English language to substitute for prosecutor?

MR. LYON: We call them Crown Attorneys, Mr. Chairman -- Crown Attorneys. If my honourable friend likes that better, it's synonymous with prosecutor. My honourable friend from La Verendrye.

MR. REID: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the speaker a question? I don't think that any violation of traffic that a person has, unless he had a legitimate case, that he'd wish to appeal

(Mr. Reid, cont'd.)....it. My point is, Mr. Chairman, that to appeal a case it would cost them more than to win it and they had no recourse except to go to provincial court. After he's paid possibly a fine of \$25, and then he wants to go and appeal it, it'll cost maybe \$50 or \$75, so the average citizen says: "What's the use?" That's my point. Even if you have an opportunity to appeal it, it costs you more money to win the case. My point is that the Crown should call in both sides, the police and the complainant, and let them fight the case out. If the party is still guilty they should pay, but if they are innocent they shouldn't have to pay. After all, it isn't only in one part of Manitoba, it's every magistrate in Manitoba. They just convict the party and the party knows they have no recourse because it costs them more money to appeal the case. That's the point I was trying to bring up, Mr. Chairman. The point was proven there where these people -- there were seven of them it wasn't only one of them -- and when they talked to the magistrate he told them straight: "well you better plead guilty because if you don't plead guilty the case will be harder on you." So what could they do? Some of these people are just young people of 18, 19, the first time they ever appeared in court, and the magistrate says plead guilty and it'll go easier on you. They pled guilty and after I contacted the Attorney-General, the Attorney-General said: "Why did they plead guilty?" I said, "they didn't know any different. They're not criminal offenders, they're just ordinary citizens, a first offence.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to have some documentation about the court advising somebody how to plead. If the honourable member has any documentation of what he has just said in the House I'd like to have it, because he's making some suggestions about the conduct of a justice, and I presume it was a Justice of the Peace, which I think should be investigated if in fact this occurred. I mentioned to him at the time, and I don't know if I should take up the time of the House with these almost private matters that were brought by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, but I mentioned to him at the time and he is aware of it, he mentioned it in his talk, that there is a remission power given in the Treasury Act to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. If these people felt aggrieved, they could apply for remission. Now I don't know if any applications were made. I don't recall any of them being made, but I specifically mentioned that power as an alternative to appeal where need is shown; or where it can be shown that the people are in harsh circumstances financially, the Crown or the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council can remit. It's true it's not a practice that's resorted to too often, although there are returns each year showing that some fines occasionally are remitted where a case of hardship is shown.

Now my honourable friend for La Verendrye -- I think many of the comments that I made with respect to the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains could well apply to him. He would like to know whether we're spending too much or whether we're not spending enough. When they make up their minds will they please convey this information to this side of the House so we'll be able to tell the public what Liberal policy is, because they haven't been telling the public and perhaps it's up to us to tell them. But that's a minor point. He has some ideas he learned from a good teacher, namely, the Director of Corrections; and I think he has a good teacher in the Director of Corrections; and I would commend considerably more reading of this material to the Honourable Member from La Verendrye because I think if he devises a personal or a party-- that honour is accorded to him -- a party platform upon the lines that are given and laid down by the Director of Corrections, that probably we won't disagree too much in corrections, because our lines are laid down pretty much by the Director and we're stimulated by the ideas and thoughts which he has been able to give to us. He made some passing comment about boys of 18 years of age being in the Home for Boys, I think it was. Well of course that accrues by virtue of the fact that the juvenile age is 18 and I'm sure the honourable member understands that. They can't be committed to an adult institution until that age is reduced, and I think that that would be conditional probably upon having some form of a young offenders unit, which we will probably see in due course in this province.

Now if I may, Mr. Chairman, refer briefly for a moment to the question of Constitutional Conferences that have been held since this House last met.-- (Interjection) -- No, I doubt very much if I can do it in four minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ....what you have started....

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister asks us about the policies

(Mr. Prefontaine, cont'd.).....of our party. Well I don't want to talk for our party but I would like to say this, that if I have to do something about it, I'll just imitate the example of his leader and his party and have a policy just about a month and a half before the next election.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't here in 19 -- let me see --'54 -- '55. What I gave to the House in my first year as Leader of the Opposition was a darn good program for the public and the country to follow, and we've pursued that all the way through to 1958, and by George they voted for it, and that's why we're here because we started out in 1955 with a new constructive.....

MR. PREFONTAINE: When the present leader of the Conservative Party was ....

MR. ROBLIN: Now look, my honourable friend is an older man than me and he understands the rules of courtesy here. He wouldn't interrupt me. In 1955, when we were making our statements we produced a few constructive ideas and I'm longing for the time when my honourable friends do the same.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Chairman, may I have the privilege, there is a few minutes yet. May I have the privilege to answer this? I would like to say that I was not present at the meeting when the present Leader of the Conservative Party was chosen in 1954; but I remember reading, and I have still the clippings of the press where he made the statement that they had not provided a platform at that time, they would have a platform when the time would come.

MR. ROBLIN: It was in the House in 1955 when I gave the platform, but of course he's forgotten that. He didn't pay any attention to it then and so much the worse for him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I call it 5:30 and leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.