

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Friday, April 9th, 1965.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Madam Speaker, I wish to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Industrial Relations beg leave to present the following as their first report: Your committee met for organization and appointed Hon. Mr. Baizley as Chairman. Your committee recommends that, for the remainder of this Session, the quorum of this committee shall consist of seven members. Your committee has considered Bill No. 4, an Act to amend The Fire Departments Arbitration Act and has agreed to report the same without amendment. Your committee has also considered Bills: No. 49, an Act respecting the Safety of Employees in their Employment; No. 51, an Act to amend The Employment Standards Act; No. 92, an Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act, and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments all of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Public Works that the report of the committee be received.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

The Honourable the Provincial Secretary.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary) (River Heights) introduced Bill No. 116, an Act respecting the Law of Partnership.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, I would just like to know whether the government intends to, for the session to introduce bills every day, without giving sufficient notice for us to study them. In other words, we have from the government every day almost new bills. Is it possible for us to get all the bills for the present session?

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

MR. STEINKOPF introduced Bill No. 115, an Act respecting the Registration of Business Names and Partnerships.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Secretary that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution standing in my name.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion before the committee is: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting the reorganization of boundaries of local government units and to establish a Municipal Boundaries Commission and to provide, among other matters, that all salaries and other expenses incurred by or on behalf of the Commission be paid from and out of the Consolidated Fund.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, the subject matter of this bill was the recommendation of both the Fisher and the Michener Commissions. This is a matter which is to say the least, one that's liable to stir up some controversy in some parts of the community. It would be our proposal that this bill which would establish a commission to recommend exact boundaries for the proposed reorganization in various areas of the province, this bill should be sent to the Municipal Affairs Committee and left in committee with an opportunity for the various segments of the community to make their representations known to see whether or not this procedure is one which would be generally acceptable. I would like to make it clear that it is

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd) . . . not the intention of the government to go into any wholesale re-organization of municipal boundaries at this time and that there will be no changes in boundaries contemplated at least for the present without local initiative.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, is it the intention of the Minister to have in the bill the exact terms of reference of the commission and lay down exactly what they are to do or does he expect to do that by regulation? I would be very interested in knowing from him if he can tell us at this time exactly what the commission is empowered to do -- in other words, will they have a certain assessment they have to work towards or a certain population they have to work towards -- will this be by local consent? We are presently faced with a bill for example in the Department of Education regarding the take-over of local schools. This has to be done by way of petition by the school boards and finally by a referendum of the electors of the area. Is this the same proposal as the Minister is making and will all of this be outlined in the bill or will the bill be merely a framework and the balance done by regulation?

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, has this bill anything to do with the redistribution of the coming election boundaries?

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, if I may, the Minister might have all of the questions or the probability that he might. He mentioned, Mr. Chairman, the fact that this committee will consider the recommendations of the Murray Fisher Report and also the Michener Report. I recall Mr. Chairman that there was another report that dealt with the question of changes in municipal boundaries that we had some years ago -- I believe it was either 1952 or 1953, that there was a joint committee between the Government of the day at that time and the respective municipal organizations and in that report there were certain recommendations made at that particular time for the consideration of changes in boundaries on more economic units, etcetera. I am wondering if the committee is also going to consider that particular report because on reviewing it just the other day, I find that there are a number of very constructive resolutions or suggestions in that particular report. I refer to the Municipal Provincial Committee. I believe it was 1952 or 1953 when it was set up.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, I would advise the committee that the terms of reference of the Municipal Boundaries Commission would be set out in the bill and it does refer to the recommendations in both the Fisher Report and the Michener Report specifically. It does not refer to the other report but there would be no reason why the committee couldn't consider any of the recommendations of the other report to which the Honourable Leader of the NDP refers if they desire to do so. Insofar as the question asked by the Honourable Member for Inkster, this has absolutely nothing to do with any electoral divisions redistribution.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the Minister if the personnel of the proposed boundaries commission will be covered by the bill. Will they be named in the bill? Will they be named as persons or the holders of positions?

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, the persons are not named either as individuals or ex officio in the bill. The bill will provide for three persons to be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. But as I told the committee, Mr. Chairman, this is a matter that we would leave in committee. It's not a bill that we propose to give third reading to at this session, so that we are quite prepared to listen to any constructive suggestions from any quarter of this House or from any interested persons in the province before this matter becomes final.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, the committee has adopted a certain resolution and has instructed me to report the same.

Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. SMELLIE introduced Bill No. 118, an Act respecting the Reorganization of Boundaries of local Government Units and to establish a Municipal Boundaries Commission.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day I would like to attract your attention to the Speaker's Gallery where this year's Easter Seal "Timmy", eight-year old Richard Wiebe of Fort Garry is seated with his father and with the Chairman of the Easter Seal Campaign,

(MADAM SPEAKER cont'd) . . . Mr. Stewart Millett. Timmy has been wearing a series of braces for the past three years to help correct the painful hip condition that otherwise would have left him permanently afflicted. Happily, Timmy's is a success story. For the past short while he's been allowed to walk around home without his brace and within several weeks he will be able to discard it permanently. We are pleased to have you here and we wish to give public recognition to the Society for Crippled Children and Adults of Manitoba for its encouraging work in this field.

Also in the Speaker's Gallery there are 15 ladies from various parts in western Manitoba under the direction of Mrs. Merle McKeand. This group has been sponsored by the Honourable the Member for Rhineland. We have some 15 Grade 1 to 8 students from Broadway School under the direction of their teacher, Mrs. Nichols. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Morris. We also have 60 grade 6 and 7 students from St. Charles School under the direction of Mr. Hildebrand. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly I welcome you.

Orders of the Day.

MRS. CAROLYNE MORRISON (Pembina): Before the Orders of the Day, Madam Speaker, I would like to announce to you and the members of this House, the birthday of one of my constituents, Mrs. Sarah Saunders of Morden, who is today celebrating her 100th birthday at the home of her daughter, Mrs. Goldsmith with whom she resides. Mrs. Saunders who was born in Ontario, has lived in the Morden area for some 75 years and was one of the pioneer farm women in that district; a kindly lady, interested always in promoting whatever was for the welfare of her community and those around her. Mrs. Saunders has very good health and when she wants a cup of tea or lunch she is quite able to prepare it for herself. She has two sons and four daughters, 10 grandchildren, 29 great-grandchildren and three great-great grandchildren. One of her sons is a principal in one of our Winnipeg schools and will be driving out this afternoon to join in the celebration of his mother's 100th birthday. I am sure those of us in this House will join in extending congratulations and good wishes. Thank you.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to address a question to the Honourable the First Minister and I apologize to him for not giving him prior notice. The question, Madam Speaker, is has the First Minister made representations to Ottawa or/and to Air Canada in respect of the transferring of employees of Air Canada from Winnipeg as the result of my questions the other day?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, I'm only semi-clairvoyant. I thought sure my honourable friend would ask me that question yesterday and consequently I brought the telegram that I sent along with me so that I would have a chance to read it, but I didn't bring it with me today. The answer to the question is that we have sent a telegram asking that these matters be placed in abeyance until such time as the policy of the federal government has been decided subsequent to the report of the Thompson Commission. I have not received a reply to date.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, Madam Speaker, a supplemental question to the Honourable the First Minister. It is my understanding that the Thompson Commission are awaiting the rebuttal of the Province of Manitoba to the material laid before the said commission by Air Canada and others. My question is when will the province be in a position to make their representations in order that the Thompson Inquiry Commission may complete their deliberations so that the government at Ottawa may be in a position to get the recommendations of the report of the Commission?

MR. ROBLIN: Subsequent to the presentation of the position of the Province of Manitoba to the Thompson Commission, the TransAir people were given -- the Air Canada people were given an opportunity to reply. The date fixed for the resumption of hearings I think was April 6th. Unfortunately Air Canada did not provide us with a copy of their rebuttal until about April 3rd and as it introduced a great deal of new material that had not been considered before it was obviously impossible to proceed with the hearings as originally planned. Consequently there has been a postponement and I think that the committee will reconvene to hear further evidence about May 6th or May 8th -- somewhere in that general time vicinity.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I really don't know why the public in Winnipeg are so interested in investing money in the provincial government. According to many members here it's not the best investment, but however they do, and they do ask for me to find out when and where and whether (is that good English) the government intends to announce the bond sale of the

(MR. GRAY cont'd) . . . Province of Manitoba to the people of Manitoba who are anxious to get the benefit from their own province.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I like to thank my honourable friend because he's one of the best public relations experts I have in this field of savings bonds. He takes a deep interest in it, a constructive interest, and I'm glad to tell him that I expect there will be an issue of savings bonds later on this spring. I'm not able to give the exact date at the moment.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that the Attorney-General introduced a resolution on Tuesday which covers two of the four points which are contained in my resolution, I would ask for consent to withdraw this resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster, and the proposed amendment in amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Selkirk and the proposed sub-amendment of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable the Member for Pembina.

MRS. MORRISON: At the outset of my remarks, Madam Speaker, I want to make it clear to the members of this House that the views I will be expressing on the subject of divorce are my own personal views; and I want also to assure the members that the statements I make are the result of much thought and consideration, much soul-searching on my part, because we are dealing with a very serious topic.

I consider this subject of divorce to be the most serious problem we have debated in this Legislature because we are dealing with family life which is the foundation of our nation. I realize there are many people who cannot conscientiously accept what divorce stands for. They believe there should be no such privilege of divorce. I sympathize with them in their views because I too find there are occasions when I cannot conscientiously agree with some of the views which are considered by many people to be quite acceptable in our present day society. Each of us has to live with our own conscience and so I believe we each have to govern ourselves accordingly.

And so Madam Speaker, there are those who feel that marriage vows should never be cast aside, that what God has joined together should never be torn asunder. What a wonderful world it would be if this were possible, if such perfection could be realized. But since the world is made up of human beings we do not get perfection. I want to say again, Madam Speaker, the statements I make on this subject are the result of I might say, years of observation and serious thought. I am sure we all know cases of marriage where one member in the partnership turned out to be, and I can think of no better description than to say, they turned out to be a "rotter" and for this type of marriage to try to hang together was a tragedy, especially when children were victims in such situations. Eventually the marriage broke up, a divorce was obtained and the innocent partner of the tragedy sooner or later married again and found complete happiness for themselves and their children; was able to take their rightful place in society and live the kind of life which I believe our Creator intended them to live. This is the type of situation, Madam Speaker, that makes me feel that there very definitely is a place for divorce in our society.

And now we come to the question of what is wrong with our present divorce laws. The answer to the question I believe is this: Our divorce laws are too rigid. In trying to keep people married we are promoting perjury. We are promoting sham adultery. We are promoting common-law relationships. We are promoting an immoral society. And I would ask us is this something we should be proud of? I don't think so.

And now Madam Speaker, I would like to consider another view in our society. We all know persons of very fine character who, because of mistaken choice, find they are completely incompatible and that life together is completely intolerable. These people have had to go through the most degrading experiences in order that they eventually can start a new life for themselves. Should we as lawmakers not show some concern for these people? Especially the children, innocent children, who should be growing up in a normal, healthy, happy family life but who through no fault of their own are being deprived of what is their God-given right. Only within the past month, Madam Speaker, I have talked with school teachers who have in their classes children with very high intelligence ratings but because they are growing up in what we call "broken homes", because they are deprived of the loving guidance of two interested parents, they are so pitifully frustrated that they are well on

(MRS. MORRISON cont'd) . . . . the way to becoming delinquents. Is this the life we want for these children? Or should we make some attempt to improve this situation? Surely if our present day divorce laws are in any way responsible for this type of misery, the time is long overdue when these laws should be revised. Again I must emphasize, Madam Speaker, that this is a serious situation. I want to make it very clear that I never wish to see our divorce laws in Canada as frivolous and ridiculous as those in the land to the south of us but I do feel there is need for a more realistic attitude.

My purpose in adjourning this debate was to take time to study the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. I find this amendment acceptable, Madam Speaker, and I will be giving it my support.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I think I have still an opportunity to speak under the amendment to the amendment. Every time the Clerk checks me of the . . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Clerk informs me that the Honourable Member from Inkster spoke on the 26th of March to the sub-amendment; so he has no right to speak.

MR. GRAY: So I have no right to speak. Well it's too bad. You missed a lot.

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

MR. GRAY: . . . . carried. I'm not calling for the yeas and nays. It's carried that settles it.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed motion as amended in amendment. The proposed motion as amended in amendment . . . .

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Inkster as amended.

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

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members on the main motion.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): . . . . members say so, how many members ask?

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House: The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster, as amended.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Campbell, Cherniack, Cowan, Desjardins, Gray, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Hillhouse, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Roblin, Schreyer, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Tanchak, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Evans, Froese, Jeannotte, McLean, Molgat, Seaborn, Smerchanski and Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 43; Nays, 9.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, unfortunately the Minister cannot be here at the moment and would doubtless crave the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand. But if there are other members who would like to speak on this motion, if the House is willing, I'm sure that that would be well received.

MADAM SPEAKER: Any other member wishing to speak? Agreed to stand? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. George and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for St. Vital, and the proposed sub-amendment of the Honourable the Member for Gladstone. The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand. Any members who wish to speak on it may do so.

MADAM SPEAKER: Any member wishing to speak? Agreed to stand? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, may I have the indulgence of the House to allow this

(MR. COWAN cont'd) . . . motion to stand and if anybody wishes to speak to it, they may do so.

MADAM SPEAKER: Any member wishing to speak? Agreed to stand? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Logan and the proposed amendment thereto of the Honourable the Member for Roblin. The Honourable the Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Madam Speaker, after looking over this amendment and going through it, there were several points in there that interested me. And the first one was from the Honourable Member for Roblin was it seemed that there was too much fuss made on automation. Well it might seem like that to him. But I don't think so. Because when you see a danger coming up, if you're any kind of a man, you're going to try to ward off this danger. But it seems that this government is going to be indifferent to what is coming up. Through the years we have looked at various things that have come along and I can remember -- or I should say, I have read -- of this premier in Great Britain, whenever any crisis would come up, he would always say, "Wait and see. Wait and see." It was always wait and see until this crisis came up, and went past. And then he could always say, "Well, we tried our best. We got through." Yes, that was a fine thing. Then in 1914, when the First War started, we had I think it was Earl Grey, and he said, "The lights of Europe are now going out." And I say, if we don't look into this thing, the lights of the world are going to go out. Because here is something that is tremendous today. But we can't see it here, we're standing in Manitoba and we say, "There is no automation in here". Rightly so, because we haven't got to it yet. But the time will come that it will come to us too, or we are going to be left behind in this world.

Then, he talks of the various things we have in this country here, and the distribution and such things, and what are we going to do with the accumulation of wealth and productivity; talks about the word "force". Now, that is a queer word coming from the opposition, because they always claim that it's the NDP that wants to make "force", wants to force people to do this and force people to do that. But I say, when we go on to distribution and when we go into these various things, we can find out where planning comes in. South of the 20th parallel in this world of ours, there are two billion people and almost half of them suffer from malnutrition. We in this northern hemisphere can do a lot to help these people out. But are we going to leave this . . . stand in our way, because if we go ahead today and work this thing out properly, we will find out we will have a beautiful world to live in. But if we don't these people are going to engulf us and pull us down to their level. It has been said that 21 civilizations have gone ahead of us and have been destroyed. Why? They wax and they wane, because they got to a certain stage and I don't know whether their minds were crystalizing, but everything disintegrated. And that has gone down the line like that. Now we are worldwide. Are we going to let something like this go along? We have two thoughts in this world today. We have the east, we have the west, and if we don't get together and work for salvation of humanity in this world today -- both the east and the west, that goes for both people, because today when war comes everybody is taken by it. It's not one particular sector of the world day, but it takes in all the people. And I say, Madam Speaker, that if we are to do anything in this world today, we have to study this thing. I have put figures before you, I have pointed out to you, I have done the various things that have gone along and shown to you what these various peoples are talking about.

Last week in six different countries of the world they called conferences on this same thing that is going along. The Honourable Member for Roblin mentioned how in England when they brought in these mills, the cotton mills -- yes that was a great thing that was brought in -- the cottage weaver, the man that was weaving this cotton or whatever it was in the cottage, he was wiped out. This mill took over. So what happens? Greed comes in again. They put women to run the mills and pay the woman instead of paying the man. Then they thought something better yet. They took children into the mills. And what did the mothers and fathers have to do? They carried these wee tots into the mills to work and the father and mother stayed home.

Now this is the thing we have to see here today. Are we going to turn around and bring our people in to enjoy this thing or are we going to go out for profit and make high employment and high productivity. But there's one thing that goes -- if you are going to do that you are going to be destroyed. But if everything is going to be done in the proper manner, well then everybody goes on his way and he can enjoy life and buy the goods that comes to him. So you say how are we going to do this? The engineers today can tell you. There are various means in this world today, there are various things that's come along. As I said there is the population explosion for one. There is a vast shortage of water for another one. We have to get our

(MR. HARRIS cont'd) . . . . engineers out to bring the various chemicals into the world, to bring agriculture up so that we can feed our people. We are doing a good job in this northern hemisphere of ours. We are well fed. You just have to take a look at me to see that. But you go south of here and see the peoples and then you start to realize. Every year they become more and more. But if we use our ingenuity here and carry on the way that we should carry on, well then I say, Madam Speaker, we've got nothing to fear, but if we let profit stand in our way and isolate these various peoples that need our product and don't find ways to distribute our product to them, well then we are lost. Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Churchill. The Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, may I have the permission of the House to have this matter stand, please? If no one else wishes to speak.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Member for St. Vital.

MR. EVANS: In the absence of the honourable member, could this order be allowed to stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Morris. The Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand. If anyone else wishes to speak I'll be happy to have them.

MADAM SPEAKER: Anyone wishing to speak? Any member wishing to speak? Agreed to have it stand? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Wellington. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, I do not intend to spend too much time on this resolution. My leader and my colleague who introduced this resolution have done a very good job and you will probably have noticed, Madam Speaker, that in the Throne Speech in Ottawa it is mentioned that the Federal Government is going to call a Dominion-Provincial Convention, but I thought that I should get a few items on the record.

I disagree with the amendment, Madam Speaker, when it says "should be available and consistent with the principle of need." Because, Madam Speaker, I don't think that the people in this province that need medical attention are getting it now because we do not have a plan to cover. There are people that are on welfare, or should be getting medicare cards that do not receive them. I have had many, many calls from people that all they wanted was a medicare card. They were over 70 years of age, they had just over \$200.00 in the bank and because they had \$200.00 in the bank they were not given a medicare card. Now these people were not ill, but they desired to have a medicare card so that they were free to call on a doctor in case of illness and they were denied this because they had saved a few dollars and they are holding it in reserve to probably pay for their burial expenses or things like this.

Madam Speaker, in the Throne Speech debate I urged the Minister of Health to get together with the medical people and start working together to find out what the problem was, why the doctors didn't want, or seem to not want a comprehensive medical plan. The reason for me asking the Minister of Health the question Madam Speaker was that I know what is going on today with people that are covered by MMS, the doctors claim they are getting only 70 percent of what the fee schedule of the Manitoba Medical Association is. Yet, if you are covered as I am by a private insurance company who claim they are paying 100 percent of the fee schedule of the Manitoba Medical Association, some of the doctors will not accept it. And to give you a case that happened to me personally -- I had to go and have a blood test, I received a bill from the doctor for \$6.00. I sent in the claim through my insurance company and they sent the doctor a cheque for \$5.95 and he refused it. He said it was my responsibility to pay it and yet according to the figures of the doctors themselves, if he had got 70 percent under the MMS he would have only got \$4.20 and he would have been satisfied with that.

These are the things that I think the doctors and the government should get together

(MR. PETERS cont'd) . . . . and I don't think the insurance companies should be called in because I don't think that anyone should be allowed to make a profit on health. And the insurance companies are making a profit on their health schemes. That is one thing, Madam Speaker, that I do not believe in, that anyone should be allowed to make a profit on a health insurance scheme.

Now, Madam Speaker, in the amendment the honourable member mentions that it's on a needs basis. Now I don't know what they mean by on a needs basis because if you go on a needs basis then I would say that there are about 30,000 wage earners in this province that are making less than \$2,500 a year, that should automatically right now be getting a medicare card and shouldn't have to worry if there's any illness in their family to have to phone a doctor. Oh, it's all very well for somebody to get up and say that you can call a doctor and they won't -- if you haven't got the money you don't have to worry about paying. I know in many cases this is true, but how many people, Madam Speaker, will phone a doctor? They are afraid to be because they have a conscience and they have some pride; they know they can't pay the doctor and therefore they do not phone, when they should be calling.

Now we've had the experience, Madam Speaker, before we had the hospitalization plan in effect. Now everybody claims, or a lot of people claim that the reason that the hospitals are so full is because there are people in there that shouldn't be in there. This is absolutely wrong, Madam Speaker. The hospitals are full because people now, because we have a plan and they pay their premiums, whereas before they had no plan were afraid to go to a hospital because they didn't have the money to pay for their hospitalization. It's the same with the medical. There are many, many people that refuse to phone a doctor when they know that they should, if they had the money to pay the doctor that they would be paying. And if we had a comprehensive health scheme, Madam Speaker, these people would -- the doctors are going to find that when we do get a plan in effect in this province or in this Canada of ours that the doctors are going to be swamped because there are people today that are sick and do not phone because they can't afford to pay a doctor.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, I hadn't intended to get into this debate but I would like to say a few things that I think are tended to be overlooked when we're talking of this concept of need, and try to add some understanding. I certainly agree with the resolution that this be discussed at a Dominion-Provincial Conference with a view to putting forward the concept as expressed to this province during the hearings of the Hall Report.

I think that we hear a great deal about people who aren't receiving adequate care in our province and so on and I just want to make a few general observations that I think are true, because the history of medicine in this province is a very impressive one indeed when we think in terms of what we have achieved in the last 60 or 70 years. Because I know that even my grandparents who were pioneers in the heart of Winnipeg, I know my father was the only survivor of a large family from a typhoid fever epidemic. The Winnipeg General Hospital was built as a typhoid fever hospital and when we think the Department of Health is now completely inter-communicable in control of communicable disease in the province and so on, I think this indicates that gradually the state has taken over large segments of medicine, mental health, tuberculosis, public health, communicable disease and I think what we sometimes overlook is the fact that whenever the profession of medicine have -- wherever a procedure, or a discovery has reached a point where it is in the public interest to place this and make it universally available to the people of this province the medical profession have been the first to recommend it. This has been the story in the various fields I have mentioned.

During my term in this House we have seen this principle extended for example, two years ago into the field of cervical biopsy where a procedure had reached a level of technical excellence where it was proven as a sure procedure to diagnose early cancer of the tip of the womb and I'm told by pathologists as of a year ago that this has, already they have detected and cured 200 cases in young women, some of them as young as 16 years of age. So whenever a procedure or a segment of medicine has been found to be in the public interest it has been attacked in this way. And great advances, a cancer treatment by other than surgical means and so on; our Cancer Research and Treatment Foundation. We have in this province and in this country, for example, we have free blood provided for sick patients and so on.

Whenever the profession have felt that something must be universally available, that it's in the general public interest for everyone to have these services, they have within their abilities given this leadership, I think we come down, if we look at it rationally, we are not

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) . . . talking about private medicine and so on -- medicine today in Canada in this province is highly socialized and I'm in favour of socialization of medical services. I'm not in favour of State medicine in the sense that I feel I don't want to be told by the Minister of Health, where, whom I should treat, where I should treat them and how I should treat them. which will undoubtedly come, and this is the thing that we have to guard against. This of course is something that our colleagues who talk comprehensive -- there's no magic in comprehensive, compulsion doesn't produce people, it doesn't produce doctors, it doesn't produce these things. But a partnership I do believe in and this is what we mean by need: a partnership between people who know their onions in the field and the State to meet the needs of those who cannot otherwise have certain services. Really we are down to in Canada -- really all that's really left in the field of medicine are the fees of doctors and surgeons in the field of practice for medical and surgical conditions. And our large out-patient facilities have been enlarged and developed and enhanced to the point where I defy any private physician to -- well not defy -- I'm sure most private physicians in this province will advise you that you can get the very best of medical services at any of these facilities. And this province in going into this last area of medical practice where there is still this void, and which we have been discussing here, and which this is all about, have, as we go into this have joined with the government as they did a few years ago in the development of the medicare scheme and going into it slowly because even under that scheme, which provides for the services to people on social allowance, has given us many guide lines for the future in extending this principle to other areas and it's my sincere hope that we don't go ramshackle, headlong into a particular scheme without this kind of experience and without carrying both partners along in unison. I don't think we want the imposition of schemes on people who aren't ready for them, both the person rendering the service and the people.

I say this because I honestly feel in my bones that in this province I don't think I've ever heard of people going without essential medical services. I don't know a colleague in the medical profession in this province who wouldn't give other than his best. Even if he were in slavery he's not going to practice lesser medicine or be lesser compassionate with his patient. If he is, he shouldn't be in the profession. This is a basic premise and a basic oath and a basic concept of the practice of medicine, that you will do your best even if you were, as I say in slavery.

We need more services, certainly. We need more communications in the north to lower our maternal mortality even lower than we have it. We need dedicated people in the north, because the facilities, the travelling, the time away from home and so on is a tremendous challenge. I personally feel that, I endorse the concept of the government working in partnership with professional groups and I'm very pleased that the federal government are apparently looking forward to meeting with the provinces to see how each of the several provinces in their own way might best tackle the problem facing them within their four borders. But the present system isn't all that bad or we would not have the very excellent, the highly developed well trained people we have today. We wouldn't enjoy the standard of medicine we enjoy in this province today if everything that has gone before had been so inadequate. I know that the rate at which the improvement in practice is proceeding -- when I am told that 85 percent of the procedures performed in 1947, or today rather were not possible 15 years ago in 1947 or thereabouts, one gets some idea of the rate at which we are moving in this profession. But I do feel that we have explained on this side quite adequately time and again, the fact that we must, governments must, and I think most judiciously, work in partnership with the professional groups in meeting the particular needs of the people throughout the province in the future.

I think one of the secrets in this is certainly we should have learnt from the introduction of hospitalization where overnight -- and universal hospitalization has in my opinion proven to be an excellent thing for our people. However it was brought in when one -- hindsight's better than foresight -- but it was brought in, an opening of the front door to \$20 a day beds with no back doors. And I say let's not think that the word "comprehensive" has all this magic that we think of. It's going to take hard work. I think that the scheme whatever we develop should be universally available. I think they should be as comprehensive as possible. But I think they should be introduced gradually and with -- as I say above, in view of our experience with hospital insurance, and to meet the particular needs of our province, part of the problem being one alone of the deployment of your medical personnel which is one of the keys to an adequate comprehensive insurance scheme. This can be done I think better in partnership than by government thinking that just with dollars we can cure and make universal medical care available to the people. I don't think we can match and point to Britain as the ultimate. We have seen this.

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) . . . . I had the privilege of seeing it firsthand, comparing it with the Manitoba situation. It just doesn't lend itself. This is Western Manitoba, Western Canada, there's different problems, a different type of geography, different kind of traditional dispensing of services to weld itself or to point to that scheme in any large measure as a prerequisite to anything we have in Manitoba. I just feel that when we sit down with the federal authorities I sincerely hope that whatever the federal authorities view, that we try and meet those principles that were unannounced by this province as far back as 1962.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Madam Speaker, listening to the Honourable the Minister of Education, I felt that I wanted to respond now rather than wait until I had an opportunity to read what he said in order to more fully try to understand it. Because, Madam Speaker, it is my impression that he had a rational approach to a serious problem intermingled and running through it a thread of some form of fear which he as a former Minister of Health I think had no right to have. The fear that I seem to have detected in his words was because some of those words were the kind of words which I always felt were foreign to the Honourable Minister of Education. I found it very difficult to hear him refer to slavery, to imposition, to compulsion. These words to me were not the kinds of words that would have been used by the Minister of Health if he didn't have some sort of a fear for something which he did not understand, and that to me is so awkward because I think he does understand these things and I don't think that he in his own mind has the right to use words of that type. He said I don't want anyone to tell me whom to treat, where to treat and how to treat. Now I don't know where he got the idea that people who would favour the motion as originally presented would want to tell him as a doctor, whom to treat, where to treat, and certainly how to treat. I find that there are people in his own profession who don't hesitate to tell other members of their profession whom to treat, where to treat and how to treat.

We have here heard a great deal of talk, especially from the Honourable Minister of Education, about tissue committees and the importance of them, of the need to raise the standards in hospitals and to supervise and review the work done by other doctors. He had a hard time convincing members of the cabinet, his own colleagues, to accept the fact that it is necessary, and it is of course advisable, to check into the standards of work and to review -- and I don't know if he used the word "compulsion" in that case -- but I think it's not an unfair word to use in that sense. I have read recently that the Manitoba Medical Service, to which most doctors belong and which I think gives the medical profession its full due, has had the nerve to look into doctors methods of practice, and has actually denied payment for certain services on the basis that the services were not required or were too extensive. And this MMS is not only a doctor's board but also a layman's board. So that, apparently the doctors who support the Manitoba Medical Service, have agreed that it is proper.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Clerk has informed me that the Honourable Member has previously spoken on the amendment by the Honourable the Member for Wellington.

MR. CHERNIACK: I am indeed sorry to have -- I still don't remember it, but I have no doubt that this was so, and I only appreciate the fact that it took so long for the Clerk to bring it to your attention. I do apologize, Madam Speaker. I had no intention of doing this.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, one hears the expression used sometimes that "such and such a thing is the last of its kind". I've heard the Member for Lakeside referred to affectionately once, as the last of the progressives -- it was used in a very affectionate way. I merely mention that by way of introduction, because I feel that a comprehensive, universally-available, public health plan is perhaps the last, large health and welfare measure that we have to put into the law of this country before we can say that Canadian society is indeed a socially responsible society. I often have the feeling or the impression that this is perhaps the last great measure we must put through before -- then after it's a matter of consolidation of existing social welfare and health legislation.

Madam Speaker, one could debate the resolution before us in much detail and one could use much statistical data. But what is the point in view of the fact that after months of thoroughgoing study by the Royal Commission headed by Mr. Justice Emmett Hall, what is the point of dealing all over again with detail and statistical data? I consider that the Royal Commission has done a thorough job in looking into costs and making costs analysis and so on. And the fact of the matter is that after having done so, that this group of people after having studied the problem perhaps more than any other group of people in the country, have recommended a public health plan very much along the lines which we envisage here and which have been put

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . into effect in the Province of Saskatchewan. The Royal Commission have recommended rather clearly against the kinds of plans that have been aborted into the statute books in some of the other provinces.

Madam Speaker, I think that what we must do with this resolution and its amendment is not so much to deal with details of cost and cost data, but rather to deal with the general principle. The question becomes: is Canada ready? Does it have the economic base? Does it have the economic capability to sustain a public health insurance plan of the kind that the Royal Commission and the kind that we recommend? And it would seem that Canada, the Canadian economy does have this capability. Therefore why not do it. Is it a question of ideology? Does it become a matter of an ideological polemic we must throw back and forth words like free enterprise and socialism and socialized medicine and state medicine, etcetera?

The Honourable the Minister of Education says that medicine, public health care in this province is becoming increasingly socialized. That he finds favour with this. He is in favour of socialized medicine but he is opposed to state medicine. Madam Speaker, if he believes in this, where does he differ with us? I don't think it worthwhile for us to spend time here on semantics, to argue about whether socialized medicine is necessarily state medicine and vice versa. What we would like to see is a universally available, comprehensive, public health care plan that acknowledges the principle of needs as -- certainly that acknowledges the principle of need, and acknowledges something more than that -- that acknowledges that health care can and should be in a sophisticated society, a matter of social responsibility, and not merely a matter of individual responsibility. This is all we are asking for and have been asking for for decades now.

It is suggested that the costs of a public health plan would make the cost of health care rise very drastically in this country. But as pointed out by the Royal Commissioners, much of the increment, of whatever increment in cost does take place, will be really in the way of a transfer from what was privately expended before to a publicly expended amount of expenditure for health care. I think that we can still say with emphasis and with sincerity and with conviction and with some proof, that there are still in this country many people -- not just those in the indigent bracket; they are now being taken care of -- but those in the lower range of the income bracket, in the lower middle range of the income brackets, who are finding health care costs increasingly difficult to cope with. A program of public health that is predicated only on the principle of indigents and a means test and a needs test, is going to ignore these people. And I think that Canadian society, the Canadian state, is ready to implement the kind of plan that would not ignore these people in the lower middle income brackets, but would be able to accommodate them. I think we have made sufficient progress that we can carry through a plan such as this without in any way ruining or without in any way impinging too much on our economic base.

So, Madam Speaker, I certainly do not see the reasoning behind this amendment because it seems to restrict the envisaged health plan to one that is based on a needs test or a means test. What the Royal Commission recommended after thorough search and investigation is something wider than that because Canada can afford it and if there is a sense of Canadian social responsibility in this country it would not be satisfied with this restrictive kind of proposal contained in this amendment.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, I left my notes at home. I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Virden. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I for one would like to thank the Honourable Member for Virden for bringing in this resolution this year. I have over the years repeatedly asked for support in this House to petition the Federal Government to bring about unemployment insurance for farm workers. This is a thing that we need in Manitoba and we need it very badly. Apparently the first federal act brought in was brought in 1935 and it was then later declared invalid.

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . In 1940 a new Unemployment Insurance Act was brought in and this went into effect in 1941. Later, in 1955, another act or a newer act was brought in and passed. Under this latest Act that is on the books, on the statutes of the Federal Government, the Federal Government contributes one-fifth of the total contributions made by the employer and an employee. In addition to that they pay for the administration costs of this Act. Since the inception of the Unemployment Insurance Act, up until March 31, 1962, 3,772,000,000 has been received and most of this has been distributed. So that a large amount of money has come in to the people that are unemployed in this nation in this way. And I think it's a good thing because we find so often people are unemployed and they have no means, no purchasing power at their disposal if it were not for the unemployment insurance fund contribution.

When we refer to the Manitoba section of the 1962 Canada Year Book, we find that in 1960 there were 43,365 persons having established period benefits, and 43,525 of these periods terminated in that year, with an average week's pay of 13.86; and the average amount paid was \$302.02. The figures for 1961 are slightly different. The number of persons establishing period benefits was down from 43,000 to 42,725 and the average week's pay was \$14.73 a slight increase from the year previous; and the average amount paid was \$359.13 compared to the \$302.00. So that we find there was a slight decrease in the number of persons getting benefits but that the amount received was slightly higher. This compares with a total for all Canada of people establishing period benefits of 1,065,000 for 1960 and 967,684 for 1961, also a reduction in '61, and the average amount paid was \$315.00 in 1960 and \$352.00 in 1961, so that Manitoba was lower than the average paid in Canada.

Then I would briefly like to quote some figures in connection with the number of people employed in the labour force of Manitoba and in Agriculture, and we find in 1946 23.4 percent were engaged in agriculture, of the labour force employed in Manitoba. When we come down to 1956 this percentage had dropped from 23.4 percent to 13.6 percent, a 10 percent drop. Then if we take the figure of 1962 the last one listed in this particular yearbook, we are down to 9.7 percent. So that the number of people employed on farms in Manitoba is continually decreasing and also at a very fast rate.

My purpose in bringing out some of these figures is that the cost of including farmers under the Unemployment Insurance Act would actually be very little, in fact, it would be less than 10 percent of the over-all cost of the program, so that certainly this is not asking anything beyond the means of the federal government to do so. Then I think it has been impressed upon the members in this House time and again, the need for the retention of experienced help on the farm. We need experienced farm workers and more so now than ever, because our farms are getting more mechanized, farmers are going into more specialized crops and as a result they need experienced help, and certainly we should, if at all possible, retain the present help that is on our farms and have new ones skilled. We find that a large number of people are imported for seasonal help on farms in southern Manitoba in connection with the special crops that are raised and produced. They have people coming from southern United States even from Mexico, they have them from Northern Manitoba. These people find work, they earn cash which they can surely use, and which is helpful to the economy of this province.

Naturally I would think that farm wages could be higher in Manitoba than what they are. We find in the Canada Year book of 1962, that Manitoba's farm wages are actually lower than those paid in Saskatchewan and in Alberta. This holds true for the various periods of the year as they are listed here, January 15th, May 15th and August 15th, and naturally to the period in August when farmers are doing their harvest that the pay during that period is the highest. I find here that the daily pay in Manitoba in 1960 with board during the harvest period was \$7.00; and this more or less held true for '61 and '62 as well. I think this is kind of low. I know that the workers in my particular area receive more than what is quoted here and the figures quoted here seem low to me. They also list the monthly wages for Manitoba. In 1960 during the August period, this is without board, \$167.00 a month; and in 1962 was \$170.00. This too, seems a little low to me because we are paying more for farm help out our way than what is shown in this graph here. But then too, we are now in '65 so this is a few years since this report was made up. But certainly our farm workers could do with better pay in Manitoba and since Unemployment Insurance is based on the pay or the amount that the worker receives naturally the cost would be very low because of the pay that the farm worker receives. So that here again is another reason that the cost to the Federal Government would not be very high to include farm workers; so that there is every reason that we should include farm workers under The Unemployment Insurance Act of Canada.

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . .

I notice that this resolution has been brought in by a government member and therefore I take it will not be amended and I hope that all members see fit to support the resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, I would like to make a couple of comments on this very important resolution, or at least I consider it so. It is quite apparent upon reading Hansard page 1312 when the Honourable Member for Virden spoke, that he was having considerable difficulty with his own members prior to introducing the resolution. He says, "I think sometimes that we have to stand up knowing that there is going to be some opposition to this resolution, but when right is right I believe you have got to go beyond, regardless of your colleagues, regardless of the buck involved, or if necessary, regardless of your friends". Well I think everybody on this side is going to support the resolution so I guess he was referring to as he suggests, to his friends and the bucks involved -- I don't know whether they were trying to pay him off to not bring it in or just what he had in mind here, but that is the inference anyway. Madam Speaker, he need not fear I don't think, that his resolution will fail. If it fails then he'll have to blame members on his side of the House. That's all there is to it, as the Honourable Member for Rhineland has just suggested.

The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture is presently not in his seat, but I have before me, as you might expect, Madam Speaker, a clipping from the Tribune July 28th last headed: "Farm Job Insurance is Partly up to the Farmer, Hutton says". "The Federal Government is unlikely to extend unemployment insurance to farm labourers until compulsory Workmen's Compensation includes the whole farm population, Manitoba Agricultural Minister George Hutton said Monday. Mr. Hutton said a meeting of the Provincial Agricultural Ministers in St. John's Newfoundland asked Federal Agricultural Minister Hays to support the extension of unemployment insurance to farm help." And it suggests here that our Minister for Manitoba was rather reluctant to go along with it. "Mr. Hutton said the extension of unemployment insurance would therefore depend on the farmers first making some improvement in their own labour policy." He goes on to talk about the first thing that would have to be done would be to have compulsory Workmen's Compensation for all farmers in Manitoba. Presently it is on a voluntary basis.

I have before me too another very important clipping of February 28, 1964, headed: "Hutton's Advice to the Farmer: Boost Production in 1964" and a very fine picture of my honourable friend there taken a few years ago, and he says in part and I quote: "The shortage of experienced farm help was touched on by Mr. Hutton. He said there was room for private enterprise to fill the vacuum by contracting out skilled help and costly machinery to farmers on a daily basis. Many could well afford to pay by the acre or hour instead of investing in costly equipment, Mr. Hutton said. The family farm will be here long after the Liberals are forgotten he said. Terming the family enterprise as the most efficient unit of production yet devised, he said it is undergoing changes." Well it certainly is Madam Speaker. It's undergoing changes and my honourable friend is helping it along by . . . . . undergo some very drastic changes when he persists in loaning money to the field factories.

Now Madam Speaker, I wrote a letter to the National Employment Office in Portage la Prairie about a year ago, to be exact, April 20th last, enquiring as to where the farmer stood in relation to unemployment insurance and I was advised -- and perhaps I should read this and if I have to table it, it's fine and dandy, I have another copy. It says: "Re insurability in agriculture. In answer to your inquiry under section 27 of The Unemployment Insurance Act, employment in agriculture is not insurable. However, certain exceptions have been shown where these activities form the major part of the farm operation. These areas are: (a) breeding and raising of poultry; (b) chicken hatchery; (c) poultry pools for preparation and marketing of poultry; (d) egg grading; (e) breeding or raising of race horses, saddle horses, or light harness horses and (f) custom cleaning of grain. These exceptions cannot be taken by a farmer as clear cut but are judged on the basis of individual operations and if the farmer feels all or part of his employees are entitled to coverage under The Unemployment Insurance Act and Regulations he should supply full details to the office of the Unemployment Insurance Commission serving his area and request a ruling as to the insurability of the employees concerned."

This is rather unfair, I think, Madam Speaker, because there are perhaps part-time farmers in this Assembly who have farm help and whose employees are benefitting under The Unemployment Insurance Act at the moment. However, I feel that inasmuch as the government

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) . . . . . has seen fit to go as far as they have as outlined in the letter here that they should go all the way and make unemployment insurance available to all farm help. This is the only way that I can see that the farmers are going to be assured of getting good, competent help, good competent help. I have farmers come into the office weekly, I am sure, asking me where they stand in relation to unemployment insurance and of course this is what prompted the writing of this letter. The Farmers' Union have been asking for this provision for years and years. They claim that one of the reasons that a farmer presently has to put in 16 or 18 hours a day is because he just cannot get the kind of help that he wants. I'm completely satisfied that there are a number of people who prefer working on the farm, because it has many advantages. But if unemployment insurance is not available and they know full well that they may not be required on a 12-month basis, then they are very reluctant indeed to go and work on the farm, as much as they would like to do.

The Minister of Agriculture, and indeed I think everyone will agree, that the Minister always maintains how important that it is in agriculture to make long-range plans. I agree with him 100 percent. This is important in any industry, is to make plans, know where you are going and proceed to go there. But how in the world can you make long-range plans if you cannot rest assured that you are going to get the kind of help you need when you want it and I say that if unemployment insurance was available that the farmers would be assured that help would be available when they want it.

And so like the Honourable Member for Rhineland I expect that this will be one of the few resolutions that will receive unanimous support at this session of the Legislature.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Madam Speaker, if I may say a few words on this resolution. I have listened with interest to this debate. In the first place I would like to make it quite clear, Madam Speaker, that I think that any assistance that we can give to our farm workers or any other workers anywhere to overcome the problems of expenses of unemployment should be given. However the resolution is not that. The resolution states: "Therefore be it resolved that the Legislature request the Government of Canada to extend the benefits of unemployment insurance to all farm workers." I assume in there and one can only assume, that the unemployment insurance mentioned here is the present unemployment insurance and I'm afraid that a lot of members would be very disappointed if such a thing went through, because I cannot see how the present unemployment insurance will improve labour, the standards of labour, the quality of labour, because at the present the unemployment insurance requires payment from both employer and employee; it requires certain stipulations on employment -- for example, I understand, I stand corrected if I'm wrong -- that within a two-year period there must be 30 continuous weeks of work, 30 weeks of work, I believe, and that the compensation is on a ratio of one week compensation for two weeks work. Therefore as I understand the farm worker who is temporary in nature, in many cases he would not be able to collect having had the expense, and the employer the farmer having had the problem and so on of the stamps. So it isn't quite what some people apparently think it will do to farm labour. I frankly think that the resolution should be along the lines that there should be something -- unemployment insurance or the system of unemployment changed by the Federal Government, which I believe is being considered in Ottawa -- to not only include the farm worker who is temporary, but other temporary workers. The fact that fishermen were included into the present unemployment insurance system doesn't change anything. I think that frankly it should have been changed before the fishermen were included. I want to make it perfectly clear though, Madam Speaker, that I think there should be some scheme worked out to cover farm labour and other temporary labour, but I do not think that this resolution will bring the results that I'm sure our farm folk would like to have.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. STANES: Certainly.

MR. TANCHAK: It's very simple. I would like to know how much experience the honourable member has in farm operations and what size of a farm he operates, if any?

MR. STANES: Madam Speaker, I have no experience on that but I've had a lot of experience with stamps and unemployment insurance and employing labour.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for LaVerendrye and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Springfield.

In giving consideration to this amendment of the Honourable the Member for Springfield, the amendment is on the same subject matter as the original motion, namely, the purpose of obtaining relief for bona fide farmers operating farm trucks. I refer the honourable members to Beauchesne's 4th Edition, Citation 203, Section 1. "It is an imperative rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed. Every amendment proposed to be made either to a question or to a proposed amendment should be so framed that if agreed to by the House the question or amendment as amended would be intelligible and consistent with itself. The law on the relevancy of amendments is that if they are on the same subject matter with the original motion, they are admissible." Therefore, in my opinion the amendment is admissible.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, with all due deference, I must challenge your ruling.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The question before the House is will the ruling of the Chair be sustained.

A standing vote was taken the results being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Cherniack, Cowan, Evans, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Hutton, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 39; Nays, 13.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. Are you ready for the question?

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, that the debate be adjourned.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, may I have leave to speak on the resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson? I don't intend to speak very long except to say that I believe that the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Springfield is a good amendment. What he is asking for is that the rate of fees for farm truck licences be reduced. I think it's a good idea and I would ask him and his colleagues in the government, if they think it's a good idea, why they have not proceeded to do something along this line?

What the honourable member proposes is in fact, I suppose, to reduce the farm truck licence fee schedule in Manitoba to bring it more in line with that in Saskatchewan. It's true that in Saskatchewan the Liberal opposition -- or the Liberal Party in Saskatchewan has done a lot of mischief throughout the province talking about purple gas and gas tax and this and that, but the fact of the matter is that fact of the matter is that farm truck licences in Saskatchewan are lower than they are in other provinces, certainly lower than they are in this province. What the Honourable Member for Springfield is asking for, I suppose, is that we look at the possibility of reducing the fee to a rate closer to that prevailing in Saskatchewan.

Now I have before me the Motor Vehicle Part I Rates and Regulations publication of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and it shows that in Manitoba a farm truck licence, 4,000 lbs. gross, issues at \$12.50 - this was before the increase; and in Saskatchewan at \$10.00, a saving of two and a half dollars. At 8,000 lbs., the farm truck licence in Manitoba issues at \$17.50; in Saskatchewan, \$15.00. A 10,000 lb. gross vehicle, the farm truck licence issues at \$22.60; in Saskatchewan it issues at \$15.00; and so on down the line. You can make the comparison: a 12,000 lb. farm truck licence in Manitoba issues at \$27.50; in Saskatchewan it issues at \$17.50, a difference of \$10.00 in that class or category. I will quote you one last comparison. A 16,000 lb. gross vehicle weight farm truck licence in Manitoba issues at \$37.50; and in Saskatchewan, similar weight, farm truck licence issues at \$22.50, a fee that is lower by some \$15.00.

No I would suggest to the honourable members that a saving of 10 to 15 dollars, or 10 dollars let's say, in farm truck licence fees would have more of a beneficial effect for the farmer than would have the resolution as proposed by the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye. I remember the Liberal Party's motion here last year, or was it the year before, where they said

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . that there should be so much coloured gas used per quarter section or something like that. -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon? Forty gallons -- 100 gallons per quarter section. Wasn't that what it was? If you figure it out, it didn't amount to very much, \$14.00 I believe per quarter section, and for a half section farmer it would mean possible \$28.00, whereas with the licence fee reduced, the farmer could realize a saving of \$15.00, \$20.00, \$25.00, and he would receive the same beneficial effect if we did reduce the licence fees.

So I think that we can easily support the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Springfield. It's a simpler technique of achieving the same end - a few dollars saving. It's a simpler technique; it does not involve extra policing, etc.; and generally all around it has much more to commend it.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Would the Honourable Member for Brokenhead permit a question? I would like him to give us the figures for tonnages around 20,000 to 24,000. I think 24,000 is the maximum load on a single axle. There are many farm trucks of that size on the road today, particularly in the beet industry and amongst the potato growers. I wonder if he would give us the figures for 20,000 or 24,000.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Madam Speaker, I think I can oblige. For gross vehicle weight of 20,000, farm truck licence issues in Manitoba at \$47.50 -- now I think this is before the last change -- oh yes, it's, it's before the change, and in Saskatchewan it issues at \$27.50, a saving of \$20.00. At 24,000 lbs. gross, the farm truck licence issues in Manitoba at \$57.50 and in Saskatchewan at \$30.00, so that's a saving there of some \$27.00, which would have a more beneficial effect than a hundred gallons on a quarter section, Madam Speaker.

MR. TANCHAK: I have just changed my mind, Madam Speaker, and I think I am going to say a few words. It's not only the women that have the privilege of changing their minds, sometimes a man has to do it too. I think what the Honourable Member for Brokenhead has said convinced me that I should not let that go by.

I'll have to say that I have nothing against this resolution and I am willing to support it, because I believe that the farmer is also entitled to this privilege or benefit of this resolution as well as the former one that the farmer should not be paying the tax on gasoline. Therefore, I am going to support this resolution although I still feel that the former resolution would have given greater benefits to the farmers than the present one. But having the two put together will be, if the two were accepted, both of them, would be so much the better. But to me it seems facetious that the present government has just increased the farmers licences by 25 percent - all the farmers licences - and now one of the members on the government side comes up with a resolution as this. They must have seen the error of their ways and now the government and the members are beginning to relent. They increased it by 25 percent and now would like to drop it.

But coming back to the comparison that the Honourable Member for Brokenhead has just made, I completely disagree with him that this would be more beneficial to the farmers than the former - gasoline. In this resolution the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye is not asking for 100 gallons per quarters - true, there was last year - this one simply asks that the farmer be permitted the use of tax-free gasoline in pursuance of his work on the farm. It doesn't mention 100 gallons. I would say that the average farmer would probably save as a result of the resolution, before it was amended, anywhere from 120 to even as high as \$170 in a year, not -- (Interjection) -- at 17 cents, yes, the bigger farmers who use quite a bit more gasoline and larger trucks. You may shake your head but it depends what kind of operation you have. If you refer to a one quarter section, sure you will not save too much, but if you operate nine quarters and you have to use your truck, one truck or two trucks or three trucks in your operation, the saving would have been much greater. But the two put together would have been much better than the first one.

Still I cannot see that if it is wise to reduce right now, why didn't the government, why wasn't the government far-sighted enough, smart enough at the time when they adopted this new ruling of raising the farm truck licences why didn't they think of it at that time? I think the argument is very poor and I feel very much disappointed that this amendment is now substituting the original motion, because that motion would have benefited the farmers much more than the present one.

We all know, and the government, the honourable members across the way know, all the people agree that farmers greatest enemy or what they have to contend with is this cost-price

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.) . . . . squeeze, and this additional truck licence, this 25 percent that has been added and now we're trying to remove, plus the former one, the resolution stated the additional tax on gas, the 17 cents we are referring to on the gasoline, added to the cost of production of the farmers products as it were. Doesn't the government agree to this? No, I suppose that through the Honourable Member of Springfield, the honourable member was coached on this and as a result we have this amendment. If the government wasn't earnest and believes that the farmers' expenses are high, they shouldn't have rejected the resolution, shouldn't have amended it with this one which does not, in my opinion definitely does not help the farmer more than the former one would have done. I'd like to know what the farmers in the Honourable Member of Springfield think of him opposing the former resolution as he did. I don't think that they'll like it very much.

You may say that if we give special benefits to the farmer, therefore other industries and factories are entitled to similar benefits, be it in truck licences reduction or in gasoline reduction, but I would say that there is a difference here because the farmer is using his truck as an implement or an instrument of production in his work. He is using it, not as a worker going to work, driving to work -- he just drives there and then he gets into a factory and works, but the farmer is using it as an instrument of his production. On the other hand, take the factory, or any business at all they use the truck also but the difference is this, that the manufacturer or the business man has control over the price that he could ask for his product and we are all agreed that the farmer hasn't got that similar control. He has to depend on markets. He cannot go ahead and ask a certain price for his product, therefore in my opinion the farmer is entitled not only to a reduction on the truck licence but also the farmer should have been entitled, and I still believe is entitled, to tax-free gasoline.

I just can't understand that if the government was sincere, I cannot understand if they are not simply paying lip-service to this price cost squeeze -- cost-price squeeze we should say it, I have it twisted around -- if they are in earnest and not simply paying lip-service, why would the government amend this resolution? Why not simply bring in a new resolution and say we are willing to do this, give them the tax-free gasoline plus a reduction of taxes.

I'll say again that I'm supporting this resolution because I think it's a good one, but I feel very much disappointed that the former was not left as it was. The honourable member could have said, "Yes, the farmers are entitled to that tax-free gasoline, I agree", and he would have had credit from the farmer, but on top of that, here is another resolution -- we want this also -- and I think that the farmer is entitled to both, not only one.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker would the member permit a question?

MR. TANCHAK: Certainly.

MR. SCHREYER: Since we are both supporting the amendment since we think it is so good, I would ask him how much tax-free gasoline was allowed each farmer for 1958? How much?

MR. TANCHAK: I'll go back to what I said before, it depends on the extent of his operation and I can fall back -- (Interjection) -- all of it free in his trucks. On his farm, as long as he uses on the farm, he's entitled to tax-free gasoline. No, I understand he had to state how many he used. I understand that because I had to make these declarations too, and I know how much a farmer is permitted. At the present time I'm not speaking on my behalf because I do not operate my farm myself. I have it leased out, therefore I'm not speaking on my behalf.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. HUTTON: I haven't got too much to say on this subject, but it seems we have gotten into a game called "Double or Nothing". My honourable friend from Emerson seems to be terribly troubled about the fact that the government benches have found a good idea, and why couldn't they have found it some time ago? Well the Liberal benches couldn't find the answer at all. I must confess we were chasing the same idea as they have been chasing, that of some way of finding a method of recognizing the fact that the farm truck is used to a greater or lesser degree off the highways and roads of Manitoba, and the problem was to find some way that you could recognize this use that would be equitable and fair and take into account the fact that farm trucks, the use of farm trucks on the farm varies a great deal from farm to farm, depending upon the type of operation that a particular farmer is carrying on.

The only thing that I can say to the Honourable Member for Emerson is that it didn't take us as long to find out that we were on the wrong scent as it has obviously taken him and his colleagues. I think that there is some merit, some real merit in the idea, the proposition proposed

(MR. HUTTON cont'd.) . . . by the Honourable Member for Springfield, because I think from an administrative point of view it is a pretty neat way of giving recognition compared with trying to set up administration of a refund for farm trucks. One of the things that has puzzled the farm organizations, at least when I talked to them and certain commodity groups, was how you could give adequate recognition to those farmers who did extensive work in the field with their farm truck, and I'm thinking here particularly of the sugarbeet growers and the potato growers, the vegetable growers, who take their heavy farm truck into the field, carry extremely heavy loads under field conditions, get extremely low mileage and who, in a sense comparatively speaking, use very much more gasoline in their farm field operations than say a grain farmer or a livestock operator.

How do you do this? If you just merely make a flat rebate on the basis of so many gallons per quarter section, you treat everybody alike and this is obviously inequitable and unfair. It seems to me that under this proposal you would take into account the numbers of trucks that the farmer owned and operated; you would take into account the weight of those trucks; and you would have some way of distinguishing between a truck which was used for heavy duty purposes on fields and the lighter vehicle which is used to a much greater extent on the highway. From the figures that were given to us by the member for Brokenhead, it would appear that there is a related, if you compare the rates with those of Saskatchewan, that as the trucks got heavier, as the licences were heavier, there was a possibility for greater adjustment in recognition of the fact that these vehicles are used as agricultural equipment.

So I think from the standpoint of the feasibility, the practicality of administering a program and the equity in the application of that program to the farmers, that the Honourable Member for Springfield has advanced a very good proposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Could he indicate to the House exactly when this government increased the licence fees on farm trucks?

MR. HUTTON: You know.

MR. MOLGAT: No, I'm asking the Minister a question, Madam Speaker. Effective when? Is it correct that this government increased the licence on farm trucks effective January 1, 1965?

MR. HUTTON: Yes, so what?

MR. TANCHAK: He was talking about a rebate to the farmer. I would like to know where he sees the word "rebate" to the farmer. The resolution in my opinion, unless I'm wrong, simply asks that he use coloured gas, and his whole speech was based on rebate. There's no rebate asked. Is there any? Where did he get that, the Minister?

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SHOEMAKER: I wonder if the Honourable Minister intends to answer the questions that have been asked, because I want to ask one more. Has he instructed all members of the government on his side to vote with the resolution? And a subsequent question, does he intend to bring a bill in at this session of the Legislature setting out the reduction in fees?

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, in his absence, may we have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Wellington.

MR. RICHARD SEABORN (Wellington): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Pembina, Whereas it would appear that the limitations presently imposed which prohibit children from viewing pictures classified as "restricted adult" are not completely effective; And Whereas the viewing of productions of such a nature is having a detrimental effect on the morals of our youth; Therefore Be It Resolved that if motion picture theatres continue to make it possible for children to view productions that have a detrimental effect on their morals, then the Government of Manitoba should take whatever action it can and deems necessary in correcting this matter.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SEABORN: Madam Speaker, in presenting this resolution to this House I am mindful of another resolution that was presented to the members last session in regard to television and the fact that the pictures on television were also having a detrimental effect on our youth. I agreed that this was possibly so, although I pointed out that this opinion was not shared by many medical men. I also pointed out that I felt that the parents who were involved could control the situation far better than any legislative action, and to prove my point we now have this resolution before us prompted by a very large petition from my area.

Perhaps to give a little bit of a background I should mention that there is a motion picture in Wellington that features, in the main, adult sophisticated films that are definitely not good for children of tender years to see in my opinion. In spite of the fact that these films were placed in the category of "restricted", the operators not only allowed the children to purchase tickets and to see these films but even engaged boys and girls to act as ushers and usherettes. This annoyed the parents and friends of these children very much and I received this petition.

Perhaps I should read it to you. It says: "We, the undersigned parents and other interested citizens, bring to your attention the failure of theatre owners to enforce the regulations on attendance at movies classified as "restricted". We hereby petition the Government of Manitoba to have this law fully enforced for we feel that this flagrant disregard is having a detrimental effect on the morals of our youth." I have since learned that there is a growing agitation in other areas.

I met with the Censor Board on this problem and found that the categories are not enforceable but are in the main merely for the guidance of those that are concerned. Now I would agree that it is good to place the responsibility where it rightfully belongs, but if there are those who refuse to accept the responsibility for the moral attitudes of our children, then it becomes important to consider other means to protect them. The parents and the signatories of the petition have acted promptly I believe and reflect their responsibility in this rather aggravated situation.

However, I do believe that their act, together with the disapproval of this Legislature, may be sufficient to warn these motion picture operators that they cannot put their own interests before the welfare of our children, and if we intimate that we will be prepared to take whatever steps necessary that is needful if the situation is not voluntarily rectified, I think that perhaps this would be sufficient.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. SEABORN: Yes, surely.

MR. CHERNIACK: Could he indicate to the House just what manner of pictures these are and what manner of detrimental effect on the morals he considers is the effect of them?

MR. SEABORN: Well, Madam Speaker, first of all I said in my opinion these pictures were detrimental. I do not attend motion pictures myself but the pictures in the area are of such titles as "Seduced and Abandoned" and other pictures of this nature. I understand that this picture show, together with one more, goes into these European films that are quite sophisticated and adult.

MR. CHERNIACK: Again, Madam Speaker, what is the detrimental effect on the morals?

MR. SEABORN: This I couldn't tell you, I'm just going by the petition that I have from my area. They apparently feel it is important enough to bring to this House.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Would the honourable member permit a question? Did the petition mention anything about television or just the theatre?

MR. SEABORN: I'm sorry, I didn't catch your question.

MR. DESJARDINS: Is there any mention in the petition of television shows or only the theatres?

MR. SEABORN: Just the theatres.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, if the honourable member has abandoned his resolution after such a short speech, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Selkirk and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment as proposed by the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party because I don't think there's any difference

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) . . . . between the resolution and the amendment as proposed by the honourable member because the principle is still the same thing.

What we were concerned with is the Section 21, Part III, of The Labour Relations Act, and which section we ask to be repealed. The reason why we had the following words "substituted by a provision requiring a secret strike vote with suitable sanction for failure to observe this provision" -- the reason for this was because we were following the legislation which is presently in force in Ontario and this is the reason why we put it in the resolution, which Section 54 subsection (3) of the Ontario legislation says, "A strike vote taken by a trade union shall be by ballot cast in such a manner that a person expressing his choice cannot be identified with the choice expressed and breaches of the act are subject to punishment." I understand this exists presently now in the constitution of the unions and there is legislation at present under The Labour Relations Act for punishment, so I would like to point out again there's no -- we're not in any difference in that respect.

But I would like to read a quotation from March 6, 1965 in The Free Press which states, "Union Strike Vote Law Still an Issue," and quoting, "As a matter of record there haven't been any union strike votes since the legislation was introduced in 1962. There have been employee strike votes but these cannot by any stretch of the imagination be called union strike votes. In other words, the strike vote legislation destroyed the union strike vote, not because of their wording of the subsection itself but because of the rules of interpretation. For instance, the employer in person can come to the voting hall. It is then no longer a union meeting when the employer is there without union invitation. From the employer's view, no doubt this seems a good thing and it may be, but the question is, was it the intent of Mr. Carroll, who was then the Labour Minister, to turn a private union procedural meeting into a mixed gathering of workers and employers with the government in charge."

I think in making rules for the conduct of strike votes by labour organizations we have laid out rules for conduct of strike votes and then installed government supervision. We are assuming that the union officers are going to break the law or would if they had the opportunity. I think that there is responsibility required on all sides and all parties and that they should be trusted.

So I would like to ask the Minister at this time, and hope that at this session he will modify the amendments of Section 21 Subsection (3) to eliminate the government-supervised strike votes, and I will be supporting this amendment.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SEABORN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Swan River, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Portage. The Honourable the Member for Portage.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, could we have this matter stand please?

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Could we have this matter stand please, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon, Whereas this Assembly recognizes the right of all workers to organize for collective bargaining; And Whereas our Labour laws should be so framed as to facilitate the certification of bargaining agents; And Whereas after legal certification the chief aim of the government in labour-management matters should be the providing of proper machinery to facilitate the expeditious and satisfactory solution of such matters. Therefore be it resolved that the Government give consideration to the advisability of: (a) Placing under the jurisdiction of the Labour Board all matters respecting the enforcement of The Labour Relations Act and regulations enacted thereunder. (b) The Labour Board setting up a procedure where upon receipt of a complaint under the Labour Relations Act, it immediately sends an officer to investigate, to attempt to resolve the dispute and to report. (c) If the complaint is not otherwise resolved, the Labour Board to hold hearings and to make a determination, the Board to have the power to make a cease or desist order, to reinstate an employee and to order compensation for loss of earnings.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, there's quite a few reasons for me to present this resolution at this time. If we followed the Labour Federation brief and a few of the quotes that I have here in the paper -- but I would like to quote first from the brief itself and it states, "As we look in retrospect over the past year we see little in the way of progress of which to feel proud. We find the same forces represented by people with whom we have been consorting all year exerting the same pressures upon our movement. We face constant frustration in carrying out the legitimate role of organizing, obtaining recognition for certification, bargaining collectively and even the right to conduct our own affairs by strike action."

Also, there's recently in the Winnipeg Free Press, February of 1965, a quotation, "Labour is no longer willing to patiently stand by until something is done about certification, on fair labour practices and Section 21 of The Manitoba Labour Relations Act."

We go further in the Tribune of February 25, 1965, "Relations between government and labour in Manitoba will deteriorate unless the province assumes a friendlier attitude towards organized labour. Our people have often told us that all committees are excuses for inaction on our problems, enabling the government to say we are studying the matter and when we have studied it enough there might be some action. Of course there never is any guarantee for any action at any time." Quotes from the Tribune and Free Press.

Now I feel, Madam Speaker, that proper labour legislation is fundamental to our prosperity, on which people's jobs and incomes depend. I understand it was last year and a year ago and also the last session that we made statements in this House that the government should not proceed at the slow pace that they are proceeding in legislation to these matters. Our labour committee has been studying these matters for over two years. The committee consisted of labour people and management people and I think it is only appropriate at this time to bring some of the studies before the legislation here.

The Liberal Party starts from its basic belief that people could, wherever possible, help themselves and that government should help and encourage people to help themselves and should not interfere unless it is demonstrated that governmental interference is required. The Liberal Party is proud of the role that it has played through the years in labour management matters. It was the Liberal Government in 1948, following the Dominion Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act enacted The Labour Relations Act. This recognized the right of all workers to organize for collective bargaining. Further, it accepted the principle that free collective bargaining is the best method by which the difference between the employers and employees can be resolved.

According to The Labour Relations Act, then and now, certification is the legal starting point for a union. To be able to bargain with an employer on behalf of the employees, a union must be certified. The majority of people employed in the shop in question must satisfy the Labour Board that they are in favour of a certain representation made by a union. Once the union is certified, the management and labour are in a position to bargain. So it can be seen that certification is the key to the whole process. Therefore, it is proper to inquire as to whether that part of The Labour Relations Act dealing with certification procedures at the present time is working out to the satisfaction of everybody concerned.

Obviously, before certification must come union activity and union organizing among employees. Some employers engaged in what is known as unfair labour practices, such as forbidding union activity and discriminating against employees who engage in such activities. The Labour Relations Act recognizes that the right to become certified, and hence to bargain collectively, cannot be enjoyed without freedom from unfair labour practices, and consequently the act prohibits such practices. It is that the law is only as good as its enforcement.

Our studies of The Labour Relations Act convinced us that the main problems with the present procedures are violations of the Labour Relations Act, especially in certification proceedings. Also, the charges for breach of Labour Relations Act in certification matters come before the regular provincial magistrates who are very busy and at times not too familiar with labour matters. The cost of investigation and providing the evidence and delays in the busy magistrate courts usually places the wage earner at a disadvantage. But I think that most important of all is this procedure seems to tend to drive the parties apart instead of trying to get them to co-operate.

So I would like to put before this House some of the recommendations as a result of our studies that have been made to this time. The Liberal Party of Manitoba being committed to the proposition that government participation in labour management matters should be aimed at

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) . . . providing the framework for the parties who must contend with each other and yet who must work with each other; at its last convention adopted the following as part of its policy: (1) Jurisdiction over enforcement of Labour Relations Act be placed under the Labour Board. (2) The Labour Board to set up a procedure similar to that of Ontario where upon the receipt of a complaint under The Labour Relations Act, it immediately sends an officer to investigate, to attempt to resolve the dispute and to report. This provision is especially significant in relation to allegations of unfair labour practices. (3) If the complaint is not resolved, the Labour Board to hold hearings and to make a determination, the Board to have the power to make a cease and desist order to reinstate an employee and to order compensation for the loss of earnings.

These provisions are in line with what already is in force in many of the provinces in Canada and Ontario, and Nova Scotia. So I hope that the Honourable Minister of Labour will give some of these points his consideration.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Emerson.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, Whereas the citizens of Ukrainian origin form the second largest ethnic group in Manitoba and the fourth largest in Canada, and Whereas knowledge of the mother tongue is essential for the preservation of ethnic culture, and Whereas Ukraine possesses the richest natural resources in Europe and has a population of over 50 million, and Whereas the Universities of Saskatchewan and Alberta have recognized the Ukrainian language as a matriculation credit, and Whereas the Ukrainian language is now being taught in Grades 9, 10 and 11 in some high schools in this province, but is not recognized as a matriculation language offering university entrance credit, and Whereas this lack of recognition imposes certain hardships on those students who are desirous of pursuing the study of the Ukrainian language, and Whereas there is a widespread feeling on the part not only of the Ukrainian community but also on the part of highly respected educators and other citizens, that the Ukrainian language should be recognized as a matriculation credit course by the University of Manitoba. Therefore Be it Resolved that this Legislature urge the University of Manitoba to recognize the Ukrainian language as a matriculation language offering university entrance credit.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, in another two years we'll be celebrating a great holiday in Canada - 1967 will be our centennial year. Now in 1867, the keystone of Confederation was the principle of unity in diversity for Canada. One way to recognize this principle would be to encourage officially the diverse strains of our great heritage. Now to preserve this heritage of many Canadian citizens, Canada is in need of citizens with knowledge of different languages. The founding people of our country, the British and the French, are senior partners, partners whose special rights include the recognition of English and French as official languages of Canada. But in addition to these two major races, a great segment of Canada's population is made up of people who came from many lands across the ocean bringing to Canada priceless treasure of cultural heritage, which is rich in variety and very rich in expression.

In Canada, citizens of the Ukrainian origin form the fourth largest group, and they come in this order: the British, or the Anglo-Saxons, as you wish; then the French; the Germans; and the Ukrainians. In Manitoba, however, the second largest group is the Ukrainian ethnic group, and they come in this order: the British again; the Ukrainian; the German; and the French.

We all like to think that Canada is a multi-cultural nation, as it is. This cultural variety should be preserved, and in my opinion the most important key to its preservation are the languages. The French fact in British North America - that is not including the United States - is of very special importance to the other ethnic groups in Canada, because the French-Speaking Canadians won recognition of the fact that to be British one did and does not have to be English. This establishes the fact that Canada could achieve unity in diversity without subscribing to this American-like melting pot.

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.)

When the Ukrainians first came to settle in Manitoba, they had the understanding from different authorities that they would not be submerged in a great melting pot, and they believed it. I do not raise this matter now because I feel that there will be a concerted demand or effort on the many different ethnic groups for multi-lingual instruction in Manitoba. But here, I think, is a very important principle of right involved, and I think that Canada gives all its people this right. This is one of the qualities that distinguishes Canada from the United States.

Now this quality, it seems to me, draws a silver thread in the history of Canada. During the war of independence, we know that Canada remained British rather than becoming part of the United States, and one reason for that is because a great part of Canada at that time was a French settlement. Had the St. Lawrence Valley been settled by Englishmen at that time, then presumably they might have joined their brothers, the 13 colonies, and become American. So the fact I'm trying to bring out is that because Canada was partly French, it remained British and united - double cultural. I feel that Ukrainians by reasserting the multi-cultural nature of our Canadian society can aid in bringing into focus once more the concept of unity in diversity.

To perpetuate this concept, it is imperative that our mother tongue be preserved. It's the only way in my opinion that the culture could be preserved, by knowing the mother tongue. Now the Ukrainian language is a well-developed language. It is used in Europe. It is the language in Europe of over 50 million people.

We know that Ukraine is an unwilling member of the Federal Republic of Russia and there is a certain amount of suppression. The Ukraine possesses some of the richest natural resources of Europe, and quite often it has been and is known as the breadbasket of Europe. But besides this, in the Ukraine there are over 400 scientific research centres and these research centres employ over 32,000 research workers. In Ukraine these scientific centres publish 14 scientific periodicals all in the Ukrainian language. We in Canada so far have been fortunate that we could draw on people coming from Ukraine - D. P. s and so on who could translate these periodicals into English, but the time may come when this source of service will discontinue. We do not know, and I think that we in Canada need our own scholars trained in our own institutions to be able to take advantage of all scientific knowledge in whatever language it comes, and one of these languages is the Ukrainian language.

Quite often Manitoba is referred to as the keystone province. I think we should have lived up to this distinction and be the keystone province in progressive educational advances. I am not being critical at the present time of the government because I realize that changes do not come very easily and I know that we have Ukrainian in our high schools at the present time. I would like at the same time to take some credit for this, because some five years ago I spoke on this subject and I encouraged the then Minister of Education to institute the teaching of Ukrainian at the high school level. Saskatchewan and Alberta are ahead of us - ahead of Manitoba in recognizing Ukrainian as a fully accredited course in equality with other foreign languages. I would ask the House: Are they suffering? No, on the contrary I would say that they are the richer for it.

I have an article here that I'll just read into the record, and this is by the Ukrainian Canadian Committee Headquarters here in Winnipeg. "For a number of years the Ukrainian language has been taught in high schools of the three western provinces, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. Up to now the best results have been reached in the Province of Saskatchewan. This is because the Department of Education in Saskatchewan assists by training the teachers, by providing Textbooks, by establishing a correspondence course for the study of the Ukrainian language and by its close co-operation with the Ukrainian school committee. The most constructive element in the success in Saskatchewan is the fact that the Ukrainian language is fully accredited as a matriculation subject by the University of Saskatchewan."

In my opinion, to teach more languages in Manitoba will not produce a Tower of Babel as has been suggested by some. I would say there is far more evidence that refusal to learn languages of different ethnic groups is apt to create more divisiveness and disunity than the acceptance of these languages, because in order to better understand people of any ethnic group it is absolutely necessary to know their language. I realize that in Manitoba the number of students selecting the Ukrainian course has fallen short of expectations, and I think that this is mostly due to the fact that this language has not as yet been designated as a matriculation language, and thus it imposes an extra burden on the student. He knows that he will not benefit in credits at the end of the term at the university. I believe that if Ukrainian were an accredited course, you would see much greater acceptance of this language study.

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.)

Not only does the Ukrainian community feel that the Ukrainian language should have equal recognition with other foreign languages, but there are many other highly respected citizens and educators who recommend it and I'm going to quote some of them. Here's a quotation by George W. Simpson, University of Saskatchewan professor, and he has this to say, "Great civilizations and little minds cannot exist together. We have before us the possibility of a free and abundant life but we cannot achieve this unless we strengthen every sound element in the structure of our society. Among these elements is the unused, uncultivated and undeveloped linguistic resources of our people. The knowledge of Ukrainian is one of these linguistic resources."

Now here is another quotation, Senator Paul Usick, "Hail Canada for not imposing an American type melting-pot on its immigrant." He said, "It is wise to promote languages other than the two principle ones. Ukrainian is one language which would greatly enrich the Canadian culture."

Doctor Cornelius Gagnon, United College Professor said this, "The teaching of Ukrainian would inevitably rebound to the whole community. Ukrainian has more status in Great Britain than it has in our own community in Manitoba." Dr. Pinfield stated this, "Besides the major languages, the ethnic child should be given the privilege of learning its mother tongue." And here is another one. Dr. P. Thorlakson, President of the Manitoba Council on Education in the publication "The Manitoba Teacher" has this to say, "A step in the right direction was made recently in Manitoba when the Provincial Government decided to offer courses in the Ukrainian Language. It is hoped that this privilege and opportunity will be extended."

Now there are other learned men I can quote from -- I have quite a few articles -- but I see the time is getting short and I think I have enough. I've read several, enough to prove there are other people who are interested in this, people who know what they are saying so I'll not read the balance of it. You will notice that most of these men feel that Canadianism does not require a melting-pot, that there should and there could be diversity without sacrificing unity. I believe that we should not lose any more valuable time here in Manitoba, that we should encourage the University of Manitoba to recognize the Ukrainian language as an accredited course on an equality with other foreign languages in all faculties.

We have a good example across the line in the United States. The Americans are currently launching a crash program to reverse the result of their melting-pot. What are they doing? They are instructing all their houses of learning to make sure and accept and teach the languages of the larger ethnic groups in the United States. To avoid a similar situation we in Manitoba should lead the way by accepting this resolution as it stands.

I hope, Madam Speaker, that I haven't offended anybody. I have tried to be frank and unbiased and I know that the Honourable Minister of Education is presently thinking something along these lines and I would plead for unanimous support of this resolution.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the Honourable Member permit a question, Madam Speaker? Does the exact proposal in this resolution mean that you want a Grade XII course for Ukrainian or does it mean that you want Ukrainian to be put in the same required category at the university as French, German and Latin are?

MR. TANCHACK: The same as French, German and Latin. That's what the resolution requests - full accreditation. Of course we have to wait until our level comes up and we have enough Grade XII students or Grade XI or Grade XII students when they enter university, but this resolution calls just for us to urge the university to give this consideration to the Ukrainian language.

MR. FRED T. KLYM (Springfield): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. EVANS: 5:30, Madam Speaker?

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I wonder because of a situation that I'm aware of, whether you might call the next resolution, and as my honourable colleague is going to allow it to stand it won't take any time -- for a reason.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand. Madam Speaker I would like to say a word to my friend from Emerson here. I would like to say to him, Debra Robota Ivan.

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