

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, April 28, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the first report of the Special Committee on Automobile Insurance.

MR. CLERK: Your Special Committee on Automobile Insurance beg leave to present the following as their first report. Your Committee met for organization and appointed Mr. Cowan as Chairman. Your Committee has agreed that the quorum for this Committee shall consist of seven members.

Your Committee proposes to meet on Monday, October 2, 1967, at 10:00 a.m. to consider this procedure.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. COWAN: I move that the report of the committee be received, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills

MR. SPEAKER: I'd like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery for a moment or two if I may, where we have 52 students of Grade 11 standing from the Elmwood High School. These students are under the direction of Miss Harder and Miss Leswick. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

We also have with us today 35 students of Grade 12 standing from the Emerson Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Miss Williamson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

Also in my gallery above me, we have eight students presently taking a journalism course from Devil's Lake, North Dakota, under the direction of Mr. Kroschinsky. These young people are the guests of the Manitoba Golden Boys organization.

On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Health. During the course of the preparation of Bill No. 68 on Medicare and the conversations with the Manitoba Medical Society, or Association, was there any consideration given to an increase in fees or any indication that fees were going to be increased for medical services?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, the only negotiations that were made by the Department of Health with the MMA were on the basis of principles that underlie the bill.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that it is announced in the newspapers of today that there may be an upward revision of 12 percent in the fees under MMS by the 1st of July; and also, that the previous arrangement where doctors only received a portion of the schedule are going to be amended? Has this been discussed at all with the Minister?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have received a notification from the MMS today that that is the case.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Health whether or not there was either an undertaking or an understanding that there would be no increase in the rates without previous consultation with either the Minister or the government with respect to the MMS. I believe I saw an announcement of that kind in the paper, or was there any understanding of that kind with the Minister?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, the MMS must advise us of any changes in rates that they undertake, which they have done by means of a letter which I have received on my desk today.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Health assure the House that the

(MR. GREEN cont'd).... unilateral steps taken by the MMS or the MMA do not prejudice the rates that will be set under the health plan which the Minister is bringing before the House.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, I can not give any information about the negotiations which will take place between the corporation and the MMA. When the bill is passed, the corporation is empowered to negotiate with the MMA which they will do.

MR. GREEN: All I'm asking the Minister to do is to assure the House that no unilateral steps taken by the MMA will prejudice those negotiations.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY: (Leader of N.D.P.) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, on this point, I'd like to direct a question either to the present Minister of Health or the Honourable Member of the Cabinet that held the position previously to the present member. Was there not a firm undertaking some four or five years ago by MMS or MMA, or conjointly, that there would be no increase in rates until after the government had been notified accordingly and that the Minister was aware as to the magnitude of the rates?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, the MMS are obliged under the legislation to notify the government if they are going to increase the rates, and they have done so by a letter which I have received today.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is an evasion of my question, because of the fact - because of the fact that it was my understanding a statement was made in this House some years ago that prior to any change in the rates the government or the Minister would be consulted. I appreciate very much the fact that the Minister of Health has said that he has been notified of the change, so have all of us through the media of the press, but the undertaking a few years ago was, as I understand it, that prior to any changes the Minister or the government would be consulted. What is the position?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe I heard the Minister to say that there would be consultation with the Commission, the Hospital Commission.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, Mr. Speaker, that's a different proposition; that was in respect of the Medicare Bill that we have before us. I'm referring to an undertaking - I'm sure my honourable friend the Minister of Education knows of which I speak and possibly he is more conversant with the matter that I raise than the present Minister of Health, because the Minister of Education was the Minister of Health at the time the announcement was made in this House.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, the MMS is a self-governing body; the MMA are a self-governing body; and the two have had negotiations. Certain matters have resulted from those negotiations and the MMS have notified the government of them, as they have said that they would in the past. This happened, if I recall correctly, in 1964 and it's now happening in 1966.

MR. PAULLEY: Again may I phrase my question to my honourable friend the Minister of Health or his predecessor in office. Was the Minister or the government consulted prior to any change in rates, as indicated that would happen previously, prior to any increase in rates?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, on the same subject, the newspaper report states that the MMS has an informal understanding with Premier Duff Roblin that it will consult him before changing premiums. Now, is this statement correct, and if it is correct, have there been consultations with the government and have the government approved of these changes?

MR. PAULLEY: That's the question.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, the government has no authority to approve or disapprove of the arrangements made by MMA with MMS. Now we might not like it, but it is a negotiation between the MMA with the MMS and they are entitled under their respective powers to do so and they have done so.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, is this statement correct, that the MMS has an informal understanding with Premier Duff Roblin that it will consult him before changing premiums. Is this a correct statement or is it not?

HON. GOERGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, maybe I could help a bit. The Act requires MMA to keep the Minister advised under their Act of this Legislature, and we either have it in writing somewhere, as I recall, or in the Act through an amendment, that prior to premium increases the Minister is consulted, and I believe ...

MR. PAULLEY: That's my question. Was the Minister consulted?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, you're asking was I consulted about about the increase in the fees ...

MR. PAULLEY: Prior to the increase.

MR. WITNEY: Prior to the increase. No, I was advised by letter that the increase has been made, or at least they're intending to make it.

MR. PAULLEY: May I, Mr. Speaker, ask my honourable friend, is this not a violation of the principle that was enunciated in this House some three or four years ago, that prior to any increase to premiums the Government of Manitoba would be consulted through its Minister.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): In view of the latest development will the -- does the Minister wish to answer this question now?

In view of these latest developments, will the Minister consider having a schedule of fees included in this new Medicare Bill that we're passing? This is the only way that the people of Manitoba will know what's going on.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I think that all facets of this matter have been discussed and aired at this particular time, and I wonder with the evidence that is now before the House if other developments may not be expected in the future, and could we proceed with the business of the House.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I agree with you most heartily but I do think that this is a matter of such vital importance that we should have an answer from the present Minister of Health, or the Minister of Education who was previously the Minister of Health, as to whether or not that this is not a violation of an undertaking previously arranged about three or four years ago, that prior to any increase the government would be consulted.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I hate to interfere or to interrupt because I know the matter is of interest to everyone, but I think we have breached the rules a number of times, that there are one or two supplementary questions on the item. It's not a period of cross-examination; it's a period to elicit information.

The Minister has said that he has received notification and he has outlined what the statutory responsibility is, and I think that that is the answer to my honourable friend's question.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the interjection of the Honourable the Leader of the House insofar as supplementary questions are concerned. There has been no breach of the House because I have only repeated the same question, and not different questions, without receiving an answer from my honourable friends opposite, and I agree with my honourable friend the Attorney-General that this is a matter of such vital importance that answers should be forthcoming.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned as the Minister of Health, the MMS in notifying me of the situation that exists as of today have lived up to whatever commitment they made. Now the Honourable the Leader of the NDP goes back three or four years and there is reference by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition to some informal agreement with the Premier. The Premier is not here, and as the Minister - having been the Minister for a period of I don't know how long now - as far as I am concerned, MMS have done what they were required to do.

As for the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface when he asks about the fee schedule, as I mentioned before, that will be a matter of negotiation between the corporation when it is set up and between the MMA, and the fee schedule will come across for the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister suggesting then that we should sign, by approving this Medicare bill, a blank cheque to the MMA? Is that what he's suggesting? That's exactly what's going to happen. I wasn't asking the Attorney-General either.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the honourable gentleman will agree with me that we might proceed with the business of the House.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, if I may, I'd like to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 59 on the motion of the Honourable Member from Kildonan. And if I may, Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, have leave of the House to make a short statement relating to employment for students. I was asked outside the House yesterday by a couple of honourable members as to the prospects of employment for students and I'd like to make a short clarifying statement on that if I have leave.

The indications are that the number of students seeking work this year is somewhat higher than last year. The opportunities for employment for students this year are expected to be more numerous and more varied than they were last year. I might tell the honourable members that about four to five hundred students from western Canada will be sought to work in the

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd).... Western Canadian Pavilion at EXPO. Holiday work and work in the construction industry in Manitoba will also be more plentiful than last year. The Pan-American Games and various centennial programs throughout Manitoba will provide additional summer work, particularly for high school and first year university students.

I wish to advise members of the House that Canada Manpower Centre operates special placement offices at the University of Manitoba, at United College and at Brandon College, and at MIT. The regular offices of the Canada Manpower Centre will also of course assist students in finding summer employment. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that it would be most helpful if employers and students would register their requests with Canada Manpower Centre Offices as early as possible. Too frequently, both students and employers don't make known their wants until the last minute.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Honourable Minister for the information that he has given me. He pretty well answered my question that I asked him outside the House, but I would like to know, are the students at the University familiar that -- or know that there is an office, a Manpower Office established, because I've had many calls and I just wondered why would they be calling me, unless they're not familiar with it.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, if I may, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. My question to my honourable friend, and I hesitate sometimes to preface my questions with any lead-up remarks so I guess I'd better be direct lest I run into the ire of my honourable friend the Attorney-General. My question to my honourable friend the Minister of Education is: An announcement was made last year that there would be a new program of teacher training instituted at the University of Manitoba to commence in the fall of 1967 which would be a two-year optional course of teacher training, and the net result would have been that a credit to the students undertaking the course would be a credit of two years in Arts and one year in Teacher Education. There are rampant rumors, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister and/or the government are considering the abandonment of this announced program of last year. The rumor is giving consternation to many people who intended to take the course, also to the teaching fraternity. I'm wondering whether the Honourable the Minister of Education can indicate to the House whether it is the intention of the government, or himself, to abandon this course which was considered a year ago to be so worthwhile.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I too, hate to preface my remarks, but my honourable good friend the Leader of the NDP from Radisson can be -- I just wish to inform him that this is under the most active consideration at the present time. A recommendation has been received from our Teacher-Education Committee, of which he's aware probably through the grapevine, through the rumors, and until such a time as -- it's right in the department under most active consideration at the moment. I can't give him anything further at this particular time.

MR. PAULLEY: Then as a supplemental question or a request, Mr. Speaker, may I enjoin my honourable friend the Minister of Education to not allow his colleagues in the Cabinet to abandon this very important and forward step in education in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, in concert with my most able colleagues, we will march forward to new horizons in Manitoba as we have ...

MR. PAULLEY: My last supplemental question then, Mr. Speaker, and I'm entitled to two, then I ask my honourable friend, is it not then a fact that I can inform my informant that the Minister --(Interjection)--Can I inform my informants? Is that a question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes you can, but you are giving the impression, to me at least, of developing three questions into somewhat of a speech.

MR. PAULLEY: Thank you my honourable friend, I'm sure it may appear that way to others; I'm sure it doesn't appear to my honourable friend the Minister of Education. Can I now inform my informants that the government has no intention of abandoning the progressive forward-looking policy enunciated by the Minister a year ago?

MR. JOHNSON: I think, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend would be well advised, as usual, to get the real McCoy from the real McCoy when it's ready, and I shall do so as soon as I've cleared up this matter within the government.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Leader of the House, the Attorney-General. It's a very innocent question. No trouble, I hope. I have two groups who have indicated their desire to witness the legislators in action

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd).... tonight. I have to phone them and tell them if that's true. Could the Minister at this time indicate whether the House will be sitting tonight or not?

MR. LYON: Yes, we will be.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, on the matter of sittings, I wonder whether I couldn't pursue this before we close it. I think it would only be fair at this stage for the Leader of the House to suggest what the probable sitting schedule will be tomorrow, if the intention is to sit, because there are a number of members from rural Manitoba and I think if we could agree now they could make their plans as to what they will do.

MR. LYON: I'd be quite happy to, Mr. Speaker. The intention would be as undertaken, to spend this afternoon on private members' matters and then this evening to revert back to the government Order Paper and try to adjourn at a reasonable hour because we have been at it fairly long, and then sit tomorrow morning and tomorrow afternoon and adjourn tomorrow at 5:30 unless of course we have made such rapid progress that we can see prorogation in sight.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may then ask about Law Amendments Committee. We have two bills still in Law Amendments Committee. When would it be the intention to call Law Amendments?

MR. LYON: I would think probably in the afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. In view of the fact that the promoters of the Junior Achievement Program conduct a program in Manitoba senior high schools designed to acquaint the students with the structure, operation and merits of corporations, as they're commonly known, would the Minister allow a similar program geared to acquaint the students with the principles of operation and the merits of the co-operative movement?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, the Junior Achievement effort is extra-Department of Education as far as I am aware. They are on their own in promoting this Junior Achievement and certainly I see no objection to teaching them the same matters in the operation of co-ops as they do corporations. By the time they're through with both courses they ...

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Minister of Health. I've been informed that one of the schools of nursing connected to one of the city hospitals are going to pay their third-year student nurses \$300.00 a month for the last two months of their course. So my question is: Is the government contributing to this; and also, are other schools of nursing doing the same thing?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, I can't do anything about it unless the honourable member tells me what school of nursing and what further information he has.

MR. JOHNSTON: The St. Boniface School of Nursing.

MR. WITNEY: And what did you say they were doing or not doing?

MR. JOHNSTON: I've been told that they are going to pay their third-year student nurses \$300.00 a month for the last two months of their course. Is the government contributing to this; and also is this plan in other schools of nursing?

MR. WITNEY: I'll take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: I take it we proceed to Page 5, the head of Page 5.

MR. LYON: ... matters, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Page 5. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. There is a bill, private member's bill, standing adjourned in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster, and then there is the motion by the Honourable Member for Inkster on Page 4 (a) at the bottom.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on second reading of Bill No. 107. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I believe that he will be here shortly. He's coming out of the -- the honourable member is here but we'll send for him right now if you like.

MR. LYON: Perhaps I could suggest that we go to the next resolution and then come back to this bill.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm sure the Honourable Member for Inkster will be right here.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd).... the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, we've had some discussion on subjects related to this under Bill No. 112 that is before us. I would just like to say at the outset that insofar as the community colleges, I share the concern of many in this House that we should be moving towards the development of community colleges across the Province of Manitoba. I think that in many cases these can be very useful as a first step in reducing some of the pressures on the universities themselves and allowing some of the, at least, say first two years of university training to be taken in local areas. I think this would go a long ways towards reducing the costs for many of the students because we have to recognize that outside of Greater Winnipeg the greater costs for the student coming to university is really that of board and room, and that this does make a substantial difference insofar as the ability of rural students to proceed to university.

So the amendment that has been proposed by my colleague the Member for Emerson should in no way be assumed to reduce the importance of community colleges or to prevent their development. On the contrary, I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that some years ago we introduced a resolution in this House calling for a Council of Higher Learning to be established and asking that one of the specific matters that they study should be the question of community colleges. This had come out of a period of study by the members of my party and summer seminar which we held in Clear Lake studying these whole questions of education.

As a result of the study, we felt that there had to be certain steps taken by the government in Manitoba to rationalize the development of our post-secondary education. The community colleges were one aspect of this, but over and above this there had to be some body that was planning the development of higher education, because it appears to me that until the Council was set up there was really no organized development. It was a little bit of a case of Topsy, and things grew by themselves and there was no plan, and we could end up in serious difficulties in the future in that certain courses which we should have would not have been planned sufficiently in advance and that we might have duplication of other courses. So some two years ago we introduced the resolution - I had announced previously in the summertime that we would do so, prior to the opening of the House - we introduced a resolution calling for a Council of Higher Education. The Minister of Education, in the course of that session, brought in the idea of a Council of Higher Learning - and I have no objections to the change of wording.

The Council of Higher Learning, however, Mr. Speaker, was not exactly in line with the resolution that we had presented. We supported it nevertheless because we felt it was a forward step. However, now that we have seen the Council in operation for some two years, we believe that some improvements can be made in the work of the Council. These are the reasons for which we have presented this amendment. We believe first of all that the Council should be responsible to the Legislature. I think that what has happened at this session is an example as to why this should be done. We've been asking the Minister on a number of occasions what the recommendations of the Council were. We have no means of knowing in this House what the Council in fact is doing because the Council is not responsible to the House and as I make out the terms of reference and the responsibilities of the Council there is no obligation of their making a report to us or of the Minister making a report to us. As it stands now we are completely in the hands of the Minister and yet the development of higher education is of such importance, the future of Manitoba is in so many respects tied so very directly to the level of education that our people reach, that I think it is essential that the House be acquainted and kept fully informed of their recommendations. During the course of the session, on the 31st of March, the Minister did table some of the correspondence, but this was by no means all of it, Mr. Speaker, and obviously the matters that were then under discussion were not referred to us.

So our first recommendation was that there be a direct report from the Council to the Legislature, in the same way as we have now reports from most bodies established.

Secondly we suggested that the Council be given additional assistance, particularly research assistance, so that it could proceed to do this work of long-range study of the needs of higher education in Manitoba, and we list there in the resolution the things that we believe the Council should be studying. We recommend as well that the Council in all cases have representatives from the various academic bodies in the Province of Manitoba with which it is concerned, because we feel very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that in any of these developments,

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd)..... the academic aspect be kept part and parcel of the study, part and parcel of the investigation and part and parcel of the recommendation that is subsequently made. And finally we suggested that the Council be available or make the opportunity for public hearings so that there would be the opportunity for other bodies who wish to make a presentation to them.

Well, since we have presented this resolution or the amendment we have found that the Minister has produced Bill No. 112, the Universities Grants Commission. As I said the other night, Mr. Speaker, I don't have any basic objection to having a special commission which is doing to study the finances, but I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, that if the choice is between the present Bill No. 112 or the Council of Higher Learning, then I have differing views from the Minister. Because let us look at the situation. I know that the Minister is probably going to get up and tell me, after my speech, there is no need for this now that we have Bill No. 112. But, Mr. Speaker, and I hope Mr. Speaker you will allow me to make here a discussion as well of the points in No. 112 because I can hardly discuss this resolution without the other, and the Minister did bring it in subsequent to this.

The Council of Higher Learning as it is presently established, does have representation of the academic community on it. The other one, the Grants Commission, has no such obligation. It will be a five-member board to being with - a smaller number. Obviously it cannot be representative of all the academic people involved. The Council of Higher Learning has a much broader base. It does have non-academic people on it but also it has representation from the various academic fields, and our suggestion here is that this be expanded. Because, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that we have to be very careful here on the question of academic freedom and if we persist with Bill 112, as the Minister has it, we could very well end up - maybe not now, but probably the Minister now would be very careful in the choice of the five board members - but we don't know Mr. Speaker, what government we'll have in this province 25 and 30 years from now. I know what government we'll have five years from now; it won't be my friends opposite; we'll be charged with the responsibility at that time. But 25 years from now I cannot prove and I think we are building into this Act some dangerous features.

I would request then that the Minister have a look at this resolution carefully and forget that it's presented from this side of the House; have a look at it as to what really is going to be to the advantage of higher education in the Province of Manitoba. There may be things that we should change in the resolution. In the light of the Grants Commission, it may be that we should remove clause (c) from Section 2; in other words remove "as a responsibility of this body, the budgetary requirements of post-secondary institutions." But I think he would be wise, Mr. Speaker, to leave the Council of Higher Learning the responsibility for the long-range planning, for the academic side, for the course, for the curricula, for all these matters that are not basically a business function and that the business function of budgets then be the sole responsibility of the Grants Commission which obviously would have to work with the other one because you cannot decide to have new courses in a vacuum; new courses cost money. But if we do not leave the academic side in it, Mr. Speaker, I think there is a risk in future years that this may end up by being a real invasion of academic freedom.

Now the Council has been at work for two years. I see no reason, Mr. Speaker, why we should disestablish them now, replace them with another commission. In fact if we do that, I think it's a straight insult to the members of that Council because it's as much as saying to them, Mr. Speaker: "Well, you've done two years work but we're going to disband you now; we're not satisfied with your work," and I don't think that is fair. Surely the terms of reference that we gave them are sufficiently broad that the Minister can add whatever he wants, so far as further responsibilities to them because their terms of reference are very clear in a number of details and finish off by saying: "To study and advise on any other matter specifically referred to it by the Minister of Education." So there's no problem of expanding the subject matter of their inquiry; it's there.

Well now, let's then look at it from another side, Mr. Speaker. The Minister shook his head and laughed when I said that if he proceeds to disband the Council of Higher Learning he's as much as saying to them that they haven't done a good job, because let's look back at his intentions when he set up that Council. Were they short range intentions, Mr. Speaker? Did he intend then that they should be working for a two-year period or a three-year period? Not at all. Because if he goes back to Item (a) of the terms of reference, which the Minister prepared, he clearly states there that they have to study for a decade, with the needs for the next decade, because he says: "To direct its appropriate standing committees to study the

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd). . . . needs of the province for post-secondary education in their respective fields at the university and at the affiliated colleges within the next decade in terms of time, quality and quantity and to advise it on these matters." Surely, Mr. Speaker, those are the authority that he's giving now to the Grants Commission. It's here; it was established in the Council of Higher Learning. They've been at work. He has the proviso that he can add more responsibilities to them. Just recently, Mr. Speaker, the Council of Higher Learning has employed a full-time research man, the Registrar from the University of Manitoba, Mr. Douglas Chevrier, it was announced recently has been taken on staff by the Council of Higher Learning to do its research. Well now what then is the Minister proposing when he sets up on the other side a Grants Commission and gives it all the responsibilities of this body?

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to plead with the Minister. Maybe there are some things in this resolution that should be properly in the Grants Commission. I'm not that bound and determined that all of the responsibilities that we set up here should be in the Council of Higher Learning. Our idea when we did this is we recognize as he does, the necessity for someone to do the long-range planning, for someone to have the budgetary control. We can achieve this by one board if we want, or by two, but I think it's wrong, Mr. Speaker, to remove completely from the Council of Higher Learning the responsibilities that we gave to them; the work that they have already done, the fact that they've established now a research director, the fact that they have the academic connection and to transfer that suddenly into a new commission.

So I would ask the Minister if he wishes to remove certain things from our resolution, the budgetary ones and refer those to the Grants Commission, I'm prepared to do that. On the other hand then the Grants Commission should have removed from it the academic aspects that are not directly tied to it, and then let us proceed on the academic end on one side, on the budgetary on the other, making sure the two have a correlation, quite obviously. But if he doesn't do that, Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid that while right now things may go along perfectly well, and under the present Minister I would not fear that there will be intrusion in the academic field. He is leaving the door open, Mr. Speaker in the future for some changes in a five man commission, for complete domination by non-academic people in matters that are very definitely of an academic nature.

So I would like the Minister to reconsider these. We are prepared to see amendments in our amendment here, some changes, but I think he must concern himself not merely on the immediate basis of getting a buffer between the government and the academics, a buffer that will take care of the finances; if he does that by simply removing from the consideration the academic field, I think he will be doing harm in the long run to the development of higher education in this province.

MR. JOHNSON: . . . speak in this matter. I believe I've spoken on this debate; that's my problem.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): The Minister has already spoken on this.

MR. SPEAKER: The Clerk will have a record of it.

MR. JOHNSON: In that case I'll have to vote against the resolution and get at it on the main motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite prepared to give leave to the Minister to speak if he wishes to.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, as evidenced the Honourable Minister has spoken and I'm sure he would appreciate the opportunity by leave of the House.

MR. JOHNSON: Then, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to just say a few words. Thank you, gentlemen. I'll try and be short because I must get back to Gimli before the 1st day of August and the Icelandic Celebrations.

MR. LYON: There hasn't been any question to this side of the House as to whether or not we'd give leave.

MR. JOHNSON: I'll be very brief. I must vote against this particular resolution. As the Honourable Leader has pointed out it is a pretty mixed up, catch-all amendment and I'd have to vote against it and propose an amendment to the main motion which I think will assist at this time.

I'm not rejecting out of hand the comments of the Leader of the Opposition and certainly the good things educationally that he recommends from time to time. He knows I pay attention much more to him than I do to his predecessor on the right who makes marvellous contributions but not in this field.

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd)....

The Grants Commission of course - and I realize the disadvantage of the honourable members, but I would say to the House that I do need a little time, or I think the government needs a little time in this vast field as it's changing so rapidly. It's true we've set up the Council of Higher Learning with the particular disciplines that were on it and the present composition because of the particular problem facing us at that time, namely the affiliates themselves and the academics and representatives of the boards of governors, laymen on these boards of the constituent colleges who were primarily involved, formed this commission with a neutral chairman and a chairman of the Arts and Science Council and a chairman of the council on other courses.

As a result of their deliberations they are recommending, as we know, and they have not completed these, and one of my difficulties in transmitting material to the House is that things are still in the stage of negotiation, but we have said of course, they've named Brandon a university; they have recommended United be a university; they're also recommending that colleges on campus, St. Paul's and St. John's become a community of colleges on campus with a particular structure; and once this information is in its final form to me of course I'll give it to the House.

In the meantime these people who are primarily involved and most knowledgeable have made these most commendable observations, commendable at least in my opinion, and they seem to be very pleased that their problems have been rationalized. As they have in the last month or two indicated to me, and our staff and ourselves have been in touch with the chairman, he feels that he must complete his work in the present job that was his priority, namely the rationalization of the constituent colleges on campus, complete that work, and as this has come it's become apparent that there should be a separate financial clearing house, and this led to the University Grants Commission, and the heads of the colleges and these boards have indicated their approval in principle to us that such a body be established to dispense government monies which are predicated to the support of higher education at the university level.

It also seemed only proper that if you're going to do that as the Act 112 states, you should graft on the powers for them to investigate the kinds and needs of services at that level. It then becomes obvious that this in effect is duplicating some of the Council of Higher Learning's work as defined in their terms of reference. So in one sense while a great deal the Leader of the Opposition says commends itself to me, certainly I think it would be unwise to unilaterally abolish the Council of Higher Learning, but I do think I need the necessary time to speak to the present chairman as he completes his work over the next few months with this particular problem he's engaged upon, find out how they're coming with their thoughts in other areas and then I think it becomes obvious to all that, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, the present constitution of this particular Council would have to be altered to bring in other disciplines that aren't there at the moment. It might well be to bring the greatest co-ordination that a common secretariat could serve in the area of research in looking ahead at our expansion in the university field.

So I have to reject this resolution the way it's worded. I really would like to suggest to the House that they would support an amendment to the main motion when we come to it which in effect would more or less suggest that we wait till we hear further from the Council and as their work is completed I think I would need the flexibility at this time to talk to the members of the Council as to its continuation in a slightly different role or in a different manner, and these things will have to be worked out. So in a sense there's a great deal to be said for what the Leader of the Opposition has said. I'm not rejecting all his comments by any means. I think we're headed in the same general area of thinking; I think we both want to see both a financial clearing house where we have more than one university; we want to see a body charged with looking at the whole field on a continuing basis, and this I think is - we have the structure coming up.

However, I think it's important as new universities are being approved this year that the University Grants Commission becomes a necessity immediately to set it up and certainly to appoint to that board the people knowledgeable in university affairs especially the chairman. The individual universities of course will have their academic freedom, their boards, their chancellors and the job of that group will be the extension of the payment of funds over to them; and it's very necessary to prevent duplication as the Council of Higher Learning has repeatedly stated in its statements to us to date.

So as this evolves, I think we're jointly on the right track, but I do need I think at this

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd). . . . time this flexibility to discuss with the Council their continuing role as the University Grants Commission becomes established and so on. I would like the honourable members to just appreciate some of these difficulties in this evolutionary period. I think I'd be prepared to table material I have as it comes to hand and is translated into action and I think continuing reports from the Grants Commission and the Council will assure the House and the people of Manitoba that sufficient attention is being paid to the prevention of duplication, to the efficient management of funds in this area and to adequate planning and I think any Minister will want it, no matter who he is, in this era of change and expansion and staggering costs that we're going to be facing over the next couple of decades I am sure in the field of education.

I think that's really all I can say at this time and will address myself further to the main motion. I wish to thank everyone for their contribution and to assure the Leader of the Opposition that I think he's made a significant contribution to this debate as far as I'm concerned.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, could I ask a question of the Minister? What now then are going to be the responsibilities and the duties of the Council of Higher Learning; if Bill 112 passes in its present form, what is the Council of Higher Learning going to do; what's its work?

MR. JOHNSON: Well this, Mr. Speaker, is what I have to discuss with the Chairman and the Council, because as the University Grants Commission comes in they obviously are responsible for the area - the post secondary level. Obviously in looking at community colleges you'd certainly have to involve the University Grants Commission because they're charged with the university like facilities.

The Council of Higher Learning has yet to make recommendations to me. They have quite a few things they haven't completed such as the completion of what they're presently doing and hoping to get it completed by this summer or before next Fall, namely solving the problem on campus of the colleges on campus which is now in hand, looking at St. Boniface College as I reported to the House, and I referred to them last Fall the junior community colleges wondering what comments they may have. Just where they are in these areas they haven't reported as yet.

The Chairman has been in touch with me to advise me that he believes, in recommending the United Colleges University for example and now Brandon, he feels it's most important, as do all the council members, as do all the heads of colleges, that a University Grants Commission be established forthwith, that this obviously changes their function as we originally visualized it and even wondered about a phasing-out of the Council of Higher Learning. However my own thought is that other disciplines might be grafted on to the presently constituted Council on Higher Learning to allow them to continue in the field of both technology non-university endeavours and that in the area of research we might well consider a common secretariat at the research level of the University Grants Commission and the Council of Higher Learning. This would certainly keep everyone in - I think it would be a necessary co-ordination that one could develop. Now this is going to take me some time and effort to resolve. I'm just sharing this with the House.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, just a brief comment on this amendment. I think there is a couple of problems connected with it. One is that the amendment would in itself delay what is I think a pressing need for community colleges to be established right now. I don't think there's any question of the fact that there is a need for these colleges I think we're far behind the times in Manitoba and I think that like so many of these other resolutions that we've had this has the effect of simply postponing. We had a motion from the Honourable Member for St. Boniface on the voting age to be lowered to 18 that was broadened to include a status of youth commission which will put it off for a couple of years. We had a resolution on day care centres which was broadened into a commission on the status of women and that will take some time, perhaps won't even begin this year. Now we have a resolution on a particular item, a community college and now this amendment of course calls for further study of other issues.

I think there are points in here which could stand individually or separately but there's such a mixture of them and in view of the recent change in the Council of Higher Learning which may or may not be disbanded and a new universities grants commission, I don't feel that we can support this amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Elmwood, could he name a community college in Canada of which he's aware.

MR. DOERN: I can't name you the name of a particular place with a - you know a particular location and a particular title - but I understand that Alberta, to take one example,

(MR. DOERN cont'd).... has a number of community colleges or junior colleges which have been set up since the first time - well have been set up partly by enabling legislation in 1958; and then Ontario also has numerous colleges which I think can generally be described as community colleges.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments in connection with this resolution. I'm not sure whether I did speak on it before or not. The original resolution seems much simpler than the amendment that is attached to it now or will be voted on, and now that Bill 112 has been introduced and is passed the second reading stage, I find that a lot that the amendment was asking for is being done to Bill 112. But whether this is exactly what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition or the Liberal Party had in mind when they brought in the amendment, I'm not quite sure, because under Bill 112, the Commission will now study the needs of higher education in Manitoba and naturally make recommendations as to what program should be followed and so on.

So I'm just wondering whether this Bill 112 will speed up things so that we can go at a faster rate. I originally thought that the original resolution was better because it called for action, more or less immediate action. However, with the amendment now before us and with Bill 112 having come in I think we can support the amendment as well.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A COUNTED STANDING VOTE was taken, the results being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Clement, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Froese, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Tanchak.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Craik, Doern, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Fox, Green, Hamilton, Hanuschak, Harris, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Miller, Paulley, Petursson, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Uskiw, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 14, Nays 38.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the main motion?

MR. DOERN: ... to close the debate if nobody else is going to ...

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish just to rise to ... I won't be long. Well I intend to get to Gimli to that celebration, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I'm sure the Minister -- order, please -- I'm sure the Minister won't mind me just taking a moment and introducing some guests that have just arrived. I ask his indulgence.

We have 17 students of Grade 7 standing from the Varennes School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Wery and Mr. Franzman. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

We also have with us today 90 students of Grade 11 standing from the Garden Valley Collegiate of Winkler, Manitoba. These students are under the direction of Mr. Weibe and Miss Zacharias. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Dufferin and Rhineland. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today. I thank the Honourable Minister.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, in speaker, to this particular resolution there is no doubt that community colleges as we have heard throughout the debate to date are designed really to fill in the gaps in education at the secondary level. We have our universities; we have our technical institutes in the last few years and there is left a group of people who either wish to go back to school to upgrade academically, technologically or go on to university. There's the group who need retraining, wish to retrain, and there are the people as the honourable member said who, if we had possibly developed community colleges in corners of the province where children could get more education at the local level.

Whatever is developed however we recognize more and more not only here from the conference in Winnipeg last fall but from succeeding conferences by the Canadian Committee on Adult Education, but from discussion with other provinces, that we must be most careful not to duplicate the kind of services that we are presently engaged in expanding. And in our province frankly we have priorities and the members have been asked to vote the largest sums

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd)... of money in the history of this province for the support of education this year. We are presently engaged in the development of our adult vocational training centers at Brandon, The Pas and Manitoba Institute of Technology, where we are now developing an Institute of Applied Arts to complement the present institute which will concentrate on the industrial sciences and the combination of the Institute of Applied Arts which will be a multi-million dollar structure and which when combined with the present enrollment at MIT will offer a service - day classes of over 5,000 students. And this type of development in itself could well be the basis of a community college in this area. Also the most interesting work of the Winnipeg School Division who, supported by full-time grants for adult day students, have shown the need in a larger community such as this for the — and the desire I should say of many adults and students who have dropped out of school a year or two to come back and upgrade themselves academically. This experiment is most worthwhile.

I'm not prepared to give a categorical definition of what a community college in Manitoba should exactly be until we've had some comment from our academic and technologists and so on. It may well be that an academic upgrading wing on the combined Institute of Applied Arts and Technology would be a definition of a community college. It certainly would be. We want more university involvement in concert with us in this area to see what credits the universities might offer to our technology students and so on. This is a very exciting and challenging field and one which we must continue to study. Personally I don't know a province in Canada that has a pure community college type of program going which combines what the Adult Conference on Education and Community Colleges defines as a community college. That is I don't know of a place where they're offering both the academic, the vocational and the university training, a year or so, in one setting. As they say you need quite a wide population to do this.

I'm not too sure myself whether junior colleges fit into our particular pattern. They may well be, that in the northern part of our province a junior college which contemplates a senior year or two of high school with a year or two of university training might be a pattern. This again should be cleared with our Council of Higher Learning and with our university folk to be sure we're not getting into area duplication. As I pointed out Brandon might not be a sitting with the disciplines they have there now and the facilities. So I feel we have to continue to study this at the moment and I propose therefore the following amendment to the resolution of the Honourable Member from Elmwood. I move, Mr. Speaker, that we delete all after the third "whereas" and substitute the following: "Whereas the Government of Manitoba has already made extensive provision toward meeting some of these needs through the Manitoba Institute of Technology, the Brandon Vocational Center and the Northern Manitoba Vocational Centre and through grants to the Adult Education Center in Winnipeg; and whereas the Government of Manitoba has announced plans to further extend the plant and facilities of the Institute of Technology by the building of the Manitoba Institute of Applied Arts in Brooklands; and whereas the Minister of Education has requested a Council of Higher Learning to study specifically the place of community and/or junior colleges within the future pattern of post-secondary education in the Province of Manitoba; and whereas the priorities of the Department of Education demand the present program be continued; therefore be it resolved that the government continue to give consideration to the place of community colleges within our educational system." I so move, Mr. Speaker, with ...

Seconded by the Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of Order. I respectfully suggest that you might take the amendment as proposed by the Honourable the Minister of Education under advisement. I find that if one reads the motion that the purport of this amendment is to amend -- that the proposition of the Honourable Member for Elmwood is similar to that of the Honourable the Minister of Education, there is no alternative proposal, other than a few additional whereases and the objective of the amendment can be achieved by the support of the Minister of Education to the proposition introduced by the Honourable Member from Elmwood. I respectfully suggest, Sir, that you should take the amendment under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable gentleman for his opinion and having heard the remarks by the Minister and by the honourable gentleman, I consider it in order and debate may proceed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if the debate is going to proceed I'm going to be very brief at this time. I find that the Minister has a very long arm indeed in this resolution, busy patting

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd).... himself on the back as to the things that he has done. He's undoubtedly got all his colleagues to assist him on this because I really don't know what other things he could have put in his whereases to say what a fine fellow he is.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if he mightn't also have made a small reference to the fact that the Federal Government pay 75 percent of the things that he is doing, or says he is doing through these whereases. I notice that my friends are very apt at criticizing the Federal Government when they fail to do the things they want. Here we have whereases explaining the Institute of Technology, the Brandon Vocational Center, the Northern Manitoba Vocational Center, the Institute of Technology which will have added to it, the Institute of Applied Arts. I think in all of these cases, Mr. Speaker, 75 percent of the money comes directly from Ottawa to build them and 50 percent of the money comes from Ottawa to operate them.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am not objecting; I think that these are things that should be done, I have been urging my friend to do them for some time. He was a little reluctant to get going on them; reminds me of the phrase "being dragged kicking and screaming" into the construction of vocational schools, but he finally did get going, and so if he is going now to study community colleges I am not going to object to it. I have spoken on this on numerous occasions in the past, introduced resolutions on it before. I only hope that he gets going on it.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I just had the quick opportunity to look at the amendment and of course it is a recitation of the pride that this government has in what has been done and that's been referred to by the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party. But actually when it boils down to practical approach to community colleges, this amendment is an admission that neither the Minister nor the government nor apparently the Council of Higher Learning have really studied the problem, and when the Minister says that he wants the government to continue to give consideration to the place of community colleges, I want to suggest, with respect to him, that there has not been consideration given and that in fact, there is a present program which the Minister has and which he wishes to continue on the basis of what he calls priorities, he has obviously therefore set the community colleges on so low a level that it has not yet attained a place in the list of government priorities, because he still isn't sure just what the community colleges, what role they have to play in the pattern of post-secondary education.

The third preamble says that he has requested the Council of Higher Learning to study this and I am assuming - and I have a right to assume - that he has not had a report and indeed -- and he nods his head; I assume that's correct - Indeed he has already told us this week that the work of the Council of Higher Learning is being wound up as a Council. There is not going to be a Council of Higher Learning once the University Grants Commission is established, and that being the case, to whom has he directed his enquiry and request for study? And having directed it, how will he get an answer from a --(Interjection) -- Well the Minister has just told me I was out of the House and that's perfectly true; I was attending to some other work for some time, but I heard every word that he said, when he spoke just recently and if he thinks, and I am concerned really with the resolution that we are called upon to vote on and as far as I can see from this resolution, the Minister although he refers to the work which has been done in the field of technology and vocational training, with justification, he is not speaking in terms of what a community and/or junior college is and I am sure that it is neither technical nor vocational and I am sure -- and we have discussed this resolution long enough to know that we haven't been thinking in those terms.

Community colleges are not technical vocational institutes; they are fields of higher learning which are either the preparation for university itself or an extension of the academic life of higher school; and what I read into this amendment is a rejection of the principle of establishing a system of community colleges in this province in areas where the population can support them, but rather a statement that we will continue to study. Well the Minister has not given us the benefit I believe of knowing what studies have taken place up to now, nor where community colleges stand in the list of priorities, indeed anywhere within the pattern of post-secondary education, and I feel if we endorse the resolution as it stands now, then we are in effect, turning our backs to the problem of community colleges for some unknown period of time. I think that for that reason we have to consider that the government is just delaying its consideration of this problem and is not facing up to our resolution but rather by inference just turning it back and saying we don't want to reject it, so we will use some language to pat ourselves on the back and say we will continue to give study. I don't think that's good enough, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the main motion, as amended?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker I'll be closing debate if anyone else is going to speak.

Mr. Chairman, just on this question I think it has been established that the need for these institutions has been made, that so many students in our present high school system do not go on to university and that there is a need for institutions that will enable them to further their education, institutions called post secondary or tertiary education, because although two-thirds of the students are now taking a course leading to university only a very small percentage of them, about 10 percent of them, seem to get there under the present conditions; and there is no doubt that the need for adult education is also considerable and there is a need for a place where people can go on a part-time or a full-time basis other than in the evenings. This I think has been clearly demonstrated by the Adult Education Center in Winnipeg.

Now in the United States -- the Minister seems to believe that there is no such thing as a community college in Canada but I think that that's a semantic question rather than a question of fact, it's a question of definition -- but if we look at the American situation first and see that there are some 850 community colleges there at present with one and a half million students, and then project that into Canada, I think that we can see that we are lagging somewhat behind, and in Manitoba there isn't really one place that can be described as a community college. There are places that have been established which could be expanded into community colleges perhaps, but there is no such place at present.

I take most of my information on this question from the conference of last fall which was held by the Winnipeg School Division in October and some of the information there points out that Manitoba is indeed behind some of the other provinces. British Columbia, for example, has 30 school boards with full-time directors of adult education; we have nothing to compare with that. And Ontario has numerous colleges of applied arts and technology which according to the paper in this study, have vocational, technology, general and recreational training in day or evening courses, which seems to embrace the concept of a community college. Alberta as I pointed out was mentioned as having had community colleges for some time and legislation was initially passed in 1958 for that purpose. So I don't think there is any question of the need for these facilities and I think most speakers are in agreement on that point. I think that we have no other alternative but to support the amendment of the Minister which calls for consideration to the place of community colleges within our educational system and talks about a system of priorities and so on, but I think that when a list of priorities are established that community colleges must go fairly high up. I think that if we look at a system of priorities of the government at the present time in relation to community colleges, we must conclude that they must be near the bottom and I would hope that if the government is going to make its case good, that they will not only study the question but will also begin a construction of these institutions in the near future.

So I conclude on that point. We have no alternative but to support this resolution which calls for an extension of present programs and to a consideration of community colleges, pointing out that the government should certainly give it a priority rather than place it at the bottom of the list.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I put the question, I'd like to introduce some students who have come a long way and I hope you will excuse me taking advantage of this opportunity. On my right in the gallery we have nine Grade 12 students from Eriksdale Collegiate. They are under the direction of Miss Joan Sigurdsson and this school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. George. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you for making the effort to come here today.

Are you ready for the question on the main motion as amended?

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

MR. JOHNSON: As amended.

MR. SPEAKER: That's what I said: The main motion as amended was the question I asked.

The adjourned debate of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, are we not going back ...

MR. SPEAKER: Sometimes I wonder where we are going. Order please. I realize that we have to go back to Page 4 but I would like to remind the House that this situation is becoming quite prevalent - adjourned debates and so on, bills and so on are being called and

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd)..... members have been outside of the Chamber when it has been awfully close to calling them and I am sure these delays are unnecessary. I would ask the honourable members to pay attention to the Order Paper and if there is a likelihood of them being called, to be in their place.

The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill 107.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE (Selkirk): On that subject, in view of the fact that this session is almost at an end, I think that the House should by-pass any of these resolutions where the member is not here to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, we have tried to accommodate everyone, but I think it's becoming a little too prevalent and I would ask the co-operation of the House.

The adjourned debate on second reading of Bill No. 107. The Honourable Member for Inkster. I would like to inform the Honourable Member for Inkster that those remarks weren't particularly directed to him, but inclusively.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I realize that the remarks were not personal and I thank the members for their indulgence. I'm almost always here. I was called out for a few minutes for a long distance call and the bill happened to be called while I was away. It has never happened before and I apologize to the House and I hope it won't happen again.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like first of all in dealing with this bill, to bring to the attention of honourable members that the explanatory note may to some extent divert them from the real purpose of the bill. The explanatory notes, which are usually quite descriptive of what a bill purports to do, in this case seem to suggest that this bill opens the way for a Member of this House or a Member of the Senate or the House of Commons to run for an area municipality, or at least if the wording is not to that effect, it's not clear as to what the intention is.

Now let me make it clear therefore at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is not related to the one that was previously before the House which dealt with the rather, I admit, uncommon situation of a person who was a member of either the Senate or the House of Commons running for this Chamber, or a Member of a Legislative Assembly running for this Chamber. The situation that we are now trying to cover is significantly different in that it is a practical problem, has proved to be a practical problem in the past, and will likely be a practical problem in the future, and that is this bill would pave the way for a person sitting as a councillor on the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, running for either one of the area councils, the Legislative Chamber, the Senate or - well I guess you don't run for the Senate - but running for the House of Commons. --(Interjection)-- Do you run for the Senate too? Well, this wouldn't affect somebody who was running for the Senate because I suppose you can presently run for the Senate and continue to hold your council seat.

In this case, Mr. Speaker, the existing law says that these people - and I suggest it's rather discriminatory with regard to these people - people who are now Metro Councillors, once they are nominated to sit in this Chamber or as a Member of the House of Commons, become ipso facto and thereby disqualified from continuing to hold their council seat. Therefore, if a person is serving as a Metro Councillor and is nominated for the Legislature, he thereby becomes disqualified from holding his Metro seat and a by-election must be held immediately.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we would abhor this situation if it took place in any other area of our society. We would abhor it, for instance, if the Honourable Member for Burrows was required to quit teaching upon being nominated to sit in this Chamber. We have been strongly critical of employers who have let their employees go because they have sought nomination - or they had received nominations to sit as a Member of this Assembly. And furthermore, to bring the situation more close to home, this doesn't apply to people who are aldermen or even mayors of other municipal councils, that is an alderman of the City of Winnipeg or a mayor of the City of Winnipeg. In fact an alderman of the City of West Kildonan accepted nomination for the Legislature, was elected and when his term expired he then did not run for re-election as alderman, although he could have.

This bill doesn't seek to do that. This bill says that sitting in the Legislature and sitting in Metro Council can't be done effectively concurrently, but what it does say is that you do not disqualify yourself from serving on the council unless you are elected to the Chamber. Let's recall, Mr. Speaker, that it's the members of the public who are choosing their elected representatives and they would sometimes - although it's not always the case - sometimes choose their representatives for the Chamber from people who are presently holding elective office. I think there are several members of this Chamber presently who hold elective office on municipal councils. I am not criticizing that, I think that that in some respects can be a very

(MR. GREEN cont'd).... healthy thing. We are not proposing that in this bill. What we are saying is that a person who is a Metro Councillor does not, because of that fact, become disqualified from running for election to the House of Commons or to the Legislative Assembly; he does become disqualified if he is elected.

Now to give this example perhaps a little bit more meaning - and I have to in some respect be personal, although not entirely - the Member for St. John's - the Honourable Member for St. John's was a member of Metro Council when he ran for elective office to this Chamber. Upon his being nominated, he ceased to be a Metro Councillor and became an elective member of this Chamber, and I think that everybody is satisfied with what happened. The problem, in my submission, would have occurred if the electors of the constituency of St. John's had decided not to choose the honourable member - and I am glad that they had the good sense to choose him - but if they didn't choose him, he would have been disqualified from sitting on Metro Council; he would not be elected to the Chamber; and as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, the public would have lost a useful servant. They would have lost a person who could continue to have given good service as an elected member of that council for no reason whatsoever -- for no reason whatsoever.

Now to go a step further, the same occurred with Bob Moffat. Bob Moffat was a Metro Councillor, ran for mayor of the City of Winnipeg, was thereby disqualified from serving as a Metro Councillor and was lost from public service for a certain period of time which was completely unnecessary - completely unnecessary.

The next example - and the Honourable the Member for Lakeside is pointing at me - when I was a Metro Councillor, having been elected in December of 1962 and then again in December of 1964, in the summer of 1965, the summer or close to the fall of 1965, the Leader of the Liberal Party and the Prime Minister at the time decided that it was time to call an election and people in the constituency of Winnipeg South felt that they wanted - I don't know why - but they wanted myself to represent them and I felt that I was obliged to accept this responsibility. I accepted the nomination and thereby became disqualified from sitting on Metro Council. I'm not going to criticize the people of Winnipeg South, it's not that they didn't have the wisdom to elect me, but they didn't elect me. Nevertheless, for that period of time, for good or for bad, the fact is I was unable to participate in public life until the election in June of 1966 when the constituency of Inkster, by the way which was very close to the constituency which I represented on Metro - so they didn't think it was a bad idea and even though I ran in Winnipeg South they didn't hold it against me - elected me to this Chamber.

Now I don't see the purpose, Mr. Speaker, of the distinction. Alderman Gurzon Harvey ran in the same federal election that I ran in. He continued to serve the people of Winnipeg as an alderman. The people who wanted myself to serve - and there must have been some, enough to get me elected - because I felt that I had this responsibility, had to be subjected to a by-election in which I did not participate because I felt that having made a choice to run in the federal election I couldn't go back to run in the municipal election again.

So there is absolutely no good sense, Mr. Speaker, and I know that the members are not trying to eliminate competition. The members of Metro Council, with great respect, Mr. Speaker, have had good training for sitting not only in this Legislature but in the House of Commons. They are amongst the choice people who should be selected for this service, but some of them feel that they would be denying, I think in some way avoiding the responsibility to their electorate - I didn't feel that, but some of them did - if they accepted a nomination and therefore became automatically disqualified.

So I see no reason, Mr. Speaker, and I want to bring to the attention of members that this is a different situation from the bill that was before you previously. The situation is different, not because it in principle differs so much, it's from a practical point of view, foreseeable, it's happened, and I suggest to you that we in this Chamber can see the possibility of losing or deterring good men from participating in public life with the present law. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, the only reason we could be opposed to this section - and I know that's not the reason - is that we could be eliminating competition. There are 10 Metro Councillors, only one of them is a member of the New Democratic Party so I'm not speaking in our own interest here. It's quite likely that if this was opened up that we who represent nine Winnipeg seats would have to face competition from people who will run for the Liberal and the Conservative Party who are sitting on that council right now. It's a strong possibility. If we were attempting to eliminate competition and thereby at the same time caused the people of Manitoba to have less of a selection of people available to choose from for elective office, and I submit that the ones

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . . that we're talking about now are the ones who are more - well I don't want to call them more qualified, but they're at least as qualified and have had some political and public experience, and should not be precluded.

I had one more remark, Mr. Speaker. After I was disqualified, or resigned - I think I resigned some minutes before I became disqualified so that the record would show not a disqualification but a resignation - immediately after I resigned from Metro Council, the council itself passed a resolution - that is my understanding - sent it to the members of the government and therefore had endorsed the position that I am now speaking from. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there's no reason why this House shouldn't endorse it, that we should be willing to have the Chamber composed of the best possible fields and let's not exclude these ten people who are now sitting as councillors of the Metropolitan Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to make a speech, I'm just going to comment on the fact that, as far as I know, the Minister whose responsibility this is, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and indeed no one else from the government has made any comment, and I just pose the question: is this problem not worthy of comment?

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): Mr. Speaker, I was about to rise here before you did put the question. As a matter of government policy we are not prepared to accept this and so I will not be able to vote for the resolution.

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

MR. GREEN: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Cherniack, Doern, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Harris, Miller, Petursson and Uskiw.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Clement, Cowan, Craik, Dawson, Dow, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Froese, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Molgat, Patrick, Shewman, Shoemaker, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Tanchak, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 9; Nays, 40.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable the First Minister. Had I have voted, I would have voted in favour of the motion.

..... continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the Proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm closing this debate with regard to the right of an employer to appear before the Labour Board. I already warned members that I wanted to try to convince the members who have presently indicated an intention of not supporting this bill to do so, and I never give up trying, even though they've indicated that they won't.

Mr. Speaker, I'm quite convinced that when The Labour Relations Act was passed, when the Order-in-Council that is referred to as PC/1003 first came into existence, that both the members of the government that passed the resolution, the labour people in the Province of Manitoba, and the management people in the Province of Manitoba, all understood that the employer would not in any way be involved in certification proceedings. I'm sure that everybody thought that this particular Act was passed so that instead of having employees going out on strike to get their employer to recognize them, that the government and the management and labour all said that there is a more sensible way of doing this. If you can convince a board appointed by the government that over half of the employees working for a particular employer desire your union to bargain collectively on their behalf, that that recognition will be given to you and then the employer will be obliged to bargain with you.

I'm convinced, Mr. Speaker, that this proposal was accepted by the labour movement and accepted by everybody else because it was never conceived that this would provide an avenue for the employer to become involved in these proceedings. It was a recognized principle of the Act that the employer would have nothing to do with whether or not his employees belonged to a union and that he would not be able to influence them in one way or another. I'm convinced, Mr. Speaker, that all that was conceived of at that time was that the employees would indicate their intention, and if the board was satisfied that over 50 percent of them wanted the union, the union would be certified. To take an analogy, Mr. Speaker, it was similar to an employer coming to the Provincial Secretary's office, providing the requirements for becoming a corporation and the Provincial Secretary issuing a Charter. I don't think it would be ever conceived under these circumstances that the employees would be able to go to the Provincial Secretary and say don't give them a Charter.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the labour relations analogy is the better one. The employers now belong to organizations of employers. For instance, the Winnipeg Builders Exchange is an organization of employers in the construction industry, and it would be unheard of for the employees to suggest that their employer could not belong to one of these employers' organizations or have anything whatsoever to do with whether he does belong or does not belong. I'm convinced, Mr. Speaker, that that was not only the case when The Labour Relations Act was initially passed, but that people generally to this day become somewhat shocked and amazed to find that the employer is involved in certification or revocation application.

And nowhere is this more demonstrated than by the remarks that were made by the Honourable Member for Selkirk when he first looked at this resolution, because he looked at it and he made the following remarks, Mr. Speaker. I consider that this probably was the opinion of the Honourable Member for Selkirk and was the opinion of most of those people who advised the Liberal Party on labour matters, and this is what he says. He said: "We also accept that" - referring to the suggestion that employers have no effective interest in whether their employees belong to a union or not - "We also accept that and there is nothing in the Act which prohibits employees from doing thus, and as a matter of fact, the Act specifically forbids an employer in taking exception to it". His opinion of the Act was that it prohibits an employer from taking exception to his members belonging to a trade union.

He goes on to say - and I think that that's what most people think the Act does - he goes on to say, "The purpose of having an employer appear before the Labour Board on a certification is not to raise an objection to his employees belonging to a trade union, and as a matter of fact, he is not allowed to raise that objection" - he says that he is not allowed to raise that objection - "and it's not against him indulging in collective bargaining through a union. The main purpose of appearing " - and I'm leaving out some lines - "before the Board is to submit to the Board a list of his employees which is private as far as the Board is concerned".

Now this is exactly what we have said. We have said that the Act was designed so that the employees would apply for certification; the employer would provide the Board with a list; the Board which has management representatives on it would look at the list of employees, and if it were satisfied that the list of employees represents more than 50 or 60 percent of the employees in the unit, it would certify the union. That's what was conceived, and I suggest,

(MR. GREEN, cont'd) Mr. Speaker, that's what the Act intended and that's what many people think the Act still says. But, Mr. Speaker, that's not what happened. The employer does come to the Board; he does object to his employees being represented by a trade union; he files what is called a contestation - he contests their right to bargain through the trade union - and he raises any objection, any and all objections which can come to the mind of the solicitor that he hires.

I remember three or four years ago it was the position of the Liberal Party that there was something wrong with Labour Board proceedings - I hope I'm right, that this was your position - and that what appeared to be wrong is that there were lawyers before the Labour Board, or that there were too many legal technicalities raised before the Labour Board and this came about as a result of lawyers appearing before the Labour Board. Well, as I said before, Mr. Speaker, I think that the lawyers are to blame for a lot of things, that quite often if you wanted to blame lawyers for something you would probably be right if you said that the lawyer was to blame, but in this case they happened to be wrong. It's not the lawyers who were to blame; it's the employer who appears before the Labour Board who is instructing the lawyer that he doesn't want this union in his establishment under any circumstances, and the lawyer then has a responsibility and an obligation to think of ways of defeating this application.

Mr. Speaker, they use all kinds of grounds. They don't say merely that the bargaining unit is not properly described; they say they are not ready for a union, that the application is premature or that their employees were misrepresented, that the union told them they will do great things for them and the employer said he will not do great things for you. This amounts to a misrepresentation. I see each and every of this type of contestation filed by employers, and what happens - and the Minister of Labour can correct me if I'm wrong or he could go to the statistics - generally, if there's a strongly contested application, you will also find that there is no collective agreement arrived at, or a strike occurs or something else happens. There are numerous applications that are proceeded with exactly on the basis that I have suggested. The Union files an application; the Board which has management representatives on it looks at the application; they get a list of employees from the employer; and they certify or don't certify on the basis of that information. Generally, Mr. Speaker, in those cases, the employees arrive at a collective agreement and there is peaceful industrial relations for the future insofar as that particular employer is concerned.

It's the cases where the employer is resisting, not resisting for any other reason but that he doesn't want a union, that we have the difficulties and those are the cases where the employer appears before the Labour Board. We have had, Mr. Speaker, an unusual situation in Manitoba take place during the last two months. An employer applied for revocation of the certificate of his union. The union was certified; the employer applied for certification on the basis that all of his employees had been dismissed and he had no more employees; and then he got the Board to revoke the certificate because he had no more employees. But on that basis, Mr. Chairman, any union certificate can be revoked and any employer can avoid the responsibility for collective bargaining which is the cornerstone of this Act merely by firing his employees.

So, Mr. Speaker, we suggest that this resolution does nothing but restore the intention of the Act. And let me make this clear, if an employee has been intimidated, if an employee has had undue influence exercised on him to make him join a union, I am for protecting that employee. I don't care if the Minister of Labour figures out a system whereby both the union applying, and the employees who claim that they were mistreated, each have lawyers appointed by the department. It'll take some work away from me, but I have nothing against it. I'm for protecting the rights of both sides, but I say that the last person who should be in the position of saying that he is protecting his employees is the employer, because, Mr. Speaker, it's like the old saying, the employees can protect themselves from their enemies; it's their friends that they have to worry about.

The employer who comes to a Labour Board contesting an application for certification on the grounds that he is a friend of the employee and is protecting them, is interfering in management-employees negotiations. And I repeat, if those employees need protection I'm prepared to give it to them, I'm prepared to say that the Minister of Labour should himself make sure that any employees who have a disagreement with the trade union that is applying for certification is appointed Counsel, but you have to appoint Counsel both ways because there shouldn't be a fight created by the department whereby the department is opposing the application. That would be wrong. So that any employees -- it would have to be a department lawyer

(MR. GREEN, cont'd) representing employees who are applying for certification and those that don't, but not the employer. Mr. Speaker, I question whether this type of protection is necessary, because if those employees have had the guts - and I submit it does take guts - to apply for certification when their employer is against it, that those employees have the same strength of purpose to resist a union which has not properly treated them.

Mr. Speaker, we don't want to go into a new radical avenue; we want to come down to the purposes of The Labour Relations Act as they were originally conceived and as they are still conceived by many people in the Province of Manitoba, many learned people including, I suggest, the Honourable Member for Selkirk. We want to adopt his principle.

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

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Yeas and Nays, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs: Cherniack, Doern, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Harris, Miller, Petursson and Uskiw.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Clement, Cowan, Craik, Dawson, Dow, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Froese, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Molgat, Patrick, Shewman, Shoemaker, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Tanchak, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 9; Nays, 40.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable the First Minister. Had I voted, I would have voted in favour of the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

------(Applause) -----

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to convey, on behalf of the honourable members, the congratulations to the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Thank you very much. As the negro said when asked by one of his mates have you got change for \$5.00, he said thanks for the compliments, and I want to thank all of you for the compliments.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak on the proposition put forward annually by the Leader of the New Democratic Party. I can't recall whether it was put forward at all of the special sessions but I think that it is safe to say that at every session of the legislature, every regular session of the legislature, that I attended the same resolution appeared on the Order Paper. Now I agree with part of it, with part of the wording of the motion that is before us. It is a fact, the first whereas is certainly a fact "that whereas automobile insurance rates are increasing annually" and it is disturbing to me as an insurance agent to see that they are. And I would think that every day that I'm in the office and at least 10 times a day, if we renew that many policies in a day, we hear the same complaint from each and every one of the policy holders who come in to renew their car insurance. They're all concerned about the increase in premiums - and it's only natural that this should happen because car insurance premiums now are getting pretty high. I think I pay something like \$135 or \$150 for my own insurance and that's quite a substantial figure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been many reasons put forward by members that have spoken as to why the rates are as high as they are - I think the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne gave us some of his assessments of the situation. The insurance industry, of course they always say it is just this simple; we are paying out more money in losses than we are taking in in premiums, and when that situation occurs you've got to do something about it. I believe that the All Canada Insurance Federation put out figures in 1963 that supported the fact that they had in that particular year paid out \$105 for every \$100 that they took in in premiums. Well you can't stay in business continuing to do that; you can't stay in business for very long. And they give many reasons as to why, why the premiums have gone up annually. The managing director of the Portage Mutual, the General Manager of the Portage Mutual gave what he really believed was some of the reasons for increasing premiums every year. He layed the blame right at the foot of the government and as I recall it the Minister of Public Utilities was not very pleased with the comments that he made in this particular regard.

(MR. SHOEMAKER, cont'd)

This happened back in February. "Government blamed for car rates forced up" is the heading of an article in the Tribune dated around the 10th or 12th of February last. Mr. Brown, Mr. Earl Brown goes on to say that, "Mr. Brown told an audience of more than a 100 at the company's annual meeting in Portage la Prairie that general government policy has forced his group to write high risk policies; the company has had to add their losses to premiums. This was because the government did not have the guts enough to say that certain people shouldn't be driving a car" - and it goes on and on. Well probably there's some truth in what my honourable friend says. I have several other articles here in which different companies lay the whole cause of increased rates right at the foot of the government.

I have articles from the Sarnia Observer: "High accident rates boosts insurance costs". From the Calgary, Albertan: "It shouldn't be too difficult for anyone to understand why Ottawa insurance rates continue to rise; all one has to do in fact is study the Calgary driving record since the first of the year until the end of June, after that the mystery ends." So they're saying not only this government in Manitoba but governments generally in Canada could do a great deal if they would to reduce the accident record in the various provinces. And so, Mr. Speaker, there are many many reasons why insurance rates are increasing annually.

And the next whereas: "Whereas it has not been established that such increases are justified or reasonable." Well I will agree with part of that. It hasn't been justified to the satisfaction of the purchaser of insurance; it may have been justified to his agents by companies and governments and so on, but certainly the public by and large do not feel that the huge increases have been justified. Certainly not justified to their satisfaction and I agree with that part of it. "Whereas it is essential that every motor vehicle be insured for the protection of persons and property." Well we have pretty well established that or nearly so in Manitoba. It's true that you can still drive if you've got \$25.00; but you can only drive until you have an accident and they impound your car for failing to have proper insurance.

"And whereas Co-operative Insurance is the best method of assuring equitable rates". Well my honourable friend the Member for Souris-Lansdowne had some comments to make on this subject matter the other day and he referred to one or two of the leading insurance companies in the Province of Manitoba and I think named them; the Portage Mutual and the Wawanesa Mutual, and I believe it is a fact that the Wawanesa Mutual write approximately 1 out of every 8 cars in the Province of Manitoba and the other 290 companies or thereabouts write the other 7. But I have always maintained that if there is a co-operative insurance company or two of them in Manitoba, certainly they are the two leading mutual companies, certainly they are co-operative. Both of them started in business nearly a century ago because they were not satisfied with the rates that were established in those days and so they set about to do something about it and established co-operative insurance institutions or mutual insurance institutions as a non-profit type of organization to take care of the risks of that day.

I'm not at all satisfied with the resolved part of the resolution, Mr. Speaker; I'm not completely sold yet on the fact that we should have state controlled insurance. I'm not sold on that. We have set up a committee, a few days ago, to look into this whole matter and the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre who is the Chairman of that Committee and reported to you earlier today that we have already held our first meeting; we're one jump ahead of all the other committees that have been set up and I hope that it's some indication that we're going to get down to business and do something about this whole proposition that is before us.

I am not, Mr. Speaker, prepared to go along with the resolution that is before us in its present form and I would like to move an amendment, so I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk that the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "and" in the fifth line thereof and by adding the following words: "whereas this House has concurred in the appointment of a special committee of the House to study the matter of automobile insurance, and whereas the question of compulsory motor vehicle insurance and of government operated insurance plans have been debated in this House; and whereas only one province in Canada has seen fit to establish compulsory motor vehicle insurance under the government insurance plan; and whereas no American state has established a government insurance plan; therefore be it resolved that the special committee of the House be requested to study these questions". --(Interjection)-- Then you should be able to vote with us.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The adjourned debate on the --(Interjection) -- ... beg pardon --(Interjection) -- Now voting on the main motion as amended.

(MR. SPEAKER, cont'd) Are you ready for the question ?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I do not have the amendment before me but I would like to make a few comments in connection with the amendment as well as the main motion. I notice that the main motion has a whereas wherein it says that the Co-operative Insurance is the best method of assuring equitable rates and then the resolved part requests that consideration be given to instituting compulsory motor vehicle insurance. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion these are two entirely different things, whether it's a co-operative insurance or a government run company, because when we speak of co-operative this means that people are willing to participate in this organization and that the . . . subscribe and co-operate whereas in a government controlled company people are forced into dealing with this company. So that the two are entirely different in my opinion.

Then, too, I do not subscribe to the matter of having a government run insurance business; and the amendment that is now before us asks that these matters be studied by the insurance committee. I certainly am not opposed to this in any way and I hope that they do give consideration to this matter because I think it is very vital and important that we have private business in the insurance business, and I think well-run organizations and businesses certainly are an asset to this province and are a credit, and I'm sure that when the committee has these meetings and discussions that these insurance companies should be called on to make presentations and to bring forward their point of view as well, so that we should get a good report and one that would be valuable to this House in making any recommendations as to the future course of the insurance business in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party wishes to move the adjournment.

MR. PAULLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, I was going to speak if no one else wishes to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: Does anyone else wish to speak to this particular motion ?

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): I would wish to say this, Mr. Speaker, that as far as the amendment is concerned, my colleague from Gladstone has included in the amendment one paragraph in the preamble with which I am not too happy, but nevertheless I think the main principle involved in his amendment is that we have a committee, which has been set up; it's had its first meeting today; and that committee will be studying this whole problem in depth, and this is a problem which has to be studied in depth. All the debating in this House is not going to achieve anything other than to show that there is a line of demarcation between the thinking of different people here, and if we wish to find a solution to the problem, I think that we have already adopted the only method by which we can find a solution which will be generally acceptable to the majority of people, and that is to refer this whole matter to this committee which has been set up.

For that reason, I would support the amendment although I am not happy about the honourable mover of the amendment including that paragraph, "whereas it is essential that every motor vehicle be insured for the protection of persons and property." In other words, I don't believe in compulsory insurance; I believe that it is essential that we keep the poor risks off our highway and that's about the only way we are going to keep down accidents.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer)(Fort Rouge): . . . worded, I wonder if the situation in which we find ourselves is that the amendment is already carried and we are considering the amended motion, and consequently I make no reference to the whereases. We have adopted the operative part of the resolution; I agree with the intent of the resolution; I intend to support the amended motion as indeed I did the amendment. I think it's proper that this should be referred to the committee, and unless I'm out of order in saying so, it does raise a point as to whether indeed there was a conflict between this resolution on the Order Paper and the other one appointing the committee. Nevertheless, that situation has passed and I intend to support the amended motion before us.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take part in this debate at all, but my entry into it is prompted by one remark that the Honourable Member for Gladstone called attention to, which was a press report of a statement by the General Manager of the Portage la Prairie Mutual Insurance Company. Both the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne and I were present in the hall when the General Manager spoke; and I am sure that the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne would agree with me when I say that there is no question that when the General Manager of the Portage la Prairie Mutual made the statement

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) which was reported in the press as saying that thus government is to blame for insurance rates, that he was meaning government, not any particular government, because I want to make it perfectly plain, Mr. Speaker, that neither the Portage la Prairie Mutual Company itself nor any individual connected with it, that I know of, takes an active or biased part in political affairs. And while I might hold opinions about various governments, I'm sure that in the context that the General Manager spoke that morning, he was meaning the general term of "government" in this. He would even be including, I'm sure, the members of the Opposition side and also the members of the Federal Government as well. He was not directing his remarks to a particular government or a particular group.

Now I suppose that it's unusual for me to stand up and try and shield my honourable friends across the way from any criticism or blame, but I do say on this occasion, in fairness to the General Manager, that he was not trying to pick up any particular government, it was a general term and was meant to include all governments, and I'm afraid he was even including pretty much all members of the Houses.

MR. SPEAKER: Does anyone else wish to speak to this motion?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I find myself in agreement with the motion, because as the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer has indicated the amendment proposed by my honourable friend the Member for Gladstone, which has been accepted and is now the general substance of the main motion, is one of course which we have already adopted, and as the Member for Selkirk informed us a few moments ago, and as was indicated under the item "reports" this afternoon, that that committee has already had its first meeting.

I want to thank the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne and other members who have taken part in this debate, and I find it very interesting, particularly when references are made to government-operated insurance plans and other aspects of automobile insurance, that there seems to be general agreement that we have got to take a look at the rate structure, and this is being done at the present time in British Columbia of course where there is a Royal Commission sitting investigating into all aspects of automobile insurance.

I am very very interested, Mr. Speaker, in the attitude of the Province of Saskatchewan and its approach to the question of automobile insurance. That provincial government has recently presented a brief to the Royal Commission in Saskatchewan on behalf of the government of Saskatchewan. I have that brief, Mr. Speaker, in my hand and I commend the Honourable the Premier of Saskatchewan, that free enterpriser Ross Thatcher, the head of the Liberal government, for his very intelligent and rational approach to the question of compulsory government-operated automobile insurance, and I commend to the reading of all members of the House the contents of this green-covered document that I have titled "Report to the Royal Commission on Automobile Insurance and Related Matters," submitted by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office of Saskatchewan.

In this document, I am sure that the Member for Gladstone, the Member for Selkirk and Lakeside, would find many very appropriate documentations to support the position that the New Democratic Party have taken in Manitoba. We are well aware, of course, that historically in Saskatchewan it was the CCF government when it was in office in Saskatchewan that instituted the compulsory plan in the Province of Saskatchewan and there has been no basic change in the program that's now in effect. And as I illustrate, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to know that the free enterprisers in control in Saskatchewan support this socialist measure that was introduced back in 1946.

And I commend to the House many of the statements, as I say, that are contained within this book because the government of Saskatchewan, both the present and the past governments, have asked for and received many investigations into the whole question of automobile insurance. In this document on Page 57 there is a summation of a study made by a committee of the State of California Legislature into the question of compulsory government-operated automobile insurance, and of course where do they turn for an example but to the Province of Saskatchewan, wherein of course there is the only government-operated compulsory automobile scheme.

I want to quote a bit from the summation of the California committee which dealt with the Saskatchewan plan, and I quote. "Whether the successful experience of Saskatchewan would hold in other jurisdictions is a separate question of study on the basis of the data applicable to the registration, population, and accident and underwriting experience. However, on the basis of the Act's original purpose, that is the provision of statutory compensation for personal injury in automobile accidents without regard to fault, there is clear evidence of achievement that cannot be measured solely in terms of dollars."

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd)

There are many other interesting excerpts from this summation but I don't want to delay the House, Mr. Speaker, I want to go on and give another excerpt from the summation of the committee in California. And they pose this question, being No. 4, and I quote from the report. "4. Does such a system" - that is a state compulsory government-operated automobile insurance scheme - "Does a system unalterably destroy freedom of enterprise and the right of individuals to make their own personal decisions?" This is the question, Mr. Speaker, deviating from the question that is posed in this House on a number of occasions by honourable members. And here is the answer of the Committee in California. "The answer appears to be no, if the system is geared to low level minimum standards of payment which guarantee that accident victims will be reimbursed at these levels for all claims. Under this system there is still freedom to insure above the limits with the carrier of the individual's choice. Also, under the third party liability coverage, the right to pursue a claim through the courts is retained." Many other interesting points are raised in this summation.

Also at the hearings in British Columbia, the General Manager of the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office, Mr. J. O. Dutton, told the Commission that his province's - and I'm quoting from an excerpt from a Victoria paper I believe of April 25th - he says, "his province's compulsory government insurance is good for Saskatchewan but might not be considered good for British Columbia." I think this bears out what I have said, Mr. Speaker, in the past, that we don't necessarily have to tailor any scheme in Manitoba to any other jurisdiction.

We hear a lot here in this House, Mr. Speaker, on the question of subsidization of the plan and the losses that are incurred from time to time in the Saskatchewan plan. What does the General Manager of the Saskatchewan plan have to say about that, and I'm quoting now from the Prince Albert Daily Herald of Monday, April 24th. "J.O. Dutton says Saskatchewan Government insurance office deficits were planned, but for the last six years, because of surpluses created, the fund rose above the statutory limitation of \$2 million set for the last six years." That surplus -- the deficits had been planned as far as their accident ratio to get them down to the level that they should be at in accordance with legislation in Saskatchewan. And at the present time - at the present time at the end of December, 1966 the overall operation plan indicates that there is still a surplus of \$988,000 according to their latest balance statement.

So this I think is evident enough, Mr. Speaker, to illustrate that when we're talking of deficits, they have, in accordance with the statement of the General Manager of the compulsory scheme in Saskatchewan, been on a planned deficit in order that the fund may come within the statutory limits, I believe of two millions of dollars, that they are allowed to have a surplus at any time.

Also, Mr. Speaker, there is one very important feature of this plan that I draw to the attention of members of the House insofar as rate settings are concerned. The situation here in Manitoba, particularly insofar as our younger drivers may be concerned, is the exorbitant rates that they are having to pay under our privately operated automobile insurance coverage at the present time. In the Province of Saskatchewan, as far as rate differentiation is concerned, that rate differentiation is only made on the basis of individual accident incidence. It is not made on the basis of an age group or certain groups of that nature but on the basis of accident incidence with the exception, as I understand it, of a \$2.00 a year more in the licence for the younger driver under 25. But apart from that, the individual himself sets his rate whereas here at the present time, because of the age grouping, the rates are set by the insurance company.

And what do they say in their brief - the Saskatchewan Government brief to the Royal Commission in British Columbia - they say that they must be given this opportunity, and to quote on Page 26 of the brief, the Saskatchewan Government's presentation says in respect of rate setting for the younger drivers, "A young driver must be given the opportunity of gaining experience, and while the driver who has not reached his 25th birthday when he applies for an operator's certificate under the Act pays a higher premium than older drivers, the rate differential is characterized by moderation. At the present time, such a driver pays \$2.00 more than do older drivers of the same class." And then it goes on throughout the brief to establish the justice of the rates being set on the individual insofar as individual conduct is concerned and not because he happens to belong to a certain class or age group of individuals.

Now I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, and members of the Assembly, that we are going to be

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) giving full consideration to all aspects of this matter in due course. I hope that the whole matter will be given consideration. I think it is of prime importance to Manitoba that we do have, as a condition of allowing a vehicle to be on the road, we should have provisions that that vehicle and the driver is in a position where anybody who may be injured as the result of the driver of the vehicle, be it property or personal, that those people are able to obtain compensation without regard to fault.

I appreciate the fact that in many jurisdictions in the United States inquiries are going on at the present time into the matter of the rates as well as we are doing here in Manitoba and Canada. I appreciate that there are only two States, as I understand it, in the United States that have compulsory automobile insurance, one the State of Massachusetts, the other the State of New York. They're having difficulties there. I have here - and I'm not going to belabour the House with reading from it - a copy of an investigation report, by the State of Maryland incidentally, into what is happening in New York. It establishes that there has been considerable evasion insofar as the compulsory aspect of insurance is concerned; also, that the rates have escalated continuously in Massachusetts and New York, and I suggest that the reason for this is being that the government there do not have the same concern or the same type of concern as a government which operates the automobile insurance scheme itself and for its people based on at least the minimum coverage.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the motion as amended, proposed originally by myself and amended by the Member for Gladstone. I look forward in keen anticipation to the deliberations of the committee. I'm glad to know that, apart from my colleague from Inkster, I now have another member of the Committee who at least is lukewarm to parts of our contention, that being the acceptance of my honourable friend of that part of the resolution that I proposed, that every motor vehicle be insured for the protection of persons and properties.

So it's a start and I'm sure my honourable friend just didn't accept that part of the resolution because he happens to be in the insurance business. I'm not in it yet, in the automobile insurance business yet, but I hope it will not be too long, Mr. Speaker, before I am in the automobile insurance business as a member of this House, and this House being the legislators of an insurance scheme and the people of Manitoba co-operatively set their own rates.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Lakeside and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Mathews in amendment thereto, standing in my name. I have considered the contents of the amendment and I consider it in order and ask that the debate continue. Are you ready for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, if no one else is wishing to speak, I would have a word to say on the amendment. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that I'm the only person in the House that could deal with such an important and complex subject in 5 minutes but --(Interjection)-- I can guarantee to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I'm well satisfied in most areas with regard to the treatment this resolution has received, because my honourable friend for Wellington in making the amendment, which I assume is the government view of the subject, has left in all of the whereases which I think lay a useful background for this resolution that follows, and then he has left in as well the endorsement of the principle, which after all is what I wanted to get the Legislative Assembly to do, so I'm well pleased with that treatment and I think it's an advance so far as we are concerned.

I have one qualification, Mr. Speaker, which I think my honourable friend the Honourable Member for St. Mathews perhaps did not fully consider when he changed the committee from that one of Privileges and Elections to the Rules Committee which has been set up. I wondered, Mr. Speaker, if perhaps that was why you had reserved decision on the question, because this I think poses a bit of a delicate question for you, Mr. Speaker, because if we follow the tradition you will be the Chairman of this committee and we will have the position that I would not be willing to commit to too many people, of where the Chairman of this committee will be the present occupant of the position that the committee will be dealing with so far as this particular resolution is concerned.

Now that is not a bar at all to it going to that committee, but I really think that in view of your position, Mr. Speaker, that it should have been left with one of the other committees. However, having the utmost confidence, Mr. Speaker, in the fact that the present incumbent of that office is able to be objective in matters like this and knowing that the sponsor of the

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) resolution is one that is so diplomatic and interested in the subject, I'm sure that if it's the judgment of the House that this is the committee to which the resolution should be consigned for further consideration and report then I'm well content, and I'll guarantee that with you and me, Mr. Speaker, both giving our best consideration to it, that the House can expect something to emanate from that committee that will mark a real advance in connection with this important matter that's been before us on several occasions. I think we can now assume that the resolution is going to be in such capable hands that this question that has agitated this Assembly for quite a few years is at last on the way to a satisfactory conclusion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Rhineland. There's only a moment or two left to the half hour.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I can't finish in one minute, so I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that the debate be adjourned. --(Interjection)-- Well in that case I'll just carry on until it's 5:30, but I'm sure I will not be able to say all that I have to say on this matter.

We have on repeated occasions discussed this particular type of resolution. I think that over the period that I've been in this House this resolution has been on the Order Paper quite a number of times and that there are merits to the question involved and the proposal that the resolution puts before us. The matter of having a permanent Speaker on the basis that we have discussed in some years, that the Speaker would still have to be elected by one of the constituencies in Manitoba, I always expressed my opposition to that because the people of that constituency are barred from having a representation in this House that can voice the people's opinions of the particular constituency that the member represents, and therefore I have on past occasions not agreed to this.

However, last year I think it was when we discussed the matter, it was also suggested that the Legislative grounds constitute a constituency in the Province of Manitoba and that from this constituency the Speaker would be elected and would then serve. Now as to just how he would be selected this is not spelled out in this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if the honourable member could conclude his remarks in a few moments.

MR. FROESE: No, I can't.

MR. SPEAKER: Well I now call it 5:30.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move then, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, that the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until 8:00 o'clock this evening.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 8:00 o'clock in the evening.