

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, February 21, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN Q. C. (Provincial Secretary)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources, and in presenting this report I wish to inform the members of the House that the Committee will not be meeting on Thursday as we had originally planned.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources beg leave to present the following as their first report:

Your Committee met for organization and appointed Hon. Mr. McLean as Chairman.

Your Committee agreed that, for the remainder of this Session, the Quorum of this Committee shall consist of Nine (9) members.

Mr. D. M. Stephens, Chairman of Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board, addressed the Committee on the subject of the Manitoba Hydro and tenders with respect to the Kettle Rapids Generating Station. Mr. W. D. Fallis, General Manager answered questions put by members of the Committee.

Your Committee has examined the Fifteenth Annual Report of the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board for the year ended March 31, 1966.

Your Committee received all information desired by any member from the officers of the Manitoba Hydro and their staffs with respect to matters pertaining to the Report and business of this Utility. The fullest opportunity was accorded to all members of the Committee to seek any information desired.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education that the Report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills

I should like to direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery. We have 128 students of Grade 11 and 12 standing from the Arthur Meighan School and the Portage Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Brooker and Mr. Schwalak. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Portage.

We also have with us today 27 students of Grade 5 standing from the Kent Road School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Zulkowski. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Elmwood. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

Orders of the Day.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour)(Osborne): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to table the Annual Report of the Labour-Management Review Committee and copies will be distributed to honourable members.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a reply to a Return No. 18 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education)(Gimli): Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Clerk of the House to distribute the report I received yesterday, the Advisory Board Report to the Minister of Education on reading.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Public Utilities. I would like to know what, if any, agreement the government has in respect to the parking of cars on Memorial Boulevard from Broadway to York. I drove up and down there, in fact I have occasion to drive up and down every day. Today I drove up and down to make certain that I was seeing straight. Every parking meter was in violation. Every single solitary one. I'm told that this is not new. It has been this way for three or four years and I'm asking what is the policy there, should the meters be removed? If they're allowed to park without depositing money in the meters then let's remove the meters. The question is - there must be an agreement of some kind.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, regretfully I answer the question as Minister of Public Works. This is a problem of which we have been aware for some time. We're at the present time engaged in preparing some new regulations. It may require some amendment to the Public Works Act, all we hope to enable us to deal with this most troublesome problem. It's just every bit as bad as described by the Honourable Member for Gladstone and worse.

MR. SHOEMAKER: A subsequent question then. Would it not be better by far to remove the meters until the problem has been resolved because there's discrimination and the law is being broken. There's discrimination and the law is being broken. Why not remove the meters until it is resolved?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, because if we can get the correct solution we'll need the meters and we don't think it would be wise to take them out only to have to return them at some future time.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, that's very easy. Why don't you cover the meters? Isn't that being done in other places? Because right now the people are breaking the law. Those meters could be covered just as easy. I think they have these little bags they put on. Or is that an invitation for all the people to break the law across the City?

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): A supplementary question. This street in question is a public street isn't it? -- and it's policed by the Winnipeg Police Department? Is that not correct?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, it's property that belongs to the Province of Manitoba and we look after the parking arrangements through the Department of Public Works. Perhaps I might best describe it by saying it's really part and parcel of the park.

MR. GUTTORMSON: In other words, the Winnipeg Police Department have no authority to tag these cars. Is that correct?

MR. McLEAN: That is correct, yes.

MR. SHOEMAKER: A subsequent question then. Who receives the revenue from the meters, if any?

MR. McLEAN: The Province of Manitoba.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to table a Return to an Order of the House No. 13 on the motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and a Return to an Order of the House No. 19 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to direct another question to my honourable friend the Minister of Public Utilities and it will nearly be necessary for me to read this in order to put the question. But presently there is going out to a great number of people in the province from the Safety Division and the Driver Improvement Clinic, the following letter: "Please be advised that Section 25 (2) of the Highway Traffic Act requires that a driver's or chauffer's licence show the date of birth of the licensee. We do not have this information on file at the present time. Please enter this information in the space provided below and return it to this department as soon as possible. Unless we have this information on your driver and chauffer's licence renewal cannot be sent out to you."

Now is this a fact? Does my honourable friend intend to refuse to send out the driver's or chauffer's licence unless they have this information? I filled out three or four of these in the office on Saturday. I have another one here now. And the question is: are they going to withhold sending out driver's or chauffer's licences until the information comes back?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not familiar with the letter to which the Honourable the Member for Gladstone makes reference. It is, however, a provision of the Highway Traffic Act that the date of birth of each person who has a driver's licence or a chauffer's licence be indicated and I would assume that this is to take care of cases where that information has not been given and if I'm correct in my assumption it would appear that the letter is a very normal sort of way in going about getting the information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK(Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. What studies have the Labour Research Division of the Department of Labour undertaken in 1966?

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would request the honourable member to make an Order of Return or better still I possibly could take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism. We have just had laid a very attractive publication on our desks. What form of distribution is planned for this publication, just through the information office or are you planning to send it around?

HON. STERLING R. LYON Q.C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'm glad my honourable friend has noticed this. I asked the staff to distribute this prestige brochure which has just been turned out by the Tourist Branch to all of the members. It's just available today and I thought the members should be the first to see it. This publication of which the Branch I think is rightfully proud displaying many of the aspects of life and recreation attraction in Manitoba will be circulated largely outside of the boundaries of our province. It's a prestige booklet as you can see with excellent photography in up-.....we hope, phases of Manitoba that perhaps some of us haven't really noticed before. The distribution, we hope, will be wide and it will be continuing over a number of years.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Russell; the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to allow this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave?

MR. SHOEMAKER: I wonder if my friend would object if anyone else proceeded at this time on the debate?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I intended to make a comment or two on the resolution that is before the House. I had hoped that my honourable friend would be speaking today so that I would be able to learn what the government's policy is in respect to the whole problem that is set out in the resolution that is before the House.

Now I have had to deal with this same question at many farm union meetings where I have been requested to attend and I have always taken this stand and I don't see any reason why I should change my position at this stage of the game. I generally start off by saying that we Liberals are noted as free traders and that we hope that eventually and sooner than later we will bring about freer trade throughout the world. The late President Kennedy was eagerly striving towards this end in the short period of time that he was President of the United States. I believe that all of the world, or nearly all of the world, recognized that he was doing a real service by promoting free trade and developing what he referred to as the ' Kennedy Round '. Every politician that I ever met, I believe, paid lip service to the cost-price squeeze. They just delighted in getting up at every farm meeting whether it was Farm Union meeting, M.F.A. or any other group where a number of farmers were assembled and pretend that they had a great sympathy for the farmer. They recognized that he was in fact caught in a cost-price squeeze and that they intended to do something to alleviate his problems.

Now just everybody understands that there are two avenues open to alleviate the squeeze. One would be to, by some means or another, reduce the cost of production on the one hand, or increase the price of his products on the other; and unless you can do one or the other, the squeeze is going to get a lot worse, unless you can do something about one or the other. Now it seems to me that little can be done. I know that efforts have been made, but little can be done to reduce the farmers' cost of production, his cost of doing business. I have stated before in this House at this Session that the farmer himself has amply demonstrated his ability to produce, and we have statistics to show that the farmer now is producing about 2 1/2 times what he did 15 years ago, and I have said that no other industry can boast of a production increase of this kind. Therefore he has done what he can do to alleviate the squeeze, and so it seems to me then that what we have to resort to is by some means or another getting more to the farmer for what he produces. Presently we're talking about wheat. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is not too great hope in the immediate future of increasing the world price of wheat. Canada in recent years has not had a problem selling wheat because Canadian wheat is the best wheat in the world. The world markets are not buying Canadian wheat because we

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd)....are a bunch of nice fellows, but it's because we've got the best wheat in the world. So therefore we are not presently having much trouble selling the wheat.

An interesting little article that I have before me - I'm going to read one paragraph because I think it does demonstrate the purpose of the London Agreement and the International Wheat Agreement, and here's what it has to say: "The purpose of the Wheat Agreement", and this is taken from a pamphlet in the library 'The World Wheat Problem and the London Agreement, 1934': "the primary purpose of the Wheat Agreement adopted at the London conference is stated in the preamble to the agreement as follows: To consider the measures which might be taken in concert to adjust the supply of wheat to effective world demand and eliminate the abnormal surpluses which have been depressing the wheat market and to bring about a rise and stabilization of prices at a level remunerative to producers and fair to consumers of bread stuffs." In one sentence, Mr. Speaker, in one sentence, it clearly sets out here the objectives that were laid down in 1934, that would if they could carry them out, solve the entire problem of price, price stabilization, markets, surpluses and everything else, and in 33 years after the agreement, we find that the farmer is still caught in this cost-price squeeze and the price stabilization that they were seeking 33 years ago has not yet been effected. And so, it seems to me that the only way that we can do anything about it is the two-price system.

Now, when people talk about a two-price system, I think they should say what they mean by a two-price system - in their terms. What do they mean when they're talking about a two-price system. And here's what I have said at Farm Union meetings - the way I interpret a two-price system is one that would be something like this: Every farmer I think knows - a lot of other people do as well - that we hope to produce in Canada something like 600 million bushels of wheat. We know that we export roughly 70 percent of that, or thereabouts. I think the last figures put out by the Wheat Board show that the home consumption is in the neighborhood of 150 million bushels, so if you grew 600 million bushels, then you would be exporting exactly three quarters, and the home consumption would amount to one-quarter. Now, of the 150 million bushels that is home consumed, there's only about 50 million that is eaten by the people - human consumption amounts to roughly 50 million; that is, apparently about 100 million is used for feeding to animals. Now, I don't think that the two-price system should apply to what we feed to livestock; that is, a two-price system would only have to apply to the human consumption - to the 50 million bushels, in other words. I suggest that if - call it a subsidy if you like - but if we could charge another dollar a bushel for the human consumption, for the 50 million bushels that's eaten in Canada, it would produce \$50 million - that's simple figuring. Then you would have \$50 million which to distribute to the growers, and I suggest that they should distribute the \$50 million by paying each and every farmer say, a subsidy on the first thousand bushels that he produces, and thereby the little farmer would benefit. The great big farmer has clearly demonstrated that he is pretty well able to look after himself by virtue of the fact that he's big. It's the little fellow that you have to be concerned about. My honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture says that the big farmers haven't been able to look after themselves - shaking his hand here. I say they have and I don't feel too sorry for the fellow that --(Interjection)--They can do better! Well, some of the great big farmers are doing fairly good. But it's the little fellow that's really our problem, so pay him -- (Interjection)--The Family Farm.

So, here's my proposition. I think my honourable friends understand my position --I'm speaking for myself, Mr. Speaker - and it seems to me that here is a way that we could more than to pay lip service to some of the farmers that are hard pressed, and we've got plenty of them that are hard pressed. My honourable friend the First Minister has said on more than one occasion, more than one occasion, that only 6,000 farmers out of 40,000 have a net income of \$4,000.00. My honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer repeated that very same words in the budget speech and I guess that every politician will repeat those words out on the hustings on many many occasions, because we on this side of the House delight in repeating what the First Minister says in this regard because it supports what we have been saying for quite a long time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the House for the privilege of speaking in this debate, and hope that I can encourage the House to support the resolution as it now stands. Let's do something more than pay lip service to these hard-pressed farmers. In Manitoba apparently we've got 34,000 of them earning less than \$4,000 a year.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable Member for Rock Lake has leave to allow that resolution to stand.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Can I ask the honourable gentleman a question? It's rather interesting - it's the first time I've heard anybody mention a suggested price. Could the member in suggesting a dollar extra, give us some idea of how much this would bring in revenue to the average small farmer?

MR. SHOEMAKER: I thought I'd explained that in detail. Did I not? I said that I would suggest paying this \$50 million - it would produce \$50 million, you understand that? Then pay this \$50 million out to every western producer based on 1,000 bushel, the first thousand bushel delivered. That is, if a man only produced 2,000 bushel, he would be paid the subsidy on 1,000 bushel; if he produced half a million bushel, he would still get his subsidy on the first thousand bushels delivered. Now, I thought my honourable friend was going to say what will this do to the consumer, and I'll tell you that one too, because I might as well make - this will be considered the same speech I hope. --(Interjection)-- I'm answering a question. I'm giving my answer to the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I believe the Honourable Member for Gladstone did answer the honourable gentleman's question and then he developed another question in his own mind which he was proceeding to answer. So I think we'll proceed from there. Order, please.

MR. BEARD: A subsequent question. Maybe I'm a little dense, but how much would this give the average small farmer is what I - on a yearly basis? --(Interjection)--Tis not to the consumer, to the farmer.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, in doing some calculating here between 2 o'clock and 2:30, it would appear that it would mean roughly 25¢ per bushel on a thousand bushel, and it would give him \$250.00. You can take the figures yourself from the Wheat Board and figure it out, but that's what it would look like, calculating that there are in western Canada or in Canada, something like 200,000 farmers, 200,000 farmers in western Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly the honourable gentlemen could get together on some other occasion and work it out.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the honourable member a question? How will it affect the consumer? I'm interested

MR. SHOEMAKER: Thanks. I was delighted - I wanted this fellow to ask me the question, but I want to thank my honourable friend for asking that question. I checked with our local baker in Neepawa, and he says that there is not more than three cents worth of wheat in a loaf of bread - not more, there could be less - so that if you doubled the price of wheat then for home consumption, this would mean what? - there's six cents worth of wheat in a loaf of bread. So, by that token, it should not increase the price of bread by more than three cents - that's the most that it would increase the price of bread, three cents a loaf. There'd be no excuse for them increasing it more than three cents a loaf; and surely, surely this is a pretty easy way for we to pay the farmer a subsidy.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution, the Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, for the same reason I would like this matter to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I would ask to have the House let it stand please.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. George; and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Highways in amendment thereto. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, we would ask this matter to stand but if anyone else wishes to speak, we wouldn't have any objections.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface; the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Burrows in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I'll be very brief on this one because so much has been said and I have on previous occasions spoken to this resolution. All I wanted to say is by a comment made by the Premier a few weeks back, that it seems to be that the tradition of the conservative party is just about to be broken. And I'll await the comment that the Premier is going to make as I understand, I thought - maybe I'm wrong but I thought he was very anxious to get up the other day when I moved this resolution.

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd).....

We know that the members opposite, the members of the conservative party have been very conservative whenever it came to liberalization of the franchise in the Province of Manitoba and that's the way they dealt with this resolution. It also seems to me that the Premier is starting just a little bit to relent. I kind of see a wee crack in the armour just appearing and I hope that I understood him correctly when he did get up before. Maybe now those who know him better will disagree with me, because we all know that the Premier on many occasions has a habit of playing on words, so until I actually hear the amendment, if there is any on his speech, I have some doubts. But I wonder where the backbenchers are going to stand. Most of the backbenchers probably now would have to take an abrupt about turn because as usual they follow the leader and some of them had strong convictions in this regard in the past and even in this session. I read an important, I'll say an interesting little article, just last year and it concerns the figure number 7. Probably some of the people knew, and it refers to a superstition of the multiple of 7's. It seems that in the middle ages people believed in the multiple of 7. It was kind of a superstition to believe that the first 7 years of a boy belonged to the mother, the mother was supposed to bring him up, and in the next 7 years, from 7 to 14 the boy became a page, he was responsible to certain duties. Then from the year 14 to 21, the next 7 years, the boy was becoming of age, and I hope that the people across are not superstitious this time and will discard this magic number 7 and support this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I'll just take a moment to indicate that I for one think this ought to go to a vote and I'm looking forward with interest to the amendment which the Honourable the First Minister indicated he was preparing to present following the adoption of this present amendment. I gathered him to say that he was in support of it and I think that this means that we will make some rapid strides.

I presume that the Honourable the First Minister has located his copy of the election Bill which has been lying around gathering dust somewhere. It is a Bill which if you will recall, Mr. Speaker, we dealt with up to the last moment and it was suddenly - well the committee was never called back to complete it. A great deal of work has gone into it and I think we ought to go ahead with it. I'm only afraid that we may come up with an amendment that will result in a commission being set up to study the problems and the responsibilities of the opportunities for youth and that the whole principle which is pretty simply set forward in this resolution will become lost or mired down in some complicated issue; so that I'm looking forward to this matter being proceeded with in a direct fashion and I hope that the amendment will be accepted by the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I too, will be very brief on this but I would like to make a comment or two in connection with the amendment and the further resolve parts. I think the first resolve under the amendment is a very good one that we institute a program of instruction dealing with the structure, function and operation of all levels of government in Canada. I personally would endorse this very much because I feel that this is essential and that we need a program of this type. I think too many of our young people are not aware of the function of government and therefore anything we can do in this direction would be very worth while.

On the second resolve which will ask the federal government to bring the voting age down to 18 as well, I'm not quite sure whether I particularly go to the 18 years in particular. I would rather like to see that we have a uniform voting age across this country and since the provinces to the west have a voting age of 19, I think if we had a gradual reduction and came to a level that would be the same for all provincial governments and the federal governments would be desirable. And therefore I will support the amendment but as I have said, it needn't be exactly 18.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? We are dealing with the amendment of the Honourable Member for Burrows.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Now the main motion. Are you ready for the question? As amended...

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, before you put the main motion as amended I would like to adjourn the debate, seconded by the Honourable Provincial Treasurer.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Carillon.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, may I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, in his absence may we have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution, the Honourable Member of La Verendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): May we have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): May I have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker? If anybody else wishes to speak it's fine.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: I would also wish to have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker, but if anybody wishes to speak they may do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, by leave may I have this matter stand. If anyone else wishes to proceed they may do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make it plain that I'm closing the debate so that if anybody else wishes to speak, I'm prepared by leave to have them do so. If not I'm prepared to close the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave?

MR. GREEN: I'm going to proceed then, Mr. Speaker. Today I just wanted to indicate that I would permit another to speak if they wanted to but if they don't want to I'm prepared to close the debate right now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I think I can be fairly brief in closing this debate. We of this party are very pleased to have the indicated support of the members of the Liberal Party with regard to this particular resolution. We think that the resolution expresses a position on which all parties of the House are agreed, and in support of our thinking in this regard, Mr. Speaker, we seem to have the agreement as to the contents of the resolution by the Honourable the Minister of Labour who somehow still indicates that although the government can find no fault with the content of the resolution, it intends to vote against it. And it arrives at this rather paradoxical situation by suggesting that there have been no situations in Manitoba which give rise to the necessity of passing this type of resolution. We listened to the Minister of Labour with great interest and immediately after he spoke I thought my honourable friend the Member for St. John's properly answered the Minister as to the contents of his particular talk. The Honourable Member for St. John's said that the Minister of Labour said nothing in opposition to the resolution, smiled benignly at the members on this side of the House for apparently trying to help him manage his department, but indicated that the government found no reason for the passing of the resolution.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to reiterate what the resolution says, and I'm sure that the government agrees with these things. First of all "that whereas it is the intention of the Manitoba Legislature that during the negotiations concerning a collective agreement there shall be no strikes or lock-outs and that the employer should not alter working conditions or rates of wages for the purpose of improving his bargaining position." The Minister of Labour and all members of the House agree with that. Secondly, "whereas this Legislature recognizes the impracticality of trying to ascertain the motive of an employer in changing working conditions." And the Minister of Labour and I think everybody else in the House apparently agrees with that. "Therefore be it resolved that during negotiations pursuant to the Labour Relations Act, the employer be prohibited from altering wages or working conditions without first obtaining the approval of the employees through their bargaining agent." The Minister of Labour doesn't say anything in opposition to that and the Members of the Liberal Party

(MR. GREEN cont'd)... apparently, through their spokesman the Honourable Member for Selkirk, also indicate that they agree with that.

But despite this unanimous agreement on the contents of the resolution the Minister of Labour appears to indicate - and I hope that this has been improper or incorrectly conveyed to me - that the government will not support this resolution. And he says that there is no problem. Well Mr. Speaker, let me say first of all that if the Minister of Labour says there is no problem, then he can't be aware of what is happening in his Department and in the field of industrial relations in this province generally.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the fact that there is no immediate problem is irrelevant. If that were so - and I don't suggest that it is so - but if that were so, that the Minister recognize that there is a section of the Act which if a situation arose would not properly fulfill his objectives for good management-labour relations in this province that he would correct that section? And I hear, and I use his words: "I'm trying to help them correct the situation." And apparently he says, "Thank you, but no thank you." These are the remarks that he apparently made.

Mr. Speaker, did the Minister adopt the same attitude when he was a member of this government -- and I don't think that he was the Minister of Labour at the time, I believe it was the present Minister of Welfare who was the Minister of Labour -- when the management groups came to the government and said that there must be a law in this province permitting us to sue trade unions, a law making trade unions legal entities? And they were challenged, both the management group and the government was challenged to produce a single instance of an employer having a cause of action against a trade union whereby the employer suffered and could not recover his loss by suing that trade union. We challenged them to show a single instance where this occurred, and, Mr. Speaker, if memory serves me correctly and I think that it does, there wasn't one employer who was able to show one situation where he had suffered by virtue of somehow not being able to recover damages against a trade union. Because in fact, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't the case. Not only were they unable to show this but on the contrary it was demonstrated that cases had proceeded against trade unions and recoveries were made. But nevertheless there was no problem. But the government apparently saw what they thought - and I disagree with them - what they thought was an inequity in the law and they corrected it. They see the same inequity in the law at the present time but they say that they will take no steps to correct it.

I say, Mr. Speaker, the existence or non-existence of an immediate problem is irrelevant. But even if it was relevant, may I advise the Minister that there is abundant problems in this particular area of labour-management disputes and that he must know of them. As Minister of that Department he must know of these problems. My honourable friend and colleague, the Member for Kildonan, indicated some of the problems that have existed, and if they have not been sufficiently demonstrated to the Minister let me indicate several others.

Mr. Speaker, I have a letter in my hand on the stationery of the Province of Manitoba, Department of Labour. I admit it's rather ancient history. It goes back to December 23rd, 1959. At that time I was a member of a Conciliation Board that was looking into an employer-employee situation involving a company which I won't name because that certainly is irrelevant. That company behaved in a certain way and as a result of it the Conciliation Board was unable to effect a collective agreement between the parties. Let's look what the then Deputy Minister of Labour said. He also said, "Thank you, Mr. Green." He said, "At the outset I wish to say that I believe my Minister and the Department owe you a debt of gratitude." Well I'll give them an opportunity to repay the debt right now. "They owe you a debt of gratitude for the trouble to which you have gone in assessing this situation and making the comments which you have embodied in your memorandum. I would not at this point presume to say what will be done in connection with the problem that you raise but it is a distinct service to the Minister of Labour to have the point set out in order and to have the situation measured against the statutory obligations of parties under the Labour Relations Act. Possibly the operation of the Act could be improved, and it may be that you feel that amendments to the Act itself or alterations in the administration of the Act in respect of enforcement could deal effectively with this problem and should be studied." So at that time the Department apparently invited amendments and, Mr. Speaker, the debt of gratitude is now being repaid. I'm suggesting the amendments. At that time, Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Minister asked me to present my views on this subject but immediately or shortly thereafter an Enquiry Commission was appointed headed by Morris Arpin, Q.C., a name well known to this government and to this House.

(MR. GREEN cont'd)....He enquired into the problem and made certain recommendations and I believe that the government was unable to do anything about them. So I'm now suggesting, Mr. Minister, maybe belatedly but there was reason for it, but here is an amendment which would in some way correct that problem. That's one case.

In another case, Mr. Speaker, which the Minister of Labour is aware of and which he can only remember because what he says is in an unlawful strike took place. That the Plasterers' Union, members of their union refused to work for somebody for \$1.75 an hour went to somebody else for \$1.85 an hour, or a ten cent differential, I believe it was \$2.75 and \$2.85, or figures comparable, and were held to have engaged in an unlawful strike. That's all that they remember about that situation. But during that very situation the Minister of Labour should be aware that while the parties were negotiating each member of the Plasterer's Union working for a certain employer, who I again won't name, found an extra five cents in their pay envelope and this led to, and I suggest contributed to in great measure what the Minister calls an unlawful strike. And they weren't prohibited from doing it according to the present law. Because when they came to a lawyer with that problem - and the lawyer will go unnamed - and they were told that there was an extra five cents in their pay envelope the lawyer said it would be impossible to prove that that five cents was given to you for the purpose of impairing the bargaining position of the Plasterers' Union, that the employer would be quite free to say that he gave it to you because he thought you deserved five cents an hour more and nobody could challenge him. So that's the plasterers' case which my honourable friend remembers as an illegal strike but doesn't remember as a violation of the Labour Relations Act by the employer.

Another case, Mr. Speaker, involving the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America where the employer pleaded guilty to altering the terms and conditions of the employees of his -- during negotiation paid, I believe, a hundred dollar fine and has never bargained with his union since, despite repeated attempts by the union and repeated attempts by the union to have him bargain with them and repeated attempts by the union to get the Department of Labour to do something about it. And they refused to do something about it. They apparently took the position that through a hundred dollar fine he can buy away the obligations which he has under the Labour Relations Act.

If the Minister will look at the Canadian Brownsteel Tank Report made by Judge Lindal he will see that Judge Lindal suggested that in that case there was a departure from the standard pattern of operations of the company, a change of working conditions which was a violation of the Act. And I venture to say that when the government lawyers read Judge Lindal's report that they said, "Well there may have been a violation of the Act in this regard but it's no use prosecuting because the way the Act is now worded we'll never get a conviction." My honourable friend the Minister can check whether or not that's what they told him because they never prosecuted under that provision. They prosecuted Canadian Brownsteel Tank for refusing to employ people, contrary to the Act. But they never prosecuted them for changing working conditions and Judge Lindal's report said that they did exactly that. But the present section wouldn't permit a prosecution. And, Mr. Speaker, there are many more cases. Numerous unions have approached me on the basis of the present Act and I have told them, and the Minister can check with his lawyers, can check with the Attorney-General, that we won't get very far with the way in which the Act is presently worded.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind the members of the House that I'm not suggesting that this Labour Relations Act is the way to achieve satisfactory labour-management relations. I'm not suggesting that an employer shouldn't be able to raise wages or lower wages at any time or to change working conditions at any time. I'm not suggesting that he should do it, but on the other hand I'm not suggesting that it be illegal for him to do it. It may be his perfect right to do it. The only reason we have a statute is to compensate the employees for the rights that have been taken away from them, that is to leave their employment and appeal for public support. And once you take that right away from the employee, that is the right to leave employment and appeal for public support which is a right that these employees had before the Act was passed, once you remove that right from the employees you must remove equal and compensatory rights from the employer. The Act makes a show of doing this but it doesn't do it.

I want to help the Minister out. I wish he's accept my help. He asked for it, or his predecessors asked for it. Now they're getting it. Mr. Speaker, I think that it's a very unusual situation that we haven't had one person in this House speak against what is contained in this resolution. Everybody agrees with it. We have demonstrated by ample practical examples that a change in the law is necessary. Everybody agrees with the changes that have been

(MR. GREEN cont'd)...suggested. There is no reason why this resolution should not be given affirmative support by the members of this House. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER put the question.

MR. CHERNIACK: Recorded vote, please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Recorded vote?

MR. CHERNIACK: Yeas and Nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is voting on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Clement, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Fox, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Kawchuk, Miller, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Roblin, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney, Mrs. Forbes and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 22; Nays, 30.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost. The adjourned on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan and the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party in further amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, could I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, can I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): May we have this stand, Mr. Speaker?

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

MR. PAULLEY: May I have this stand, Mr. Speaker, please?

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I have leave of the House to allow this matter to stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, when the Honourable Member for Gladstone had spoken on his resolution I thought he had pretty well said everything that had to be said on it, but when the Honourable Member of the New Democratic Party, the Member for Kildonan, felt called upon to deplore some of the expressions and some of the thoughts of the Honourable Member for Gladstone, I felt, Mr. Speaker that I should take a small part in this debate.

Now, the Honourable Member for Gladstone is saying in effect that he believes that the Boundaries Commission is not the proper body to decide on the location of the proposed ten vocational schools to be located throughout the province, and he went to some length to document his case. I believe it wouldn't be far off the mark if I were to add to that by saying that this is a proper function of the Department of Education, and because it may involve some thorny choices, the government, the Premier and the Cabinet have saw fit to hide behind an appointed body who don't have to answer to the electorate. Now this department in the coming year is calling on the taxpayers for \$119 million. The department themselves have built up a staff of research people and qualified people in the senior civil service, and the Minister himself has some experience by now in this field, and surely this department of government have the qualifications - I don't know if the Minister has the courage, but certainly the department

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd)...have the qualifications - to make the choice based on their own research and their own studies.

What alarms some people in this province, Mr. Speaker, is the manner in which the Boundaries Commission was chosen, the fact that they are working part-time, they are treating their duties as part-time duties. I understand the chairman receives \$12,000 a year for a part-time job. The legal counsel and others are receiving healthy stipends, indeed so are the members, and it is a part-time operation as far as they are concerned; yet this government has made much of the fact that they consider education to be a matter of the highest priority; yet we have heard a public pronouncement by the Chairman of the Boundaries Commission where he intends to take some years before turning in a complete report, and certainly a good deal of time before turning in a preliminary report in this regard. So that the honourable member for Gladstone's contention, which he documented well, is certainly valid, and I think that the government should at least stand up and tell us what their reasons are for taking this action.

I believe the Member for Gladstone referred to the fact that the Boundaries Commission was heavily weighted with former candidates of the Conservative side in the last election, and I took the trouble to count them up, and out of the 14 members there are four of them that fit into this category. Out of the other ten, there are people who are well recognized as particularly good friends of this government. Now, are we going to receive political decisions based on expediency, based on loyalty to the Premier and his group? - I'm afraid we are, Mr. Speaker.

I would like for a moment to review the history of the appointment of the Boundaries Commission. On July 29, 1966 - the month after the election - the former Minister of Municipal Affairs was named Chairman and he made the statement, the statement was made in the press release, that an immediate start was being made following the swearing-in ceremonies. In other words, this commission was going to be named and they were going to get right down to work. That was on July 29th. On August 22nd, another press release, and the heading is: "A powerful Boundaries Commission is named. Members experienced in local government affairs." Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the "powerful" would be relating to their political prowess or their qualifications in the field of education, I'm not too certain. However, that release came out in the following month. On August 26th, another press release came out, and the heading is: "Boundaries Commission is geared for action." Geared for action - geared for action. It didn't say what the action was, but at that time they divided into two sub-committees, one on the sites of schools and the other on the local government boundaries.

Mr. Speaker, during the election that took place in Portage la Prairie, much was made last June of the fact that if you were not on the government side, you'd better look out, you'd better be pretty careful on how you cast your vote. Mr. Speaker, I come back to my contention that the political make-up of this Boundaries Commission leads many people in this province to be rather suspicious, especially in view of what took place in some of the constituencies in the last election.

I have here in my hand an ad that was authorized by the local Conservative Association. I'd like to read it to you so that members who had not seen this ad would know that there was certain implications built into the election of some of the candidates for the Conservative Government. It says in the first line, and it's outlined in heavy black print, it says between the first two heavily printed lines: "Figure it out for yourself. Governments build roads. Governments build parks. Governments build vocational schools. And it's tough to get these projects for Portage if you're sitting with the opposition. On June 23rd get with government, sit with Duff Roblin and share Manitoba's growth". And in large print: "Read between the lines". Well, Mr. Speaker, can people be questioned for looking askance at the Boundaries Commission, their lack of action to date and the political make-up of that same commission? Mr. Speaker, people who are concerned with education, namely school boards and local councils and what not, are endeavoring to find out information on what they should be doing; whether they should be presenting briefs; whether they should be lobbying - if that's the correct word; whether they should be appearing before this commission, or whether they're going to be called before the commission. Some of these bodies are trying to find out.

I have a clipping here from the Portage Graphic where it notes that members of the Portage School Board had gone into Winnipeg on December 1, 1966, and had an interview with

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd)...the Chairman of the Boundaries Commission to endeavour to find out what the possibilities were for the area that they were responsible for in the education field, and through a very carefully guarded conversation on the Minister, or the ex-Minister's part, the Chairman's part, it was partly revealed that Portage had a very good chance. It was also partly revealed that Dauphin stood a very good chance.

My honourable friend from Kildonan here deplored the fact that the Member for Gladstone when he opened the debate - Seven Oaks - when the Member for Gladstone opened the debate and said that he had people who had told him that they had heard and other members of the Boundaries Commission state definitely that the constituency that he represented would not be getting a school and that another constituency represented by the Honourable the Leader of our Party, that constituency would not be getting a school. Mr. Speaker, when you add up all these bits of information and evidence, it leads one to wonder what the outcome is going to be of the final locations of these schools. I would like to suggest to the Minister of Education that he take his responsibilities and him and his department do what they were put there to do and that is to look after the educational needs of the province and not take a particularly thorny problem and push it off to a commission. Surely the department can tell with some certainty and some knowledge where the majority of these schools will be going, so that the school boards will know where they stand in their future planning. Surely this is not too difficult to arrive at. I would be the first to agree that there may be in the last analysis, where the last one, two or three schools would go that there would be some difficulties in making the final decision, but surely the school boards of this province who are being asked to co-operate with the government and promote the program of the single schools division, the single board's division, should be taken into some confidence as to where the proposed locations of these schools are going. Surely in a province of less than a million people, where half the people are congregated in one large community, surely in the other centres in this province it is not that difficult to decide on the population growth and the trade patterns, the patterns of the roads of this province - it is not that difficult a job that it should be farmed out or sent out to a commission that is largely political in character, and when they go to invite submissions, certainly this is going to be in the minds of people who will be appearing before them to make the submission.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I hadn't meant to enter the debate at this time but I think that it would be only proper to review with the members some of the reasons for the action of the government last year in bringing in the Boundaries Commission under Bill No. 16 which I believe received the support of my honourable friend who has just spoken and his colleagues and indeed this legislature, as an impartial way and method of bringing about a thorough examination of the several factors involved in the location and the pattern which Manitoba should follow in developing a vocational high school pattern.

I would point out at the beginning that the resolution when it refers under one whereas, students are now obliged to attend training or technical vocational training in Brandon or Winnipeg, these institutions at Brandon, Winnipeg and The Pas as we know are trade and technological institutes which cater to the post-secondary level, the child or the person who has completed a formal course of high school training, whether it be grade 9, 10, 11 or 12, then goes to either through a trade training, pre-employment trade or technology. We have electrical technology at Brandon and which we saw, mining technology at The Pas and twelve technologies at our M.I.T. I want first of all to make it fully understood what we're talking about. We're talking about vocational high schools and the pattern that should follow. As members recall when we were examining this we had some apprehensions because of the pattern which education is following in this part of the world, vis a vis Ontario and other provinces, and we decided there should be some instrument that would do the necessary research to determine population trends, school densities and so on. Certainly we had a tremendous amount of this information, and have in the Department of Education, but it was felt this should be pooled together. Concurrently with that were the discussions of a standing committee of the House on municipal boundaries and it was thought rather than have a municipal boundaries commission and a school boundaries commission we should combine the two. I think this was a wise move and we all endorsed that concept and we said to this commission, your priority is education, look at the Interlake under this pilot ARDA deal and look at the divisions around the province toward the possible grouping of divisions, 3 or 5 divisions whatever the case may be, for the purpose of meeting special educational needs, because divisions can group together for providing facilities for the retarded, to get enough children together for proper age grouping or what have you, and so on. And also as an instrument to provide

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd). . . . vocational high school opportunities, because at that time if you recall, the expert committee that I've had involving people from Ontario who had had experience, plus Dr. Ford, the federal head of the technical-vocational program in Ottawa, plus our own local Manitoba people and departmental people, advised me at that time that we should build institutes with a minimum of 750 high school students on a regional basis, possibly up to 8 or 10 would be required to meet our population needs. To build them too small would be a mistake; that possibly if this was done they would share in residences at such residential institutions.

So faced with these recommendations the Boundaries Commission lent itself as the instrument to form these regions, that's why it was formed, and that's why this matter was referred to it. And secondly, we wanted a little more research in this area to be done. They have taken over and welded the material and knowledge in municipal affairs and other departments with that of the department of education, and I hope and understand are doing a very thorough job in this area. I regret that some may think we're lacking courage or hiding behind some commission. Certainly I can't as Minister take responsibility for the kind of advertisement my honourable friend has just read to the House. I hadn't seen that before. Certainly I have made no commitments or said anything in this regard. I feel it's a matter which is of far too great public importance to do other than to do what is absolutely educationally sound and in the public interest. This is a major breakthrough in Manitoba in education to branch into this field and we've got a golden opportunity to do the right thing. Insofar as I am concerned, educationally, I want to see the very best possible thing done by the boys and girls of this province. I regret very much that a member -- if a member of this boundaries commission has said something to the Honourable Member from Neepawa or he's overheard it or knows of this person, I'll be the first one to demand his resignation, on the spot.

I also claim that there's nothing wrong with you and I being defeated some day and sitting on a commission. I think my Honourable Member from Portage or any member that sat in this House has an awful lot of horse sense in the grass roots that can well rub off on commissions like that and I don't think we should classify ourselves in the future as second class citizens in any sense of the word. I have confidence in the research staff of the commission; I have confidence in these men on the commission as outstanding Manitobans. Heavens, one of the members of a commission from my area ran against me as an NDP in 1958. This man is picked and I'm sure chosen for his intimate knowledge of municipal and other affairs and I have every confidence in his sound judgment. But these men are going to have to depend on what are the facts, where are the kids, where are the people, what is educationally sound and advisable.

We in the department could certainly have many ideas as to where these schools should be but maybe there are facts we're overlooking. We want to be sure of that. Certainly the educational advantages of the different types of vocational schools and training must be made known to the commission and that is what the experts in my department will be required to do. Right at the present time and over the past few months our people have been discussing these matters amongst themselves preparing I think to advise the commission, the boundaries commission, as to the educational preference of one type of vocational program or school over another.

I would point out to honourable members that in general terms my understanding is that in Ontario for example they've built a large number of vocational additions but they didn't have the general course as we have developed it here. So when you hear the figure of 50 or 60 percent of the boys and girls in Ontario attending vocational school, it's because maybe there's only the two course pattern - they're either in university entrance or they're in a vocational course with a varied amount of academic We are tending to develop as you know the university entrance course, the pure general course which is academic, the combination of which, I hope, will lead to university in the not too distant future or possibly the general course itself which is an excellent course, but designed obviously for a different purpose than the university entrance. We will have the occupational entrance course which will have a certain high vocational content and we will have the vocational course proper which we anticipate as half general course and half vocational - that is in time in the school room. We're looking at these matters and it is not an easy matter to resolve, but I do hope that the pattern that we'll come up with will be recommended to us in the first instance as a priority area. I imagine in the Interlake, and then the regions will be established and sites chosen or a pattern recommended to the government. The government can't alter that. It can send it back for

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd)re-examination but at this stage we're looking at both the regional concept and the composite and it may very well be that we need a combination of both. But this is a complex matter and I do trust that we will do the right thing in this regard.

So I would say to the members opposite, despite their reservations, I want to give every assurance that insofar as the department is concerned, we hope to give solid recommendations educationally to the commission as to the pattern of education in our province as we see it, what we think is best for the child as to the size of schools in which proper vocational programs can be instituted, what the difference between regional schools and composite schools are and ask them to bring us forward a plan based on all the known factors in an area. To do other than this could on the other hand lead to the same charges of political matters and I would hope the members of this House would feel that we want our educational system to stand on its own integrity and not horsing around with any nonsense. So Mr. Chairman, on that basis I would have to vote against this resolution at this time. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few comments in connection with the resolution that we're debating at the present time, that of removing the jurisdiction of the Boundaries Commission the right to determine the location of new vocational training schools.

Mr. Speaker, I've stated this before and I will reiterate it again that I'm opposed to the principle of appointing commissions to doing the type of work as this particular commission is supposed to do. I have stated this on previous occasions and I still hold to that view. I think if we need a committee or a commission of this type it should be a committee of the House, of members of this Legislature. If the government does not want to take on or assume the obligation or responsibilities of this type, certainly it should be the members of this House to decide on matters of this type. And as has been pointed out and demonstrated, otherwise the resolutions would not be before us, that this commission, the members of this commission do not enjoy the confidence of a number of members of this House, and I think this is a serious matter especially if they're supposed to decide where we will build the rest of the technical-vocational schools in this province. I think and I believe that the government should have appointed a committee of this House to deal with this matter. This would then allow for public representation to be made to the committee; people of the various areas of this province could make their views known to this committee, and in turn the committee could also get the necessary information from the department, from other sources and to gain a proper decision.

Then, too, I think it should be a matter of all political parties of this House and not as has been pointed out that probably this is a commission, the members of whom are defeated candidates of the government side. They claim the commission to be political. Certainly members of this House belong to different political parties and they make the laws of this province. Surely they should be able to decide on matters of this type.

We hear the charges by the Member for Gladstone that a certain member of the commission says that certain areas of this province, because they have members in this House other than from the Government side, they will therefore not receive consideration or will not receive vocational schools in their areas. Why isn't the government pressing this charge? I'm just wondering why. Certainly if this charge is fact, and I have no reason to doubt the honourable member who made this charge, then the government should definitely go after this; they shouldn't just leave it as a matter of minor importance. I think this is a very important matter in my opinion and this should be pressed and not left hanging in the air, and I have a hunch if they don't press it that they know who the guilty party is but just won't do anything about it.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege -- it's a matter of privilege. Either that statement is retracted or I want an apology.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I think, and I'm speaking mainly of the resolved part of this resolution, that is that this matter should not be

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if the Honourable Member for Rhineland heard the request of the Minister -- or the remarks that the Minister made a moment ago.

MR. FROESE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think they're serious. If they really believe what they say then they should

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, can a member impute that statement of another member?

MR. SPEAKER: In listening to the Honourable Member for Rhineland and the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, I wonder if the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie intended it to be a charge.

MR. JOHNSTON: May I address you on a point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, to my question.

MR. JOHNSTON: I make the charge that in view of the election propoganda that was used in the constituency of Portage la Prairie in the last election, that this government has not got the right to make political appointees to work of this importance, and that is my charge.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I was not referring to the Honourable Member for Portage, I was referring to the charge made by the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JOHNSON: I would ask that the record be examined and see what he said.

MR. SPEAKER: Could the matter rest at that point? Does that satisfy the Honourable Member for Rhineland or does he wish to proceed in the remarks that he has been making thus far.

MR. FROESE: That's quite all right with me.

MR. SPEAKER: Beg pardon?

MR. FROESE: That will be satisfactory to me. I'm sure that I would like to check the records as well, but the charge was made here at that time and nothing happened as a result, and certainly I, as a member of this House, would like to know what the score is.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure the Honourable Member for Rhineland -- I appreciate his opinion and he has indicated that he would prefer to check the records before he goes any further in the comments that he was making a few moments ago and probably continue his address.

MR. FROESE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was close to the conclusion of my remarks, because as I have mentioned here I feel that this should have been a Committee of this House to look after this matter and not go to a Commission of the type that we have appointed. I certainly intend to support the resolution, the resolved part of it, because I'm not so interested in the various whereases and certainly the resolved part is what I was speaking on.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

..... continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Seven Oaks the other day or a week or so ago stated the position that we in this group are going to take on this resolution, but I think in view of the length of time that has transpired that it might be as well for me just to restate the position of this group in respect of this resolution and that is in opposition to the resolution as proposed by the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, sitting back and listening to the arguments that have been proposed and opposed during this debate, it's really been quite interesting because on one hand we hear that the Commission was appointed as a political commission and nothing more or less, and of course being in that frame of mind - a political commission - of course all of the decisions will be in favour of the government that appointed the Commission.

On the other hand, however, the suggestions which have been made in the debate by some members in opposition to the Boundaries Commission is that we should have it within the House and that we should decide in this House. Well, we had a vote here just a few moments ago as to a decision of what should transpire in this House or on a matter - and it was a political decision, may I suggest - and the politicians who happened to be in the majority in this House made their decision one way or the other. I'm not reflecting particularly on the vote, Mr. Speaker, but using the fact of votes in a Legislative Assembly as indicative of how matters turn out in any case.

The only alternative might be that rather than the government appoint a Commission, it has been suggested that this House, being comprised as it is of various parties, should appoint the Commission and the personnel. Again I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the same result would be to the fore, that the majority still would be the group that said who was going to be on a Commission that would have to work outside of the House. So it really doesn't matter does it, Mr. Speaker, insofar as the political connotations are concerned, at least in my opinion.

Now actually what does the resolution say. It says, "Therefore be it resolved that the Government of Manitoba immediately remove from the jurisdiction of the Boundaries Commission the right to determine the location of such new vocational training schools, and without delay, and solely on the basis of the greatest need, determine and announce to the people of Manitoba, such new locations." Now my friend from Portage behind me says, "Hear, hear." Now in whose opinion, Mr. Speaker, are we going to arrive -- if the motion is adopted, whose opinion is going to be the opinion to decide on the basis of the greatest need. If we're afraid of the Boundaries Commission as set up making political decisions, I think I'd be a little more in favour of giving them the right to make the decision than I would this government on the basis of greatest need, because I'm sure - I'm sure in my own mind that if the members opposite were the Commission, based on the greatest need, they would have a nice little conclave between themselves and possibly the Honourable Minister of Agriculture will now say, "Boys, I think maybe the proper place would be out in Stonewall"; and the Honourable Minister of Education would come along and say, "Well now look boys, I think maybe Gimli is the better place"; and St. Vital and so on; and even my friend the Honourable Member for Springfield might think that Oakbank would be the best location for a vocational high school.

So then I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that would be the net result if this motion is adopted. Solely on the basis of the greatest need, the party who will decide where the greatest need is to be will be the political party that happens to be in power at the time. We got away from this type of gerrymandering, may I suggest - and this could almost be comparable insofar as electoral divisions are concerned - by the setting up of an independent Commission, or a Commission that is slightly different than this I agree, Mr. Speaker, but the basic principle I suggest is relative to this.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that all of the arguments that have been made in the House on this resolution since it was first introduced, we in this group are still of the opinion that we'd prefer to take a chance, on the basis of need of the locations, on a Commission. It's true, Mr. Chairman, that in many respects that the members of the present Boundaries Committee could have been and are defeated candidates of previous elections, but the government did, if I recall correctly, broaden the scope a little bit. I believe that there is one fellow who was once a candidate for the New Democratic Party in an election up in the constituency of Gimli and I believe that - maybe this was a national affiliation rather than political that put him on the Commission - you know this accusation could be made. I also believe -- (Interjection) -- he understands now. I also am of the opinion that there may have been one or two present or former Liberals in the whole Commission, whether this was for a reason or otherwise, I'm not going to

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) state here this afternoon.

But basically again, Mr. Speaker, the only reason for me rising, it appeared as though this matter was coming to a vote and I wanted to reaffirm our position - certainly no love for the government, certainly of necessity no particular love for all of the members of the Commission - but we would rather take a chance on a Commission, and on that Commission really looking at needs, than to give it to the politicians who happen to be in the majority at the present time.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I feel that I have to say something in respect of this resolution because I think I was the individual in municipal affairs when there was a Bill 18 came up -- 16 -- when Bill 16 came up for consideration I moved then that the Bill should not be proceeded with and that we should have a commission to make an investigation into municipal boundaries, etc., as recommended by the Michener Commission. I'm not sure if it was Bill 16 or Bill 18, nor if it was a Bill that came before the municipal committee - 18 - and it dealt with a partial - partial disturbing of municipal boundaries - and I felt at that time that they were dealing with the matter piecemeal and it would be far better to set up a commission which would look into the full complete aspect of municipal boundaries as envisioned by the Michener Commission.

Now I believe myself that a commission is the best method of dealing with this matter and I don't think there could be any better commission established for that purpose than the commission which has been established by this House in determining political boundaries following each census. Now that commission was composed of the Chief Justice of Manitoba, the President of the University of Manitoba, and the Chief Electoral Officer of the Province. I think that the government should have stuck to that type of commission rather than forming a commission composed of fourteen members, because I don't care what you do, you're bound to have political considerations whether it's made in this House or whether it's made by a Commission appointed by the government, but there's less chance of having political consideration if you stick to the personnel that composed the political Boundaries Commission, namely, the Chief Justice of Manitoba, the President of the University of Manitoba and the Chief Electoral Officer of the Province, and I think that's where the government made a mistake. They should have stuck to a Commission composed of men who had no political axe to grind.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, just a few short remarks with regard to what the Honourable Member for Selkirk said. It doesn't appear to me that what he says is what this resolution says. This resolution says, "That the government of Manitoba immediately remove from the jurisdiction of the Boundaries Commission the right to determine . . .", and then implies that the government will determine on the basis of greatest need, etc. So that while there may be some agreement as to the fact that it shouldn't be the Boundaries Commission or that it should have been another commission, this resolution doesn't appear to say that. It says that it wants it removed from the Boundaries Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: May I have the indulgence to have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, because I along with a number of others were unable to take part in the Throne Speech debate and because of the nature of the subject matter under discussion, may I first congratulate you, Sir, on the occupancy of your high office, and may I sincerely hope that you may be there serving this Legislature for many years to come.

May I thank the Honourable Member for Lakeside for having brought this subject to my attention some years ago, because I have been interested in it since that time and I find it a most interesting study.

The resolution, Mr. Speaker, as I see it, clearly states: shall we make a change; if so, let's put it to the committee to decide what the recommendations shall be in details of that change. That's the way I read this resolution. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because a number of

(MR. STANES cont'd.) items were added in the preliminaries which I cannot agree with, as mentioned by the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party, but I take it as such and because of that we'll support this resolution.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside mentioned the history of the Speaker. I would like to go a little further, and I think I'm perfectly correct in saying that every Prime Minister of Canada from Sir John A. onwards has at some time or other spoken in favour of a Speaker with more permanency, and not one of the Prime Ministers have translated those words into action. I think it's a very interesting point; I think it's very interesting and helpful that this resolution is brought before us, because it does give us the opportunity to take the lead.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that I've been interested in this subject for some time. Eighteen months ago, I had the privilege and pleasure of having lunch in the House of Commons in London, and this subject was the subject at that lunch table. I was informed by several, including Mr. Robin Vanderfelt, who as you all know is Secretary-General of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, that we have in Canada the best words on this subject - and I was also informed by a number of my members of Parliament friends. This is the report as mentioned by the Honourable Member for Lakeside. I have it in my hand. It is an excellent report, Mr. Speaker, and I would strongly suggest that this report be available to every member of the committee, and, if possible, to every member of the House. -- (Interjection) -- Thank you. It is a very easy report to read; it's very concise and very good. It is the "Speakership of the Canadian House of Commons - Some Proposals - A Paper Prepared for the Special Committee on Procedure and Organization," by Dennis Smith, Assistant Professor of Politics, Trenton University, published as an appendix to the Canada Parliament House of Commons, Votes and Proceedings No. 34, June 2, 1965. I do strongly recommend that as excellent reading, particularly to the committee. I also recommend, too, the "Items in Procedure of Canadian House" by W. F. Dawson. There's a couple of very good paragraphs in that.

So, Mr. Speaker, we come to the point - shall we change? Indications everywhere, everything I've read, everybody I've spoken to in many parts of the Commonwealth indicate there should be a change. I would like to perhaps remind and inform members that the folks in the House of Commons in London are not too satisfied with their situation. They feel that they need a change. So perhaps we should think, the committee should think a little beyond what they have got in London to perhaps something where London is going as well, so that we might bring it completely up-to-date. So there is general indication by those that know that there should be a change. I strongly support that.

Now as to the change, Mr. Speaker, I think there's no point at this time in going into great details. I think perhaps the question of details should be discussed by the House on receipt of the recommendations of the committee. But I do note that the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party suggested - one of the things I have noted here in my consideration some time ago on this subject - that perhaps we should not go to a person with parliamentary experience but one perhaps with predominant experience in rules of procedures of Legislatures and Parliaments. I'd like to mention to him that in the work that I have read of very eminent people, they all strongly recommend the parliamentary knowledge in the practical sense is an essential to the Speaker of the House.

We also mentioned the question of re-election, and there we have a problem that the committee will have a great deal of interest in discussing, because it's definitely a problem in itself. I personally favour, as this report favours, that the Speaker be from an area and the constituents of that area be the Members of the Legislature. The reason in this, that it does put the Speaker in a difficult position in trying to serve his constituents. In other words, try to be impartial and partial at the same time, which is impossible. Of course on this question of partiality, I suppose it's true to say the person who is completely impartial hasn't got a thought in his head, but there is no such animal of course.

But with that of course too, if one accepted that - and, I'm just briefly touching these points - we are then in a position of having to make the Speaker, having elevated him to this height whereby he is elected by the constituents being the Members of the Legislature, that he then can not be used for any political purposes at all. We have to know before an election who shall be the Speaker. This is binding on all. In other words, Mr. Speaker, I feel, with all due respect to you, Sir, and your position which I hold in very high esteem, that the Speaker is the property of -- or shall we say within the scope and realm of the Members of the Legislature is completely impartial, party and political-wise, and should be treated as such.

(MR. STANES cont'd.)

Now I have a lot of notes here, Mr. Speaker, on the various pros and cons of the various methods, but I think it would be quite wise if we perhaps at this time decide should there be a change. I'm convinced from what I've read and I've read a lot on this subject, that there should be a change. If so, put it to the committee and let's have a debate on the detail when it comes back from the committee.

Just one final point, Mr. Speaker, I noted with considerable interest the Honourable Member for Lakeside in going over the history of the Speaker, its early history, that he was really the go-between, the Speaker for the House to the monarchy, and very often was in a very dangerous position. I think we should all be aware that under a different cloak similar situations could return, that monopolies and combines could be a greater threat to the House of Commons than ever a monarchy was.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Wellington. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington), Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Member for Logan, that

WHEREAS medical authorities are universally agreed that smoking constitutes not only a threat to the health of those who indulge in the practise as being the cause of many respiratory ailments and even including cancer, and is the direct cause of deaths in increasing numbers; and

WHEREAS medical authorities are almost unanimous in condemning the practise of smoking; and

WHEREAS through advertising in newspapers and periodicals, on radio and television, encouragement is constantly being given to the use of tobacco; and

WHEREAS it has been seen fit to forbid the advertising of alcoholic beverages in Manitoba; --If I may interject, it seems to me this no longer holds, but in any event --

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba be requested to consider taking steps to enact legislation to prohibit the advertising of tobacco in the province; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Government be requested to consider the enactment of legislation to control the sale of tobacco in somewhat the same manner as it now controls the sale of alcoholic beverages.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, I have been going through an experience which I believe that young ladies who find fault and complain that they have "often been a bridesmaid but never a bride." During the past several weeks, it seems to me that during Private Members Day I have sat and waited and the tension has grown as the resolutions have been gone through one by one, and eventually getting right up to mine and then the Speaker immediately preceding has seen fit to talk long enough to bring the clock to 5:30 and I haven't been able to get at it, so I have gone away feeling that perhaps I would come back better prepared another day. As it turned out, by being outside of the Chambers at this moment, I almost missed this opportunity too.

In speaking to this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I must make it known that I'm not speaking for any of the other members of my Party group represented in the Legislature. This is purely on my own. There are some of them who have a preference for tobacco, and some a little weakness of will and unable to give it up, and they don't wish to be associated with me in the resolution that I present for that reason, but then they will have to speak for themselves and try to disprove the evidence that has been presented over and over and over again by medical authorities and others who have done a considerable amount of research work into the subject of the use of tobacco.

I was pleased the other day - several days ago, I don't remember exactly what day it was now - to see a picture of the Honourable the Minister of Health smoking a cigar and boasting that he had given up cigarettes, that he has switched from a pack of cigarettes a day to a few cigars and that he would like to quit them altogether, but of course he suffers from the same disability that some of my fellow members, colleagues, suffer from. I sympathize with

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.) him. I wish that they had taken a better picture of him, it doesn't flatter him at all as it appears in the paper. But I congratulate him in wishing to give up smoking.

The thought occurred to me the other day that I had been described as one who wished to spoil some of the fun of the Members of the Legislature, but I assure them that I am not at all inclined in that direction. I do not want to spoil anybody's fun if they think it is fun to smoke and then to suffer the consequences. Two of my colleagues have quoted Scripture in presenting their resolutions. I of all people in the House who should quote Scripture am not quoting Scripture today, I'm quoting words of Abraham Lincoln who assured some of his fellows that -- in his own words he says, in reference to drinking - alcohol of course, what else - he says, "I don't aim to control any man's drinking but my own." He says, "I believe that every man has the right to go to Hell in his own way." So there you have it. I think I can subscribe to what Lincoln said; I'm not restricting anybody but I'm proposing to inhibit or make less effectual the blandishments that the tobacco companies try to approach the young people with.

Statistically, I think the larger number of people who begin to smoke or begin to use tobacco are between the ages of 12 and 18 than in any other age group, and those who develop the tobacco habit somewhere during that period are caught and they continue to use tobacco for the remainder of their days usually, and many of them of course suffer the consequences. Lincoln said that every man has the right to go to Hell in his own way, but no man has a right, with wiles of one kind or another, expensive advertising, to impress upon young people who are in their most impressionable years the idea that that which is evil is good or desirable, that is that it is a sign of manhood or of feminine sophistication to use tobacco, which in fact, and speaking bluntly, is according to all of the medical authorities that I have read a cancer-causing, a cancer-producing product. No man has a right to urge, upon young people particularly, the development of a habit which they themselves know is wrong - at least if they have read the findings of a great number of commissions of one kind or another that have been set up, inquiries into the matter - and little or nothing, in spite of all the results that have been presented, has been done to restrain the tobacco companies from promoting or continuing to promote their product. There are hundreds of millions of dollars spent every year in advertising and, by comparison, a mere nothing as to persuade people to leave it alone.

The subject of glue sniffing was brought up in the House here this afternoon - I think it was this afternoon - and questions asked of the Minister of Health I believe. We would all be aghast if the manufacturers of this particular variety of glue were to buy full page space in the newspapers to advertise glue sniffing as a desirable thing and to persuade young people that it is a thing that they should do. If for instance we had a page from a magazine that size with a glue bottle on it and saying "sniff glue" - if you could find something to rhyme with glue they could manufacture a song about it or something of that sort the same as they do about cigarettes - and in effect this is just as bad.

Now I have a great number of books, periodicals, articles from periodicals, newspaper clippings and so on that all show the same thing, that is that the use of tobacco is a dangerous and an evil thing. I have to pay my respects to the man who represented Wellington constituency before my time who also stood up in this House to speak against the use of tobacco and expressing the hope that in some way it could be discouraged. He didn't go to the extent that I have gone in suggesting that advertising be prohibited, but he did express the hope that in some way, and he didn't have any way that he could suggest, but in some way the promotion of the use of tobacco could be discouraged. I pay my respects to him and I would have the particular copy of Hansard in here from 1963 in which he gave his address except that, although my colleagues are all honest men, somebody must have run away with it and taken it elsewhere. In any event, the same things as what he brought out I can bring out from other sources.

There are three main - what would I call it - research efforts that have been made that the greatest attention has been given to, and that's one by the Royal College of Physicians in London and the Surgeon-General's Report in the United States - these are the most authoritative - and then there is a Canadian study that was completed in 1961, an article appearing in the Canadian Medical Association Journal of April 3rd, 1961; and then quite recently there is another report, a 137 page Canadian study on smoking and health, and these reports all in their own way show exactly the same thing.

This most recent Canadian effort was published in a 137 page study and it shows that heart and circulatory diseases accounted for 58 percent of the early deaths among the 92,000 people surveyed, while diseases of the lung - including lung cancer - accounted for 28 percent.

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.) What this article is saying is something a little different from what many of the others have said. They were emphasizing the fact that the use of tobacco, most particularly the use of cigarettes, caused lung cancer; this latest study in Canada is now saying that it isn't only a lung affection, a lung cancer that is caused by smoking, but that it is also heart ailments and circulatory disabilities, and heavy cigarette smokers - if I may quote, this is a clipping from the Winnipeg Tribune, February 8th - "Heavy cigarette smokers die more from heart and circulatory disease than anything else, and this is the major indication," it says, "of the federal report on smoking and health submitted to Health and Welfare Minister Allan MacEachen by his department recently."

I was listening to the radio, as a matter of fact it was the television that I was watching and Allan MacEachen appeared there when he was being interviewed on the results of this particular report, or the reports that were being made in connection with it, and he was asked whether he still smoked. He says, "No, I don't." The next question was, "When did you quit?" He says, "This morning," and he says, "I'm not going to smoke tomorrow either," and he indicated that he had sufficient - what is it - willpower, that he wouldn't smoke the day after that either.

This study, the Canadian study covered 92,000 persons and they were, as I say, medically followed. They were kept under observation over a period of over six years, from 1956 to 1962. They were all war veterans and widows of war veterans and during that period 11,285 of the group died. Officials concluded that there were 2,059 more deaths in that group than would have been expected if the group was a wholly non-smoking group, and they died from, as I said, heart, circulatory diseases and lung cancer and throat cancer and so on. I know that everybody in the House is not unaware of these things, everybody has read articles that have appeared in newspapers and periodicals from time to time, and while I could give statistics I don't know that it would add very much to what you already know.

In the Royal College Report in Great Britain, for instance, they say coronary heart disease is a more frequent cause of death in smokers, particularly cigarette smokers, than in non-smokers. Then it goes on, dealing with the subject of gas to intestinal diseases, and it says that smoking affects the movement and secretion of the duct in many ways and may cause symptoms such as nausea and discomfort, depresses the appetite and so on, and creates ulcers and interferes with their healing. Cancers of the mouth, throat and gullet appear more frequently in smokers than in non-smokers.

The Minister emphasized the fact that the need for preventive measures is great as a reduction in general air pollution would reduce the risk of cigarette smoking, but it is necessary for the health of the individuals that any measures that are practicable and likely to produce beneficial changes in smoking habits shall be and must be taken promptly.

Then we get to the subject of advertising in Great Britain in the particular year that was being dealt with, it was shown that local health authorities, health and education authorities spent less than 5,000 pounds on anti-smoking education while tobacco manufacturers spent 38 million pounds to promote the use of tobacco.

In a report given by the American Cancer Society, it says that Cancer of the lung now kills approximately 41,000 Americans every year, 35,500 men and 5,500 women. This is nearly 15 times the annual toll of 30 years ago, and some of this increase is accounted for by the increase in population. However, the death rate from lung cancer per 100,000 population, standardized for age, is now 10 times what it was 30 years ago. It goes on to indicate that smokers suffer from coronary artery disease and that generally across the board there's a reduction in life expectancy.

There's a committee -- the Royal College of Physicians of London and a joint committee of the Danish National Health Service brought out a report together and they repeat the same, give us the same information. The Surgeon-General's Report in the United States created quite a stir in the United States because it was regarded at the time as the most authoritative of any or all reports that had been brought out, and it repeats the same story - you read it over and over again in whatever report you turn to. And for every report or article that is written -- there was one that appeared in MacLeans not long ago to indicate that the statistics were not quite accurate. For any one of such a study there are dozens, I could say probably hundreds, of others who point to just the opposite direction.

One of the paragraph headings here tells us that cigarette smoking is a health hazard of sufficient importance in the United States to warrant appropriate remedial action. Another place here it says, "The death rate for smokers of cigarettes only, who were smoking at the time of

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.) entry into the particular prospective study, is about 70 per cent higher than that for non-smokers." And then they go on, there's another section in this particular little booklet that deals with the Canadian study that was reported on in April - whatever it was - 1961.

There's another booklet that goes through rapidly and in very brief form and it supplies exactly the same statistics. I have papers culled from many directions: the British Medical Journal; there's a booklet here by E. Cuyler Hammond from down in the States with graphs - and this was The Society of Sigma Xi and reprinted by permission of the copyright owner from the American Scientist - and this points out exactly the same thing. There's one here, the Parents Magazine; and an interesting letter by a well-known doctor locally. He's a member of the Manitoba Medical Association and he says, "The Manitoba Medical Association considers that the dangers to health are very real and cannot be minimized." The man who writes this is Dr. M. T. MacFarland, Doctor of Medicine, who is a member of the Manitoba Medical Association. And so it goes. Over long periods of time the reports are given of increases in deaths as a result.

In 1942 - I don't remember exactly what proportion but there is a proportion - in 1942 there were 20 male deaths; in 1961 there were 176 from lung cancer. Then they said this is an increase of 600 percent in the twenty years from that particular date, 1942. All of which points out that some thing, and whatever that some thing is it is important that we do it, whether we cut the advertising people who are promoting - in effect they are promoting cancer in young people that are beginning to learn to smoke today. I would have some serious doubts about the number of people who begin to smoke from the ages of 12 to 17 or 19, serious doubts about the numbers of those who actually quite smoking, because we know among ourselves, I'm one of those who tried to quite smoking but it took over a period of eight years and finally I made it and now I haven't smoked for quite some time and don't propose to begin again.

I know exactly what the struggle is and there are a great number of people who have exactly the same struggle and much worse. But there are a great number also who become so convinced of the rightness of the authoritativeness of the findings of these various research projects that they compel themselves to quite in one way or another. Judy LaMarsh, I think, is one who quit smoking and now the Honourable Mr. MacEachen is another one. Our own Minister of Health has switched to cigars and I know that there are other members in the House who have done the same thing and some in the House with strength of character and ability that they quit altogether. They come home from a party smelling of smoke because of others around them who are smoking but they haven't contributed to it.

I won't read all these things because they repeat pretty much the same story, but I think it's a shocking thing that any commercial concern should be permitted to - well, call it what you like - they try to pretty it up but it's debasing the pages of our magazines and it's giving very enticing but misleading propaganda to anybody who happens to be watching television or over the radio and make it appear to be very attractive, very manly to smoke, and when they're dealing with women, very feminine and very womanlike to smoke. If they can't be persuaded to stop or to cut down on their advertising or to reduce their advertising to show only unattractive, middle-aged old men and women who are smoking instead of the most beautiful and youthful, then I don't see anything wrong with having such restrictions set upon them that it becomes impossible for them to advertise at all. If anybody wants to buy cigarettes or a cigar or tobacco for a pipe he'll know where to go for it, just the same as in this province people who want to get a drink, who want to buy a bottle of liquor, they know where to go to get it and it creates no problem. You may find a few bootleggers in cigarettes springing up here and there but that in itself would act as a hindrance rather than an incentive to smoking.

I know that magazines and newspaper people and radio and television would cry "murder" if that part of their income is cut off, but then you wonder how they value things, how they figure out in their own minds what their values are. Knowing that the use of cigarettes creates cancer and premature death in many people, is it more important for them to save these lives or is it more important for them to continue to operate the way they do on the income that they get from that kind of advertising. I think that somebody somewhere along the line has got to make a choice and that's why I'm suggesting that - not only suggesting, I'm presenting a motion that steps be taken to - how did I word it? - I've lost the motion - eliminate or whatever it is. That the government be requested to consider taking steps to enact legislation to prohibit the advertising of tobacco in this province.

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.) .

Now refusing to take steps - and the onus is on the government as much as it is on the cigarette advertisers - refusing to take steps to prohibit the advertising, then the government itself and all who vote against this motion become accessories to the continuation of this infliction upon people who now don't smoke but are being persuaded to smoke every day through these displays that they see in magazines and the newspapers.

The government saw fit some years ago, and I don't remember exactly at what point, but the government saw fit to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages and they had good reasons for doing that at that time. I think those same reasons still hold, and I now don't see any reason why the government should suddenly begin to want to open up the advertising channels to alcoholic beverage. If I want a drink I know where to go to get it, and if I don't know some of my colleagues will help me out as they - I was going to say as they did so generously up at The Pas - and the same would apply to cigarettes or to tobacco. If I were to want to get hold of a cigarette or cigar I would know where to go and get it, or again my colleagues or the opposition or the government members, they would be generous enough and kind enough as they were on that trip to lead me to a place where it was available.

So I don't see any reason or logic at all, considering what the consequences of smoking are, for opening the pages of our newspapers or magazines, periodicals, or opening up the - we call it the "idiot box", and when cigarette advertising comes it is an idiot box because it's persuading people to do things that are completely wrong for them and we are exposing our children to that kind of a thing. They're invading our homes to try to draw our children into the habit - well, in years to come perhaps create an illness that will result in their premature or early death.

Now I don't believe, and I shouldn't say this, but nevertheless being a realist or trying to be a realist, I don't believe that the government will be or has been or is persuaded by my presentation, but I do think that one thing that the government should do, even though it does not accept this resolution or vote for it, I think that one thing that the government should do, something it has been derelict in, is at least to enforce the laws that are on the statutes.

There is a federal law and there is a provincial law and I would wish to read for the members of the Legislature just what that law says. This is an Act to restrain the use of tobacco by young persons and in the second section - this is the Federal Act - it says, "Every one is guilty of an offence" - then there's padding in between - "who directly or indirectly sells or gives or furnishes to a person under the age of sixteen years any cigarettes or cigarette papers whether for his own use or not." Then in the next paragraph it says, "It is the duty of any constable or person having the powers of a constable to seize any cigarettes, cigarette papers, or tobacco in any form other than cigarettes, in the possession of any person apparently under the age of sixteen." Then in the fourth paragraph, "Everyone is guilty of an offence who, being under the age of sixteen years, smokes or chews tobacco in a street or public place or purchases or has in his possession, whether for his own use or not, any cigarettes or cigarette papers or purchases, or has in his possession for his own use tobacco in any form other than cigarettes." Then in Section 2 of that same paragraph, "It is the duty of the Justice to examine upon oath or affirmation all persons brought before him who are found guilty of violation of this section as to where or from whom such persons purchased or obtained the cigarettes or cigarette paper or tobacco found in the possession of any such person, and the refusal to give such information to the satisfaction of the Justice shall be deemed a contempt of court," and so on.

That's the federal statute and we also have a provincial statute, and in the non-enforcement of this statute, particularly since it is a provincial statute, the government is guilty of not seeing that its own laws are observed. If the laws on the statute are not worth being observed or of enforcing them, they should be repealed; and if the government votes against my resolution to prohibit advertising and if it is being consistent with its non-enforcement of this statute, then it should bring in a motion to have this statute repealed, I guess it would be, or whatever it is, to remove this from the statute books. If they don't believe what is inscribed in the statute books then they should in all good conscience cut it out, take it away.

The statute says, and this in The Child Welfare Act, I think it is, with page numbers and so on that I can give if you really want it, under the heading of "Tobacco". Paragraph No. 1. "A person who sells or gives or causes to come into the possession of a child under the age of 16 years, cigarettes or cigarette papers or tobacco, is guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding \$200.00; and in default of payment of the fine or in

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.) addition thereto, is liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year." Now at the time that this was written into the statutes, this - and this was pre-cancer scare days - but it was regarded as being of sufficiently seriousness to levy penalties on people who were doing the very things that it is prohibiting.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry to interrupt the honourable gentleman at this time, but he has five minutes left.

MR. PETURSSON: I didn't realize that I'd take up so much time, but it's an absorbing subject. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm just winding up in any event.

In the second paragraph of the same statute it is stated: "A peace officer, school attendance officer or an officer or director of a society or a school teacher, may seize cigarettes, cigarette papers, tobacco, etcetera, etcetera, in the possession of a child apparently under the age of 16 years whom he finds in possession thereof in a public place, and in such a case. . .", and it goes on. I won't continue reading because it's padding, it's legal jargon, I think I can use that word because I am not a lawyer - lawyers might not appreciate it, but there is such a thing - "and any such thing found in the possession of the child may be confiscated or destroyed."

These are quotations taken from our own statute books. They are on the statute books, and to the best of my knowledge they have not been repealed.

And then there's another one which calls for preventing of a sale of such articles to children under the age of 14 years except on written order of parent, guardian or employer of child, and so on. I can remember in my earlier days as a parent, when I wanted a package of cigarettes, I had to go through this procedure of writing a note and have my young son carry it down to the store and come back with a package of cigarettes.

If the government cannot in good conscience feel that it must deprive the advertising agencies of this income, television, radio and so on, then of course it will vote against my motion, but the least they can do is to enforce what is in their books, either that or take it out, if it doesn't mean any more than what it means at the present time.

In closing, I thought you might be - I was interested in receiving this thing from a cigarette company. I'm not even going to mention it, because I'm not advertising the company. It's headed: "I am a Canadian," and it goes on, "I am the primitive hunter," and so on, "I am the Northman" - nine different things that "I am as a Canadian," and I wrote them a letter. There were nine. I told them that there should have been ten - you know, you round things out much better if you have a tenth one. And so I wrote them a letter and said: "Dear Sirs, I wish to thank you for the tribute to Canada, Canadians, as it appears in the advertisement you forwarded to me in the form of a large folder. You list nine categories of Canadian. I would add a tenth category to round it out as follows: 'I am a Canadian who sickens and dies from circulatory and heart and lung condition caused by the smoking of cigarettes. My years are fewer in which to sow and reap, to travel the highways and the waterways, to enjoy the many beauties of this great land. I would cherish a few additional years in which to extol my country's greatness and to take pride in proclaiming I am a Canadian'." Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, at the outset I would like to assure the Honourable Member for Wellington that I sympathize with the objective that he is seeking to achieve in this resolution, although, and I say this with respect, I do not think that the methods suggested by the honourable member of achieving that objective are adequate or realistic.

I have lived through the prohibition days in Manitoba, and I know that the prohibition days in Manitoba never achieved anything other than lawlessness. I feel that the only way that we can effect a change in an individual's sumptuary habits is by education. I do not believe there is any other process of achieving the objective which you seek.

Now, you mentioned two ways by which this objective would be achieved, and you link the prohibition of advertising of tobacco in this province, and you draw a parallel between the prohibition of advertising tobacco with the prohibition of advertising alcoholic beverages. Now we have had in Manitoba a partial prohibition against advertising alcoholic beverages for a number of years, and I would just ask the honourable member to take a look at the revenue of the Liquor Control Commission during the period that that prohibition has been in. It has gone up steadily every year.

Now, there's another matter too that I would like to refer to, and that is the ineffectiveness of any such prohibition enforced provincial-wise. One of the big objections that we have had to the prohibition of advertising liquor in this province is that we were putting provincial periodicals out of business, because there was no way that we provincially could prohibit a

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd.) magazine printed in Ontario or any other province in Canada from coming in here, and they were making the money off those liquor ads. Now, there's no way that we can legally prohibit cigarette advertising from appearing in other news media in different parts of Canada from coming into this province. It's true that the Canadian Broadcasting Commission will recognize a provincial law and will black out any advertising which is prohibited under that provincial law, but I wonder if the honourable member has considered what the effect of Channel 12 would be on the people of Manitoba. There's more cigarette advertising coming over that channel, there's more liquor advertising coming over that channel, and yet the people of Manitoba, the newspapers of Manitoba, the magazines of Manitoba, are prohibited by law from advertising these various things that are flooding our province from other jurisdictions.

Now, the honourable member says that we should control the sale of tobacco somewhat in the same manner as we control the sale of liquor. Now I would like to know how we could achieve that. Does he mean that we would only have one agency which would have a monopoly on the sale of tobacco, something the same as they have in France; and would that agency be a provincial agency; and what control and what restrictions and what limitation would we place upon the citizens of this province who wanted to purchase tobacco. Would we be limited to so many cigarettes a day or so many pipes of tobacco a day. Mr. Speaker, I don't think, with all due respect, that the two methods proposed by the honourable member would be effective or would be adequate, and the reasons I have given for my beliefs. •

I think what we should concern ourselves with is insisting upon all cigarette manufacturers observing a code of ethics, which code could consist of, but not exclusively, the following: 1. There must be truthful advertising. 2. Every package of cigarettes that they sell must clearly show (a) that smoking may be hazardous to health; (b) the nicotine and tar contents of that particular brand; and (c) that the analysis of the nicotine and tar content has been made under the supervision of the Federal Department of Foods and Drugs. I also suggest too that at all levels of government, we should use every means we have of conducting an educational campaign on the dangers to health of tobacco, and particularly cigarettes.

Now I realize that any campaign of that nature is not going to be easy. I think if the members know that in United States alone the tobacco people, the cigarette people, spend \$240 million a year on TV, radio and newspaper advertising, you have some idea of the strength of that organization, particularly from the standpoint of a lobbying strength. And believe me, Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of lobbying going on in United States today by the tobacco interests for the simple reason that they realize that in United States the Federal Trade Commission is taking active and adequate steps to control cigarettes; and I think that what they are suggesting too is something along the lines that I have said, self-defeating advertising. The only way that you'll ever be able to control the sale of tobacco is every time you pick up a packet of cigarettes you see on that package a warning that the smoking of cigarettes may be hazardous to health, that the tar and the nicotine contents of that particular cigarette is so much, and I think that is the only way that we'll ever be able to achieve anything. We certainly never achieved anything in our prohibition days in cutting down the consumption of liquor in this province. All we did was to create lawlessness.

I would suggest that the Honourable Minister of Health, who is not in his seat, should in conjunction with the other Provincial Ministers of Health convene a conference with the Federal Minister of Health with a view to mapping out an effective program for the education of the people of Canada relating to the dangers of cigarette smoking. I am sorry that I have to oppose the methods suggested by the Honourable Member for Wellington in introducing this resolution, but I do so sincerely and in the conscientious belief that the methods suggested by him would be ineffective and inadequate. But I wish to assure every member of the House that I am just as earnestly concerned with the dangers to health as he is, caused by cigarette smoking, and I will do anything that I can to try and curtail that, but one method that I will not use is prohibition. I will try to do it by education and pointing out the dangers to health of the overuse of cigarettes.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne. The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Thank's very much. Mr. Speaker, could I have the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand? The same for the next motion too, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. McKELLAR: May I have the indulgence for this resolution too, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I beg the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand in light of the time of day.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, may I have the indulgence of the House to have this stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on this motion today but I couldn't finish in the time I don't think, so I'll have to ask for the matter to stand, please.

MR. SPEAKER: You beg leave to have the matter stand? May I have the Minister's wish please?

The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: I don't see any better way to put in the last ten minutes, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, that

WHEREAS Northern Canada's development will be seriously curtailed if Government services are unduly delayed; and

WHEREAS all levels of Government should join forces to assure the necessary promotion and leadership in providing encouragement to private enterprise to invest in our Canadian North; and

WHEREAS a modern Highway system is generally considered necessary to provide modern, competitive transportation for both freight haulage and passenger service; and

WHEREAS communication and transportation systems are two of the important services which governments are called upon to provide to all Canadians;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Assembly encourage the Government of Canada to enter into an agreement with the provinces of Canada to hasten the orderly development of Northern Canada by providing these services to all Canadians on a cost-sharing agreement throughout our Nation by renewing Roads to Resources programming.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, I think that in re-introducing this program I almost feel as if I'm beating a dead dog, but I think probably we should reconsider it, particularly inasmuch as there are more emphasis as time goes by on building costly roads in northern Manitoba. I would like members to consider the impact of roads on any part of the, not only the province but the country, and I think that just as roads in Canada, or railroads probably in western Canada was important to the development of this part of our country, so roads in northern Manitoba must be important to the development of Manitoba as a whole. Certainly I think that the railroads and the development of western Canada had a real impact on industry in eastern Canada, and so it must follow that the impact of the development of northern Canada would have on the areas that lie in the southern part of our country.

I think that if we even went back into considering what was our Roads to Resources programming in past years, we would find that it hastened the development of our highways both to Thompson and to Grand Rapids, and I think this is very important because both of these long highways were built in very quick time, and particularly the Grand Rapids road was constructed all in one short summer construction period. I believe that you must also consider that the Thompson Highway has opened up over 200 miles of wilderness area, and in addition of course it's relieved the isolation of the Town of Thompson. These are the things that were done - these are the things that were done under a cost-sharing agreement.

I think too that members must remember or recall the impact that the development at Thompson has had in the past year or so. Here we have recently announced three new mine sites which are all within half a mile or less of the Thompson highway. Here's a development of over \$100 million that is within a half a mile of the highway that was conceived and built long before the mines themselves were discovered, and so it must follow I think that if roads are built in the areas that would assume to be the productive areas, then we will have more mining

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) and we will have more exploration, and I think we will have more mines.

I think that we must realize that in the \$100 million that INCO are investing, that we have to face up to our commitments, particularly in the hard surfacing of the Paint Lake road this year. I think that you will find that as we pass along we'll see that - again referring to the Town of Thompson, which it is estimated produces over \$100,000 of tax dollars per day for the Federal-Provincial Government - a town producing over \$100,000 of tax dollars a day, 365 days a year, is a very productive area; it's a growing area; and certainly I think we would all agree that it would warrant the development of service roads to connect that community with the rest of the province. I think that the opening of the north encourages private enterprise to invest in our resource development and it will bring about a true economical development of our last frontiers which to date are still waiting for us to move in and develop.

I think too that if roads are considered a modern economical necessity in all other areas of the country, then surely, Mr. Speaker, then surely they must be considered necessary to the development of our north. I think this is one of the important points that we are forgetting. Why has most resources programming been withdrawn by the Federal Government? I haven't found an answer, I really haven't found an answer yet, but it would seem that this is an old Conservative program and it's been thrown into the political field. I wish that our federal friends could come up with a program somewhat different, maybe a little better program, maybe a little sweeter program, but something that would allow us to carry out the development of a resource that is giving money not only to the provincial Treasury but also to the federal.

I think that we must remain morally committed to the development of our road to Lynn Lake. Here is one of our earliest mining settlements and it still does not have a road. I think we must consider the road from Thompson to Grand Rapids which would develop a shorter distance between the three mine sites in our north.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry to interrupt the honourable member. Does he wish to carry on when this resolution comes before the House again - is that the feeling?

MR. BEARD: Yes, I'd appreciate that.

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30 and I'm leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 this evening.