

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, April 6th, 1965.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Speaker, I was wondering if I could ask leave of the House to pay my respects to the Winnipeg Tribune on the eve of its 75th Anniversary. As an ex-carrier boy Madam Speaker, some 44 years ago I carried the Winnipeg Tribune. In fact, before that I delivered the Winnipeg Telegram and that's going back a little while, but I thought that I should express my feelings because after all those were good days away back when we were delivering this paper and 75 years of public service is worthy of mention, and I thought I would just like to rise in my place tonight and to wish the Winnipeg Tribune many many more years of its anniversary.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I'm sure we would all join in the sentiments expressed by my honourable friend from Seven Oaks. I wonder if he carried for the Telegram at the time that my father was the editor of it?

MR. OSCAR F. BJORNSON (Lac du Bonnet): I think that I must rise on this occasion and give recommendations for the Tribune to which we have been a subscriber for a long time. I also was a Telegram carrier. I can well recall the time when I delivered the Telegram and this building was being built and I had the pleasure of delivering the Telegram to the Lieutenant-Governor's quarters here. I can remember with a great deal of nostalgia the little oriental servant that was employed there who used to greet me at the back door and it didn't matter whether the day was bright or whether there was a day of this kind of this evening, this little oriental would greet me with the remark, "This is a velly bad day, won't you come in and have a cup of tea?" and I can assure you that when the days were cold, and this was an exceptional honour for me to dine in the kitchen of the Lieutenant-Governor.

I can recall other incidents when my wagon would break down in front of this building, when it was being built, and I would have to go and borrow a nail from some of the builders to put the axle back on, so I share my memories and my feelings of this auspicious occasion of the 75th Anniversary of the Tribune with my friend across the way. Thank you.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, if all of the ex-Tribune carrier boys are going to get into the act, I think I'll have to have a word to say on this occasion too, because my first business venture was as a carrier for the Winnipeg Tribune, and I remember well delivering papers particularly in the winter time, because the paper used to come in on the early morning train and I had to deliver them before I went to school and some of my customers accused me of delivering the papers in my sleep and the only reason that I knew where to deliver them was because the dog that pulled my sleigh always stopped at the right houses and so long as my route didn't change we were all right, but it was a rather wonderful experience that first business venture. I got to know an awful lot of people and, as the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet has said, many of them were very, very kind to the carrier boys and certainly the Tribune itself was very kind to the carrier boys. One of the first visits I can remember to the City of Winnipeg was on the occasion when I won a trip to Winnipeg at Christmas time for having increased the subscriptions to the Tribune in the Town of Russell beyond a certain percentage and I must say that the Tribune were really royal hosts to us carrier boys on that occasion. It wasn't the only time I won such a trip but the first one was perhaps the most memorable because it was one of the first times I can remember visiting this fair city. And I think that we would all of us in this House agree that this newspaper -- I can't remember the Telegram which preceded it -- but this newspaper has performed a great service, not only for the people of Winnipeg but for the people of all of Manitoba and those parts of Ontario and Saskatchewan neighboring this province. So I too would like to say a word of tribute to this very fine newspaper on this most auspicious occasion.

MR. HILLHOUSE: This seems to be the day Madam when we are paying tribute to our Alma Maters. I too delivered for the Tribune. I also delivered for the Free Press and I can recall when you used to be able to buy the Free Press, Tribune and Telegram, 3 for a nickel. When I worked for the Tribune it used to be on, I think it was behind the old Aikens Block on McDermot Avenue. The Telegram office was on the opposite corner and I can remember annually when the Telegram used to hold that marathon race, which was an event which presaged the spring in Winnipeg. I enjoyed my work as a carrier, I think the same as everybody else did. I think perhaps we met a lot of people and we were treated with a great deal of kindness

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd) . . . but there's one thing I will say, I think the loads were much heavier in those days than they are today.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Morris.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Madam Speaker, I would just like to add a word in congratulating the Tribune for their splendid service that they have given the people of Manitoba in reporting the news, not only of this House, but of the news that has taken place world-wide and I would also like to mention that possibly I'm one of the senior members of the old Telegram's carriers and if the Minister of Industry and Commerce would tell me just what year his father was editor of that paper, it was about 1912-1913 that I had a morning route and I delivered the Telegram paper on Maryland and Sherbrook Street in those days, and -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. SHOEMAKER: I thought you said you had delivered them both here and in Morris.

MR. SHEWMAN: Oh no, I'm not quite that same class as the Honourable Member from Gladstone, but I did enjoy my associations in those days with the Telegram paper and I'd like to be one that would offer congratulations to the present Tribune paper.

MR. LISSAMAN: Madam Speaker, if this is going to be a regular confessional for early deliverers of the Tribune, I must plead guilty to this also. Unlike the Honourable Member for Selkirk I never got contaminated. I delivered simply the Tribune and the Brandon Daily Sun and another influence on my life which this delivery might have had, I can recall now that I delivered papers to my wife's family's home which may have had some influence on my latter days: So I have great pleasure in congratulating the Tribune upon its birthday today.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you very much Madam Speaker, I hadn't intended to speak on this resolution, Madam Speaker, but owing to the amount of humour that was generated the other evening, I thought perhaps I would like to rise and say a few words because the Honourable Member for Morris -- and I might say I was a little apprehensive this evening Madam Speaker, when he rose just a moment ago for fear that he would trigger off another epidemic of humour similar to the other evening, because when he said he abhorred the idea of seeing this large sign with "Southern Fried Chicken" and he said that he didn't wear a panama hat very well, I think that led my leader into one of his rare evenings because he had a field-day. I was wondering that evening -- the devil was in my leader as the Irish say, whether it was St. Patrick's Day and when I looked back in Hansard I found out that it was March 16th, Tuesday, but I'm pretty sure it must have been getting near midnight because all the leprechauns were out in the House that evening.

However, the honourable member mentioned haggis and then he mentioned yorkshire pudding and we got so far away from Manitoba, with the idea of trying to get the locomotive back on the track that I'm rising to speak on behalf of this resolution, because Madam Speaker, I think this is a good resolution while it's a simple resolution and probably we shouldn't spend too many hours discussing it because we all are loyal Manitobans and it's very nice to see the position of Manitoba enhanced, especially along the lines of the wonderful foodstuffs that we can produce here. Ever since the Selkirk settlers in 1812, the Scotchmen that came over from the Orkneys, they started to grow things here and quality even then was one of the things that they strove so hard to get.

I think that anything that makes people conscious of good food, properly served food, amid pleasant surroundings must be a good thing. I used to know an old gentleman in North Kildonan that used to go down every once in a while to Chicago and he always came back with the world championship for cabbage and cauliflower. I'm speaking of a gentleman by the name of Mr. DeJong. And while we may not have too many things here in Manitoba in this centre of the continent to probably brag about, we do have the Manitoba Goldeyes as has been said on many occasions.

But I think the honourable member had his heart in the right place when he proposed this resolution because anything that we can do to let our tourists know that Manitoba honey is just about the world's best or the Manitoba Goldeye, but I think too that it's psychological to keep on telling these people of these things. I think that, while Winnipeg is noted for many many good restaurants, I think that way out on the periphery there is room for much improvement in our eating establishments, especially in regard to the training of help. I would like to see recognition given to people who will train and I think that probably our Tec Voc school is doing -- our MTI is doing a good job there too, because I don't think that you can have people too highly trained even if it's in a position such as this. I think that people, when they're being

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd) served, like to be treated as guests. This is something that they have to acquire. I think that a friendly smile and this sort of thing does help to bring people back, and I think Manitoba should be known as a place where this is predominant. I think if we give recognition to people who do subscribe to training along this line in order to make our guests welcome when they get here that they too should be rewarded with working conditions that are good. I don't think that Manitoba has to take a back seat but I just thought I should rise to say that I would go along with the resolution of the Honourable Member for Morris. Being Manitoba born I am always proud wherever I go to see anything with the name Manitoba on it and I think that we should give encouragement to this resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Wellington. The Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. PAULLEY: I regret to state that the Honourable Member is home in bed--he's sick. I wonder if this could stand or I'm sure my honourable colleague would not mind if somebody else spoke.

MADAM SPEAKER: Any other member wishing to speak? Agreed to have it stand? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Brandon, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member from St. Boniface. The Honourable the Member for St. Vital.

MR. GROVES: Madam Speaker, when the House adjourned the other evening at 5:30 I was just about through what I had to say. I left off with the words "he asked". I would like to read the rest of the page from the article in the Winnipeg Tribune of March 31st, 1958, which I was reading at that time, and then table the two documents, or the copies of the two documents from which I read at that time. Now the remaining words in this quotation after the words "he asked" which we leave off in Hansard at 5:30 p. m. on April 2nd are: "He asked", repeating, "attacking the Conservatives who will not have a chance to answer the charges because of today's election." And I'd like to table these two documents, Madam Speaker.

The Member from St. Boniface, Madam Speaker, in this resolution has introduced subject matter relating to two other matters which still have to be debated in this House. The plane of those debates when they come before the House will depend on him. It is my hope that the debates on these occasions will be carried on on a very high plane, the high plane that I think the subject matter of these debates will deserve. I want to take this opportunity however, Madam Speaker, to warn the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, that he's not going to get away with trying to bully this House nor is he going to get away with trying to bully the people of this province into accepting prematurely something which they do not want at the present time. I would hope that the Honourable Member would channel his energies into constructive debate rather than some of the abuse that we have listened to from him on various occasions. I would hope, Madam Speaker, that the Honourable Member from St. Boniface would keep our future discussions on these subjects on the high plane that he and I kept these same subjects on at a time not so long ago when we both appeared on a radio program on Radio Station CJOB. At that time we gave each other's points of view on the subject which was under discussion at that time; we didn't engage in any disparaging remarks.

MADAM SPEAKER: I rather think the Honourable Member is not staying on the topic here. I would suggest that he confine remarks to the amendment.

MR. GROVES: I thank you Madam Speaker and I apologize. So Madam Speaker, going back to the amendment which the Honourable Member moved, to the resolution of the honourable member from Brandon, I want to say that I accept the resolution that was proposed by the Honourable Member from Brandon and seconded by the Honourable Member from Pembina in the spirit in which it was presented and I reject the amendment on the grounds that it was not presented, in my opinion, in accordance with the spirit that was intended by the honourable members that introduced it.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam, it's extremely hard to speak with restraint after listening to the Honourable Member for St. Vital because in spite of the fact that he repeatedly refers to

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd). keeping the debate on a high plane, his height must be a relative conception because of his idea of height and mine is completely different. However, Madam, I wish to assure the House that in taking part in this debate I do so without rancour and in the hope that no one will consider that I am attempting to continue a personal and unjustified attack on anyone in this House. In fact, Madam, my sole purpose is to get this discussion back into the confines of relevancy by trying to impress upon the members of this House the true meaning and intent of the remarks of my honourable colleague from St. Boniface.

It's true that my colleague from St. Boniface did deal with certain matters respecting minorities and, according to the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that is a dirty word in this House. But I think that his point was that the minorities to which he referred in the original discussions concerning The British North America Act referred to the Protestant minorities of Quebec but subsequently that expression was enlarged to include minorities of all races and creeds throughout those parts of Canada which originally came into Confederation and which subsequently joined up.

I feel too, Madam, that my colleague was trying to recapture the true spirit of Confederation by suggesting that a citizenship ceremony should emphasize the following points: namely, the benefits, rights, privileges, and obligations of Canadian citizenship; the meaning purpose and intent of Confederation as set out in The British North America Act; the necessity of guaranteeing and preserving the aforesaid rights and any and all such other matters as in the premises should be noted and emphasized in such proceedings. I believe that that's what he was trying to do and it is unfortunate that the Honourable Member for St. Vital took a different meaning out of the words of my colleague from St. Boniface because we are approaching our Centenary year and I think it is only right and fitting for us as Manitobans and as Canadians to give thought to the true meaning of Confederation and I believe that in spite of anything that the Honourable Member for St. Vital may say to the contrary, I believe that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface when he introduced his amendment to this resolution did, in my opinion, capture and place into words the true meaning and spirit of Confederation.

I think too, Madam, that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface may, as I did, have a feeling after listening to the Honourable Member for Brandon and the Honourable Member for Pembina that there was an element of a patronizing air in their remarks regarding the form of the ceremony in a Canadian citizenship court. I may be wrong in the impression that I got but the impression that I did get was that those people who were applying for Canadian citizenship were inclined to be somewhat inferior to native born Canadians, whereas I feel that those people who do apply for Canadian citizenship are our equals in all respects. And I feel too Madam that we should not only put on that ceremony for those people to impress upon them all of the benefits, rights and obligations of Canadian citizenship, but I think we should also use that occasion to make all Canadians, whether of native origin or Canadians by naturalization, rededicate themselves to the true purpose and meaning of Confederation. I think Madam, and I am sincere in my thought, that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface was really trying to capture and impress upon the members of this House what Confederation meant to him and I am satisfied beyond any reasonable doubt that he was sincere in what he had to say, and I don't think that the remarks of the Honourable Member for St. Vital were justified on this occasion.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity to speak in this debate after the Honourable Member for Selkirk in that he did bring the discussion or debate on this resolution back to the confines of relevancy as he put it. Actually, I find myself in somewhat of a dilemma at this time because I find both the original motion, the original resolution to be good, one which we could have supported, and for that matter we find the amendment to be good in its intent and we can support it also and since the vote on the amendment will take place first we shall support the amendment. Perhaps the amendment is slightly preferable, if for no other reason than that it spells out rather more clearly what should be some of the essential features of this sought after citizenship ceremony. Particularly do I support the (b) provision, --(b) part of the amendment, which asks among other things that the meaning, purpose and intent of Confederation as set out in The BNA Act be incorporated as part of the citizenship ceremony. I feel rather strongly in favour of this because it is my belief, my understanding, that there are many Canadian who took their naturalization papers, who received their naturalization, and who were never really explained --had never had it explained to them just what was the nature of Canadian Confederation, what was the nature of the

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) Canadian state, what was the nature of the different language group rights under The BNA Act, and so on. And so to this day Madam Speaker, there are Canadian, particularly in Western Canada I would think, who really do not have any idea of the language group rights that exist in this country. There are still many Canadians, particularly in Western Canada, who think that Canada was, is now and always should be or shall be a unilingual country. One need only go out on the street or out into the countryside and you can meet people like this, well-meaning people, but people who are misinformed shall we say about the nature of Canadian Confederation. And I think that it's not too late to redress the wrong and start explaining to people in this country that Canada was at the very beginning, at the very time since Confederation, organized and established as a state in which two nations of people had rights, had equal rights as to language and culture. Now it's true that if you look at The BNA Act very strictly, if you look at the letter of the BNA Act rather than the spirit, one will find that the bilingual provisions, the provisions for status of the French language, are rather limited. It's only in Section 93 and Section 133 of the BNA Act that there is any express mention made of the French language rights. But anyone who cares to read the debates of Confederation, who cares to examine in detail the historical events leading up to Confederation, and including the Confederation years themselves, will soon come to the conclusion that Confederation, Canadian Confederation was indeed a compact of two peoples, not a compact as between provinces, as many people seem to have thought at various times in the past, but a compact between two peoples. This compact has been ignored in the past several decades, in the past many decades, and that is one of the main reasons why Canadian Confederation today faces somewhat of a crisis situation. It's not the only reason, but it's one of the main reasons. Therefore it seems to me that we should be willing here in the Province of Manitoba, and in this Chamber in particular, we should be willing to support any sort of measure within our means that will give complete credence to the fact that confederation was a compact between the English and French people who lived here at that time and should be so construed at the present time also.

There is not very much perhaps that the individual provinces can do to help solve the current confederation problems. There are some things that the Federal Government can do and it is doing: bilingualizing the Civil Service within reasonable limits, as far as is practicable and so on; providing for interchange between students and so on. But there is one thing that the provinces can do. In those provinces where the French people did have their language rights acknowledged by statute and honoured in practice, those provinces can think seriously about restoring to those French people their language rights as they once enjoyed them under the Constitution. It would seem that decades ago French populations in certain provinces had their constitutional language rights torn away from them. I think that now in the 1960's it would be an act of good faith for us to take whatever steps are necessary to restore to them their language rights which they enjoyed sixty years ago and more.

But Madam Speaker, in connection with this resolution on citizenship and citizenship ceremonies, surely it is important that immigrants coming to Canada now, upon taking out their citizenship papers, they should have explained to them in the actual, as part of the ceremony if you like, or as part of the program leading up to the citizenship acquisition, just what the constitution of this country says about the French and English language rights, and cultural rights. There are some people, again in western Canada in particular, who have the idea that all of the ethnic groups have as much legal and constitutional right for their language and culture as do the English and French languages, and this is causing some confusion and if misused by some mischievous politicians it can cause us a good deal of trouble in the years ahead, because there are some who are already saying that French-speaking people have no more language right to this country than say people who are German-speaking or Polish-speaking. I tried to explain it this way: that within Canadian society all the different ethnic groups are free to exist and flourish and contend, but within the Canadian states and under the constitution they do not have a right to parity of legal and constitutional status. I am, you might say, of German or Austrian ethnic stock. It could be argued, it is being argued by a few, that the German and Austrian ethnic group have as much language, linguistic and cultural right as the French in this country, and this is absolutely incorrect. Why do some people think that way? Because when they came to this country they never had the nature of Canadian constitution, they never had the nature of Canadian citizenship properly explained to them. That is why they lived and suffered under this misinformation or this delusion. I would think that anyone who is really interested in averting a crisis of Confederation if you like, no matter what his ethnic

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd).background, he will support any motion, any resolution, any policy which seeks to clarify and which seeks to explain to people just what the legal and constitutional rights are of the two main language groups.

And finally, I would like to reiterate once again that I'm very much afraid that in the next few years, five years, ten years, perhaps fifteen, there will be agitation in perhaps this province and in western Canada, among the so-called other groups, among the third group. People, some people, will go amongst them and say: "You have as much rights, language and culture, as do the French". In society, in Pagan society, yes, but in the Canadian state and under the Canadian constitution it is "no", the answer is "no", and it should be clearly understood by all; and if it is then I think we can make progress to clear up this misunderstanding, this acrimony which exists today as between some of the French Canadians in Quebec and citizens in the rest of the country.

But, Madam Speaker, honourable members like the Member for St. Vital, is not helping matters very much when he suggests that the people of French Canada are agitating too much, that they should just let matters cool off and take their place in the sun; that the fact of the matter is that it's been only in the past four or five years that they have had some of their legitimate requests acknowledged and honoured to some degree. The fact of the matter is that the --it is my understanding that the French Canadians, particularly in Quebec, want nothing more or less than to be able to improve their standard of living, to improve their opportunity while maintaining their cultural and linguistic heritage. In other words, they want to make progress in French. It's as simple as that. And to do that they will have to.their friendship by their economy. That's what they're attempting to do and I think that we in the rest of Canada must understand that they are in a special situation, that Quebec is not a province like any other province; it is a province which is also the bastion of, one the two official constitutional, linguistic and cultural groups of this country, and so they should be allowed to contract out of some of the Federal-Provincial sharing schemes; they should be allowed to contract out, because there is justification.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, please. I rather think the honourable member is a little bit off the topic here in my estimation. I would suggest that he try and stay to what we are discussing here, as to citizenship and this resolution and this amendment.

MR. SCHREYER:Madam Speaker, this resolution has to do with citizenship and Canadian citizenship involves confederation. However, I will abide by your call. I would conclude then by asking all members to support the amendment, because it does not negate, it does not negate the original resolution; it merely specifies somewhat more than the Honourable Member for Brandon specifies, and I would announce that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface in my opinion was not doing a disservice to anyone when he introduced this amendment, because it makes good sense.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I have received my citizenship papers three years after I have arrived in Canada, and at that time they had given us a white paper declaring that I am --inserting my name and the rest is a printed form. Later, the regulations have changed and I also keep my original papers and those supplementary forms they have issued later on. No one can appreciate more a certificate of citizenship than a stateless individual, and anybody coming into Canada, particularly from Europe, because the British feel that they are coming home, but no one can feel the sensation of obtaining the right of being a full-fledge citizen with all the rights of any Canadians. I have visited many of the ceremonies which we've had now for the last years when a number of people have been handed out their citizenship and without exception I watched the faces of those receiving it that they did not have tears in their eyes when they received it. They appreciate this and for this reason I'm strongly in favour of making the ceremony as impressive and let them appreciate that while they did not have the rights and privileges from the countries where they came, particularly the European countries and the dictatorial countries, they feel that there is something there. I am going to support the amendment but I preferred the original motion. It has in my opinion a softer language. A romantic attitude and it's not cut and dried. I have nothing against the amendment, it probably covers the same thing so my position now as one of the naturalized citizens that the motion is absolutely necessary and we should endorse it. In the meantime I cannot oppose the amendment so if the amendment carries, it's perfectly all right with me; if it doesn't carry I'll gladly support the original motion.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. LISSAMAN: Madam Speaker, I think while I will have the right to close this debate when it reverts to the main motion, I think I should say a few words on the amendment.

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd).

I would like to say first of all that I shall be opposing the amendment. Not on the grounds that members might feel that I would be opposing it on. Upon my first reading of the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, I was almost disposed to say well one will achieve the same as the other and I was tempted to say well I'll go along with this amendment and vote for it. But the more I've thought about it since, and it leaves me in a rather difficult position, but the more I think about it, the more I conclude that so often when we attempt to define things we confine them; and as the last speaker has suggested, the original motion is probably couched in more broad and idealistic terms, notwithstanding still plainly making its demand as is desired. Now I'm afraid that if the amendment were to carry, if we specifically ask from this Legislature that the Federal House do certain things, well then it would be quite correct I would think for the other provinces to expect the same voice in the matter; whereas the main motion simply leaves it up to the Federal Government to decide upon an adequate ceremony and as several members in speaking have suggested that certainly responsibilities of the citizen be placed in this ceremony I would certainly agree with this and I would expect that all the responsibilities of a citizen as defined under the constitution, and his rights, would be covered at that time, but that they be couched and enclosed in a proper ceremony; and for this reason I shall be voting against the amendment.

While I'm on my feet I would like to suggest that since the Member for Selkirk suggested that he detected a patronizing air I would say that he came awfully close to slipping off his high plane. I think if anyone were to read the main motion particularly the one, two, three, third and fourth line, this would impress upon new citizens and all Canadians that Canadian citizenship is a condition of value and pride. Well I can't conceive of there being any condescension here or patronizing air, because this means a mutual pride in citizenship and I don't see how two people one patronizing the other can feel that mutual pride and accomplishment of being a Canadian. I think that there was certainly no reflection of a patronizing or condescending air anywhere in either the mover or the seconder's speech on this matter. I felt Madam Speaker, that I should, and while I have no objection to the amendment proposed by the Member for St. Boniface, and I don't doubt that in the long run it would achieve much the same effect or demand as the original motion suggests, I think that because it is less defining, therefore less confining, action would be quicker, especially in the fact that this Legislature is not demanding certain conditions but simply requesting that the Federal Government set up such a citizenship ceremony and certainly this could be done without reverting and requesting that all the provinces send in their suggestions which might quite easily be justified if we approved of the amendment.

MADAM SPEAKER: Minister without Portfolio.

HONOURABLE ABRAM W. HARRISON (Minister without Portfolio) (Rock Lake): Madam Speaker, I hadn't intended to speak on this motion and my remarks will be rather brief. I might say that half of our family are American. I have many American cousins and their attitude to citizenship is somewhat different than the attitude of Canadians to citizenship in Canada. They believe in the United States that there is only one citizen that is worthwhile, and that is an American. No matter where he comes from, if he's from Sweden or Norway and resides in North Dakota, if he's French from France and lives in Louisiana, no matter where he lives in the United States his main desire is to become an American citizen. That is the prized goal of his very existence to become an American. We do not seem to have that same desire in Canada; we're inclined to break up into two groups or three possibly, English, French, Scandinavians, and we do not seem to have that unifying agent that will bring us all together as one people, Canadians. Now how we will achieve that I am not sure. I do not have any remedy at the moment, but surely our boys and girls that are growing up should be desirous of becoming Canadians and working for Canada and becoming good loyal citizens of Canada. You cannot have a nation that is strong and firm if you're going to have the division as far as your nationals are concerned. Let us get together and be one nation. Let us be Canadians, not Englishmen, not French, not Scandinavians, or any other nationality; let us take the card out of the pack of the American constitution and once we are able to qualify we become Canadians. I leave that thought with the House today. I haven't prepared a speech on it but I do have thoughts along that line that my boys and my grandchildren should be desirous of being Canadians whether they're born in Quebec or whether they're born in British Columbia. Now I have no thoughts as far as the Quebec people are concerned; I think they're very fine Canadians, they were the first Canadians and we as the English section of Canada should recognize that. They're good people and I know that the people in Quebec believe that the English-speaking people of the prairie are good people.

Let's get together and be Canadians.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, it seems to me the resolution and the amendment before us more or less deal with the immigrants coming in and applying for citizenship in this country. The amendment in its preamble mentions the many cultures and minority groups. I myself in this House represent a group that is a minority in this country and I feel that my people are making a contribution to this country as such. Many of our people have migrated to other countries over the years, yet we find that they are still proud to be Canadians and will not voluntarily give up their citizenship as Canadian even though they move to other countries. They value their citizenship.

Then I would like to mention that culture and language which are both stressed in the amendment, in my mind go hand in hand, that if you want to retain the culture of the minorities that we should also try and retain the languages. I think this is a must and therefore we should encourage that the various minority and ethnic groups do retain their languages and make it possible for them to do so.

Sometime later on I hope to be speaking on the resolution introduced by the Member for Morris in connection with dishes. As Mennonites we have a lot of dishes that I feel are very good and this is part of our culture and we have many other things which I could bring in in connection with the culture. Then I think, and this is known, that my people the people I represent generally are peace loving people and that is what they came here for to this country, to be able to live in peace.

To me this resolution does not go quite far enough. I would like to have it extended somewhat and to allow, to give recognition, and give certificates probably to those people that become of age, that become the age of 21. Why not recognize these people on occasions like this, present them with certificates because at that time they become full fledged citizens of this country. It is worthwhile that we do a thing like this and that we make them aware of the importance of their obligations, of their privileges, of their opportunities, and also the responsibilities that they have. Some years ago we had small books on civics in our schools. I thought it was a very good book. I don't know whether it's still in use or not but I think a book like that could be used and also be handed to the new immigrants that come to this country. I would certainly endorse and support both the resolution and the amendment. It's more or less immaterial to me which one we adopt. I feel both of them are good and as already stated by the Member for Brokenhead in the various clauses of the amendment it just brings to notice more the specific items which we feel are of importance and our citizens should be made aware of.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Yeas and Nays please Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House the proposed amendment of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

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

YEAS: Messrs: Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Shoemaker, Schreyer, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Wright.

NAYS: Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Weir, Witney, and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 19; Nays, 28.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Brandon.

MR. STANES: Madam Speaker, I'd like to say a few words in support of the main motion.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. STANES: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Firstly, I would like to congratulate the Honourable Member for Brandon for proposing his resolution. I wonder, in listening to the debate how many honourable members have had the opportunity or taken the opportunity to go down to the Citizenship Court which is held in Winnipeg. Those that haven't I strongly recommend that they do so. It's a very interesting experience and extremely worthwhile. I'd like to congratulate those who run that court, Madam Speaker. They're doing an excellent job. I also congratulate the many organizations that support that court, particularly of course the IODE, the ladies there put a tremendous amount of time and effort in support of that court. However, as the Honourable Member for Brandon mentioned, and others, there is nothing that cannot be improved

(MR. STANES cont'd). and I think there is lots of grounds for improvement and guidance from the Federal government.

The people who come over here, being one myself, come here for many reasons. A lot that come from my country, England, Britain, come here or have come here in the past because they wanted to own a piece of land of their own and build on that piece of land which a few years ago and previously was impossible. Other people come for freedom, for our way of life, government; they come here to be Canadians. They bring with them their background, their cultures of their old land. They need Canada. Canada needs them, because Canada is building a country with all the people of the various worlds, with all the great strength they bring with them. I always liken it rather to a pudding. There are many ingredients in a pudding. Some of them on their own, separately, are not very tasteful, but collectively and collected, and when they are mixed in the correct proportions having given the very best of their own and then that cake having been mixed and baked you have a very fine edible product. I don't know in what stage we are at the moment in Canada in producing the final product but we are somewhere in between.

I do commend very heartily to all members the resolution which is before us because much can be done and it would add a great deal to those people who feel strangers at this time because they have not been here too long, that they get a warm warm welcome, greeted by if possible members of an elected body, people, Canadians of many walks of life from such organizations as I've mentioned; that they may feel welcomed, wanted, and give their very best to make this the country which we hope it will be.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam, I would much have preferred had the House seen fit to adopt the resolution as amended, but the House has not done so. I have taken part in many ceremonies of naturalization and these ceremonies are not confined to what is referred to in this resolution as a Citizenship Court. They take place in all county courts in Manitoba where certificates of Canadian citizenship are presented, and as I say, I have taken part in many of these at the request of the presiding judge, and in all that I have taken part, I have always tried to emphasize to the recipients of these certificates, not only the rights that were being conferred upon them as Canadians citizens and the obligations which those rights impose, but I have also tried in a small way to try and impart to them some knowledge of the real intent of Confederation as we know it in Canada. As I say Madam I am sorry that the government majority preferred to adopt the views of the Honourable Member for St. Vital instead of the views as expressed by other members of this House. But that is their privilege.

MR. BEARD: Madam Speaker in rising on this debate I don't feel that I could say very much that would add to it except that I would like to point out that coming from Thompson I am sure that probably the town of Thompson represents a larger majority of new Canadians than any other town or city, in all probability in Canada. It is made up of peoples from not only all over Canada but all over the world, because we in Thompson in large majority are all new members of the north, and of course in Thompson in its recent history we are all new members of the town which was not there a few short years ago, so we in part can sympathize with the problems that people have when they change areas, when they move to new locations and we do feel that probably we all have a little in common in the town of Thompson. And it is at this time that I would like to join with my colleague the Member for St. James in passing along congratulations to the IODE in their endeavours to welcome people, not only to citizens as citizens of Canada but as citizens of the community to which they have immigrated to. I know that we had a ceremony last month to introduce 16 new members. This was a ceremony that had started years ago but had been dropped in Thompson and now there is an endeavour to have a ceremony each time people have their citizenship or get their citizenship. I believe that it is a good program; certainly the evening that we had it the members certainly seemed to enjoy the fact that many of the dignitaries of the town were out to welcome them. I think that it does impress upon them the fact that they have a place in the community and I would certainly like to support the member for Brandon at this time in his resolution.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): I would just like to add one word, Madam Speaker, something that perhaps has not been mentioned in the debate, but it is worthy of mention, and that is when the new Canadians come to take the Oath of Allegiance and of citizenship through the offices of The Canadian Bible Society, each one who is to become a Canadian is furnished with a copy of Holy Writ, whether he be Jew or Gentile, whether he be Protestant or Roman Catholic, and each one who receives it accepts it as a treasured possession, because he or she feels that it plays an important part in the new citizenship to which they have pledged allegiance.

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

MR. LISSAMAN: Yeas and Nays, please Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Brandon.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Desjardins, Evans, Froese, Gray, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Hryhorczuk, Jeannotte, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Schreyer, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Mr. Hillhouse.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 45; Nays, 1.

..... Continued on next page.

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

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Speaker, in rising to close this debate, I would like to say that the Honourable Member for Roblin when he started his address claimed that there was confusion in our ranks. He said that we didn't seem to get the idea, and he said that to use, and I quote: "To use a charitable word, confusion in the opposition ranks as to what the principle of the government's action is in this regard." Well, I submit, Madam Speaker, if there's any confusion, I think it's the public that's confused. I think they would like to know, too, just what this school tax rebate really means. I think that the principle of the system of rebate, Madam Speaker, is entirely wrong. I think that there could have been other ways in which this government could have given relief to the property taxpayer in regard to school taxes. It could have increased grants, Madam Speaker. For some time now there has been considerable concern over the school grants and I only -- I wish to refer to a brief submitted to the Premier and to the government by the joint action committee of the School Board and Council of Seven Oaks, School Division No. 10. They are pointing out the need for revision of school grants, so one would think that with this, it would be a simple matter just to increase school grants, and not go to this rather complicated and confusing way of making a rebate to the property taxpayer.

I would also submit that if the government wanted really to give relief to the property taxpayer, it could also see that it paid its school grants on time, because this in itself is costing the school districts of Manitoba considerable money. By having the school grants late, Madam Speaker, it's costing the people of Manitoba three quarters of a million dollars in interest, because 25 million dollars is involved; six months' interest at 6 percent is three quarters of a million dollars. So I suggest that if the government really wanted to give relief, this is one way in which it could do it.

Another way, Madam Speaker, would be to give some relief to our Metro Transit in regard to its payment of taxes. I have here a sheet that tells me that the increase in cost to our Metro Transit, due to new taxes, is \$60,900.00. Now, there have been requests made from time to time to get some relief in regard to the tax on diesel fuel because this is a publicly-owned transportation system, but now they have this added burden of \$60,900 on top of what they have already paid. So this would have been some way of giving relief to the people who pay taxes. I think that this is the thin edge of the wedge, Madam Speaker. I think that the government is flying a kite to see which way the wind blows in regard to a full-fledged sales tax, because while I would have voted against a sales tax, I think that it would have been much more honourable if they had proposed a sales tax, probably eliminating some of the necessities of life, because this would have been clear-cut. But this way of doing it has more than we in the Opposition confused; as I said before, the whole public are confused.

I said in introducing the resolution that this is being paid to a select group of taxpayers, namely, the owners of property. The Honourable Member for Roblin agreed with me, and I quote, Madam Speaker: "He said" -- and he's quoting me, by the way -- "he said this was only helping a select group of taxpayers, and this is quite right. This is the point I am trying to make to your Leader, that this burden of education has been bearing on a select group of taxpayers." Well, I wonder if he thinks that it's only the owners of property that have been paying school taxes, Madam Speaker, and this is the very point that we're trying to make; that in this day and age of high rise apartments and this sort of thing, we have people who live for years in this sort of accommodation. They too are certainly paying for the cost of education.

It's interesting to note that in the City of Winnipeg -- I haven't the figures for the rest of the Metro area -- but the owners of property only represent 45 percent. Fifty-five percent of the people in Winnipeg are renting; 45,600 in fact are only the owners. The honourable member was quite frightened over the fact that two rebates would be paid, and I submit that for anyone owning an apartment block with 40 or 50 suites and who would be only entitled to a fifty dollar rebate would be enough of a businessman to know that he would much prefer the fifty dollars to go to the tenants, \$50 each, because this certainly would enhance his business investment, and I submit that that was just being over-anxious. I said before that this school tax rebate discriminates; it discriminates against people who have bought through the co-operative venture, and this is a trend in society today, Madam Speaker, and we will hear more and more of this co-operative effort so I suggest that this is discrimination. This government seems to be, in my opinion, good at over-compensating just as it over-compensated when it put the 50 percent increase in the Manitoba Hospital Services premium. Few people could see the

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd).....sense to have such a wild jump; but it seems to be the policy to over-compensate, to bring in the money and then they seem to make themselves heroes. In other words I submit that this is a similar situation in making the school tax rebate. I think the government hopes that by the time May and June rolls around and that people will be getting their school tax rebates that they will be more inclined to forget some of the taxes, some of the taxes which have been called vicious, and I believe them to be so.

I think that this government, despite some of the good work it has done, has made itself very very unpopular with the people of Manitoba at this time. I want to draw a parallel, Madam Speaker, and I don't wish to be unkind. I wish to remind the House that in West Kildonan on November 8th, 1965, the joint action of the Council of West Kildonan and the School Board triggered off a series of meetings which was responsible for the defeat of the former Liberal government and I said I didn't wish to be unkind because this government did guide the province through a period of depression when it called for austerity and close budget logic. But that government erred just as this government is doing; it didn't keep its ear to the ground as to what people were saying. Out of my scrapbook here I wish to just remind the House the Winnipeg Tribune of that date had a headline, "West Kildonan starts cry for political pressure in battle for increased school grants and this was joined by councils right across the breadth of Manitoba." Now I think that a similar situation exists because I think this government, despite the good work it has done about the larger school divisions and many other things, would not stand a chance if it faced the people of Manitoba today for that very reason.

I wish to draw attention to a brief just presented to the government by the West Kildonan, or the Seven Oaks School District, which comprises the joint action committee of the School Board and Council of West Kildonan, because and I quoted it a few moments ago, here again they have submitted a brief showing a similar chart just as the people in 1956 showed where provincial costs to education were declining in relation to the amount the local taxpayer was asked to put up, here we have a parallel case. It shows school budgets as compared to the provincial grant share. Very graphically illustrated. One would think there could have been a far more intelligent and simple way of making a rebate or to give relief to the property taxpayer, because we have seen not only the one commission, but three commissions; I believe the Murray Fisher, known as the Murray Fisher Commission, I believe the Cumming Commission mentioned something of it, and the Michener Commission, all favoured the idea that real property taxes were carrying far too much of the tax load and I believe the government, heeding the recommendations, wanted to give some relief. But this was a strange way to go about it. This is political suicide because, as I said before, they wouldn't dare face the people of Manitoba with this type of taxation.

A copy of the Thompson Citizen came to hand, a letter to the editor; I don't wish to read it because it's lengthy, but it says "enough of Duff" and it even suggests separation from the rest of Manitoba because of these taxes. Probably a little extreme, Madam Speaker, but it's here and I don't like to see these sort of things because I like to see harmony. I would like to have seen the government follow the recommendations of the Michener Commission by a more straight-forward approach to the assistance of the real property taxpayer and I think that by now surely they must have seen the error of their ways and I think they should give consideration to seriously changing, because, as I say, this is relief to a selected group of taxpayers and I think that this will be easily spotted by the people of Manitoba, and I would sincerely ask the support of the House in supporting my resolution in regard to the school tax rebate in order to include people who are the renters of property also.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays, please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Jeannotte, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 17; Nays, 27.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The proposed resolution standing in the

(MADAM SPEAKER cont'd). name of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. PAULLEY: Could we have this stand, Madam Speaker?

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

MR. DONALD M. MCGREGOR (Virden): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member of Souris-Lansdowne, whereas the farmers of Manitoba have difficulty in obtaining efficient farm help; and whereas scarcity of skilled labour tends to inhibit diversified agricultural production; and whereas scarcity of skilled farm labour tends to reduce the flexibility and adaptability of farm industry to changing market demands and conditions; and whereas an efficient and flexible farm industry is in the interest of not only farmers, farm employees, but the entire economy; and whereas the denial of benefits of unemployment insurance to farm workers is an important consideration to those seeking employment; therefore be it resolved that this Legislature request the Government of Canada to extend the benefits of unemployment insurance to all farm workers.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MCGREGOR: Madam Speaker, this is rather a complicated resolution inasmuch as the products it produces, but I will try to stay within the rules of the House.

My first comment would be that the quality of our labour is the result, the better quality of our labour, the better results we have or the better products we have off our farms. I think that possibly we're not carrying the full load that we should as agriculture I know just a little bit about. I think we only have to look back possibly to 1961 when there was a drought, at least in the western part of the province and anyone who had come in to Winnipeg to try and do business, realized the deep concern that the businessmen here in the city had expressed regarding the prospects. Or we could go to the other side of the ledger I think and look after the big wheat sale to Russia and how the economy, our quotas were up, the farmers were spending their money and I think they are probably the best spenders. And when this resolution was getting off the floor I contacted many organizations, the Farmers Union, the United Grain Growers, the Manitoba Pool Elevators and just generally every farmer I met I asked his impression of this resolution. While there were some that were opposing it -- even a week ago today at Brandon Fair, every stranger I met I asked him and the odd one would oppose it, but when you really went into it and asked him, is this fair that the farm labourer should not be entitled to this, he had to admit it was right. I think a few days ago the Honourable Member for Morris said that we had the best of this and the best of that and I agree with him, and today this was carried on, but I say the best is no longer good enough because here in Canada we are importing far too much agricultural produce. In fact, I could probably have this article tabled, it's The Voice of The Farmer and it states, "Canada, though an agriculturally advanced country, imported \$140 of agricultural goods per capita" -- and it goes on but I won't carry this any further. This was very surprising to me that this is the case. I think possibly if we look around, even here in the City of Winnipeg we will find some of our eating houses and some of our department stores are importing goods that we raise right here, possibly because we are not sharp enough, we are not producing an economical enough a product. I say that if our labour was better -- and this is where we must start I think to improve it.

Further, in other articles I have read you will see here, "Improvements Needed in the Grain and Oilseed Crops," and this is true. I would like to go into special crops myself but I am a little worried as far as the labour is concerned. If I was sure of getting the right type of labour I would be quite happy to go into this, but I think this is cutting down somewhat of the gross product that agriculture should be producing in Manitoba or in Canada. I think it was a very timely article this afternoon and I do congratulate the Tribune for this article, "The Province that Wheat Built". Well I'm mainly a wheat farmer. In the other heading, "Diversity is The Key Word," and I certainly agree this is the key word to our agricultural product today.

I had an experience last fall after leaving this Legislature just a little bit late, harvest was upon us and I had to resort to import combines from the United States. This was rather costly to me. It was some \$32 bucks an hour, but it was a job well done, and although we have very fine relationships with them, it still was money going out of Manitoba. There were some 48 combines came into Manitoba last year, and in phoning back to North Dakota I understand they averaged something in excess of \$3,000 per machine. There was 47 other pieces of harvest equipment came in here and I think in all sincerity this would have been cut down greatly had we had the reliable farm labourers. Myself I wouldn't have had them had I been able to get a man to run my combine day and night and do an efficient job.

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd).....

Furthermore, in contacting some of the members in Ottawa, there has been a Royal Commission on unemployment insurance and they are going to try and weed out -- I have the report here, I just got it -- it was unavailable at the library and I certainly won't start to read any portion of it, but glancing through it they are trying to weed out some of the weaknesses and I think we who are so-called lawmakers are not too proud of some of the weaknesses and some of the abuses that have been going on on the unemployment insurance. I would like to see that the farm labour people are included in this -- Gill Report it's called.

I think sometimes we have to stand up knowing there is going to be some opposition to this resolution, but when right is right I believe you've got to go beyond, regardless of your colleagues; regardless of the buck involved; or if necessary regardless of friends. You must say right is right and I think the farm labourer today is in many circles considered the door-mat of our social living. This is not right because the farm labourer today is a skilled man. If he is working for a livestock farmer he's got to know almost a portion of the business of a vet. If he's working on a grain farm he's got to be a mechanic, he's got to know the running of the equipment, and he's got to know how to adjust it. I say that he is skilled, more skilled probably than 60 percent of us right in this Assembly Hall. In any case, I would like to suggest through you, Madam Speaker, that we get behind this resolution and for once possibly forget our political affiliations and go for the betterment of Manitoba and also indirectly for the betterment of Canada.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, we heartily support the resolution. There should be some equalization and no section of labour helping the economy in Canada should be disqualified, particularly at the present time when farm labour is scarce because of unemployment insurance, and if they go to work on the farm by the day they lose so many days when it's raining or the weather is not good. Equalization is the main principle in connection with the unemployment insurance. I think if this resolution is adopted and if Ottawa gives it favourable consideration, I don't think we need to worry about a shortage of farm labour, particularly during harvesting time.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for La Verendrye.

MR. VIELFAURE: Madam Speaker, I would just like to say a few words in support of this resolution. I imagine that when the Unemployment Insurance Act was passed farmers were not included because at that time it was always thought that farming was a very seasonal operation. It was mostly grain farming in those days and the other types of farmer were not the main source of farm employment, and grain growing was mainly a summer operation. However, since then the farming situation has changed very much and today we will find a great many number of farmers who conduct an operation that lasts the year round. For example, the cattle farmers, the hog farmers, poultry farmers and so on have a very specialized operation which is operating the year round.

Now most of the farmers look as a source of employment to farm sons, because farming itself is not like industry, a departmentalized operation, and anybody who is to work on a farm has to have some knowledge. Usually the best farm labour that is available is from farmers who have more than one son and do not have enough work on the farm itself to keep them home. Quite often you will find that these boys would like to remain on the farm or would like to go into farming, but at that very moment they do not have the necessary money to buy a farm or so on and they would like to go and work for some other farmers. However, the fact that there is no unemployment insurance available to them makes them in a very special situation which is not good for them, because if they should be laid off they are faced without unemployment insurance.

I think this is a detriment to farming and it makes it bad in more than one way due to the fact that farmers can not get the kind of help that they would like to have, and here I mean farmers' sons, and the fact that these young farmers who would like to stay on the farms are deprived by the same factor. As I said, now that farming is a year round operation and employs a fair amount of people, I think it should be considered under the Unemployment Insurance Act. I do not see why they should be second class in relation to industry. Definitely, if industry is granted the benefits of the Unemployment Insurance Act, I think our farming situation today has reached the stage where it should qualify and I sure will endorse this resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. M. E. MCKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd).....by the Honourable Member for Churchill, that the debate be adjourned.

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to bring to the attention of the House that a member seconding a motion should not adjourn the debate.

MR. FROESE: In that case, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye. The Honourable the Member for Springfield.

MR. FRED T. KLYM (Springfield): Madam Speaker, a few days ago when I took the adjournment on this resolution as proposed by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, I did so because I have the welfare of the farmer at heart as many other people who are farmers and non-farmers in this Assembly.

I realize that the farmer today is faced with a problem because he no longer has horses on a farm as they did years ago. You could have seen that pretty thoroughly just a week ago at the Brandon Fair. The horses of the heavy draft type are not there any more. They are few and far between. Therefore, the farmer is being faced with the situation whereby he has to do all his work with machinery. A farm truck on a farm today is a very essential vehicle but that of course could not be run on any other fuel but gasoline, and as the proposed resolution calls for, coloured tax-free gasoline.

Well, Madam Speaker, as fond as I am of farming and as fond as I am of many things, I do not think that coloured tax-free gasoline would solve the problem to the farmers of Manitoba or anywhere probably in the world. I think that there is a different way of looking at the situation. There's always another side of the coin. As one thing leads on to another, we must always try to do something for the people in such a way that they will not be confused. I think by trying to allow coloured tax-free gasoline for the farmers would cause a great deal of confusion and discomfort to many farmers, because a farmer could not always be driving around with his truck on the farm. He is bound to be on the road, and every road in Manitoba, regardless whether it's a trunk highway or a path or a trail, when it is 99 feet wide or so, whatever the case may be, it is still the Queen's Highway, and I think that that coloured tax-free gasoline would not be the solution.

I think, Madam Speaker, that we have to as farmers, and the government of the province, do something for the farmer, but not the way they are doing in Alberta or trying to do something in Saskatchewan. I don't care what they do there. I am interested to know what we are going to do right here in the Province of Manitoba for our own farmers, and I think that there is a way of doing things. What I wish to propose is something more realistic, something more workable for efficiency purposes, and this regardless of the number of trucks owned by the farmers, of convenience or common farm requirements capacity.

Madam Speaker, I believe that what we should really do to circumvent this situation in Manitoba, instead of trying to allot a certain number of gallons per farmer of coloured gasoline which is tax free, I think it'd be far better to reduce the license fees on trucks for farm use only, trucks that would be bearing farm truck license plates. The reduction of farm truck license fees should be more readily accessible by all bona fide farmers, because of the freedom that he will have to go wherever he would like, whether it be on the farm, whether he is travelling down the road, nobody's going to stop him and ask him what type of gasoline he is using in his truck. He'll be able to get out on the road anywhere in Manitoba or anywhere he would possibly want to travel. He would not have to run home probably and pick up his car instead.

I think, Madam Speaker, that in the long run other provinces where farmers are living, where they have great farming communities, those governments will beat a path to the door of Manitoba and try to adopt the same methods of helping out the farmers rather than giving them allotments of coloured tax free gasoline.

Therefore without much more ado, Madam Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dufferin, that a proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye be amended by striking out all words after "and" in the second line, and substituting therefor the following: "Whereas a substantial part of the use of such farm trucks is in farm work and off the public highway; and whereas the special character of farm trucks is recognized by the insurance of a special license under The Highway Traffic Act; and whereas it appears

(MR. KLYM cont'd).....equitable that the particular nature of these farm vehicles should be further recognized; therefore be it resolved that the government consider the advisability of extending such further recognition to bona fide farmers operating farm trucks licensed under The Highway Traffic Act by way of a reduction in farm truck license fees."

MADAM SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable the Member for Springfield, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Dufferin, that the proposed resolution be amended by striking out all the words after "and" in the second line and substituting therefor the following: whereas.....

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, if I may on a point of order here, I just wonder if the resolution is in order, because the previous resolution dealt with the question of gasoline and the present amendment, as I understand it, deals with an entirely different principle, an entirely different question altogether, and that's the matter of licensing, and I just wonder, I put up the point of order, whether it is in order.

MADAM SPEAKER: I was going to read the resolution, but I think I am wrong here. I think instead of reading it, I intend to hold the resolution and give my decision on it at a later date. Do I read the resolution or do I not? I'm confused here.

MR. MOLGAT: I'm afraid, Madam Speaker, if my reading of the rules is correct, that once the resolution is read by yourself that in effect it is accepted. Now I may be wrong on this, but my understanding was that once you read the resolution it is accepted.

MADAM SPEAKER: Could I ask the Clerk.....

MR. EVANS:my impression, Madam Speaker, before you rule on that point, this may well be the case in the case of these motions to adjourn the House on a matter of urgent public importance and I think that has been established, but my impression is that this does not apply in the case of reading a resolution. If there's any doubt in Madam Speaker's mind on this particular point, she could neglect at least to read the rest of the motion and give us her decision later.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I'd like to hear the resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: I recall that I have been asked before to read the resolution in this.....I will read it. Where did I leave off? The proposed resolution be amended by striking out all the words after "and" in the second line, and substituting therefor the following: "Whereas a substantial part of the use of such farm trucks is in farm work and off the public highways; and whereas the special character of farm trucks is recognized by the issuance of a special license under The Highway Traffic Act; and whereas it appears equitable that the particular nature of these farm vehicles should be further recognized; therefore be it resolved that the government consider the advisability of extending such further recognition to bona fide farmers operating farm trucks licensed under The Highway Traffic Act by way of a reduction in farm truck license fees." I would like to take this resolution under consideration and I will give my ruling later. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable the Member for St. James.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, the underlining motive behind the resolution before us from the Honourable Member for Assiniboia is of course safety on our highway, particularly our highway Portage Avenue west of Winnipeg. This is of course the most commendable purpose and I am sure has the unanimous support of every one of us. We are all and should be most gravely concerned with the toll of traffic accidents on our roads today which I am afraid will incline to get worse. It's very easy to say that. It's very difficult to find a solution, but I do want to say how much I commend the honourable member for bringing this forward.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland asked regarding location of this area, and may I say that this area lies west of Winnipeg, west of the finest city and constituency of Manitoba, St. James, into the area of Assiniboia. Portage Avenue in this area is carrying an increasing load. The area both north and south of this main artery is increasing extremely rapidly, as the Honourable Member for Assiniboia pointed out, and safety is becoming an increasing problem. The government is fully cognizant of this point and as mentioned in a similar resolution last year, construction to widen this road was commenced and I think almost completed to a cost of approximately \$200,000, which has helped the problem somewhat; but the traffic is increasing and has pretty well taken up that slack.

Safety on our roads, I feel, -- it's difficult to find a single solution. Traffic lights, yes they do help. Control of traffic, yes it helps, and I think probably the biggest ingredient is probably courtesy on the road, something which you can't legislate. These two intersections

(MR. STANES cont'd) as mentioned in this resolution are particularly apparent and as members probably saw tonight in the press just this evening, in the Winnipeg daily Tribune, tonight's paper -- and with that, many happy returns to the newspaper -- they pointed out the tragic death of a small girl at this intersection, and pointed out that an elderly gentleman was killed there fairly recently, and also a child was seriously hurt at this point. It is a problem.

As the Honourable Minister of Public Works pointed out during questions before the Orders of the Day today, Madam Speaker, this area of roadway which I think starts at Sharpe Boulevard extending through this area to the perimeter has been or will very shortly be passed over to the control of Metro. I would like to mention the purposes of lights, which in order to illustrate the difficulty of trying to put lights in their right places rather than have them scattered at every intersection. The main purpose of lights, so the engineers tell me, is to firstly, get as much traffic through the road as possible with the maximum safety and speed that the limit will allow; secondly, to break that traffic into blocks so that cross traffic can pass across that main highway and also pedestrians can pass. This is the reason why they like to time the traffic lights so that traffic can proceed the whole length of this roadway without being stopped, and then parts of the traffic be broken up so that, as I say, pedestrians can use the road which they have every right to do and should do safely, and cross pedestrians.

However, the problem is now with Metro, and I am sure that Metro will continue its studies in this matter which has been studied by the engineers of the Provincial Government, and I am sure that very shortly we can expect lights -- I hope so -- in these areas in the right places for the safety of everybody and that we may see no more, no repetition of this tragic accident that was reported in tonight's paper. Incidentally, I might add that the jury verdict was that lights be put up at these two points.

The second part of the resolution, Madam Speaker, is the overpass and cloverleaf at the perimeter highway. Really, little has changed since this resolution was before us last year, except that the perimeter in the eastern section has been completed with an overpass on the Red River, and the traffic has increased substantially on the perimeter highway, so I am informed, on the south section. It's interesting to note that the big increase in the perimeter highway on the south part of Winnipeg is truck traffic, which is of course one of the main purposes of having that perimeter highway, to divert these large trucks from the centre of Winnipeg, and apparently it is now working. After the completion of the eastern limits, with the completion of the bridge this year across the Red, it is I believe the intention to continue the north section. As this north section is completed, more traffic of course will be using this highway, which will increase the traffic at the intersection of the perimeter highway at Portage Avenue in Assiniboia. The cost of such a cloverleaf and bridge, I am informed, is close to a million dollars. Therefore, the engineers in the position of trying to give priorities use that money to the best advantage at that time, and I believe the time when this cloverleaf and overpass will be built is coming very shortly. I cannot support this resolution because in the resolution it includes of course the lights on Portage Avenue, it includes the overpass and bridge, and out of the current year's highway program, which of course is not possible to put in at this time. However, I feel sure, in all respect to my good friend, the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that if he keeps bringing this resolution through, he will coincide with the building of the overpass.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Member would the House allow this item to stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, whereas it is in the best interest of government-labour and labour-management relations that there be a mutual and reciprocal trust; and whereas Section 21, Subsection (3) of The Labour Relations Act, presupposes or implies that before the passing of this section

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd). strike votes in labour unions or any labour bargaining agencies were not secretly conducted and/or did not truly represent the wishes and views of those employees voting thereon; and whereas organized labour did resent, and still resents, the implication of the above section, and insists that all strike votes in the past were secretly and properly conducted. Therefore be it resolved that Section 21, Subsection (3) of The Labour Relations Act providing for a government supervised strike vote should in the best interests of government-labour and labour-management relations be immediately repealed and substituted by a provision requiring a secret strike vote with suitable sanctions for failure to observe this provision.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam, this resolution is really self-explanatory and there isn't very much that I can add to it excepting to say this, that when The Labour Relations Act was under review by a committee of this Legislature a couple of years ago, strong representations were then made on behalf of organized labour against the inclusion of this government supervised strike vote. At that time I took the position, as I still do, that the insistence upon the part of the government that a strike vote be government supervised was implying that labour had not in the past conducted their strike votes secretly and properly. And in order to ascertain from the then Minister of Labour whether or no there was any evidence that such votes in the past had been improperly taken, I was informed by him that there was no evidence in the Department of Labour that any such practice had prevailed or there was any evidence at all of any strike vote having been taken in the past which was not properly taken. I also enquired of the Minister at that time as to whether or no he had copies of the constitutions of the various labour organizations that were certified as bargaining agents and I was informed in the affirmative. I was still further informed that all of these labour constitutions contained a provision respecting a secret strike vote.

Madam, I feel that in the interests of good labour-management relations that this section should be repealed and should be replaced by a section making it necessary for all strike votes to be secret as they were in the past and I'm sure they would be in the future without this section, and imposing sanctions against any bargaining agent or any labour union which did not observe that provision. I think that that would put this matter back in its proper perspective and in the place where it should have been in the first place.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Madam Speaker, in rising at this time, I would like to inform the honourable members of this House that partaking at this time would be our position to several resolutions on the order paper at the present time. And, Madam Speaker, I would like to say a word or two to honourable members about the labour-management relationships and labour-management-government relationships. It is true that there has been considerable work done between the parties themselves and between labour-management and government. However, in recent years we have been able to establish a continuous consultative group of labour and management and government people. Now early in the spring of 1964, we established at the request and with the consent of the labour and management consultative committee a twelve man labour group and a twelve man management group under the chairmanship of Dean H. D. Woods of McGill University to study and review The Labour Relations Act, The Labour Standards Act and The Employment Standards Act. On March the 2nd of this year I tabled an interim report of this committee. It is true this committee was not imposed on the parties by the government nor was it passed by resolution of this House. Actually this committee was established with and by the consent of the parties themselves and Madam Speaker, with your permission I would like to read at this time the interim report of the Woods Committee.

The Committee was established in the spring of 1964 in accordance with the government's commitment contained in the Speech from the Throne February 6th, 1964. It was committed to a comprehensive review of its labour legislation and labour policy. The Committee consists of a Chairman, H. D. Woods and a Deputy Chairman, G. C. MacLean and twenty-four members. Twelve of these latter were nominated jointly by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce, the Midwest Metal Mining Association and the Winnipeg Builders' Exchange. The present business representatives include the following: Mr. N. Bergman, Mr. J. S. Scarfe, Mr. W. H. Davison, Mr. J. D. Grant, Mr. R. H. McIsaac, Mr. J. S. Roper, Mr. J. Berkowitz, Mr. J. S. Campbell, Mr. T. H. Gibson, Mr. George Keates, Mr. A. R. McPherson and Mr. E. A. Wynne.

The labour members were nominated by the Manitoba Federation of Labour and are as

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd).....follows: Mr. Otto Andersen, Mr. Harry Duhamel, Mr. A. A. Franklin, Mr. J. James, Mr. C. F. Schubert, Mr. H. L. Stevens, Mr. J. A. Coulter, Mr. T. E. Fick, Mr. R. J. Henderson, Mr. R. H. Robbins, Mr. Jack Shirkie, Mr. Joe Wilford.

It was decided at the first meeting of the Committee to establish a sub-committee on which would fall the primary responsibility for reviewing labour relations legislation. The industry members selected the following five: Mr. W. H. Davison, Mr. E. A. Wynne, Mr. A. R. McPherson, Mr. George Keates, Mr. J. Berkowitz. The labour members selected the following five: Mr. R. J. Henderson, Mr. J. James, Mr. H. L. Stevens, Mr. J. A. Coulter, Mr. R. H. Robbins.

During the course of the year, Dr. Gordon Blake, Chairman of the already functioning Joint Committee on the Construction Trades, tendered his resignation. After consultation with the interested parties the Minister of Labour arranged the appointment of Dean Woods and Mr. MacLean as chairman and deputy-chairman respectively, of this Committee as well. Thus, the two Committees, one concerned with the over-all problems of labour policy and the other specifically with these problems in the construction industry, have become linked together.

The Review Committee has to date confined itself to an examination of The Labour Relations Act. The Committee in due course will undertake a similar examination of The Employment Standards Act, The Vacations with Pay Act, and The Department of Labour Act in accordance with its terms of reference.

The Committee unanimously resolved that all meetings of the Committee and Sub-Committee would be held in camera and that all discussions, minutes and memoranda be held in confidence by each member, subject only to the publication of such interim reports or recommendations as may be agreed upon by the whole Committee. This procedure was adopted as a means of encouraging uninhibited expressions of views and of more readily achieving mutual understanding and agreement wherever possible.

The principal method used has been rather frequent meetings of the Sub-Committee under the direction of either the chairman or the deputy chairman. All minutes and memoranda produced by the Sub-Committee deliberations are distributed to all members of the full Committee and several meetings of this larger body have been called to get endorsement of the Sub-Committee's actions and further directions.

The Committee has been aided in its work by the study of existing documents, including representations to the government made over the years by interested groups in this province and it has also studied a memorandum prepared by the Labour Relations Board some years ago.

The Committee has also commissioned the preparation of data papers on specific subjects with which it is concerned, including such matters as certification, conciliation, unfair labour practices and other provisions in Manitoba with those found in the laws of other provinces and in federal law.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, on a point of order is the Honourable Minister speaking on the resolution or is he just telling us about a committee that has been set up separate and apart from this House?

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, I am speaking to this resolution, and pointing out I am reading into the record for the honourable members the report of the Woods Committee. I told the Honourable Members earlier that it was not imposed upon the parties by the government nor was it set up by resolution of this House, but it was established by the consent of the parties themselves and I know that honourable members of this House would not want to do anything that would be prejudicial to the work of a joint committee of this nature in dealing with such sensitive and volatile subjects.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, by the same token, by reason of the fact that the Honourable Minister has allowed this Committee to be set up, does he mean to imply that because this Committee has been set up separate and apart from this House that we in this House are going to be denied the right to move resolutions dealing with the same matters and debating them? -- because that's the only inference that I can draw from your remarks.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, on a point of order I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister if he considers members of this House are bringing up matters prejudicial to his group that he's talking about.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Labour.

MR. HILLHOUSE:whether he's in order or whether he's out of order.

MADAM SPEAKER: In my opinion the Honourable Minister of Labour is trying to show, in his discourse here he is trying to show what he is doing to

MR. BAIZLEY:may I continue then?

MADAM SPEAKER: I think the Honourable Minister of Labour is in order.

MR. BAIZLEY: Thank you. Madam Speaker, the Committee has also made use of published works of students of industrial relations, and has sent delegates to two conferences. Four members attended the labour-management co-operation conference organized by the Economic Council of Canada, and three attended a Joint Study Conference at Dalhousie University where a project similar to the Manitoba Committee work has been functioning for several years. Reports were submitted to the Committee and discussed.

The Committee also had the benefit of the views of a member of the Nova Scotia Joint Study Committee concerning the Nova Scotia experiment and of reports on the Dalhousie Conference. The Committee members are breaking new ground in the sense that they are attempting to reach agreement on what they believe public policy should be, with the object of making joint representations to the government. This is in contrast to the more usual approach wherein interested groups approach the government without prior discussion with other parties of interest and with no attempt to reach common ground. In his letter of appointment to the members it was pointed out that the Committee should develop better understanding among labour, management and government and of each others problems and position, and to arrive at acceptable legislation and policy in the labour relations and labour standards field.

Members of the Committee were concerned with the dual responsibility which membership imposed upon each of them. After considerable debate they adopted the following set of principles to clarify and resolve this problem and to guide them in their work: "that labour members have the obligation to look after the labour interest; that management members have the obligation to look after management interests; that each member should be prepared to cooperate with the chairman and other members of the Committee and should have a sense of responsibility to the process itself, an attitude of integrity and good faith; that each member should approach the work with the intention of giving it honest support and effort, with flexibility of mind and patience, avoiding prejudging; listening and evaluating carefully in an attempt to understand the position of others; and that within the framework of the foregoing the Committee should give recognition to the importance of legislation which protects fundamental rights and freedoms of employees, employers, unions, and employers' associations, and enforcement of provisions designed to induce appropriate patterns of behaviour in labour relations."

The work of the Committee moved slowly at first. The members were engaged in an unfamiliar experience. As time has passed a very much improved atmosphere has developed and the discussion has become more analytical and constructive. There is every reason to believe that a rather wide range of agreement may result. The Committee has mapped out its plan of work and is engaged in serious research, study and discussion and it is becoming evident that the members are increasingly approaching their tasks as a series of problems to be solved mutually. From time to time as progress is made and mutual agreement is achieved and otherwise as the Committee determines, recommendations will be made to the Minister.

The members recognize their representative character and the need to encourage acceptance among those for whom they speak and act, of both the joint study principle itself and of any results that may flow from their work. To this end they welcomed the invitation extended by the Manitoba Federation of Labour to the chairman to address their convention and to explain the committee's work to the several hundred delegates. A similar invitation to the chairman to address a meeting of management representatives was equally appreciated.

Madam Speaker, the purpose of reading this report is to point out that the Labour Relations Act is under study; that our position is not one of asking the honourable members opposite to withdraw and not debate it if they so desire, but I think there is a strong feeling by honourable members here when they consider the relationship between labour and management and when you have non-partisan people working on these committees that debates could be prejudicial to the work of the Committee. I merely say this if members opposite wish to debate these problems I would ask my colleagues on this side to refrain from entering into debate and vote against these resolutions.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker we have just heard the most amazing proposition for a Minister of the government to take. This is a House where we are supposed to have free speech. That's why we are sent here Madam Speaker. And for a Minister of the Crown to get up and to say that --first of all to infer that members on this side should not be proposing resolutions because he happens to be giving consideration to something and that he happens to have a committee, and then to further get up and say that he has instructed his members --(Interjection)-- instructed the members on the government side not to speak on the subject and to vote against any resolution that's brought forward. Well Madam Speaker what's this House coming to? On what basis are we expected to come here? Are we sent here by our constituents? Called here by the Lieutenant-Governor to be told by a Minister of the Crown that we should not be bringing up certain subjects before this House? And his backbenchers to be told by him that they are not to make statements on the subject and close their ears to any suggestions made by this side of the House and vote automatically against a proposition? I've never heard of anything as preposterous.

This government is saying, as seems to be its attitude so frequently in this House, there is no need for the House, there is no need for the members to come here, that it can operate fully well, in fact according to its dictates the better, by having its own private committees with no discussion and that members of this side should be asked to sit quietly and if they dare propose a resolution as has my colleague the member for Selkirk then he's to be criticized and indicated that this isn't the proper course of action for him to take.

Madam Speaker, this legislation that my honourable member seeks to change was introduced in this House, if I remember correctly now some three years ago, as a result of the Brandon enquiry. We opposed that legislation at that time. We opposed the whole attitude of the government then on the matter of labour relations because they took one special case, one unfortunate case, true, in the history of labour relations in Manitoba, on the basis of that one case and that one report they proceeded with legislation which in my opinion was unwise unwarranted and uncalled for. And now, after three years when an honourable member on this side proposes to remove this the Minister says we have a committee investigating it; it's really not proper for you to do so but if you absolutely insist well I can't stop you but I'll see to it that my members at least don't participate and simply vote it down. I'm opposing any such attitude.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I wish to take part in this debate at this time. I will not make reference to the suggestion of the Honourable the Minister of Labour as to the conduct of anyone in this House. I want to deal with the subject matter that we have before us in the resolution of the Honourable Member for Selkirk but I cannot help Madam Speaker but refer to the remarks of the Honourable Minister of Labour. He has indicated to the House generally speaking that because of the fact that the Woods Commission is considering aspects of labour legislation in the Province of Manitoba that all parties, I don't mean political parties, but all parties concerned with labour legislation in the Province of Manitoba should await until such times as this commission has considered all aspects of labour legislation and made their report.

But Madam Speaker I want to point out to my honourable friend the Minister of Labour that such is not the case, because one of the more important partners who are taking part in the consideration of the Wood's Commission is labour itself, and labour itself Madam Speaker, only this year, only this year, presented a Brief to the Government of Manitoba which contained many items that dealt with labour relations and in particular with the Labour Relations Act itself. Now I wasn't present at the Cabinet meeting when representations were made by the Manitoba Federation of Labour to the Premier and the Cabinet but I do happen to have in my possession a copy of the submission that was made by the Manitoba Federation of Labour to the government, and in their submission Madam Speaker they make reference to the Woods Commission and I want to read from the submission of the Manitoba Federation of Labour what labour has to say in respect of the suggestion of the Honourable Minister of Labour --and I am reading from page 2 of the submission of the Manitoba Federation of Labour to the Premier and the Cabinet of the Province of Manitoba-- and I quote: "During the past three years we have participated in joint discussions in labour, management, government seminars in Minaki. Our labour consultative committee has met the Minister of Labour and his assistant several times and we appreciate the informality of these meetings and personal friendly relationship that has grown up between us and the Minister and all his staff. More recently we have ventured into a new experience and we are participating in the Wood Labour Legislation Review Committee. We would be less than honest however if we did not admit that we have entered into this joint review with our eyes wide open. We are not being led down the garden path in blind anticipation that any great

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). revolution of social or legislative reform will follow from these deliberations, at least in the foreseeable future." I think that's very important, Madam Speaker. And to add emphasis may I re-read from the brief so that we completely understand the position of labour --and I again I read from the Brief to the Cabinet:" We are not being led down the garden path in blind anticipation that any great revolution of social or legislative reform will flow from these deliberations, at least in the foreseeable future." I go on: "We do hope however that by continuing this association we can demonstrate to the public and to those who have constantly attacked us, that we are indeed responsible members of a democratic society and are anxious and willing to play a significant role in the development and the progress of this province which we all call home."

Then Madam Speaker, the presentation to the Cabinet goes on dealing with matters of concern in the Manitoba Labour Relations Act --and again I quote, and this time from Page 3 of the submission: "We have contained in our Brief several suggested amendments to the Manitoba Labour Relations Act. We feel that these suggestions will expedite the carrying out of the general purposes of the Act and alleviate certain specific areas of dispute. All are important but we give top priority to the following --and then Madam Speaker, we come into the question of the; some of the sections of the Labour Relations Act which are not connected with the resolution that is before us at the present time, namely that section of the Labour Relations Act dealing with the secret strike. So in order to place on the record Madam Speaker, what the Manitoba Federation of Labour has to say in respect of that portion of Section 21 of the Act dealing with the secret strike vote, I want now to read from Page 6 of the submission, what the Manitoba Federation of Labour had to say to the government respecting the strike vote legislation. And again may I quote: "Once again we reiterate our complete disapproval of Section 21 of the Act, which deals with government conducted strike votes. We reaffirm our original objections which are vindicated in the light of the past two years experience: (a) Section 21 of the Act infringes upon a Trades Union traditional right to conduct its own affairs; (b) Despite the recommendations of the Tritschler Report there was never any justification for the introduction of this legislation; (c) The implications behind Section 21 presupposes that union leadership would institute strike action without the full knowledge and approval of the majority of its members. It is an insult to the intelligence of every responsible trade union leader. We respectfully suggest in section (d) that Section 21 has been nothing but a running sore of infection since it was enacted. It detracts from rather than adds to realistic collective bargaining. (e) Section 21 accomplishes nothing, but simply establish another avenue or area of dispute in collective bargaining when we already have too many. It has not proven to lessen the incidence of unions taking strike action; indeed it may be argued that it may have in fact contributed to strikes which may not otherwise have occurred. And (f) Section 21 causes unnecessary delays in the settlement of disputes and cannot be adequately administered under the existing rules of the board. It permits persons who are not members of a union to vote on a matter that is strictly a union affair. (g) Section 21 conflicts with the constitutional provisions for taking strike votes of many national and international unions. If it remains it is only a matter of time before more legal warfare will occur due to this conflict. (h) Employers have interpreted the fact that they are provided with copies of the union's application for a strike vote to mean that they have a right to intervene on such applications and to argue before the board whether a strike vote will or will not be taken. (i) Section 21 of the Act cannot be made to apply to unions where no vote is required to institute strike action. The denial by the board to conduct a strike vote of the Plasterers this year is just an example of the difficulties labour can encounter in attempting to administer this section of the Act. (j) Section 21 has thrown additional burden of work on the Labour Board staff which is already overburdened and has cost the department and the taxpayer additional and unnecessary expense." Then Madam Speaker, the brief goes on: "We have laid stress on these particular sections of the Act Mr. Premier to impress upon you the urgent need of our membership for immediate change in these areas of the Act. Continuing on Page 9 of the brief. Madam Speaker, the Manitoba Federation of Labour goes on to say: "We agree that there is some merit in making a detailed study and analysis of certain sections of the Act; however, we can assure you that our membership is no longer willing to patiently stand by until something is done to say certification unfair labour practice in Section 21.

So Madam Speaker, I think that this is very important and very vital to harmonious relationships between labour and management and while I'm sure that labour appreciates, as it indicates in their brief to the government, that they are ready and willing to sit down with the Wood Commission, or may I suggest Madam Speaker, indeed any other commission charged with

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) the responsibility of attempting to bring about more harmonious relationships between labour and management that the Manitoba Federation of Labour and its affiliates are ready and willing to take part. But however, Madam Speaker, labour as indicated in their submission to the government do not want to wait. And I respectfully suggest Madam Speaker, that labour should not be asked to wait. I respectfully suggest that it is proper for any member of a House to propose a resolution to bring about improvements in our Labour Relations Act. I think the regrettable part is that the speech of His Honour did not contain a sentence or two to indicate that changes would be made in The Labour Relations Act to remove the objections of one of the larger partners in the community in the Province of Manitoba.

So I say to my honourable friend the Minister, I hope that he was only jesting when he suggested that labour should wait until the Woods Commission made its report. I hope that he was only really jesting, Madam Speaker, when he suggested that members of the government should or might be precluded from taking part in this very important resolution that it means so much Madam Speaker to labour as indicated by their submission to the Premier and Cabinet this year.

May I further say Madam Speaker, that this submission of the Manitoba Federation of Labour was as a result of their annual convention whereby a considerable number of delegates from all of the unions representing labour organizations the length and breadth of the Province of Manitoba, considered all matters pertaining to labour and to management and to the Province of Manitoba and as the result of their deliberations in their convention, came to the conclusion that this is what they wanted in respect of a secret strike vote and this portion of The Labour Relations Act. So I say to my honourable friend, let's not tarry, let's not delay, let's remove from The Labour Relations Act that portion which charges irresponsibility, by inference at least, on labour in the Province of Manitoba.

May I say Madam Speaker, that insofar as the resolution itself is concerned the Honourable Member for Selkirk, I think, has put the finger to a source of trouble and I think that his resolution is reasonable, except for one portion of his resolution to which I take exception -- and I'm sure Madam Speaker that labour would likewise-- and that is the last portion of the resolution as proposed by the Honourable Member for Selkirk. For in the resolve as a whole Madam Speaker, my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk says, "therefore be it resolved that Section 21 (3) of The Labour Relations Act providing for a government supervised strike vote should in the best interests of government, labour, labour-management relations be immediately repealed." Then my honourable friend goes on to say "and substituted by a provision requiring a secret strike vote with suitable sanctions for failure to observe this provision."

It appears to me Madam Speaker that there is a conflict in this portion of my honourable friend's resolution with certain portions of the preamble, because in the preamble to his resolution he states that "whereas organized" --in the second whereas he states "whereas organized labour did resent and still resents the implication of the above section, 21.(3), and insists that all strike votes in the past were secretly and properly conducted." I suggest to my honourable friend that basically he is right or indeed he is right that in the past labour did keep its house in order, it did conduct the votes in accordance with the constitution of their respective organizations. So I would suggest Madam Speaker that we should revert back completely and not impose by legislation as suggested by the last two or three lines of the resolution of my honourable friend, substituting something else, namely a provision requiring a secret strike vote with suitable sanctions for failure to observe this provision, because I would respectfully suggest to my honourable friend from Selkirk that this in effect would almost have the same result as the present section in The Labour Relations Act. So therefore Madam Speaker I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster that the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word 'repealed' in the third last line thereof. The resolution then Madam Speaker would be worded, "therefore be it resolved that section 21, (3) of The Labour Relations Act providing for a government supervised strike vote should in the best interests of government, labour and labour-management relations be immediately repealed."

MADAM SPEAKER put the question.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, "whereas it is in the best interests of Manitoba that every effort be made to promote, establish and perpetuate a sound and harmonious relationship between management and labour; to create and maintain an attitude which will be conducive to the retention of present industry and to the encouragement of the establishment of new industries here. And whereas one of the best methods of achieving the foregoing would be the establishment of a joint Labour-Management Study and Research Committee. Therefore be it resolved that the Government of Manitoba give consideration to the establishment of such a joint Management-Labour Research Committee with such research assistance as may be provided by Manitoba or by the University of Manitoba for the purpose of achieving: (a) a sound and harmonious relationship between management and labour. (b) The creation and maintenance of an atmosphere conducive to the retention of present industry in Manitoba and to the encouragement of new industries to establish here. (c) To establish, maintain and perpetuate such procedures and relationships as will be conducive to free collective bargaining. (d) To discourage all legislation which will be restrictive in nature. (e) To devise ways and means of promoting and encouraging greater industrialization in Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. EVANS: this resolution is to be dispensed with I would like to raise a point of order. I thought I heard my honourable friend read the resolution in a slightly different way from the way it appears in the Order Paper, not a serious difference but there was a difference of wording. I think if I am correct, and perhaps if I am not correct the honourable member will indicate this, that in the second "whereas", he read that 'one of the best methods of achieving the foregoing would be the establishment of. . . ' ". Now if there is a variation from the wording that we have, perhaps it should be accepted by the House and the resolution go forward as the honourable member has read it.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed to go as you have read it?

MR. JOHNSTON: I am agreeable to the wording of the resolution Madam Speaker and if I misread it I apologize.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. Are you ready for the question?

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, in order to clarify, would you mind reading the resolution?

MADAM SPEAKER: Whereas it is in the best interests of Manitoba that every effort be made to promote, establish and perpetuate a sound and harmonious relationship between management and labour; to create and maintain an attitude which will be conducive to the retention of present industry and to the encouragement of the establishment of new industries here. And whereas one of the best methods of achieving the foregoing could be to establish a joint Labour-Management Study and Research Committee. Therefore be it resolved that the Government of Manitoba give consideration to the establishment of such a joint Management-Labour Research Committee with such research assistance as may be provided by Manitoba or by the University of Manitoba for the purpose of achieving: (a) A sound and harmonious relationship between management and labour. (b) The creation and maintenance of an atmosphere conducive to the retention of present industry in Manitoba and to the encouragement of new industries to establish here. (c) To establish, maintain and perpetuate such procedures and relationship as will be conducive to free collective bargaining. (d) To discourage all legislation which will be restrictive in nature. (e) To devise ways and means of promoting and encouraging greater industrialization in Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question ?

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker.

MR. EVANS: convenience of the Honourable Member to address the House at its next sitting. Now this is Private Members night and I suggest it only for his convenience. If he would prefer to continue for five minutes then that's quite acceptable to us, otherwise I ask what his wishes might be.

MR. JOHNSON: I'm agreeable, Madam Speaker.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move --(Interjection)-- Then I think Madam Speaker, I would ask that this order be allowed to stand. Is it agreed?(Agreed) Then Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that the House do now adjourn.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until Wednesday afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.