

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Hamiota.

MR. STRICKLAND: I'd like to be assured of that applause when I sit down, Madam Speaker. Before the 5:30 hour, Madam Speaker, I was endeavouring to show that Manitoba because of the addition to the compulsory licence for a compulsory -- in place of compulsory that we have the additional sum on the licensee to provide for -- in place of the third party liability. In Manitoba now, it's within a half of one percent of a compulsory state in regard to coverages.

Now, I would like to cover the point made that automobile insurance under the compulsory state would be cheaper. And I think that that is an incorrect assumption. I think we in this country are provided with probably the lowest possible premiums at this date. The insurance companies in 1963 in Canada had a deficit of \$26 million in automobile insurance; and in 1964, this deficit is expected to be in excess of \$20 million. When they are suffering deficits, Madam Speaker, on the rates that they are charging, how could you possibly have lower rates? With the tremendous increase in the registration of motor vehicles and the increased mileage being driven on our roads, we are bound to have more accidents. Repair costs are higher; our hospitalization and our medical costs for those injured in accidents are higher. So the rates couldn't be otherwise than an increase, whether it's 9.8 percent as mentioned by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks or not, I can't say. In the green book which is the statistical book for automobile insurance, or all insurances for that matter, all accidents in the Province of Manitoba increased from '61 to '62 by three percent; and from '62 to '63, they increased by six percent. The latest figures of the first nine months of 1964 -- and if you compare that with the first nine months of 1963 -- there is a further 4.3 percent increase in all accidents in the Province of Manitoba. These figures, Madam Speaker, would indicate the year to year increase and it emphasizes the sharp jump of a 65 percent persons who are injured, or killed rather, and 23 percent persons injured between the years 1962 and 1964. When we consider that the average bodily injury and body damage claimed from 1958 was \$254.00 and increased up until 1963 so that it is now \$321.00 automobile rates have to increase and it doesn't matter whether its compulsory government insurance or a private industry. Likewise under the comprehensive with a 25 deductible, which we have in Manitoba, the rates in 1958 - or at least the average claim in 1958 was \$70.00, and in 1963 it is \$115.00 Collision, under the \$100.00 deductible, in 1961 it was \$337.00 gradually increased up to 1963 at \$368.00. Once again I say, Madam Speaker, with these increased costs, premiums have to go up and it doesn't matter whether it's compulsory government insurance or whether it's private industry.

I understand that the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office in 1964, suffered a deficit of \$752,000, and that deficit is expected to be greater this year. So even under compulsory, if it's to break even, the rates have to be increased, simply because the losses have to be paid. I have some figures, Madam Speaker, comparing Manitoba and Saskatchewan. I realize it is extremely difficult to compare these two provinces when their coverages are not the same. For instance, the Saskatchewan Government entered compulsory insurance in 1944, and at that time the charge was \$5.00 and it was more or less an accident insurance. I think in 1946 they brought in their third party liability with the minimum limits of \$5,000 for one person; \$10,000 for one accident - that's bodily injury; and \$1,000 property damage, also with a 100 deductible property damage. In 1949 it was again changed and they added collision with a \$100.00 deductible. About 1957 they changed the whole procedure again and they cut out the property damage deductible and they added in a \$200.00 deductible collision clause. So even today, it's extremely difficult to compare the coverages that they have in Saskatchewan with what we have in Manitoba, simply because there's no common ground.

So for the purposes of figures that I want to quote this evening, Madam Speaker, I have endeavoured to draw up a plan for each case that would be as close to similar in both Manitoba and Saskatchewan. But if we use the figures for bodily injury and property damage of 300,000 inclusive; collision with a 50 deductible, which you can procure under the package policy in Saskatchewan; and a comprehensive, which in Manitoba is a 25 deductible and in Saskatchewan is a 50 deductible - we don't sell a 50 deductible in Manitoba, so this is an advantage to the Manitoba buyer; and on top of this all the private insurers in this province, their premiums are subject to a maximum of 45 percent discount for winter cancellation which is not provided by the Saskatchewan Government. For the purposes of these examples, if we have a Chevy private passenger automobile, if there are no claims for the drivers and there are no drivers

(MR. STRICKLAND cont'd). . . . . under age 24 in all these instances that I wish to quote - and I want to put these on the record so that they can be looked at afterwards. Let's take a farmer living at Fleming, Saskatchewan, right on the border. One farmer lives in Manitoba, one mile east of the town and the Saskatchewan farmer lives one mile west of the town. If we go back to 1960, we find that in Saskatchewan a 1957 model owner pays \$56.00 for this coverage, and the Manitoba farmer pays \$50.00. We go to the 1963 rates - I don't quote the '61, '62, simply because I haven't got them, and I was unable to get them - the '63 rates, we find a 1960 model paid a \$65.00 premium in Saskatchewan compared to 46 in Manitoba. In that same year a 1963 model paid \$70.00 in Saskatchewan, and \$51.00 in Manitoba, or a saving of \$19.00. The '64 rates: the 1960 model Chev paid \$67.00 in Saskatchewan, and the '60 model in Manitoba paid \$48.00, or a saving of \$19.00. In that same year a 1964 model paid \$76.00 in Saskatchewan, and \$59.00 in Manitoba, or a saving of \$17.00. The '65 rates: the '60 model Chev paid \$71.00 in Saskatchewan, and it paid \$52.00 in Manitoba, a saving of \$19.00. And a '65 model paid \$81.00 in Saskatchewan to \$65.00 in Manitoba. How can the Manitoba farmer then want government insurance when the coverage he's getting in Manitoba is better and the premium is lower.

I also tried to compare, Madam Speaker, urban areas -- and this is an extremely difficult thing to do again because the populations are different, they are not exactly the same and the conditions in the different urban areas cannot be compared basically. But Moose Jaw and Brandon are fairly similar. Moose Jaw has a population of 33,000 compared to Brandon's 28,000. The 1963 rates for this 1960 model in Moose Jaw is \$70.00 compared to \$63.00 in Brandon, or a saving of \$7.00 to the Brandon motorists. For a '63 model of that year, they paid \$75.00 extension compared to \$69.00 in Brandon, or a saving of \$6.00. I was unable to get the Moose Jaw rates for the next year but I did get the Regina rates, and I compare that particular year with Brandon, and I realize here that it's not a true comparison because Regina's a much larger city than Brandon and you would have thought that the rates probably would have been higher, but I want to quote them just to be fair. The '60 model in 1964 rating in Regina was 71 compared to 68 in Brandon; the '64 model was \$80.00 compared to 74 in Brandon, or a saving of 6. And in '65, I have the -- back to the Moose Jaw ratings the 1960 model Chev cost \$75.00 compared to \$65.00 in Brandon, and the '65 model this year in Moose Jaw cost \$85.00 compared to Brandon at \$79.00. This is again a saving to the Manitoba purchaser of automobile insurance. The one thing. . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Before the honourable member leaves this phase of his remarks, would he permit a question? Does not the Manitoba premiums have in addition to that the cost of the plates whereas in Saskatchewan that is included in the figures that you are quoting?

MR. STRICKLAND: Madam Speaker, I'm not sure that that statement is correct. I understand that the--(Interjection)--Oh, no it doesn't. I'm making a flat statement, too. Mind you, the cost of license plates in Saskatchewan is not as great as it is in Manitoba. I have the comparisons if they are of interest to the honourable member.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may. Are not the costs for the license plates included in the assessment for insurance in Saskatchewan?

MR. STRICKLAND: No, my understanding is that that is not so, Madam Speaker. There's a separate figure used for the insurance and one for the license plates.

MR. HILLHOUSE: . . . . . permit a question. Is it not true that in Saskatchewan the cost of license plates is determined by the number of drivers?

MR. STRICKLAND: There is a variance of . . . . . and this is true. Even your driver's license is increased for insurance purposes. For instance, I think the automatic compensation that the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks mentioned this afternoon is charged on the driver license rather than on the license registration.

MR. PAULLEY: Speaking of this. Madam Speaker, on this point --

MR. STRICKLAND: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I might continue and the honourable member could probably -- if I've made any error, he could probably correct me after if he doesn't mind. --(Interjection)--Fine. You can correct me if I'm wrong.

The point made by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks this afternoon, Madam Speaker, was the automatic compensation, which is payment to anyone involved in an accident regardless of costs. My understanding is, Madam Speaker, that the premium for this in the Province of Saskatchewan is \$5.00. The limits of coverage under that particular portion in Saskatchewan is \$10,000. A Manitoba resident can buy this from a Manitoba base company not for \$10,000 but \$35,000 for a \$3.00 premium. This is being sold in this province right now, so

(MR. STRICKLAND cont'd) . . . . . if you look at the automatic compensation feature, it really doesn't mean much when we're talking about dollars and cents in premiums. It is my opinion, Madam Speaker, that in Manitoba under the Safety Responsibility Law that we have, that it is a vast improvement over that that they have in Saskatchewan, or in Ontario where they have a straight financial responsibility law or that of Saskatchewan where it is compulsory law. I think under the safety responsibility law a motorist must prove himself capable of financial responsibility at the time of the accident. In Ontario they only prove their capacity to pay for an accident once they have been proven guilty under the Finance Responsibility Law, which means in effect that if you were in an accident with an individual in Ontario and he is unable to pay your costs you don't bother throwing good money after bad and bother to sue him. He therefore is able to continue on the road and being a hazard to other motorists. Here in Manitoba ours is an improvement because you must prove your capacity to meet your obligations at the time of the accident.

I think it's also true, Madam Speaker, that under compulsory insurance people tend to be careless. They don't feel the obligation that they do when they become financially obligated themselves. The honourable member this afternoon said that claims were paid in Saskatchewan regardless of fault, and this is only true to a degree, Madam Speaker, because under their collision portion of their automobile insurance if two insureds are in an accident and they both suffer \$300.00 claims, the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office pays each one of them \$100.00 and once they prove in a court of law between themselves who is liable, they then turn over the \$200.00 to the party that wasn't responsible for the accident. So it isn't true to say, Madam Speaker, that they pay regardless of fault.

Together with our Safety Responsibility Law in this province, Madam Speaker, to cover those who are in collision or in accidents with persons who are not responsible, we have the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. This is operated by the government. It's true that it's not always easy -- it's not just handed out to you, you must claim and prove your right to this money under the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund, but I nevertheless think it's the answer to those who are responsible for accidents and haven't sufficient funds to cover it. Together with the fact that we have an assigned risk plan in Manitoba which guarantees everyone that has a license. Automobile insurance, I believe, is the best arrangement that will do these three things that I believe are necessary in our automobile insurance. The one is to reduce the motor vehicle accidents. I think when you make people financially responsible themselves, they are going to be much more careful than if it's compulsory and as the honourable member said this afternoon, payment is made regardless of whether you have any obligations or not.

We assure victims of payment for their damages. It has been in the past the bodily injury claims were always paid and this year it has been extended to now take in property damage. And I believe too, Madam Speaker, that because of the type of safety responsibility law we have in this province that we have cheaper automobile insurance and I would recommend that we not accept this resolution that was put before us this afternoon, and while I realize that there are many points going to be made yet, and probably many corrections to some of the points that I have made, I am sure that it can be proven in no uncertain terms that compulsory insurance will not do what this resolution says that it will.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I wish to move, Madam, seconded by the Honourable Member from Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Before we continue I think that the honourable members would like to acknowledge the people in the gallery. There are some 100 delegates to the 6th Annual 4H Club Youth Leadership Conference. These people have been chosen to attend the 4H Leadership Conference in Winnipeg, chosen from the best across Manitoba and on behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly I welcome you.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Virden. The Honourable the Minister without Portfolio.

HON. ABRAM W. HARRISON (Minister without Portfolio) (Rock Lake): Madam Speaker, I may say at the outset of my remarks this evening that it is my intention to support the resolution, and to speak in favour of it. I might say that we maybe should go back to many years in this province to get a proper prospective of the farm labour situation in this province. The majority of this province was settled in the year 1882. I might say that my parents came to Manitoba in 1878 and they did engage in the grain business at that time and our firm has been

(MR. HARRISON cont'd). . . . prospering throughout the years since that time, and I do have some knowledge of the agricultural situation in the Province of Manitoba since the inception of grain growing in -- particularly in the western part of Manitoba.

And in speaking in respect to the resolution and unemployment insurance for farm workers, I might give just a little review of the situation a number of years ago. When the farm settlement took place in Manitoba, farms were settled by people migrating from the east who took up homesteads of a quarter-section of land and they were able to acquire or pre-emption as they call it of another quarter-section of land, which gave them a half-section of land in order to start a farm family in Manitoba. You'll recognize of course that in those days the land horsepower were actually horses. They tilled and operated the land by horses. The original settler of course did not possess horses and they used oxen to pull a one-furrow plow and break up the virgin land in Southern Manitoba. They did engage in livestock production to some extent and milk production but it was a small part of their operation and they tended to as they expanded their land holdings and their cultivated acreage increased. It became necessary for them to employ labour to assist them in their operation of their farms.

There has been over the years of course in the farmers' outlook, or objective, to become self-sufficient. For many years it was necessary that they employ labour to operate their land and unlike most employers it was necessary for them to take into their homes the labourer that they employed and they actually became one of the family. The farmer of course always has been desirous of operating the farm on his own and to dispense with hired labour wherever it was possible to do so. In the early days of course he, at harvest operation he went to the harvest excursion that came from Ontario with surplus help, and the farmers went to the harvest train and hired labour to harvest their crops. There were more farms of course in those days than there are now. As the Province of Manitoba has developed the smaller half-section farm has been uneconomical and when a farm is offered for sale of course it's usually purchased by the neighbour and he increases his holdings and he becomes a larger farmer.

The recent development of improving farm machinery has tended to accelerate this trend in Manitoba where they employed more labour, and now they buy larger and better machines. The horse of course has been relegated to the museum or the race track, and today we have farms that are known as power farms or mechanical farms and no horse is to be found anywhere on the farm. This trend of course has brought other problems to the farmers. Whereas years ago he was able to hire help that need not be too skilled, today with the operation of machinery, which costs him sometimes \$10,000 for a large tractor, it is very necessary that he employ labour that is able to operate efficiently and take care of this expensive machine. The field work of course has also become an exact science and most farmers today do not leave to chance what will happen in the harvest season of the year. They take the advice of agricultural experts and they plant those crops that are best suitable for the land and they also make use of modern machinery to harvest that crop.

This of course also tends to increase the size of the farm. The more money that you have tied up in machinery, in capital, the more acres that you have to farm and the higher skill the farm worker needs to have to be successful in the operation of a power farm.

The farmer desires to control his own operation. I think he's no different than the person who operates a business or a factory, he must be in command of his operations. And he has in the past of course as far as he was able adopted a "do-it-yourself" policy. The cost of machines and the cost of land, and capitalization of his farm has really forced him off that sort of a policy and today he must operate his farm almost in comparison to the operation of a factory. He takes all of the factors into consideration and he moves along with his farm work and the employment of help much the same as an industrialist does with his factory. It is true with the cost of machines, there's larger amount of acreage required by the farmer. It is for economic reasons of course that he acquires more land and his farm gradually becomes larger. The result of course is that there are fewer farmers in Manitoba today than there were 30 years ago. Larger machines, fewer farmers, and more skilled operations -- we have more successful farms, and we have farms that while they do not employ as much labour as they did before, the labour that they require are more skilled and they are a good deal harder to acquire, or hire if you do not keep them at least for a portion of the year. It's not possible to pick up a skilled operator for two weeks to harvest your crop and the farmer realizes this and he tries to make his operation more flexible so he can employ labour for a greater length of time. He has solved his problems as I have said, through larger machines,

(MR. HARRISON cont'd). . . . . more land, and he has also increased his capitalization. But it seems as though he's in a vicious circle, that it goes round and round and the more expensive machines he buys, the more land he has to acquire and one wonders if we are not moving rapidly towards the same situation as they are in Europe where some day we will have a landed aristocracy in Manitoba and the rest of us will work for or sell to the landed gentry.

It is true that today that one man, whether he is a farmer or a farm helper is able to take care of more cultivated land than ever before. Some of us doubt the economic advantage of this system. Certainly it is profitable to the farmer but fewer people derive a living from the soil and other industries must absorb our natural increase and the people who come to Canada to make Canada their home. It is also true that Canada to a large extent, particularly the western economy, depends on the new wealth that are produced on the farms in Canada each year. Now you might say to me, what is the new wealth? Well the new wealth is the wealth that is produced by the soil where there was no wealth before. It is exactly the same kind of dollars as a miner makes but it has special significance for Western Canada and Canada as a whole, because farmers are free spenders. They spend their money, and this wealth that they produce goes in to bolster our economy in no uncertain terms.

The farmers, and the farm workers particularly, up till the present time have been denied the benefits of unemployment insurance. They are the only group of people today in Canada I believe, outside of possibly the fishermen, that are denied the benefits of unemployment insurance and this is a situation that should be corrected. You might say that they are second-class workers in Canada. I don't like to apply that term because I have a great respect for those people that work on the farm. They have high skill today; they are able to operate a combine; they can repair a truck; and they are very able and very clever people. They do cost the farmer considerable money. Farm wages are higher than they are now. Combines and machinery cost him more money and he is in the position that in order to make his investments and his expense meet his income that he must enlarge his production.

Now in respect to unemployment insurance for farmers, it certainly would work out well in a hog farm where the workers are operated the year round, or on a dairy farm where the operators and the help certainly are employed the year round. In the egg plants and fowl production plants this also is a farm operation and it is a year-round operation. They should enjoy the benefits of unemployment insurance. If you look at it in the light of the labourer's position, why should he be a second-class citizen in Manitoba. He has the same rights and privileges in every other respect to any other citizen in Canada and why should he not be able to participate in the benefits of unemployment insurance.

We visited the potato plant at Carberry the other day and we saw the farm product produced there and processed. I wondered at the time if the operation, that is the land operation of the company and I expect it was, that the labour employed on the farm producing those potatoes would receive the benefits of unemployment insurance. I think probably a company of that size certainly would see that they did but on the strict application of The Unemployment Insurance Act they would not be eligible to participate.

I believe that the application should not be of a voluntary nature but should be mandatory and farm labour should not be ruled out. There may be a case for ruling out the members of the farm family but even they I would agree should come under the provisions of unemployment insurance. Farms are the greatest producer of new wealth in Canada today. Each year, money received from grain, meat, fowl, special crops bring dollars to Canada. Farm products are the spark plug each year that regenerates the Canadian economy. The money that is raised from the products produced on the farms and the mines certainly rejuvenate the economy of Canada. If you do not believe this just go back to a year when we have a poor crop and assess the business activities of that year in comparison to a bumper crop year.

The farm sales breathe new life into our economy. It encourages, I would think, the young people to remain in the rural areas if they were able to receive unemployment insurance for farm labour. They might even work on the farms for a season or two and become farmers themselves. Farmers should welcome a supply of skilled farm workers and I believe they realize that the way to accomplish this labour pool is to agree and work in the direction of inducing the Federal Government to add to those workers who receive the benefits of unemployment insurance, and I am sure that unemployment insurance, health insurance, medical insurance and all of the other terms of insurance that are available to workers of the factory should be available to the workers of the farm.

I intend to support the resolution and I would hope that all members of the Legislature

(MR. HARRISON cont'd), . . . . . would think over the proposition very seriously and try and convince themselves, if none of the rest of us can, that they should vote for this resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. J. D. WATT (Arthur): Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak on this resolution I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Rupertsland, 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, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Springfield. The Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Madam Speaker, there is very little I should say in this resolution because we have heard the Honourable Member for Emerson speak -- say that he was going to vote in favour of it, and the Honourable Member for Brokenhead of the New Democratic Party, has also expressed his belief in this amendment to the resolution. So speaking as a farmer and one who is anxious to get home and burn purple gas in his tractor, I think the best thing that I could do is to sit down and shut up, because we have been here for 60 days now and up till I saw that snow comin' down tonight I was gettin' a little anxious to get home and get the tractor out but I guess we got another day or two now to put in before we head for home.

But many arguments have been expressed on this resolution regarding the three principles. The one that was expressed in the original resolution purple gas for farm trucks, all farm trucks, and the one we heard, the resolution we heard last year on the rebate on so many gallons per quarter-section, and now we have the amendment to the resolution this year, the amendment made by the Honourable Member for Springfield which changes the picture somewhat by decreasing the licenses on farm trucks. I myself are in favour of that rather than getting into the rebate system or into the purple gas. Most of us have saw what has happened in Alberta from time to time where if you go to Alberta all you see is farm trucks travelling up and down the highways, and I think as far as highway safety that's very dangerous to our whole society. Many of them have gone on many long trips to Alaska by just loading up a couple of barrels of purple gas and away they go or going to Florida even. So I don't want to see all our farmers leaving the country with a barrel of gas in the back of their truck and taking off for the winter months.

In Saskatchewan this year they have brought in legislation to endorse this principle of purple gas in farm trucks. I understand this will mean \$4 million to the treasury and for those of us in the province who are not just as fortunate to be loaded with money, I think we should take a second look at this because I don't think we're financially prepared to go along with this type of proposal.

I would imagine that reducing licenses plates will mean around half a million dollars and one which I think the treasury can accept and I think this will be agreeable to most farmers because most of us who have owned farm trucks -- you'll find that license plates for three-quarter ton, as the Member for Brokenhead mentioned, I think run around \$19.00, a ton truck 25, two-ton trucks 45 and three-ton trucks 65. So if we bring those down by considerable amounts it will mean quite a reduction to the farmers of Manitoba and also will ease their problem on gas burnt on their own farm. I myself must say that I'm very fortunate because I live exactly 200 yards from the pool elevator and 300 yards from the United Grain Growers and I can haul my whole year's crop out to the elevator for about two tankfuls of gas, so I must say that I'm an exception to the rule. But with the railway abandonment proposals coming about now I would think that this problem will get greater and farmers will have to buy larger trucks and also haul their grain many more miles. I would think that this will increase their costs considerably. And when this does come about maybe we'll have to take another second look at this whole problem because I know many farmers will have considerable costs in this abandonment of railway lines throughout our province.

I don't think there's much else that I have to say only to hope that the urban members of this Legislature speed their speeches up a little and let the farmers get back on the farm. Thank you.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): If the honourable member would permit a question or two. He mentioned about a half a million dollar loss in revenue. On what basis, what type of reduction would produce a half a million dollars loss in revenue?

MR. McKELLAR: Madam Speaker, this is my personal guess, I don't know how many trucks there are in Manitoba but I was just -- this is an offhanded way -- I think anything less than a half a million wouldn't be worth the while to even bring in. That's my personal opinion. But considering the \$4 million in Saskatchewan, I think we have half as many farmers -- that would leave about \$2 million if we went into purple gas, so a quarter of that will be -- in my estimation I think this is a good deal. I'm all in favour of it.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, may I ask another question? Is the reduction now contained in the proposed Bill 108?

MR. McKELLAR: . . . . . Bill 108 I'm . . . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Highway Traffic.

MR. McKELLAR: Proposal of what? In the Highway Traffic Act, no, no, no, no. This is not in there.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, I am disappointed that we didn't get some kind of a concrete answer to the question put to the last speaker by the Honourable Member for St. John's because I had my pencil all sharpened up here too in wondering where this half a million dollars come from. You recall that when the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture hoped, I suppose, that he was closing the debate the other day on this subject, I asked him some questions after he sat down and everybody said, "order, order, order" as usual. The question that I asked was, I wonder if the Honourable Minister intends to answer the questions and then I put the questions to him. He looks amazed over there now again but here are the questions that I asked him.

I say, I wonder if the Honourable Minister intends to answer the questions that have been asked. The Honourable Member for Emerson, I think, asked one or two, and my honourable leader asked one or two and he failed to get an answer because I want to ask one more. Has he, that is the Minister, instructed all members of the government on his side to vote with the resolution? That was one. And a subsequent question, does he intend to bring a bill in at this session of the Legislature setting out the reduction in fees that he suggests, or that was suggested by the Honourable Member for Springfield? And then they said, order, order, that that was a silly question to ask I suppose, or something of that kind. Well you agree it was a silly question, the Honourable Minister says. Well then I would like once again to ask the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, where did this half a million dollar figure come from? Now my guess is, and this is purely a guess, that the members opposite have been kicking this resolution around at their various caucus meetings and deciding well what are we going to do with this blinkety-blank thing anyway, and they said, "Well listen if we give so much back on every license plate in Manitoba it will come up to nearly half a million dollars and as the Honourable Member for Inkster says, half a loaf is better than no bread at all and surely this will satisfy everybody for the time being." That's my guess. I can't prove it because I don't attend the caucus meetings of the honourable members opposite. However, I intend to when I get finished speaking very shortly to move an amendment, to move an amendment that will result in about a half a million dollars, I think. And I think I can prove just about exactly how much it will mean when I get done moving this amendment because there's no point, there is absolutely no point that my honourable friend the Member for Springfield, or the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, or my honourable friend from Souris-Lansdowne talking unless they mean to do something.

Now the Honourable Minister of Agriculture suggested that we wanted double or nothing; that we wanted to use coloured gas in the trucks, no limits; and then we wanted a reduction in license plates as well. He's right, he's right. That's exactly what we do want. There is no point at all of pretending that you are a champion of agriculture and that you are going to do a lot of things to alleviate the cost-price squeeze and then not doing anything about it. It's simply ridiculous to talk on the one hand about what we're going to do to alleviate this cost-price squeeze, and surely, Madam Speaker, we don't have to explain to the House what the cost-price squeeze is because the Farmers' Union have been talking about it now ever since my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture went to Ottawa in 1957, I think, about that time as a delegate, I believe, with the Farmers' Union to do something about alleviating the cost-price squeeze--(Interjection)--Parity prices was it? Well it was intended to alleviate the cost-price squeeze anyway, and now, now we have the opportunity to do something to really help the farmer out and I suppose my honourable friends opposite will vote it all down. Well we'll soon find out, Madam Speaker, because I'm going to move the amendment shortly. But this will not prevent me from talking on the purple gas part of it when I get to it I think. This

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd). . . . . is the first time that I have spoken on the resolution.

Throughout the debates that have taken place on the resolution to date, that is the Honourable Member for Springfield had quite a little bit to say and the Honourable Minister of Agriculture -- they talked about some kind of a limitation on the amount of purple gas that we would propose to allow the farmers. Madam Speaker, the resolution that we have before us does not, does not set out anywhere any limitations on it. We say you should be able to burn, as they do in Saskatchewan, all the purple gas you like in your truck whether it's used in the field, on the back road, on the highway or anywhere else as long as it's a farm truck. That's what they propose to do in Saskatchewan, and that's what the resolution calls for here. However, I know that my honourable friend the Member for Springfield, his heart appears to be in the right place, I understand he's farming himself and he knows, he knows what the cost-price squeeze means because in his opening paragraph he says, "A farm truck on the 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." He goes on to say that it is too bad that all of the horses have vanished from the province. He says, "I realize that the farmer today is faced with a problem because he has no longer horses on the farm as they did years ago. You could have seen that pretty thoroughly just a week ago at Brandon Fair," and so on. Now he points out that if he had horses, or the inference is that if he had horses he would probably have to use them if they don't intend to allow them to use coloured gas, because it is a costly operation, operating a farm truck today, because as you know the mileage that you get from a big farm truck, as pointed out by my honourable friend the Minister, is excessively small, the mileage is excessively low. So, Madam Speaker, to make the resolution that is before us really meaningful, really meaningful and to alleviate the cost-price squeeze that the farmers find themselves in today, I propose to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the amendment be further amended by inserting a comma after the word "fees" at the end of the last line thereof, and by adding thereto the following: "to a flat fee of \$10.00 per annum and that such reduction be made retroactive to the first day of January, 1965."

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker. I would like to make a few comments in connection with the resolution before us. Noticing that the original resolution called for the use of purple gas in trucks tax-free, and then we have the amendment and now we have a sub-amendment to the amendment before us. First of all, the area I represent is an agricultural area and where a lot of the special crops grown in Manitoba are grown, and I might add here to start off that our local area is the fourth largest area in the way of vehicle license registrations in Manitoba. First we have, naturally, Winnipeg, Brandon and Dauphin and Portage and then as far as the rural areas are concerned or even after that, our area is the one that has the largest number of vehicle registrations, so that in itself we know that a large amount of gasoline is used in the vehicles up in my area and especially the trucks that haul the various products because with these special crops grown in the area such as sugarbeets, of which you have a large volume -- I think the production in the last number of years was well over 200,000 tons -- that to haul this large number of tonnage of beets on soft ground naturally takes a large volume of gasoline.

The same holds true for potatoes because this too is a very bulky crop and the crop has to be taken out by way of trucks going on the land when the harvesting is done. So that here again you have a large volume to contend with. The same holds true for the onion crop; for the canning crop such as sweet corn, and peas. All this has to be hauled in by truck to the cannery. It used to be that they had the viners out in the fields but this is no longer the case. They have the viners centrally located so that all the vines are hauled to this central point and this involves a lot of hauling and trucking, so that we can readily see that first of all we have a large vehicular registration here which indicates that there are a large number of trucks going in the area.

Secondly, we have these large crops to contend with and they have to be hauled, so that we see an enormous revenue accruing to the government coffers from this area, and very often I feel that we are not getting our share as far as improvements to roads are concerned so at least I would like to see that we could have this tax-free gasoline for farm trucks. But it seems that this is wishful thinking by now. After all the government members have amended the resolution to give us some reduction in our license fees.

Up until tonight I had no idea as to what this would amount to, whether it would just be a

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . . matter of returning the additional taxes that were imposed at the last fall session on licenses; whether this would be the amount or a lesser amount or more. But tonight we hear the figure of a half a million dollars which was mentioned by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne. I had hoped that it would be something more substantial because when I look at the budget statement, I look at the amounts that the government anticipates in the way of revenue from both the motor carrier licenses and the automobile and driver licenses, this amounts to a large figure. The amount they anticipate from automobile and driver licenses is \$10,775,000. I don't know whether this figure already anticipates the reduction that has been mentioned here or not. Last year that same figure stood at \$6,700,000, so they anticipated an increase of over \$4 million. Now if they only are going to give back half a million, this is a very small amount in my opinion that they are going to return to the farmers instead of the tax-free gasoline, which would be much more in my opinion.

Another matter that I would like to raise in connection with this, if we are going to have a reduction in the license fees I think the government should give consideration to the matter of giving better reductions as far as seasonal licenses for trucks are concerned. So many of these trucks are not used except during harvest and fall time when crops are being harvested and yet they have to pay a large amount of the original fees. Even if they turn the licenses in after harvest they can recapture very little of the original cost of purchasing that license. So I would hope that they would give consideration to this item and also to make the reduction in license fees more substantial.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

. . . . . continued on next page

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

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, I deem it a privilege to take part in the debate on this particular resolution because anything that has to do with saving a life or saving an injury or a maimed person is a privilege to take part in or be a part of.

In 1963, two years ago now, the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie I believe introduced a resolution asking for a four-lane highway from Winnipeg to Portage -- or Headingley to Portage I believe to be exact -- and a great number of the members in the House took part in the debates at that time. I know that I moved an amendment to it, and on checking back over the debates of that day I find it very very interesting. Apparently, following the introduction of the resolution at that time the Honourable Member for Dufferin spoke and went over a great deal of statistics, quoted the number of cars that travelled over the road, the accident record and so on and so forth, and he ended up by saying that he was certain that the province would act in due course and when the real need for a two-lane highway was eminent that the government would certainly see that there was one.

I believe the Honourable Member for Roblin spoke next and more or less suggested that all of the accidents on what was referred to as the "death strip" -- and still is incidentally, this stretch of road from Headingley to Portage -- he said, the Honourable Member for Roblin, that a great deal of the accidents resulted from drivers who had had too much to drink.

However, the government voted down the amendment that I introduced, and all I did was change two words, if you remember. I asked them to speed up or accelerate their program in this regard, strike out "in due course" and put in "accelerate", or something of this kind; and strike out "if" in another place and put in some other word, and they voted it down. I expected they would vote it down even if I only changed one word. I expected that.

What I didn't expect, Madam Speaker, was to see headlines in the paper about six months after that, "A Crash Program to Put In a Four-Lane Highway" -- a crash program for a four-lane highway. I want to thank my honourable friends because probably by interjecting this word accelerate it did, to quote my honourable friends opposite, give them a shot in the arm and they did accelerate their program and saw fit to immediately, or more or less immediately, implement what we had been recommending.

So the resolution that is before the House at the moment simply asks for another stage in this program that is on the way. There's a program on the way now for a two-lane highway -- (Interjection) -- a four-lane highway. Part of it is built now. I travel over it twice a week. What we are asking for in the resolution here is another step. It's all the more necessary now to have an overpass at the Perimeter Road.

You will recall, Madam Speaker, that for two or three years now we on this side of the House have been attempting to get traffic counts. I think we have even put in Orders for Return for traffic counts and we have been turned down on the grounds that it was none of our business or something of this kind. They wouldn't give us the traffic counts, but anyway, lo and behold I did get some traffic counts the other day and I'd better not say who from because I don't want anybody to get fired, but I've got some very interesting figures here. I find that the average daily count -- I see my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works getting his pencil sharpened up there -- I hope that I'm right, but the average daily count at the Perimeter Road is 8,520 cars that traverse over that road at the Perimeter Road, east and west only. I'm not talking about the ones that are going north and south. The east and west traffic alone at the Perimeter Road is 8,520 daily.

Now at the Perimeter, at the intersection of the Perimeter and No. 75, there's only about two-thirds of that amount I believe, in the neighborhood of two-thirds of that figure. So there's roughly 2,500 or 3,000 more cars per day -- per day -- that's quite a few in a year -- two or three thousand a day going over the section that is referred to in the resolution.

Now there is -- there is a cloverleaf at the intersection out here at the Perimeter and 75. There's been one there for a good many years. I understand that they are building one, or there is one on the Perimeter north, I'm not certain. I've never been out on that one. There's one east, so I am told, I don't know what the traffic count is east, but my guess is it's about equal to what it is out west -- less, I'm told. So surely -- surely we can look forward in the very near future to having another crash program to put in a cloverleaf out here.

I hope that this government has seen fit to acquire the land that is required for the overpass. Surely they have acquired that long ago. I would think so. I think 90 percent of the members that are in the House will recall with a great deal of interest the night that this very

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) . . . . . famous book was introduced to the House called "Manitoba Highways Planning for Tomorrow", an engineering study that was introduced in 1960 I think, or '59 perhaps, I don't recall -- five or six years ago -- setting out the future needs until the year 1980. On Page 38 of this famous document there is a picture of the cloverleaf at the intersection of 75 and the Perimeter Road, and then it goes on to say how necessary that structures of this kind are.

I think it would be well, Madam Speaker, if I read a paragraph from this document because my guess is that a lot of the members of this House will be unable to find theirs now. We get so much material, and I'm one of the few, I suppose, that saves it all, but I'm going to quote from Page 38 of the Planning for Tomorrow. "The most outstanding feature of full freeway design is complete control of access. This means prohibition of direct access to through traffic lanes and abutting property or access only to frontage roads which collect local traffic and direct it to safe points of exit or entrance to the main highway. All crossroad traffic would be carried over or under the freeway and have access to it only at interchanges, which would provide for right turns only. There would be no traffic signals or no stop signs to slow traffic on the freeway." Now that's what the engineers said about five or six years ago, and certainly the traffic has increased immensely since that time.

Now as regards the other two parts of the resolution that is before us. Madam Speaker, (1) refers to the cloverleaf at the Perimeter and Portage Avenue in the vicinity of Assiniboia, then there's (2), parts (a) and (b), and in (a) we are requesting the installation of a traffic light at the intersection of Westwood Drive and Portage Avenue; and (b), the same at Cavalier Drive and Portage Avenue.

Now if my assessment of this area is correct -- I travel over it quite frequently, twice a week at this time of the year, Madam Speaker, as I have already said -- but it strikes me that there is presently no signal lights between the Perimeter and the intersections that are referred to in the resolution. I can't recall that there are any. Therefore, if they install the traffic lights as requested in the resolution, they will be the first ones to be installed east of the intersection.

Now this area in between, which is an area I think about two miles in length in that neighborhood, is built up immensely. I had an occasion last year to drive down through Westwood to see a fellow way down in that area there and my guess is that all of the people residing down in that section in order to get downtown, or most of them, will likely come out to Portage Avenue and proceed downtown on Portage Avenue rather than go down the Perimeter Road and down through St. Charles. My guess is that 90 percent of the traffic from that area would come out to Portage Avenue and then proceed east on Portage.

I don't need to tell the House how much this particular area is being built up out there. This new Safeway Store -- what do they call it -- Birchwood Shopping Area I think in there. A terrific new area that will give rise to a great increase in traffic. There is the new provincial park, I understand, being built out there; a new shopping area on the north side of Portage Avenue; and then of course this famous race track that we've been talking about, not so much about the race track, Madam Speaker, but what goes on at it, and there are a great deal of people attend what is known I think as one of Canada's finest race tracks. Thousands and thousands of cars go out there every year. This all adds to the traffic there. And then this very elaborate outdoor theatre. You can't help but notice it every time you go out there. I'm amazed at how it -- or if it pays its way, because when it's 40 below they seem to be having a show on out there. I don't know whether there's anyone there, but it's a very elaborate drive-in theatre. All of these things, Madam Speaker, add to the need for what is requested in the resolution.

So, Madam Speaker, I don't expect that we will get unanimous support on this right now, but I do look forward, oh sometime this summer, to see an announcement in the paper where there will be a crash program and a cloverleaf designed for this intersection, and I expect before that takes place that the traffic lights will go up. I'm almost certain of that. I don't want to bet, because they might take advantage of me if I did, but I look forward to seeing everything that is called for in this resolution being implemented or started in 1965.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): Madam Speaker, like the other odd individual in the House has said from time to time, I am prompted to get to my feet because of a few things that have been said by the member that just took his seat.

I began to wonder, Madam Speaker, if all of the information that was provided by the honourable member was as accurate as some of it. By his own admission, the Honourable

(MR. WEIR cont'd) . . . . . Member for Gladstone drives twice a week in this area. He finds all of this great inconvenience and that there is no light between the Perimeter and the area that is in question in this area. It's not quite correct. My impression is that there's one at, I believe at South St. Charles Street which is somewhat east of the Perimeter, but this is the only one. It's not out very much, but out just a little.

He talks about a shopping centre which he calls Birchwood. I'm under the impression that it's probably Westwood he's talking about. He talks about a provincial park, and I'm not sure whether he's talking about the park in the Spruce Woods -- I doubt that he is. I think probably what the honourable member had in mind was a park that the Metro government is contemplating out at the west end of the city. But with these few errors, Madam Speaker, and trusting that none of the other information that he has given us is any farther astray than these, I think that probably I should maybe have a word or two to say. --(Interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): How about the traffic counts? Are they accurate?

MR. WEIR: Well, I'll take the honourable member's word for it to the same extent that I buy the other things that he said. Well, Madam Speaker, I am reminded that last year there was a resolution very similar to this that was approved by this House. I copied down the resolved part of it and it says, "Therefore be it resolved that this government consider the advisability of providing during the coming construction season six traffic lanes on Portage Avenue between School Road and David Street, three eastbound and three westbound with a median divider, and that it continue to purchase right-of-way to facilitate the construction of a grade separation as the need dictates."

Madam Speaker, that resolution was approved, and as far as I know the direction that was given by the House in this case has been followed. In other words, the lanes that were spoken of were built in last year's construction season and, if I may say so, presents a very fine entrance to the metropolitan area on No. 1 Highway west. The right-of-way has continued to be purchased. I'm not sure that all of it is available as yet, but certainly the majority of it is and negotiations are taking place as far as any remaining sections that there are.

Now, Madam Speaker, I am of the opinion that the resolution that was passed last year in this regard is sufficient direction from this House as to the development of this intersection. I have no quarrel with my honourable friend's quotes from that lovely green book that was laid on the table here a few years ago and the freeway parts of it that he discussed. I agree, relatively speaking, that these are desirable things and that we are growing towards them.

He quotes the traffic counts which he says are the ones for that area. Fine. I accept it if this is the traffic count. I haven't checked it of recent date. It may be in that area, but if that's what it is in that area, I submit it's probably higher this way. I wonder why we don't talk about the grade separation at Westwood and some of these other areas because you are into an area here of high density traffic as well as a congested area from the standpoint of buildings are concerned. It's going to be an area however where speed restrictions are going to be used over a period of time and therefore the intersections aren't as dangerous.

The Honourable Member from Gladstone discusses the traffic count in one direction but indicates that he's paid no attention to the traffic counts from the other direction, and of course, Madam Speaker, the purpose of a grade interchange is to separate traffic which are going in different directions. I think that he's absolutely correct, absolutely correct that in due course there is going to be a grade separation at No. 1 Highway and the Perimeter, and I don't think it's very far away.

I'm not going to vote for this resolution this year. It'll likely be back next year. But as the traffic increases on the north-south stretch of that road, as the other four-lane program that hasn't received as much interest from my friend from Gladstone, as it is developed a little further and the traffic increases in that direction, then I'm sure that I too am going to suggest that the time for priority of this particular project has come.

As far as the lights are concerned, Madam Speaker, I think that I gave an indication in the House some little time ago that there were going to be lights at at least one of these intersections. I have no reason to believe that this is changed, because prior to the metropolitan street take-over as far as lights within the metropolitan area were concerned, the Highways Branch and the Metropolitan Corporation administration people worked very closely and the warrants for lights were worked out quite well together, and I am sure that before I was advised that this was going to take place, it had also been worked out with the Metropolitan people. I'm sure that in a very short time the lights are going to show up on Westwood, and the best

(MR. WEIR cont'd) . . . . . information I can get is that the warrants have been pretty well established for Cavalier too.

So I do believe that these lights are coming, but, Madam Speaker, I can't support the resolution calling for the construction of this grade separation at No. 1 West and the Perimeter the way it is at the moment. As a matter of fact, I really believe that the resolution that was passed by this House last year gives a pretty good indication of the needs and desires of the area.

I think that while I could go on and talk about some of the things that my honourable friend said about the crash program on No. 1, and the fact that he talked about things that were said in 1963 and some few months later an announcement came that there was a crash program, I think that if the honourable member checks his dates, if it's the '63 accounts in the House that he's talking about then it's some year and a half later because we had two debates on this particular subject in the House and it was 1964 when the announcement was made.

The honourable member is not so naive that he doesn't know the reasons for the delay and all of the other things that were involved at that particular time. I don't propose to argue them at this time, Madam Speaker, and I cannot support the resolution.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, will the Honourable Minister permit a question? Is it still the policy of your department to refuse traffic counts on provincial trunk highways to the members of this House?

MR. WEIR: As far as I am aware, Madam Speaker.

MR. JOHNSTON: I gather that you are still refusing traffic counts to the members of the House, is that correct?

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a question of the Minister: Is it correct that there is presently an overpass south, east and north of the city on the main highways leading out of the city and the perimeter route.

MR. WEIR: Yes, Madam Speaker, that's correct. It's also correct that the roads north, south, and east of the city have -- I've got to correct that -- north and east have roads completed in both directions past them for some considerable distance. The road north of the intersection in question is just being constructed at the present time.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a subsequent question. The Minister has indicated that it is not the policy to give out the traffic counts. I wonder if he would be willing to give the traffic counts insofar as those four intersections are concerned however. In view of the fact that there are overpasses on three of them and we are discussing the fourth one, would it be possible to obtain the traffic counts for those four specific points?

MR. WEIR: Madam Speaker, I don't have them with me.

MR. MOLGAT: Would the Minister be prepared to get them and give them to the House?

MR. WEIR: No, Madam Speaker.

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

MR. PATRICK: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

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

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Weir and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 16; nays, 29.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Wellington. The Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, this resolution sponsored by the Honourable Member for Wellington is a very puzzling resolution. In effect the honourable member is asking his own government to enforce its own laws respecting censorship and movie categorization. The effect, or the intent of this resolution seems to be to tighten up on movie censorship and categorization and then to see to it that the movie houses live up to the letter of the law in admitting young people to see the movies. Now as I understand it, and it's a rather difficult area to understand, there are three main kinds of movie categories that's

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . . presently provided for. The general, adult and restricted. Now it is my understanding that the first two categories assigned by the censor board are matters of public information only, that is to say that these two labels, general and adult, really provide information to the public; there is nothing about them that involves law enforcement. But the third category "restricted" apparently does have or does bring into play the element of the law, of law enforcement, because according to my understanding a movie house is not supposed to admit to the premises anybody under the age of 18 when a movie is playing that has been categorized as restricted. Now according to the Honourable Member for Wellington it is his contention that in the City of Winnipeg, I suppose in the province, when restricted movies are playing some movie houses are admitting people younger than 18 which is apparently against the law but they are doing so nevertheless. He objects to this, I suppose on two grounds, one that it's a violation of the law and secondly, that young people under 18, when they view these restricted movies, suffer you might say a corruption of their morals and so on. They suffer a sort of debilitating effect.

Madam Speaker, it is my contention that North American society as a whole is moving away from censorship and it is moving toward more and more freedom of expression, freedom of, you might say freedom of expression, learning and knowledge. In fact the United States Supreme Court in the past ten years has struck down virtually every prior restraint law passed by the fifty state legislatures. In fact the present trend is a very clear one and a very dramatic one. It is toward virtually no censorship of expression whatsoever. I am not saying that we or I could find ourselves in agreement with this trend but nevertheless it is a clear trend and I really hesitate or wonder whether we should be advocating the tightening up of censorship at this time. In fact this resolution really opens up the whole question of censorship and as honourable members well know that is a topic which is centuries old, that is a topic which could be debated in any Legislative Assembly body for days on end. The reason for that being that it varies so much with the individual.

In fact this very day at 5:30, at the 5:30 adjournment, there were some honourable members out in the corridor in hot dispute as to whether or not a play currently playing at the local theatre centre was or constituted immoral or salacious theatre. -- (Interjection) -- Well there's only one theatre centre, "Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf". One honourable gentleman who's quite serious, said that the play was in his opinion quite chippy, immoral and he allowed that it had no saving or redeeming qualities to it whatsoever. Another honourable member was firmly of the opinion that the play, although it did contain passages that could be construed as immoral and so on, nevertheless that the theme of the play was one which portrayed a great social theme or lesson. So there you have it Madam Speaker, censorship. -- (Interjection) -- I didn't see the play, Madam Speaker, and I pass no comment on it for the simple reason that I have not seen it. But I will say this, that I tend to be opposed to censorship, be it of the press, or be it of the screen.

We tend to view with alarm, if I can use that expression, we tend to view with alarm any legislation that would presume to censor the press. I think we should also view with alarm legislation that would involve censorship of the screen. After all they're both modes of expression. Why view with alarm censorship of one medium and not of the other? I suppose that would qualify me for the label libertarian but I want to make it clear that I don't believe in absolutely no censorship laws. There are magazines being sold that are sick, that really don't have any redeeming qualities or passages in them; the kind of magazines that centre around fictional sadism, masochism, and so on. Honourable members I'm sure have seen them and I don't think that it is good that young people, young children, be allowed to pick them up at corner stores or at corner magazine stands. Yet there is precisely where there is no control, Madam Speaker.

I believe the Honourable Member for St. Boniface had a resolution on this a couple of years ago, three years ago. I believe that is an area where there should be some effort made toward cleaning up. But there is none in that regard and I think that there should be there some effort rather than towards tighter censorship of the movies.

So, Madam Speaker, I'm really rather puzzled by this resolution sponsored by the Honourable Member for Wellington. I can support him in only one sense. He is asking his own government to enforce its own laws although he seems to be, in the resolved paragraph, he seems to be sloughing the blame off on the movie houses. Well I'm not so sure that that's where the blame -- if any blame is to be assessed -- I'm not so sure that that's where it should be imputed because I have spoken to some movie house operators and they say that it

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . . is difficult to keep youngsters out under the age of 18 when the law does apparently permit their entrance if they are accompanied by adults. And so very often if they are refused entry there is nothing to stop them from leaving and coming back later in the company of an adult or a friend just a few years older who is over the 18 year mark and so on and so forth. It's difficult to enforce. And is it justified in any case, Madam Speaker?

I don't think that I shall bring myself to support more censorship in movies. I think that this is properly a matter for the individual and if the individual is not of the age of discretion, in other words a child, it us up to the parent or the guardian. I think that the Censor Board performs a useful function if it does nothing more than simply to screen the movies and assign them categories, and let the categories be nothing more than information to the public, nothing more, just information to the public. Let the public decide, let the individual citizen, the parent, decide whether or not he or she wishes his child to see such a movie. I don't think that there's any need for paternalism by the state in deciding for the individual what sort of movies he is to see. I find myself, there have not been too many landmark cases heard by the Canadian Supreme Court, but as I meentioned earlier Madam Speaker, the trend as far as United States Supreme Court is concerned, is clear. And that is that they are leaving selection of movies, of literature, etcetera, up to the individual more and more and I believe that in our society as the general level of education improves, and it is improving, we can afford to do likewise.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. STRICKLAND: Madam Speaker, if anyone wished to speak I am sure they could go ahead; otherwise I would ask the matter to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Any member wishing to speak?

MR. HILLHOUSE: . . . I would like to ask the House Leader a question. In view of the statement made by the Honourable Minister of Labour, did the Honourable Member for Wellington, in adjourning this debate, was he playing the part of a maverick or is he just trying to stall a resolution?

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

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder Madam Speaker, whether I may have the pleasure of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable the Member for Brandon.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, I wonder if I might have the indulgence to have this matter stand. I intend speaking on the other resolution standing in my name.

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

MR. STRICKLAND: Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member could we have this matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: . . . . . the suggestion from the Honourable Minister of Labour that none of his members take part in debate on any labour resolutions, could you give us a ruling as to whether or not a member from that side can stand a resolution unless he is going to speak?

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

MR. FRED T. KLYM (Springfield): Madam Speaker, there goes a story somehow where a fellow once lived in the good old days and he only said his prayers once a year. It happened to be on New Years night when he did say his prayers. All other nights, 364 of them, he just got ready for bed and called out "ditto", and went to bed. However, I am not tonight in as

(MR. KLYM cont'd) . . . . . fortunate a position as that fellow was, therefore will have to have you people put up with me while I am busy trying to speak and debate on a very important resolution before this House.

Madam Speaker, in speaking to this resolution, I commend the Honourable Member for Emerson very highly for his resourcefulness in bringing in a resolution with respect to the Ukrainian language. One in eight people today in Manitoba is of Ukrainian origin, and as a member of the Ukrainian community of this province, I am anxious to take part in this debate.

It is only in more recent years, and as we grow older, that we begin to appreciate the cultural advantages to our children, our province and our country, in preserving what is good in our culture, and a fuller understanding of the Ukrainian culture can only be maintained and enhanced in a community by giving an opportunity to our young people to learn the Ukrainian language and to enjoy it.

Because of these factors, I feel we now hear so much of the desirability of a second language, and that to be probably a Ukrainian, probably a French or a German. Madam Speaker, I have had the opportunity of speaking for quite a few years in the Province of Manitoba and I firmly believe that the English language should be the language of instruction in the schools because of the pluralistic and cosmopolitan society of Manitoba, composed of very many ethnic groups.

I am happy today that the present administration introduced the first experimental classes in Ukrainian in the Province of Manitoba. That happened in the year 1962 to begin with, and I am pleased that today we have Grades 9, 10 and 11 -- and in those days they had 395 students in 29 classrooms speaking Ukrainian. I'm sure this is just a start and I recommend the administration a great deal for having made that start. Madam Speaker, I wish to inform this House that the Ukrainian language is not restricted to only boys and girls of Ukrainian origin. It is being taken by many others, and to prove something right now in Manitoba, I know of a girl in one of those schools of Scottish parentage who excels in Ukrainian very very highly.

Now furthermore, Madam Speaker -- (Interjection) -- boys will be boys always. Madam Speaker, in order to make any language very efficient, effective and beautiful, I think the best part of that language is to have its being taught conversationally. I know -- I speak more than one language, probably neither one any too well but I get by, especially when I'm hungry I could ask for something and I know what it is and make them understand maybe. However, I think the beauty of any language and the necessity to take it is to be conversational, because then they put it to use. The reason why many people, young people especially, after taking a language for a year or two generally drop it because it is not used conversationally. However, I think that under the present administration we will be able to probably have that done in a very short time.

Madam Speaker, today we have four School Inspectors in Manitoba who are of Ukrainian origin. They are all personal friends of mine and they are promoting the Ukrainian language, especially for university courses at present, very very highly and to the best of their ability. It is always good and a wonderful idea to have a second language, but preferably that it is being taught also conversationally.

Now in 1962, not too long ago, in the year 1962-63 the Department of Education provided a Grade 9 instruction in Ukrainian; 1963-64, Grade 10; 1964-65, Grade 11. Now in these three years, three short years, tremendous progress has been made in promoting Ukrainian in the high schools of Manitoba. However, I think it was the Honourable Member for Emerson the other day while speaking for his resolution, he mentioned Alberta and Saskatchewan. Well I agree with him that they have gone a long way ahead of us, but we must also note that they started their courses there well over ten years or better ago and therefore they have had that advantage over us, but in the three years that I have noticed tremendous strides have been made and tremendous strides are being made continually.

It is my belief that at present we are only a short distance and time away before Grade 12 is accepted as a university entrance course subject, and I think that I wouldn't be far wrong in saying that. At present for a little while of course we have a shortage of teaching personnel in the province and they are also short in high school grade texts. At present there's a shortage of reading material of high content befitting Grade 12. Now there is material but it has to be assembled and well chosen by a special committee, probably of Slavic languages, and that is being done at present at a very certain rate.

The Member for Brokenhead, the Honourable Member for Brokenhead speaking the

(MR. KLYM cont'd) . . . . . other day to this resolution had stated that there is material available through Taras Shevchenko's "Kobzar" and all that, but no doubt all that material has to be selected and assembled before it could be effectively used for the purposes as outlined in the Ukrainian course. A Ukrainian Grade 12 today is accepted by the university and the general course. It appears to me that present trends for furthering Ukrainian courses in Manitoba is going rapidly enough ahead, as I had outlined a few moments ago. I maintain that one does not have to be afraid of melting pots regardless of the number of languages one may be able to be well versed in.

In the United States, the Honourable Member for Emerson the other day also stated that they are having difficulties and are instructing their houses of learning to include the languages of different ethnic groups in their courses of study. However, with us in Manitoba such is not the case. We have started our Ukrainian classes and we are making forward strides in them. We do not anticipate any difficulties that are experienced in some jurisdictions abroad.

The Honourable Member for Emerson stated that the Honourable the Minister of Education is already thinking along the lines of furthering Ukrainian in Grade 12. What more could one wish when a Minister is already doing all in his power to further the cause and promote Grade 12 Ukrainian courses in Manitoba high schools. The Department of Education of Manitoba, and neither does this Legislature have any particular right to dictate to the university what the university is to do or not to do. They have their own Board of Governors and they look after the educational aspects in Manitoba as they are able to propel it at a certain rate, and I am certain and I have confidence in them, that the promotion of the department slowly, by getting along with them well and making suggestions here and there, along with the committee, such progress will be made.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, I wish at this time to suggest the following amendment to the motion presented by the Honourable Member for Emerson. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, that the proposed resolution be amended by striking out all the words after "whereas" in the fifth paragraph thereof and substituting therefor the following: "Whereas Ukrainian is now a recognized subject in Grades 10 and 11 of both the General and University Entrance Courses, and will be introduced into Grade 12 of the General Course in 1965; and Whereas the Department of Education and the University of Manitoba have agreed to establish a committee to consider the proposed syllabus for Grade 12 Ukrainian in the University Entrance Course in order to insure that it meets the standards for University Entrance subjects for the Grade 12 level; Therefore be it resolved that this Legislature concur in the action being taken to secure University acceptance of Ukrainian as a senior matriculation subject."

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before you rule on the resolution if I may, I wonder if I can ask a question at this time. Has the Minister of Education made an announcement to the effect that Grade 12 Ukrainian will become a general course subject the following year, and has the Minister of Education made an announcement that the University and the Department of Education are setting up a committee to study this? Has this been officially stated in this House?

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Chairman, in response to that question . . . -- (Interjection)--

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I think that unless there is a statement from the government in this regard that the resolution or the amendment may not be in order. I would expect that if there has been no announcement made by the Minister then the amendment is anticipating government legislation.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Ethelbert Plains, 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 Logan, The Honourable the Member for Brandon,

**MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon):** Madam Speaker, the Honourable Member for Logan has proposed a resolution which I think in some degree at least I must find myself in support of. I would rather suggest to the honourable member that the language used under the two where-ases may be a bit drastic. I am a firm believer that sugar catches more flies than vinegar, but nevertheless since these abuses do exist to some degree, I suppose the honourable member felt that he had the right to use rather forceful language of this sort. I think some of the reason for his use of such terms as "that employers generally used the Act to their advantage and the disadvantage of the workers" and such expressions as this, stem to some degree from misunderstanding. I have always felt over the years that it is rather unfortunate that a certain circumstance exists between labour and management which is understandable but regrettable. Generally speaking, most people in management positions have come up through the ranks and already understand the problems of labour and then they become acquainted with the problems of management. Unfortunately on the other hand, people who are generally engaged strictly in labouring positions never experience the problems of management and are therefore inclined to misinterpret things that management do and condemn in many cases management for what they believe to be the shortcomings of management.

Now having said that, Madam, I would like to pass on to the actual meat of the accusation. I'm really doubtful if there is widespread abuse such as the resolution might suggest. Certainly within my own field of endeavour, the building business, this business is a very seasonal type of business and regardless of whatever programs we may have and promote such as winter works, there nevertheless remains in this climate that is killing and can literally kill, there does naturally derive a dropping-off employment during this period of time, so that it could be apparent and appear to be the case that some employers are dropping off employees during this period of time to avoid paying holiday pay. I might say that I think all fair employers in the building field have generally recognized that it is not fair for the person who is more casually employed and as a result, he is maybe employed by two or three different employers during a year, that these people do not over the broad province accumulate anything towards a holiday.

I know when the Act first came in force, in my own case I felt that it was rather drastic in saying that a person must work 95 percent of the time or 11 months and -- I'm just having difficulty to recall whether I went back to 7 months or 8 months and paid holiday pay from that period on but within a year or two I found that the competition was so tight in the building business that this put opposition at an advantage over me of two or three percent. I think you would find general agreement among employers in the building field, that if it were uniformly enforced so that employers gained no advantage one over another, there would be general agreement in some method of definitely assuring that casual labourers got their portion of the holiday pay during their term of employment.

Now because many members I suspect may wish to have their memories refreshed as to how the Vacation with Pay Act operates, what are the terms of the Act, I have outlined, I think rather briefly, some of the main provisions of the Act and for the record I would like to read this so that members will have their memory refreshed as to the working portions of the Act. The Vacations With Pay Act provides that every person within the province who qualifies shall be entitled to two weeks vacation with pay each year. In order to qualify a person must work not less than 95 percent of the regular working hours during a continuous 12 month period. Regular working hours do not include (a) a period of vacation and (b) the aggregate periods not exceeding 30 working days comprising (1) authorized absence and (2) illness where a doctor's certificate is filed with the employer. Upon termination of employment an employee is entitled to two weeks vacation with pay if he has worked 95 percent of the regular hours during a continuous 11 month period, with the same exemptions as noted in 1 and 2 above apply. The Act further provides in section 11, subsection 1 that where a transitory employee is engaged in or working on construction work in Greater Winnipeg, his employer shall give him vacation pay credits to the extent of four percent of the wages. Now, Madam Speaker, it is easily realized that four percent roughly approximates two weeks holiday with pay being 52 weeks in the year, that would have been earned by him in each regular pay period or part thereof if he were paid for each hour he worked in the pay period at his regular rate of wages for regular hours and not at an overtime rate for any overtime hours worked.

Now here is where I come to some difference with the resolution in question, Madam

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd) . . . . Speaker, because the resolution asks for a minimum of four percent on the gross earnings. Now the general idea of a holiday, labour unions may be tending to look upon it as something different, but generally speaking holiday is generally recognized as being somewhat of a reward for good services and that when a person works overtime in almost all recognized trades that I can think of, the general prescription is time and a half on hourly rates and Sundays double time so that this means that the worker for working those particular extra hours has already had a bonus handed to him, so I can't find myself in agreement with four percent on the gross earnings.

Then the resolution goes further to suggest that a minimum of six percent of gross earnings for all employees with five or more years of service. Madam Speaker we have to recognize that with statutory holidays there is certainly at least three weeks of total time provided under the provisions of the Act, and while all of us are naturally inclined to wish we could have holidays as long as possible, we still have to keep in mind the competitive position of industry in this province as compared with other provinces, and certainly the time may come because we have seen the hourly possible totals during the week drastically reduced over the years. I remember when I first started work I think we worked a 10 hour day and six days a week and then we got a nice little surprise of having half day Saturday off and the hourly rates have subsequently come down so it's not impossible to believe that within a reasonable period of time the general policy may be to have longer holidays than two weeks, but certainly at present I question if extending holidays would be wise in that it might put us in a position of not being competitive with other provinces.

Now in addition to this of course, to those who would feel that workmen maybe are being restricted in their wishes, we must recognize that certainly in most fields of employment these days with a little thrift almost any employee, especially in the building field if he has made himself valuable and has become master of his art, can certainly take extended holidays if he wishes to. So that in general, Madam Speaker, I find myself in agreement with that part of the act which requires that all workmen be assured four percent of their salaries so that those people -- and there are a great number of them I do believe, certainly within the building business and there must be others in other lines of employment -- who because of their casual nature of their employment are literally done out of any money towards a holiday and I have felt for some time that this was not right. I find myself in support of this, and furthermore it is the law of the land that this should be achieved. The Act requires it. So that within this portion of the Act I find myself in agreement and commend the Honourable Member for Logan who has suggested the resolution. But I cannot find myself in agreement with increases in this either through the calculation on the gross earnings or of extending the equivalent period of holiday to six weeks.

So, Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that the resolution be amended by striking out that part of the resolution following the word "consideration" in the first and second lines of the third paragraph thereof and substituting therefor the following: "To the study of instances of such abuses and the remedial measures that should be taken,"

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, on the point of order I believe that the amendment is not in order because I think it is a matter that would require the expenditure of money due to the fact that it asks for the establishment of a study and does not therefore contain the proper wording.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Madam Speaker, I believe that it is out of order.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I haven't the wording -- if I could just see the wording of the amendment.

MR. LISSAMAN: Madam Speaker, if I may comment on this, I realize regretfully that "to the advisability" has been stricken from the resolution and that it should be stricken following the words "give consideration to the advisability of." That should have been left in the resolution and then amended. -- (Interjection) -- Thank you, I wonder if the House would agree to that change.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . allowing the amendment to stand then, Madam Speaker, not the content.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Who is your -- Lakeside?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Yes.

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

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre) presented Bill No. 82, an Act to incorporate Planetarium for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, this is a Bill to incorporate the organization which hopes to operate the Planetarium which will be part of the Art Centre. The persons who are sponsoring this bill are now members of the Manitoba Museum Association who are also the sponsors of Bill No. 46 to incorporate Manitoba Museum of Man and Nature. The members of the Manitoba Museum Association deem it in the best interests of the Art Centre that there be two separate organizations to operate the Planetarium and to operate the Manitoba Museum of Man and Nature.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the honourable member a question. Are there some words omitted in the order paper -- an Act to incorporate Planetarium. Somehow it reads as though there are words missing.

MR. COWAN: No. There is quotation marks to be changed in Section (1) of the Bill, but I am informed that it is now worded the way that the sponsors wish to have it worded.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I'd like also to ask the sponsor of the bill a question. Would the sponsor of the bill designate Planetarium as a private company in this case? -- (Interjection) -- Madam Speaker, the Honourable Minister is just at this stage answering questions.

MR. EVANS: . . . and I suggest that the proper procedure as we've always done is to have all the questions asked and then the Minister closes the debate. -- (Interjection) -- the member that introduces the bill closes the debate.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I would suggest that it's quite usual for us here that we ask questions of the sponsor of a bill and to some extent depending upon the answers that we get, whether or not we do speak. That practice has been followed quite frequently.

MR. EVANS: It may be usual but it's wrong.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, it is a private company just like other organizations that are incorporated by private acts in this Legislature.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, can we proceed now with the addendum to the Orders of the Day, in other words the adjourned debates on second readings I think it's not to be found in the regular orders but in the extra sheet.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 42. The Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I adjourned debate on second reading of Bill 42 because upon listening to the explanation of it by the Honourable Member for Springfield I was still left with some puzzlement about Section 2 of the bill. The Honourable Member for Springfield did explain at some length, well not so much length, but he did explain the intention and the content of Section 1 of the bill which is the section that makes provision for changing the amounts to be payable to the three municipalities, but he did not deal with Section 2 and Section 2 is the one which has to do with the authority of the Metropolitan Corporation to alter existing zoning by-laws in the area municipalities.

I have checked on this further and it seems that what is provided for here in the section in question is not out of the ordinary. There is nothing amiss and I have no further comment on it. But it does serve as a useful vehicle for me to once again put to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs the issue, the question, the problem of those few municipalities on the periphery of the Greater Winnipeg area who are subject to Metro planning, subject to the Metropolitan Planning Authority but which have no representation or a voice whatsoever on the Metropolitan Council or on the Metropolitan Planning Authority.

What is to be done about this problem, Madam Speaker? I make no apologies whatsoever for raising it a second and a third time because the Minister has to this date given no indication as to what the intention is. The problem exists; no one disputes that the problem exists. The problem is one of people in a municipality being subjected to planning and zoning without

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . having a voice in the determination of that planning and zoning. This cannot go on indefinitely, Madam Speaker, because it violates a pretty basic and fundamental principle of government, government by consent and government by representation of the governed and etcetera, etcetera.

I understand full well that there are some practical difficulties but some years have now passed. It would seem to me no more than reasonable that this government has by now achieved or come to some sort of solution. If they have not yet, I suggest they get busy and formulate some sort of policy which will take care of this problem.

I know that the Minister has received at least one delegation from the people and municipalities affected. This would be all of those municipalities that lie in the Metro secondary zone or outer zone. They are not happy with the present situation. They have served notice that they would like something to be done about it. I think that at most the Minister can expect only one more year of grace, and perhaps that's too long because this government has already had some extended period of grace to deal with this problem.

I myself think that the Minister must have some idea by now firmly in his mind and maybe the time is appropriate now for him to disclose what it is. Silence on his part can mean only one thing, namely, that this government is not concerned about this problem and about the dissatisfaction on the part of these municipalities and the residents thereof, Madam Speaker, even if I don't evoke a response from the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, I feel nevertheless that it was incumbent upon me to voice once again the dissatisfaction, not just of myself but of the people that I represent and of other people in this circle periphery area.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, I don't think that I can let the remarks of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead go by without making some comment on this matter. As the House is aware, the area of Metropolitan Winnipeg was changed last year as a result of the recommendations made by the Cumming Commission. The area of the additional zone was not changed, and if you reduce that additional zone -- it could be reduced somewhat from what it is -- but if you reduce it by doing what the Honourable Member for Brokenhead suggests, that is allow the municipalities in that zone to do their own planning, then they could defeat the whole purpose of the Metropolitan Winnipeg Act, one of the basic purposes of which of course was to ensure that the development of the urban area took place within the urban area and that we did not develop a series of satellite communities in the additional zone which surrounds the urban area.

The development of satellite communities in that area could create impossible problems. We have already seen one indication of a possible problem when the question came up of water supply for the Village of Headingley in the Municipality of Assiniboia. The proposal that was made was a proposal to run a pipeline from the metropolitan area all the way out to Headingley. Several suggestions were made as to how this might be controlled but we have found no practical way in which it could be controlled so that you could by this method give service in the way of a water supply to the people of Headingley without allowing the development of all the intervening area which is essentially an agricultural area at the present time.

There is plenty of room for development within the metropolitan area, and cities like Transcona and municipalities like Assiniboia and others such as West Kildonan and St. Vital and Charleswood and Fort Garry have all kinds of room for expansion and these are the municipalities which are equipped to handle the urban type of community. So I think that it is essential that this control over the additional zone must remain with the Metropolitan Corporation if we are not to develop satellite communities which are going to create impossible problems of service to those areas which we are not going to be able to cope with without great additional expense and inconvenience to the people in those areas.

I must recognize that to some extent the authority of those municipalities which are partly within this additional zone has been reduced by removing from them the right to do the planning in that additional zone. They can still do their planning in the other areas of those municipalities, and the delegation which the honourable member referred to certainly understood the problem apparently better than the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

I don't say they are happy with the situation but they certainly understand what the problem is and I believe those municipalities have accepted the situation, not gladly but certainly they have accepted it as the only practical solution to the difficulty which would arise if each individual municipality was planning on its own and if there were no over-all control over the development of the area immediately surrounding the Metropolitan Corporation. So there is no contemplation at this time of any change or any reduction in the additional zone.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, the Honourable the Minister taking part in this debate in his last two or three sentences used the phraseology of understanding. I think the Honourable the Minister does not understand the point that was being raised by the Member for Brokenhead, and certainly in his reply and in his wandering talk on this subject evaded answering the question posed by the member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Minister, Madam Speaker, shakes his head, and it's understandable I suppose. What my honourable colleague is endeavouring to have is at least representation from the area municipalities outside of the absolute Metro zone when planning -- (interjection) -- I beg your pardon!

MR. SMELLIE: They asked to get out of Metro.

MR. PAULLEY: But just a minute. Of course they did.

MR. SMELLIE: Absolutely.

MR. PAULLEY: But in getting out of Metro, Madam Speaker, they were still subject to the zoning regulations in an area outside.

MR. SMELLIE: Right.

MR. PAULLEY: While they were in Metro they had an opportunity and some say in the over-all picture of zoning. Now what has happened, through legislation passed with the approval of the Minister which allowed these municipalities to be set outside of Metropolitan Winnipeg, of Metro . . . .

MR. SMELLIE: . . . and with the . . . of the municipalities. . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Who is making this speech, Madam Speaker? I wonder if you would mind getting my honourable friends to order there so that they might understand what is being said.

MR. SMELLIE: You are the one that needs to understand.

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

MR. PAULLEY: You know, I was just contemplating whether I should or not, and quite frankly, Madam Speaker, I came to the conclusion that it might be ineffectual on such an area as the periphery around the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

But the point though, Madam Speaker, is this, that it is true that these area municipalities were taken out of Metro, but remaining however is the area in which zoning is taking place, and what is desired now was the same type of relationship that prevailed before, or an opportunity of those area municipalities outside of Metro when zoning is taking place within their municipality to be allowed to have representation on the zoning board of Metro which is considering what is going to happen within their respective municipalities.

I appreciate the fact that there may be some very minute difficulty in having what is being suggested accomplished, but surely there would be no harm in having a representative from the municipalities concerned as a member of the zoning board while dealing with the problem of that particular municipality. I think this is what is being requested, and I say to my friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs that this is quite capable of being done without any harm, instead of the people on the outside, which were previously in Metro, being kept entirely out. The point is to allow them to have a say insofar as their municipalities are concerned when matters of zoning are being considered.

Now I don't know if I have added to the lack of understanding of the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs or maybe now -- and this I doubt -- he might understand what the Honourable Member my colleague from Brokenhead is trying to achieve on behalf of the municipalities outside of Metro but still within the zoning areas of Metro. This is what is being asked for. It's simple of solution, and maybe that's the difficulty that my honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs finds. It's so simple that it's obvious to everyone except my honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill 105. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, in speaking on this bill I have two major points that I would like to raise in the debate here. First of all, I object to the clause which will permit the passing of money by-laws without having a vote as far as the people of the City of Winnipeg are concerned. I object to this principle very strongly. I have done so in the past and I will continue doing so in the future because I just can't go along with this.

I feel that these are powers that should not be delegated to bodies other than the provincial and federal governments where you have official oppositions to voice any matters that should be brought out in these by-laws where you call for large amounts of capital. Too often we find that there are meetings of the Committee of the Whole where they discuss these matters, and quite

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . often they are closed meetings so that the matters involved very often don't come out and are probably not aired by the press at all and the people concerned do not know what is going on, yet they are saddled with this debt and have to pay for it eventually. I find that too often the general public is not informed as to what is going on, especially when we have large increases in debt, and that pertains to this government as well.

I would like to draw to the members' attention a few statistics in connection with the City of Winnipeg and then later on with Metro. We find that the City of Winnipeg at the close of 1963 had a gross debenture debt of \$87,126,139.00. After deducting the sinking funds there was a net debenture debt of \$35,580,193.00. This represents a per capita debt of \$138.65. Now when we go back over a number of years, at the end of 1954 this gross debt was \$51,684,000 compared to the present \$87,000,000, but over the last four years the amount of debt has been very stable. In fact, in 1960 the city's debt was \$81,306,000; in '61 it was \$81,795,000; in '62 it was down to \$78,948,000; so that over the last number of years there has not been too great an increase in the debt picture as far as the city is concerned.

But then if we take a look at what happened in 1964, we find that from January 1st to October 31st of '64 the City of Winnipeg borrowed new money to the amount of \$10 million so that there is a substantial increase in the city's debt of that one particular year, and I'm afraid if this authority is given that they are seeking in this amendment to their charter that the debt of the City of Winnipeg will increase by leaps and bounds, because we've seen on many occasions where bylaws were rejected by the people of the City of Winnipeg that the City Council was calling for. I think another proof of that is if we just take one look at Metro, because Metro has these powers. They can pass money bylaws without asking the people for a vote and look where they got themselves into just in the matter of a few years.

We find those statistics in the same publication, and I am taking the statistics from the Canadian Government and Municipal Financial Statistics as put out by Wood Gundy and Company, and we find here that as at December, 1963, the Metro Corporation of Greater Winnipeg had a debt of \$27,026,224. Then in 1964, from January 1st to October 31st, the Metro Corporation borrowed capital to the tune of 12,700,000 in that one year, 6,700,000 payable in Canadian funds and another 6,000,000 payable in U. S. A. funds, so that as at October 31st, 1964, the indebtedness of Metro stood at \$39,726,224. I am not aware of any more recent loans, but there might have been some more recent loans made that I'm not aware of.

We find here that the local municipal councils who have no say in the matter are burdened with the obligations to levy taxes in the various municipalities to pay for these costs of financing and borrowing. So, Madam Speaker, I am opposed to the principle and I will oppose the bill on that count, because I feel that by giving them these powers they go head over heels in debt and our people have no say whatsoever.

There is another matter that I would like to bring to the attention of the members, and that has to do with another clause in connection with business colleges. Presently, the proprietors of these business colleges pay a licence fee of \$1.00 per person for whom accommodation is provided. Now if this measure goes through they will be asked to pay a business tax, thus the cost of these business schools will increase as a result and I feel this will be to the detriment of the young people taking advantage of these business courses offered.

I know quite a few people that have taken business courses in these schools and they have benefited greatly by this and have received jobs more readily and are much more useful to their employers when they do take them on. So they serve a very good and useful purpose in my opinion. But I feel that this new cost will naturally be added on to the cost to the pupils or students attending these courses and that will make it that more difficult for the people who are trying to avail themselves of these courses and of this training. So in my opinion, Madam Speaker, this should not be done. I feel we should try and accommodate these students who are in fact probably retraining for other jobs and who need jobs badly and we can assist them in this way.

So, Madam Speaker, I will oppose the bill on second reading on these two counts. There are naturally some other bylaws attached to the bill which I do not care to comment on at this time, but I might have to question in committee.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, there's just one point where I think perhaps the Honourable Member for Rhineland has misunderstood this bill. This bill does not give the City of Winnipeg any additional powers that it does not already have to pass bylaws for the borrowing of money without the consent of the ratepayers. There is already a section in the City of

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd)..... Winnipeg Charter which provides that the City of Winnipeg may issue debentures for the raising of money for certain specific purposes and it lists all the purposes in that section.

In the past, they have had to pass a separate bylaw each year for each one of those different purposes. For example, if they wanted to borrow money for the construction of a storm sewer in a given area they had to pass a specific bylaw for that purpose. This section will allow them to pass one bylaw for the borrowing of money for all of those things that are already listed in that section, which I believe is Section 591, for all the money they wish to borrow in that year or at any given point in time. So it does not really extend any further the principle of borrowing without consent of the ratepayers.

There are some other sections in this bill about which some questions might be raised, such as the section which would allow the city to prohibit absolutely the sale of firecrackers, for example, which is a section that I think perhaps the city may have some trouble with. But I do think that the bill should be allowed to pass second reading so that the city can come in and make their case before the committee when the opportunity presents itself.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the Honourable Minister permit a question? Would the Minister care to comment on the suggestion which I made on speaking on this second reading that an amendment be brought in to enable the city to split the assessment rolls so that the school tax rebate may be made available as it is to other municipalities other than Winnipeg and St. Boniface.

MR. SMELLIE: I'll take the matter under consideration, Madam Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I'd just like to say a very few words on the bill. I'm not going to object to any particular clauses in the bill. My main objection to it is that I think the time has really gone by when we should be faced every year with amendments to the City of Winnipeg Charter. Surely we can do something to give them the powers to do things. I look at this bill and I see for example that we're going to allow them to have the proprietor of a business college pay a licence fee -- or rather have a business tax instead of the licence fee of a dollar per student. Well surely we should allow them to have that right to make a decision of that sort without having to come to us to validate it.

But there's one that's even more outstanding, Madam Speaker, in the bill, and I'm not referring to any particular clause, Madam Speaker, I realize the rule, I'm speaking of a principle. The principle here is to allow the City of Winnipeg to make rules regarding the selling of fireworks, prohibiting the sale within the City of Winnipeg of firecrackers, squibs, fireballs, etc. Now surely it's not necessary for the Legislature of Manitoba to be spending time to decide whether or not the City of Winnipeg should be entitled to make rules and regulations on the sale of firecrackers.

I submit, Madam Speaker, that we should take whatever steps are necessary to permit the City of Winnipeg to have a good deal of measure of home rule, that they could on matters of this--(Interjection)--I am, I realize he's not here so in his absence I'm making it for him -- but when I see details like this that have to come to us for validation, I suggest to the Minister, can't we do something to establish some means of home rule for Winnipeg so that each year we don't have a thick bill regarding the Winnipeg Charter.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, I hadn't intended to speak on this bill until my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition spoke, but my words will be brief and few. I was very happy to hear him tonight however subscribe to the principle that paltry little details shouldn't be troubling the House, and I would only hope that he and the members of his group will keep that very nice principle in mind during the balance of the session in order that we might finish up much faster than we anticipated.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the last speaker a question. Would he consider that the matters in his department are paltry little details?

MR. LYON: Everything that has been discussed this far -- yes.

MADAM SPEAKER: In order to keep the record straight, I would like to say that I called Bill No. 105 which is blurred on my paper here. The bill is No. 103. The Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN: I'd just like to say to the Leader of the Opposition that the Winnipeg Charter contains, generally speaking, what the City of Winnipeg has asked it to contain from time to time and we generally comply with their requests. With regard to the firecrackers, this is something that they have requested again, and when we give them what they request,

(MR. COWAN cont'd).....generally speaking you could say that we give them the home rule to that extent.

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

MR. STRICKLAND, in the absence of the Honourable Member for Virden, presented Bill No. 109, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Virden and District Elderly Persons Housing Corporation for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. STRICKLAND: Madam Speaker, first of all, I am informed that all of the municipalities involved are in favour; secondly, it changes the first five-year period down to two years and then it reverts back to the five years.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable 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 2:30 Wednesday afternoon.