

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 25, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing And Special Committees

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the sixth report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments directs me to present the following as their sixth report.

Your Committee has considered Bills:

No. 75 - An Act to amend The Mental Health Act.

No. 95 - An Act respecting the Protection and Preservation of Historic Sites and Objects.

No. 114 - An Act to amend The Magistrates Act.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered Bills:

No. 21 - An Act to amend The Employment Standards Act.

No. 74 - An Act to amend The West Kildonan Charter.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Provincial Treasurer, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

MR. SPEAKER: I'd like to take a moment of the time of the House to introduce our guests today. We are particularly privileged in having with us 40 ladies from the Western Association of Canadian Highways Officials (Western Canada). I understand that they are the guests of the Honourable the Minister of Highways. How fortunate he is! On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, ladies, I welcome you here today.

We also have 21 students of Grade 4 standing, of the Montrose School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Young. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. We also have with us today 20 students of Grade 11 standing, from the Garden City Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Froese. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

Orders of the Day.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Yesterday he made a statement on a bill to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act and at the same time made a statement regarding the marketing of vegetables in the Province of Manitoba, and tabled the Baron Report. Did he have any consultations with the two groups that are concerned about the vegetable marketing in particular - that is, the VGAM and the Manitoba Association of Vegetable Producers? Was there any consultation with them prior to the statement that was made in the House?

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I think all the honourable members are aware that I've had a great deal of consultations with all interested vegetable growers in this House since assuming the office. Specifically, as to the question of consultations with respect to the Baron Commission, the answer is 'no'.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a subsequent question to the Minister. I haven't had the opportunity yet of reading his comments of yesterday. Am I to assume, though, that he has decided to accept completely the recommendations of the Baron Report?

MR. ENNS: Again, Mr. Speaker, no; not completely. I would suggest to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to examine my statement yesterday. On one particularly rather important aspect we are not accepting the recommendation of the Commissioner.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Seven Oaks, that the House do now adjourn to discuss a definite matter or urgent public importance, namely, the announced intention of this government to eliminate vegetable growers immediately from the jurisdiction of the Vegetable Marketing Commission and to eliminate potato growers therefrom on June 30th, 1967.

MR. SPEAKER: I'd like to thank the Honourable Member for Brokenhead in giving me prior knowledge of this motion in accordance with our rules, and having given the matter consideration and in the light of the fact that the Minister of Agriculture made a statement with respect to this matter yesterday, and particularly that the Orders of the Day indicated that legislation titled, "An Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act," Bill No. 117, is before the House for consideration and debate, as a consequence the honourable member will, in my opinion, have ample opportunity to bring before the House the subject matter of his motion. I might also bring to the attention of the honourable members that the urgency within the rules does not apply to the matter itself but the urgency of debate, and in this connection I would refer the honourable members to Beauchesne's Citation 100, sub-paragraph (9), and the same citation sub-paragraph (3). In view of the foregoing I must rule the motion out of order.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not rise to challenge your opinion and your ruling. I just raise one question, if I may, for consideration, if you would permit me, Sir; is that under the rule my honourable friend the Member for Brokenhead be able to cover all aspects of natural marketing under the bill which is before us, which only contains certain specific matters relating to The Natural Products Marketing Act.

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to give an opinion in that respect but I would suggest -- the tenacity of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead would suggest to me that he will do his level best.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, then I trust and hope that the tenacity of my honourable colleague will prevail on the House. One other point dealing with the urgency: I trust and hope that we will be getting to Bill No. 117 e'er too long.

MR. MOLGAT: I wonder if on this matter...

MR. SPEAKER: Order; order, please, if you don't mind. I've just had a note passed up to me and I'm sure you would not want me to overlook this matter, that we have in the gallery 20 students on my left from the General Wolfe School and this school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wellington. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you also here to the meeting.

I'd like to thank the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. You have the floor, Sir.

MR. MOLGAT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before this matter was closed on the subject of the adjournment I wondered if on this question of urgency the Leader of the House might indicate if in fact the bill in question will be called in time for discussion this evening. I recognize that this afternoon is Private Members' Day, but when we reach this evening then it's government business, and it could be that the government would not call that item first. Could we have an understanding from the Minister that it might be called as the first item of debate tonight?

MR. LYON: I couldn't give an undertaking it will be called as the first item because there are other matters of equal, at least equal priority, but we will do our best to get to the matter as soon as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Highways, who I believe is responsible for the Flood Control, or Flood Forecasting Committee. Apparently the Americans have revised their flood forecasts to substantially higher levels, and here in Winnipeg the Red River is certainly much higher than it was last week and that was anticipated when the Minister made his statement that the crest was expected I think somewhere around a week ago Monday. Is there any further forecast? Is the Red River likely to increase any further, or has it reached its maximum now?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Highways)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I didn't receive it in the House. The Flood Forecasting Committee issued another report late Friday indicating that the levels in Winnipeg might be expected to be from 20 to 21 feet in Winnipeg, primarily as a result of the high waters on the Assiniboine and the extra precipitation we've had in the area. We're not expecting any further increase beyond the predicted levels, or the levels that they have experienced south of the Greater Winnipeg area, but the level is -- they were

(MR. WEIR cont'd)...anticipating a peak, possibly today, in the Winnipeg area at around the 20 foot level, someplace in there.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Could the Honourable Minister tell us whether there are adequate ambulance facilities at the Kettle Rapids project to provide for quick transportation of injured workmen? I'm asking this in view of the fact there are many men employed and no doubt the project anticipates employing several thousand men, and this is a matter of concern to them.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour)(Osborne): Well, Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member knows, there is aircraft transportation in and out several times a day, and I will inquire as to the ambulance service that he's asking about.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Some time ago when speaking at a meeting in the Interlake on the question of flooding around Lake Winnipeg, the Minister had indicated that the government would proceed to buy lands behind the dikes on the south end of Lake Winnipeg. The question was brought up in the House at a subsequent time and, as I recall it, there wasn't any firm decision at that time. Has the government reached any decision on this matter? I think that the people in the area are vitally concerned. They are now reaching the planting season and I think they should be told what the situation is.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I believe if the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition checks Hansard of that time, I corrected a misrepresentation, I thought at the time, in the press that indicated that I was indeed announcing government policy at that meeting. I certainly indicated my personal concern or feeling that this may or indeed should be a policy that we would like to adopt if feasible, and these studies are still currently under way in consultation with my colleague the Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Honourable Minister: is it the intention of the government to refer this whole matter to the Water Control Commission?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, no, I believe this is not the intention. The particular duties or functions of that body are envisaged in another way.

MR. MOLGAT: I wonder if the Minister of Highways, then, might have clarification for us due to the fact that his Department is involved? Could he tell us when we might expect an answer for these people, because there is a great deal of urgency insofar as they are concerned.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): I think, Mr. Speaker, that when one Minister replies he replies on behalf of the government. It is unnecessary to canvass the front bench.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll come back to the Minister of Agriculture in that case, if I can't ask another Minister. Could the Minister of Agriculture indicate when a decision might be forthcoming, because there is a good deal of urgency for these people. Their livelihood is at stake.

MR. ENNS: I can only repeat, Mr. Speaker, that this matter is under active consideration at this time.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education with reference to a report of a Winnipeg School Board meeting held last Saturday, April 22nd, and my question is: whether the Minister feels that the Winnipeg School Board has acted within the scope of their powers and authority and, I should add, in a responsible manner, in dealing with that particular situation, and I'm referring particularly to the matter of a representative of the board going on school board business beyond the boundaries of Canada.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education)(Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Honourable Member for giving me notice of this question. Section 73 and Section 453 subsection (18) of The Public School Act clearly gives the power to the board to decide in a matter of this nature.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I believe there's agreement that we should pass over Committee of the Whole House and come to the Private Members' resolutions. I notice that there is one bill remaining on Page 16, Bill No. 107, a private member's bill. I wonder if there's any

(MR. LYON cont'd)...disposition to have that considered first and then to move on to the resolutions.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Member for Inkster is at the present time appearing before the Supreme Court and I would appreciate very much if we may hold this until that august body is finished with my colleague.

MR. SPEAKER: Shall we proceed to Page 3? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

Mr. M.E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Speaker, as I was speaking on the resolution on government automobile insurance on Friday, I have a few words I'd like to say before completed. I know that I won't convince the Leader of the New Democratic Party and it's not likely he'll convince me in the end, so we'll still end up with the same result. But I'd like to put my few words across anyway to the members of the Legislature here at this time.

I was discussing a particular part of the resolution here the other night dealing with co-operative insurance, and I guess the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party wasn't familiar with co-operative insurance and how it was identified with government insurance, but there's quite a difference entirely. If you bring in government automobile insurance you do away with co-operative automobile insurance companies, so this is quite ...

MR. PAULLEY: ...interrupt my honourable friend just to make a correction. It just came to my notice this afternoon, the words "Co-operative Insurance" in the resolution should not really be spelled with capital letters. It was my intention that they should be small letters indicating not a company but rather the theory of insurance.

MR. McKELLAR: Well, Mr. Speaker, that might be true but it doesn't read that way, and I would take it Co-operative Insurance means Co-operative Insurance Company, like Co-operative Fire and Casualty Insurance Company. Well, I don't know how you'll explain this to the Co-operative Fire and Casualty Insurance because they'll want a real good explanation anyway when the committee appears.

I'd also like to explain too the tax laws of the various insurance companies. Co-operative insurance companies do have a terrific tax advantage over the mutual insurance companies, while they both elect their directors and management under the same principles, that of being a policy holder, and I think that this is where the comparison exists. While you say that you didn't mean it, you actually said it, so I had to speak on that assumption. --(Interjection)-- Yes. Yes, ... three.

You also made a statement too that there hadn't been any check on automobile insurance rates for the last while and there had been increases, unjustified increases, or unreasonable increases annually. Well this might be so but we have to take a number of things into consideration when we talk about rates, and the insurance companies operate on the same basis that the government operates. They estimate their annual costs a year in advance and set their rates accordingly, and I'm sure that no insurance company ever comes out with the same actual costs factor as what they estimate at the year previous. So they have to make sure that the public are protected in that way.

I would like to say to the members here that if government insurance was brought into Manitoba we would lose a number of large insurance companies in Manitoba. These are some of the largest industries that we do have in all of Manitoba, and this is the one point that I would like to mention to the members here, that while the members on the right hand side of me, the New Democratic Party, they're always advocating for the government to do more about industry in Manitoba, they in turn are advocating we do away with all the industry dealing with insurance, and I think that they would have to illustrate in no uncertain terms to the people of Manitoba that they were doing this in a manner such as would be in the best interests of all the people of Manitoba.

I would like to say here that one large insurance company in my constituency does 1.99 percent of all the business done in Canada, and I know this is really a high figure. Their premiums were about \$31 million this past year, 1966. This is the kind of business we're talking about. Their profits for the year were a million dollars. Their costs of operating their insurance company, including the cost of their losses plus the cost of their agents' commissions and all their operating costs dealing with adjustments and that, were at a total of 98.22, so this means that there's 1.78 percent profit in their industry, the Wawanesa Insurance Company. This, in my opinion, is a very small margin of profit because you have to realize that there's disasters from time to time and the industry at large gets hit fairly hard. Also, too, the

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd)....automobile companies are building their cars in such a manner that it's costing more to repair, to fix the bodies in case of an accident, and this is also creating large expenses. I have too here where the body shop costs now in the City of Winnipeg are \$7.00 an hour. This seems like a fairly large figure but I guess that in the true sense the man that's working on the car is actually getting about half of it; the shop gets the other half. In rural Manitoba the average cost is \$6.00 per hour which you take 50-50 - 50 percent for the man and 50 percent for the shop.

So these, in turn, have gone up at the rate of about 75 cents an hour over the year previous, so you can see this is about a 10 percent in wages or in the cost of repairing automobiles for the body work only, just for the hourly work. The cost of parts have also gone up some too, in some models, because in some of the new models they're bringing out the fenders don't stop at the fender, they continue right through. So the automobile companies are actually helping to create larger costs in the insurance industry.

Also, too, I'd like to mention there are 140 insurance companies doing business in automobile insurance in Manitoba. Fourteen hundred agents are also selling automobile insurance in Manitoba, so you can see such a large industry as it is, doing business all over our province. I don't really know the amount of dollars taxes they contribute to our province of Manitoba, but I would imagine it would be up in the millions of dollars, up in the millions of dollars these companies would contribute in tax money towards our Province of Manitoba, and a goodly sum of tax money from the 1,400 agents too is also contributed to the tax Provincial Treasurer's fund for the years.

These are some of the figures I would like to give to say that all is not rosy if you go to the government automobile insurance as they have in Saskatchewan. These are some of the moneys that our Provincial Treasurer will not have coming to him annually.

Now, we all think there's so much money in the automobile insurance industry and I'd like to quote you a few figures here of some of the companies we're more familiar with. The Co-operative Fire and Casualty; their earn-claim ratio - that means their operating costs - is 73.69 percent. This does not include their cost of adjusting fees and their agents' commissions and their office expenses too. Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Company; their earn-claim ratio was 74.22 for the year, a little higher than the Co-operative Fire and Casualty.

Another company which the Honourable Member of Lakeside and myself are associated with, their earn-claim ratio was 59 percent, and this is one of the best ones in the whole of the Dominion of Canada, I must say - the whole of the Dominion of Canada. A small company doing business in four provinces of Canada, they had an increase of 40 percent over the past year in automobile insurance alone, and they're doing a fine job in our province of Manitoba and also the other three provinces too. Another one is the Saskatchewan Mutual Insurance, they're another company known.

Their earn-claim ratio was 63 percent for this past year, 1966. Another one is Gore Mutual. Their earn-claim ratio was 74 percent; they're one of the higher ones too. Lloyds of London - 66 percent for the year. They write more premiums than any other company in Canada - automobile premiums. They had a very unsuccessful year in the fire business due to the many fires and storms that were across Canada. They do a lot of re-insuring.

There's a number of other companies here. Federated Mutual is another company who are well known - 77 percent, their earn-claim ratio was. They're I guess about the highest of all except one here that reads 100 percent; Aetna Insurance Company - 100 percent, so they lost considerable money, but the total percentage, the average percentage is 67 percent which means the automobile insurance industry made a profit of about one percent on the average. This is the kind of profits we're talking about. So when anybody talks about high rates for automobile insurance here in Manitoba, I think they should take a second look.

I'd like to mention too here that I have here before me - and I want to just compare premiums - on a '67 Belair Chevrolet six cylinder sedan; and if you're in Winnipeg Class A3, which means you don't drive this car to -- it isn't used to drive to and from work; two drivers; and it's the best rating there is in the Province of Manitoba. It's \$89.00 in Winnipeg; \$80.00 in Brandon; \$87.00 in rural Manitoba and \$57.00 if you're a farmer. And the reason for a farmer's reduction is that this past year the farmer's reduction was increased from 40 percent to 50 percent, which means that the farmers are getting cheaper rates in '67 than they were in '66. So this will be a great saving to the farmers of Manitoba, I'm sure, in their automobile insurance.

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd).....

These rates are pretty well comparable. While there may be four or five dollars difference here and there between one company and another, they're not that far apart. One reason is their experience isn't that far apart. The experience is right in the figures that I have before me, and if anybody wants a copy I'll give them a copy of it. The experience tells. This is the factor that they use in arriving at their rates.

Now in getting back to the Saskatchewan Government insurance, I'd like to mention here to the members that when I was talking about the rates here that I had before me, I was talking about \$100,000 deductible, ... inclusive though, I mean, plus a \$25.00 deductible all peril coverage. It's one of the best coverages you can get - \$25.00 all peril. And this is one of the best coverages that you can get with the exception you could raise it up from \$100,000 to \$200,000. When you're talking about Saskatchewan Government insurance, if you just take out their initial policy with your licence, you only have a \$35,000 inclusive coverage plus a \$200.00 deductible in your collision, plus a \$200.00 deductible on your comprehensive coverage. So this means that your policy isn't very much good to you. If you want a real good coverage you've got to go to a package deal and that in turn costs more money than the actual policy which we could get in Manitoba. So this is one of, I think, the things that you have to take into consideration. You mustn't be misled by information that we receive on Saskatchewan Government insurance.

I don't want to belabour the members of the Legislative because I know that they all -- we're going to have this committee dealing with this most important matter in our province, but I hope the members understand that this is one of the most important industries that we've got in all Manitoba and let's not hurt it in any way, and I hope that this adverse publicity about increased rates, about the treatment of the policyholders and all that type of knowledge, this will come in any line of business, and I'll bet you Hudson Bay or Eatons down here, the stores have a lot of unsatisfied customers every day who walk out of the store a little provoked, and this applies to every industry. The automobile insurance industry is no exception, I am sure. The small complaints are that the agent didn't look after them when they had a loss, or something of that; the adjuster was a little too tough or something of that nature, but over-all I think the people of the province of Manitoba are well looked after in the insurance industry that we have here today, and I hope that I have explained my side of the story to the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party, and I know we'll have many registering sides dealing with this important subject in committee. Thank you.

MR. FRED T. KLYM (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, if I may make a few comments in connection with car and motor vehicle insurance. In the first place, I'd like to inform this House that I'm not fond of government being the insurer for any motor vehicle. I believe that private motor vehicle insurance is still the best we could ever have in the country. The basis of Canadian economy is competitive private enterprise. Look and see in the world whatever have achieved the high standards of living that Canada has under its private enterprise, and anything that is built from private enterprise is really something to be proud of. It isn't often probably the very best, but it is still something to be proud of, something to look forward to. As consumers in private enterprises, if we don't like a product that is being handed to us over the counter we can just leave that enterprise and get away somewhere else and do business with someone else. If we do not like our employer as employees, we can walk out and quit and get a job somewhere else. This is something that is inherent with everybody. But we come to automobile insurance today. Certainly we have troubles and we have to pay for them, but let us figure this out, that our cars are far larger than they were years ago. How many remember the old Model "T"? That was the cheapest car yet, the most economical to drive, and probably the insurance wasn't very high, but how many of the members here today have come with one to the Legislative Assembly grounds? I'd like to see that.

I remember years ago when I drove one of those. I had never driven a car before. I got out on the streets of Winnipeg and that's where I learned to drive, and I must have learned to drive because I'm still around. Yes, probably I am on the safe side of the wheel because it's always someone else holding another wheel. However, that little car could not be bruised very quickly. You could have pulled parts off and you could have been travelling or taking the thing to anywhere to get fixed and it didn't cost you very much. However, today you practically have to take half the car apart when you happen to have a dented fender, and that costs money. It may cost you \$4.00 an hour on a body job for anywhere in a garage.

(MR. KLYM cont'd)....

Now, they go to work and tell us, oh, Saskatchewan has had a plan. Yes they have, and I agree with them. I give them credit for establishing one. But has anyone else copied it? Any other jurisdictions taken it into their hands? No. Several have studied it, looked it over and just threw it aside for the simple reason that it would be just another cost to the taxpayer. You know, when the accidents are high at times, what happens? If the government runs short of funds in the insurance plan, what would they do? Just pump more tax dollars into it, anywhere three, four million dollars, and pay for it quietly and that's all there is to it. Now why should I, who probably do not own a car, or do not wish to drive one, or somebody else who's past driving stage, be paying for someone's else's reckless mistakes? This is something that bothers me at all times. I cannot figure that one out. If somebody could go to work and point it out very clearly to me, I probably would try and study the plan, but since there are people all throughout Canada, probably other jurisdictions in the world, that heard of the plan and tried it out in every way by looking at it, discarded it completely and did not even bother with it. However as it may be, they can say Saskatchewan probably may not have as many accidents because they haven't any cities as large as Winnipeg. You know half the people of Winnipeg, or say half a million people, live in Greater Winnipeg here, in Metropolitan Winnipeg and surrounding country. We are on the way to all the parks, the beaches, the lakes, all of which radiates from Winnipeg in every direction. Many large cars come in at terrific speed sometimes, everybody trying to get past the next man and get there sooner than ever - as we sometimes say, "Slide by, big man, cemetery ahead", - but that doesn't stop anyone. You've heard of the carnage on the highways every weekend, every holiday. Now who pays for that? It costs money. Not that I am fond of paying high insurance - I pay it quite as high as anybody else even though I am a farmer, but I do not wish to levy that expense on the taxpayers. I would still have to be shown the plan that would work out as well as it worked out in Saskatchewan.

We have a city here of Winnipeg, a city of many bridges, a city of the confluence of two rivers. Now the bridges are generally bottlenecks, everybody going to work from all directions, people commuting 50 or 60 miles every morning and going back at night, and everyone is trying to get there on time. The cars are large, the cars are long and they're speedy; they're powerful; they get ahead very fast, not as they used to. Now I'm not trying to belabour any particular scheme but this is something that I cannot see. I think that the private insurance companies have been promoting some safety standards and it's probably their duty, rightful duty to do that. I do not know whether we could go to work and start levelling any more expense at the public by levying taxes upon them. They're right now in the midst of teaching young people how to drive in schools and so forth, government grants put to that effect, and I don't think we should do any more others because of the good works that the insurance companies have done in spite of the fact that they cost a great deal at times. I still think we should not throw any slurs at them or slanders, or condemn them in any way. They're doing a service and it's not an easy one. If you count the number of people who died, people who are hurt, are in hospitals, if you notice ... probably take some statistics of damages been done to property, it would not make anyone laugh. It will astound one.

Therefore, looking at it all from all directions I still think that we should leave it to the private companies to do the job, although they too could probably look at the picture somehow and concentrate their forces in such a way that they would not overly charge the public in order to chase the money out of their pockets too fast. However, it would also happen on the other side of the government insured, because as I said the taxpayer would foot the bills whether he had a car, whether he drove one, whether he didn't like it.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the comments made this afternoon by the Honourable Members for Springfield and Souris-Lansdowne. The Honourable Member for Springfield in his opening remarks stated that the basis of our economy is a competitive private enterprise. He's probably right. The unfortunate thing is that he's been reading from a very very old history book because the enterprise that we have today, it may be private but I don't believe, and I am sure that he would not really agree, that it is competitive. I am sure that he would not agree with me that the insurance companies which fall within the domain of the - which one is it? - the Royal Insurance Group, which had reported its financial statement not too long ago, whose subsidiaries consist of, I don't know - 12, 15 or 20 insurance companies. Surely, Mr. Speaker, those companies which are subsidiaries of Royal Insurance are not competitive amongst themselves, or if there is any competition it's merely a fiction but not any true competition.

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd).....

The Honourable Member for Springfield also suggests, or raises the question: why should I pay for someone else's mistakes? And I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that I would agree that the bulk of the burden of paying for automobile insurance should fall upon the driver. However, if it should be so, and I'm not at the moment prepared to debate this point because situations may change and it may well be that at some time or another it may be desirable to in some way subsidize an insurance plan of this sort, and if a subsidy should come out of the pockets of all the taxpayers I don't think that that would be such a tragedy or such a disaster. I would suggest to the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, that I would feel far more comfortable and at ease even if I do have to pay a dollar or two out of my own pocket, to ensure that each and every automobile driver on the streets is adequately protected when I let any of my children out of my house to cross the street on their way to school, and if I know that if they should have the misfortune of being struck by an automobile, that the person that I would have to deal with or negotiate with is adequately covered. So I cannot agree, Mr. Speaker, that that line of reasoning is quite correct or is the type of reasoning that we in this day and age wish to adopt.

Now the Honourable Member for Springfield also mentioned: let's not overburden the taxpayers. He is right. Let's not overburden the taxpayers. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that he and the Party that he represents would have done the people of Manitoba a greater service, a greater favour, had they not imposed a 5 percent sales tax than dealing with this question of a compulsory automobile insurance plan, because insofar as a government-operated automobile insurance plan, the burden is not going to be any greater on anyone. There's still going to be the same number of automobiles driven; there's still going to be the same automobile drivers on the roads; the rift of accidents is not going to change appreciably - in fact it may decrease, because a government-sponsored plan may initiate an education program that may result in a decrease in accidents. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, the suggestion that this would merely increase the burden on the taxpayer is not correct.

The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne praised the virtues of the companies in the insurance business, and he mentioned that if the government were to go into an automobile insurance plan that we would lose many insurance companies in the Province of Manitoba, and he says that what we are proposing from the New Democratic Party is inconsistent with our pleas to the government to expand and develop the industry in the Province of Manitoba. He suggests that out of one corner of our mouth we're talking in terms of expanding the industry of the Province of Manitoba; out of the other corner, we're suggesting something quite the opposite because if we put the automobile insurance companies out of business then what happens to the industrial development of our province? After all, the insurance companies employ, I believe he said, approximately 1,400 agents in the Province of Manitoba - what would those people do for work if suddenly they found themselves being out of a job, that they employ office staff and so forth, that the results of their operations bring tax dollars into the coffers of the Province of Manitoba. Well Mr. Speaker, the dollar that is earned by a person in Manitoba, if it is not spent for the price of a premium for an insurance policy that's presently being sold, if the insurance company should suddenly not be there and he no longer has the opportunity to spend that dollar in that particular place, it will not necessarily mean that that dollar suddenly becomes lost to the economy of this province. Likely what would happen, Mr. Speaker, is that he will spend fewer dollars for the same commodity providing himself with the same service from another source, from mainly the government, and the difference will be spent elsewhere in the development of other industries in the Province of Manitoba, which I have no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, would bring the province the same return, perhaps even greater than what we obtain from the operations of insurance companies. All it would really mean, Mr. Speaker, is the redirection of the spending of consumer dollars, and in talking about the industrial development of the Province of Manitoba, our Party had suggested ways and means in which the province, the government and the people within the government could participate in the development of industry within it, and I would suggest to you that the savings that may come about from a government-operated automobile insurance plan could be directed towards a real and a true development and expansion of industry in this province.

Now the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne also makes reference to the fact that the profit that insurance companies make, automobile insurance companies in particular, only amounts to one percent, but he failed to go one step further and tell us one percent on what. One percent on the investment in the business? Surely, Mr. Speaker, these famous free-or-no,

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd)....he didn't speak of free enterprises; he was clever enough not to mention that knowing that there are no free enterprises today, but surely these private enterprisers aren't going to be foolish enough to invest their money in a business operation that will net them only a one percent return, and if they are, why aren't they getting out of the business? I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member uses the same -- in arriving at this one percent profit figure, he uses the same type of reasoning, the same type of logic as is put forward by the Westons and others in the grocery business who claim that the return on the grocery business is less than 2 percent, 2 percent on sales. But you relate the profit to the investment in the company and it works out to well in excess of 8, 9 or 10 percent per annum.

The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne also mentioned, he injected a word of caution into his speech by suggesting: let's not be misled by the low premiums in Saskatchewan. After all, Saskatchewan has a \$200.00 deductible. We in Manitoba sell \$100.00 deductible, \$50.00, \$25.00, what have you. Well, I'm not an expert on insurance, Mr. Speaker, but there are two sides to that coin and there's another side that can be argued, and I'm sure that the honourable member is well aware of this, of the other side of the coin. The \$200.00 deductible that is in existence in Saskatchewan at the present time, there's a reason for it, because their studies, their surveys show that it's a very very expensive proposition to service claims below \$200.00, that in the long run the insured would do far better by assuming that risk himself than placing the risk on an insurance company and coming to the insurance company with a \$40.00, \$50.00, \$60.00 claim, whatever it may be, and putting a crew of adjusters to work on it to arrive at a claim, that frequently the costs involved in settling that claim far exceed the amount of the claim itself. And this, Mr. Speaker, does increase the price of insurance. So I'm really not quite certain in my mind, Mr. Speaker, whether the \$15.00 or \$25.00 deductible policies that are being sold in the Province of Manitoba really are such a great service to the people of Manitoba. Now maybe they are, but I'm simply putting this forward to you to present the other side of the argument that we heard here a moment ago, that there is a very good reason in the opinion of the Government of Saskatchewan for holding the deductible at the \$200.00 level.

Now I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that whether it be automobile insurance or whether it be any other change in our way of life in this century, that we think in terms as related to our present day living and not attempt to apply the thinking of fifty, sixty, seventy or eighty years ago, and let us be consistent in our thinking. It was rather interesting reading a brief presented by the Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Company on February 1st, 1951, and at that time Wawanesa Insurance did criticize a government plan as creating a monopoly, as being discriminatory, and then they went on to say that in particular - they did not mention all forms of monopolies but they did make specific reference to this - that particularly when the monopoly is based on compulsion and that the monopoly is imposed by the state, then the motorist is at the mercy of the state, the state tolerates no competitor, and then they go on to say in the same brief that there are some savings. Farther on, on the same page, in speaking of competition, and it's rather strange, it's rather strange because the brief sets out on the premise that competition is a healthy and desirable thing as we now have it, and then the brief continues to make this statement: that most provinces' coverage is standardized by The Insurance Act and competition as to coverage can no longer exist because of this standardization by The Insurance Act in different provinces. And then it concludes by saying that much of this type of competition was harmful to the public.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let the advocates of competition, let the advocates of the type of private enterprise we have today, let them get on one side of the fence or the other. Is it a good thing or is it a bad thing? How can it be both? And I would like to hear from someone on the other side to explain that to me.

I suggested to you a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, that we should think in terms of present day needs. Now I'll be the first to agree that co-operative insurance companies, mutual insurance companies - and there is a slight distinction between the two - that they did serve a very very useful role in our economy. It is rather interesting to look back into the history of the growth and the establishment of mutual insurance companies in Canada, or in any other part of the world for that matter because mutual insurance companies are very old institutions. I am sure that they are at least two or three hundred years of age, perhaps older, because mutual insurance companies did take root in various fraternal societies and so forth, several centuries ago, and it was rather interesting, Mr. Speaker, in reading the First Annual Report

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd)...of the Ontario Mutual Life Insurance Company - and this report is practically, it's close to a hundred years old; it's 1871. Now, I wish to say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that even though this is not an automobile insurance company, automobiles were unheard of at that time, but I simply wish to refer to this to demonstrate to this House the reasons why these insurance companies came into being, and then I intend to proceed to give the reasons why further change is necessary today.

Now, the Directors in their report to the policyholders, stated that this insurance company was founded on the belief that benefits should be extended as widely as possible and at the cheapest rates compatible with safety to the assured. Now, why was there this concern amongst those instrumental in organizing this insurance company? And the reason was this: because they found that the largest proportion of life insurance business at that time was in the hands of British or American companies, who annually drained the Province of Ontario of large sums of money and over whose business the policyholders had no control; and they went on to give an example of this - that in 1869, in referring to the Province of Ontario, the total premiums amounted to \$742 million for the year; the claims were only \$177 million, leaving a balance of about 75 percent of the premiums in the pockets of the insurance companies, and therefore this prompted them to organize a mutual insurance company to curb this type of situation.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, in the light of the thinking of the government of the day, the mutual insurance company, the co-operative insurance company, which came into being some time later, no doubt was the best answer to the problem as it then existed. However, I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the facts of the day indicate that that does not solve all the problems, that we must go another step and surely, Mr. Speaker, regardless of our party affiliation, all of us agree that there are certain services in which there is no need for competition; there are certain services which can be best offered by government. We do not think of private or free enterprise competition in the public school system. You don't find ten or fifteen schools in any town in the honourable members' ridings, one competing against the other for students and for teachers, publicizing the different curricula, course of studies that they offer, that sort of thing. We don't find free enterprise or private enterprise in the provision of health services. We don't find competition in the provision of electric services or telephone services. We've come to realize that it is unnecessary to compete in those areas, that there are certain services, certain commodities out of which the profit element should be removed and they should be offered at cost. And I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that that is exactly the case, that is exactly the situation that we find ourselves in today in dealing with automobile insurance. We can no longer afford to look at automobile insurance as something that a person may or may not provide himself with. It's important to everyone, be it the automobile driver, be it the pedestrian, that automobile drivers do be adequately covered and at a minimum of cost.

To those who say that the position taken by us in this resolution is not in keeping with the thinking of the advocates of mutual insurance companies, that we're not in line with the thinking of co-operative insurance companies, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to them that if they do a little bit of research into the philosophy of the people who have made a study of the role of co-operatives and mutual organizations in the insurance business, that they will not be able to find anyone making any statement in opposition to a government-sponsored, a government-operated plan in cases of this type. In a book written by an economist who had studied the co-operative movement in England, a man by the name of Barou, he has this to say about public insurance. He says that public insurance is prompted by desire of public authorities to protect by insurance such interests as are largely exposed to dangers which in consequence have to be safeguarded for the benefit of the community, and then he does not go on to discount that, he accepts that principle, and I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that automobile insurance falls into this very category and it should be a matter administered and offered to the people by the Government of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I take it we'll hold the next one over.

MR. PAULLEY: ...if you will, please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the Honourable the Member for Logan, and the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister in amendment thereto. The Honourable the Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs)(Cypress):

Mr. Speaker, this is 1967, Canada's Centennial year, and yet we citizens of Manitoba and Canada know that there is still much to be done before women have anything like equal rights and equal human dignity, and when I say this may I be quick to add that in so stating it, women certainly do not detract in any way from the rights of man or the dignity of man. But some of the impediments that have led to this throughout the years are legislative, and some of these are due to human prejudice which is deeply rooted in history and they are just as true today as they were 100 years ago. However, the question today becomes one of economics in this fast-changing world, and it is one which will affect the future of Manitoba's growth and of Canada's growth unless we take a good look at it.

In my opinion, over the years the problems which have contributed to the attitude towards women could be summarized under three headings: political discrimination, economic discrimination, and social attitudes. We have nowhere near the amount of women's opinions being expressed in Legislative Assemblies or in Parliaments across our country as we do have that of the men's viewpoint, and I question today whether we would still be debating, or even wondering whether we should be debating divorce laws, child marriages, and family planning, if we had had more of a woman's viewpoint in some of these things. But whether we say that part of this is the fault of women or not, I'm not going to debate that part of it. We all have our own viewpoints on this. However, I must confess that our economic and our social organizations, in my humble opinion, are geared to the convenience and the activities of men and they are not geared to the convenience and activities of women. There really has been no recognition given of the totally different pattern of a woman's life, and those women who have broken through must certainly re-orient themselves and enter a world which is simply not theirs and one which they must make the most of the, what shall I say? - the steps towards getting into rather than it being fashioned to their convenience in any way.

In looking at this, we must also think about the fact that there has been economic discrimination, because there must be equal opportunity for the training and opportunity to realize the real potential of women if we are going to contribute as we should to the world as it exists today, and without equality women cannot serve society well, and without women's participation in society and in public life, then society will be that much the poorer. So there must be access to equal employment opportunities and, in my opinion, there can be little advantage here if we have not equal opportunities in education as well. So I think that there are two main fields in which legislation is required and that is in discrimination on the basis of sex in employment and legislation providing for equal opportunities and equal rights.

When we think of the discrimination in employment on the basis of sex, I was reading in the paper the other night that in certain businesses women do not receive the same equal pay as men, and there were many reasons given why they didn't; that men were more secure in the position and if a firm intended to train them that they would have someone there who would be there for life, whereas women may marry and are more apt to leave the work that they were trained for than men are. Now this is a logical conclusion to come by but they also stated that in many cases if a firm did give equal pay, then probably women wouldn't be working because they would think about it twice and they would hire men instead of women, and so they certainly are admitting that there is not equal pay for women in the labour world.

Now I do not intend, in this brief few moments, to go over all the inequalities here but I do want to suggest some of the traits rather than this commission which we are hoping to have in Manitoba to make a presentation and work along with the Commission which the federal people have established to look into the status of women, I was hoping here rather than to discuss many different cases which I know of, but rather to give some suggestions which we could have relating -- or could consider relating to the employment of women in Manitoba, and one of the first things would be to examine the effectiveness of equal pay legislation. I spoke briefly on that for a moment just before this so I won't elaborate on it but I do think it is one that should be considered.

I would also suggest that we extend protection to women under the Fair Employment legislation, and that we should suggest to the Federal Government that they do likewise. We should take a lead in the government for hiring and giving of promotions by considering women who have equal talent, equal education, and who may be able to adapt themselves as well as men,

(MRS. FORBES cont'd) give consideration to giving them promotions and equality of treatment in government employment, and if we make a concentrated effort here at the government level to do so, that probably we would promote this so that the private sector of business might do the same.

I think, too, that we should give every consideration to the providing of day nurseries, latch-key programs and other such programs, for women who need this type of service if they are going to fulfil a public role and lead a life outside the home. Now this decision must be with the individual and I would not like to see anything which would be forced on her by society or tradition but rather that she should make her own decision on questions of this nature, depending or considering the likes or needs of her own family.

I would like also for us to consider the extending of maternity protection to employed women in Manitoba. The International Labour Organization Maternity Protection Convention of 1921, which was revised in 1952, fixes the minimum period of maternity leave for women during which they may not be fired or lose their seniority rights, and I think that we should take a good look at that in Manitoba too.

I think we should re-assess the whole role of our educational institutions and training colleges in preparing women for their right in society. Women need training at different stages in their life, different stages than men, and I think that this should be considered and training courses and education acceptable to them should be considered so that they may be served on their own terms just as these educational institutions are geared today to serve men on their own terms. I think too that when women are being educated they should be educated and counselled as they go along, with their total life work in mind rather than just probably that training period which would lead up to the period of time when they marry. But I think that this counselling service has not been given as well to women in our educational institutions as it might have been done, and I think their whole life work pattern should be kept in mind.

I do think also that we should study the position of women as they will find themselves in the world of automation, and we certainly must prepare them for this world if they are going to give their part in it or even to be able to cope with it. And another one I think we should study is the position of women in the area of insurance. A woman today, receiving equal pay for an equal job she is doing, her estate is not necessarily going to be paid the same amount as a man receiving the same amount of pay doing the same amount of work and with the same home obligations. In fact, her estate will be paid much less, and this, in my opinion, is very discriminatory.

But I think of all the discriminatory fields, that probably the income tax field is the most discriminatory of any, and here I think we should take a good look at this field because it doesn't only affect the women but it also affects the men, and I've often wondered how men have gone along this great number of years without paying any attention to it. We must remember that about 30 percent of the working force is women and about half of that percentage are married women, and married women, no matter what they work for, whatever reason it is that compels them to work, whether it's to add to the family income or to educate a child in the home or children in the home, whatever the cause may be, whatever their reason and the opportunity to work that they have they should have an independence and a dignity that goes along with this. They enjoy this independence and dignity more today than they ever have, but when it comes to the income tax field, you will find that it keeps out many married women simply because it doesn't pay them to work due to the fact that their husbands are taxed more or they themselves are taxed and classed as single. It's a fair criticism of our Act to say that in the low salary range it regards the income of a married woman as belonging to her husband, so a married woman, if she receives over \$250.00 she increases her husband's income and he becomes taxed accordingly until she reaches the amount of \$1,250.00 and then she's classed as single, and here again her husband becomes taxed as single.

Underlying this provision is the common law attitude that whatever a married woman possesses belongs to her husband, and it's rather interesting to determine whether this is not an infringement on the Provincial Married Woman's Property Act which declares that a married woman's property belongs to herself. Income she earns should really be regarded as her property unless the laws are changed to recognize the legal rights of a spouse to a significant share in the earnings of the other. The provisions of the federal Income Tax Act might be an infringement on our provincial rights. Certainly it is an infringement on the rights of women regardless of how we look at it.

(MRS. FORBES cont'd)....

The Act does not give a married woman the same benefits as it would give to a married man in the business world. For instance, if a married man has to hire someone to look after his children he may deduct this from his income tax as an expense and it's labelled for the purpose of gaining or producing his income, but if a woman has to hire someone to look after her children as alternative care in the area in which she's earning a living, then the income tax is not exempt, or she is not exempt from income tax, on this particular item of cost. Now this is grossly unfair. If a man can take it as a tax exemption from his income, why can a woman not take it as a tax exemption from her income?

Also, one other problem here is that the income tax looks at the head of a household as being that of the husband, and it deems that he has supported his wife if they live together, whether or not he really is the man who brings in the bread and butter for that family, and not too infrequently it happens that it is the woman who is the sole supporter of the family and not the father, and as a result -- this really isn't comical though when it turns out to be a case where a husband is unstable and it is the mother who is bringing in the income and she certainly must work to maintain that family; the father contributes little or nothing to the support of the family, yet the family deductions are from his income tax and not from hers, and the mother in this case desperately needs these deductions and she's not allowed to have them. I think this is grossly unfair and it is something that should be looked into.

Then there is another case where I just can't understand how men of this country have gone along with this so long either. It's a case of where a great many wives work side by side with their husbands to earn a living, such as farm wives, or in many cases doctors whose wife happened to be a nurse working alongside him and helping, or lawyers or dentists or go down the list; but if the man has his wife working for him, her income is considered as part of his so far as his tax deductible income is concerned. Now, if he had hired somebody else's wife he could deduct her salary from his income and he could get an allowance for it. I just can't see that this is fair whatsoever, that certainly if two people work together their incomes should be considered separately and you should be able -- if it's considered as one business he should be able to deduct the salary he pays his wife as a legitimate business expense, and it seems to me that this has been going on for so long and I hear so many businessmen complain about it that I wonder why men themselves have not done something about this.

Another hardship here, too, is where two people work together to build an income, to build an estate as they go along, the wife should not then be required to pay an estate tax on the property which she has actively and directly contributed to over the years; but she must do this. She simply must pay this estate tax and pay it as soon as the estate is being considered. To me, this is wrong because she has shared in it all through the years; she has worked to it; and yet no recognition of what she has done to acquire this estate is given once the husband dies.

One other inequality that I see here is that on the death of a husband, everything the couple possesses, unless the husband has made a specific record of a gift to his wife or unless it happens to be something that she has acquired through an inheritance or money earned outside her home or a registered gift, it's considered as part of her husband's estate, and to me this is also grossly unfair and it's an infringement on the rights of women.

The other portion which I think is grossly unfair is the capitalization on pensions. A man of very modest means may pass away and he has a pension coming to him. Now, when the wife receives this pension she must pay an estate tax on it. Actually what happens is that they think about the fact that if the wife lives she'll likely live and project the annuity that is coming to her up to, say, 78 years. Now she has to pay on this extended annuity which really greatly increases his estate, and she has to pay that at the time that he passes away. But should she happen to die before she's 78, then the estate she leaves doesn't get any refund out of this and she is actually paying on something that she hasn't received...the projected extension, and at the same time, if she passes away, her estate doesn't get the benefit of it. This to me is grossly unfair and infringes on the rights of women.

Now I've only outlined a few of these but I think that when we are talking about the commission which is set up that these are some of the things that we should consider, and I'm sure that the men sitting in this Assembly will give consideration to them right now, because there are many of you who would not like to see, I am sure, like to see your wives left in this position, and certainly as the law stands today she will be left in this position unless we do something to correct these inequities that exist. I don't really attach blame to anyone. It's

(MRS. FORBES cont'd) . . . something that we have gone along with for many years and it's something that we haven't just taken time to look at, and I'm sure that if we did take a good look at it that we would like to give it very close consideration and it's for that reason that I look forward to this commission from Manitoba which will assist the federal Commission, in trying to bring about some of the inequities which exist.

Now of course there are other points that I could make here, especially for those who are left alone. I think there's a resolution on the Paper by the Honourable Member for Selkirk which will deal with this and so we could speak on it probably at that time. But I'd like the members of the Assembly to think over the few points which I have made this afternoon, with the hope that you do give it serious consideration, not only for the benefit of women alone but for the actual rights which should come to people because we are citizens as women just the same as men, and I think that these inequalities are the things which we are asking to be corrected. In other areas I think that women do have and enjoy an equality today that our parents did not know about, and to me I think that it comes from within. If you want to accept some of the things that are in the light of the public, then it is from within you whether you take advantage of it and enter into that world; I do not think any amount of legislation would change that. But what I am asking for, the actual inequalities which exist in our laws today, these are the things that I would like to see our Legislative Assemblies and our governments correct.

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

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. For the benefit of the comparatively few that were not in the House, we are dealing with the resolution as proposed by the Honourable Member for Logan commencing on Page 3, ending on Page 4, and the amendment thereto. That is, we are dealing with the amendment now, of the First Minister.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bjornson, Cowan, Craik, Dawson, Desjardins, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Molgat, Patrick, Roblin, Shewman, Shoemaker, Stanes, Steen, Tanchak, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Campbell, Cherniack, Doern, Fox, Hanuschak, Kawchuk, Miller, Paulley, Petursson, Uskiw.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 37, Nays 10.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment carried. Those in favour of the main motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before we take a vote on the main motion I would like to say a word or two. Being one of the males in the House, I want to assure the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the other honourable lady member that I am not against women or motherhood, and it was not for that reason that I cast my vote a few moments ago against the amendment that was proposed by the First Minister, but rather I can see in the terms of the motion as now amended, long, undue delay in alleviating the problems that confront women today.

The original motion, proposed by my colleague from Logan, suggested to this House that action should be taken in at least one of the spheres, that help for women and their offspring has been sadly neglected by this government over the years, and typical of the government of today, that proposition was cast aside and rather than any concrete and positive action being taken in regard of one aspect of a deficiency in respect of mothers, we are now faced with the main motion as amended by the Honourable the First Minister. I questioned, first of all, whether the actual amendment may not have been considered out of order. But what are we faced with now in the main motion? And I want to say to my honourable friends, the two lady members, that I'm going to support the motion now that it becomes the main motion, because I was always of the opinion that it should have been a separate resolution, and now it is in effect a separate resolution from that that was originally introduced by the Honourable Member from Logan. So now we are going to deal with a resolution to procrastinate and delay action.

At the present time, we have at the federal level a commission which has been set up to do the very same job as this government, through its First Minister and this resolution, proposes for Manitoba. You know, it seems rather strange to me, the inconsistency of this government, that on matters that are of vital concern to Manitoba where there is an opportunity of working jointly with other provinces and the Dominion of Canada, that this government refuses to accept the proposition. I'm referring, of course, to the joint study on water resources in the

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) prairie provinces; because of cost, this government over there saying that we should not proceed with an investigation jointly with other jurisdictions, and then with the shoe on the other foot, turn around and say, "Well, irrespective of whether there's an investigation going on at the federal level into the status of women, we'll set up another commission here in Manitoba." How inconsistently inconsistent can that government be? And certainly that's the way they are in matters of this nature. They give lip service to costs in some areas, and where a job can be done for them at no direct cost they say, "Well we're going to substitute anyway."

I want to say to the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I listened with a considerable degree of interest to her remarks this afternoon. I must apologize because of the fact that I had to leave for a moment or two, but I heard her main discourse and I think it was a pretty good one. I question whether or not she really had to come to the defence of women to the same degree because there are some who figure that women are pretty fairly well treated. In any case, I think we are proud here in Canada of course that, if memory serves me correctly, it was this province under T. C. Norris that was one of the pioneers in giving the franchise to women in Canada. We've not been too far behind in many other areas as well. But here she is today, supporting a measure which in my opinion will be tantamount to sloughing off a real consideration of the problem of the status of women in Manitoba. Because really, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the First Minister in his resolution doesn't really know what he's going to do. He's not even consistent in his resolution because what does the "resolved" portion of the resolution say? "Now therefore be it resolved that consideration be given to the advisability of an investigation into the status of women in the Province of Manitoba by a Commission of Inquiry or other appropriate means."

Already in this "resolved" portion of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, the front man on the Treasury Board doesn't come forward and say to us in this House that a commission is going to be set up. The resolution is phrased in the abstract to start with, which to me is rather peculiar and unusual coming from the First Minister of the province. If my honourable friend and if the government - and they voted unitedly for the amendment - were convinced, were determined to have an investigation by a Commission of Inquiry into the status of women, why the delay? I ask my honourable friend, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, why is the resolution proposed by the government in the abstract? This means at least, Mr. Speaker, a year delay, because if I am correct the establishment of a Commission of Inquiry which might call for an expenditure of money from the public treasury cannot now be proceeded with at least until another Session of this House which can give authority to the setting up of such a commission. So here we are and I think I am correct -- my honourable friend says we're absolutely wrong. --(Interjection)-- No. And my honourable friend, the heir apparent, will find out in due course that I'm not so wrong as often as he thinks I may be wrong. I say, Mr. Speaker, and it's proof positive in the wording of the "resolved" part of this resolution, that neither the heir apparent or the apparent himself can justify being in the temporary responsible positions that they are, bringing in an abstract resolution of this nature. Unless there could be an out for my honourable friend. It may be this is where he's suggesting I'm wrong, Mr. Speaker, this "other appropriate means", which may not call for any expenditure. It may be the other appropriate means might be an investigation conducted by the honourable the heir apparent, the Attorney-General, which might not require authority from the Legislative body. So I say, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and I say to this House that if this government really meant what they said, this commission should be established now, that provision should have been made for the establishment of the commission if indeed it is required, and on a matter of principle, as I suggested, Mr. Speaker, we are going to support this now it is a different resolution because of the fact that it now becomes a main motion. But I say to the Honourable Minister, as I read the resolution now, to use the words I believe that you used almost at the start of your discourse this afternoon, women have been waiting a considerable period of time to be given due consideration. And I think, my friend, that that is what is intended by this resolution, that you're still going to have to wait a period of time, and instead of first of all dealing with the proposition as introduced by my colleague from Logan which called for at least one section, a segment of the problem confronting Winnipeg and women, namely aid to setting up day nurseries, you're going to have to wait a lot longer for that, you're going to have duplication between the federal investigation if, in effect, Mr. Speaker, that that government comes out of the abstract and into the positive.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid that on the next vote that we have on this resolution, as amended, that the recent coalition will be broken, because I find it completely unfathomable to see the force of the argument of my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party because here, if my reading of the resolution is correct, then the whole of his party's amendment has been stricken out - the whole of it - and something that he recognizes, as I do, that simply a diversionary tactic has been put in its place. Why, under those circumstances, would he support it, Mr. Speaker? I suppose he can say that the matter of position of the services for others who need day nurseries is one of the things that could be included in this study, but it's so buried among so many other things that I think it's almost indiscernible in the group. However, it is not new of course in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, for the government to adopt the method of avoiding a vote on a subject that they don't want to make a decision on by bringing in a side-stepping resolution. This has been done, I suppose, from time immemorial.

One of the things that I couldn't help but comment on is the fact that the resolution itself isn't even properly worded, the amendment that my honourable friend the First Minister would associate his name with such a poorly drawn amendment is really, I think, something of discredit to his reputation as a parliamentarian because the amendment was couched in these terms: "The proposed motion of Honourable Mr. Roblin in amendment thereto as follows: Delete all the words after the first 'whereas' and substitute the following." This is not the method by which we propose amendments, Mr. Speaker, but it's before the House and that part of it doesn't matter particularly.

But the valid argument remains, as I see it, and that is that it's really on a completely different subject to the original resolution, and if the government had really been intent to make a study of this sort of thing, then of course what they should have done is introduce a resolution of their own, and, Mr. Speaker, they do not need the words "that consideration be given to the advisability." This is the government that is proposing this motion. My honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party is perfectly right when he says that this is only a pious expression of intangible opinion or plan. It's not an undertaking by the government because they don't need the term, as one of us on this side does need the term, "consideration be given to the advisability."

So that I'm at a loss, Mr. Speaker, to see why my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party would accept this resolution as amended. As far as I'm concerned, I think it would be maybe more consistent for me to accept it than him because I have made it quite definite here that I did not support the original resolution, and not supporting the original resolution, I shouldn't worry so much about this one being so sweeping that it takes away completely, or practically completely, the effect of the first one. However, that's for my honourable friends to decide, not for me, but as far as I am concerned, I simply cannot support the resolution because I believe that it is a tactic, a device only, and that it is couched in such general terms, those terms being unnecessary for the government side of the House, that it really means little or nothing, and that's exactly what I expect it will result in.

MR. LYON: I don't want anyone to say as I rise to my feet that I was brought to my feet by indignation or by the strength of the arguments on the other side, because I hasten to assure the House that that is not the case. But there were, however, so many misstatements made in the last two speeches, I thought perhaps just for the sake of the record and nothing else, that if some women were looking back some 25 years from now I wouldn't want them to read the speech of my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party and that of my distinguished friend the Member from Lakeside and judge that too many of us sat mute and listened to this kind of thing without making some friendly response to indicate the track that perhaps the government thinking is following.

I must comment first of all that I find it difficult, as did the Member for Lakeside, to follow my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party in his rather convoluted reasoning, because he says first of all that he won't vote for the amendment and he didn't and then he turns around and says now that the amendment is the main motion, I'm going to vote for the main motion because it's a separate proposition. But it's a separate proposition which he then proceeds to call a tactic for procrastination and delay, which he thinks is terrible, which he thinks is injuring the original motion that was brought in, which is not helpful to the status of women in Manitoba, and any number of things. He proceeds to denounce us in every epithet that he can call to his tongue, then he turns around and says "I'm going to vote for it." Well, that's very interesting and we appreciate his support, but I suggest that perhaps he might

(MR. LYON cont'd.) be able to trot forward some better reasons for supporting it than those that he mentioned.

He talks about such terribly unimportant things as this being couched in the abstract rather than in the more affirmative way of saying that the government do this or that, and there's a very simple reason for that. If the amendment had been brought in other terms it would have had to be preceded by a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, and for the purpose of a resolution of the House to discuss the principle of the matter, it was thought suitable to do it this way. I don't think the subject deserves any more comment. It should be obvious to a kindergarten student that that was the case.

And then insofar as his comment about the government not having funds to do this, the government has funds; the government has Acts under which we can set up inquiries to look into matters of this sort. Here was an opportunity to debate the spirit, the principle of this matter, to see whether the House felt that this was a subject that should be looked into today, and to gain the opinion of the House upon the matter in an abstract sense, and this has been done. And now my honourable friend says: Ah, but this shouldn't be done; this is a terrible thing.

On the one hand, we're always accused by my honourable friends opposite of not consulting the House on matters, then when we do choose to consult them upon something, namely, whether or not there should be some form of inquiry into the status of women in Manitoba, they say: Ah, you shouldn't do that - you shouldn't do that. It's terrible that you should come here and consult us about this. Why don't you just go ahead and do it? Well now, you can't have it both ways. Either you want to be consulted or you don't want to be consulted. For my part, I appreciate some of the comments that we've heard and I'm sure that the women of Manitoba appreciate some of the comments that we've heard across the way too. It's very very interesting to see what my honourable friends have said about the status of women in Manitoba.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, you can do better than that.

MR. LYON: My honourable friend says I can do better than that. I hasten to assure him that I can do better than him any time.

MR. PAULLEY: I know that, but you can do even better than you're doing, not better than I'm doing. I expect you to do better than I can.

MR. LYON: But really, when he doesn't put up much of a fight, what does he expect in return? So I say to him that this is a very worthwhile - and I agree with the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Urban Development - a very worthwhile and a very meaningful resolution upon which the House should be consulted and have the views of all of the members before a commission of enquiry or some other appropriate study is undertaken into this subject.

And he says, but you're overlooking this vastly important matter upon which the first resolution was founded, namely, the question of day nurseries. No one is trying to undermine or to try to suggest that day nurseries are not important, but I suggest that day nurseries is only one scintilla of the problem that affects the status of women in Manitoba today, and indeed if one looks over the various points set forth in the resolution, (1) to (8), then (9) - all inclusive, all other matters - you see that special services in No. 4 -- special services needed to enable women to play an appropriate role in Manitoba's economy such as day nurseries, emergency mother's help, latch-key programs, training programs, and so on.

Even my honourable friend, I suggest, can see that this is going to much broader than what was introduced by the members of his party and I think it should be. Instead of gnawing away at the periphery of something and doing nothing about it, we're suggesting here that there should be a thorough-going review -- (Interjection) -- I'm sure my honourable friend doesn't understand me and that's why he keeps on interrupting, because I know it's very difficult to make him comprehend even these simple matters, but it should be comprehensible even for him to realize that his resolution dealt only with a peripheral matter, an important matter, but it's only on the periphery of this whole problem of the status of women in Manitoba, and we're delighted to have his support for it. Now I say to him as well . . .

MR. PAULLEY: If I could only get yours as much as you have mine on this side, I'd be happy and so would the day nursery people.

MR. LYON: He says that the matter that really concerns him is - what was it again about the . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I don't trust the government in doing anything.

MR. LYON: He doesn't trust the government in doing anything.

MR. PAULLEY: On this.

MR. LYON: What was the other point he raised? Oh yes, on the water, the water matter. He said that the government didn't see fit to join in a particular study with respect to the Nelson River basin in Manitoba - which by the way was going to cost Manitoba initially \$800,000 and which by the way we are still having negotiations on with the Federal Government, although I don't expect him to be aware of that even though I gave him that information in the House several weeks ago - but in any case he tries to equate that with a commission of enquiry into the status of women in Manitoba that won't cost - I use the word again for him - a scintilla of that. He says if you haven't got money for the Nelson River then you haven't got money for the status of women. Well, what sort of errant nonsense is this? Of course we have. Of course the government can find it and of course the government will, and the government, if this resolution passes the House as I expect it will, the government will undertake to carry out the will of the House which is to ensure that this kind of a study be made into the status of women in Manitoba today.

So I really can't see what my honourable friend objects to.

MR. PAULLEY: There's none so blind as those who can't see.

MR. LYON: Or do I perceive it? Do I perceive it? Do I perceive the object of his objection when I realize that perhaps he doesn't want to vote for something that he wishes he had thought of first. Is that really what bothers my honourable friend? I wonder if that's perhaps what bothers my honourable friend more than anything else, that he didn't think that this resolution should be recast in this way.

Well, he goes on into such talk about -- he says that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the Honourable Minister is not provoking some of these interruptions that are . . .

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): He didn't even fool the Speaker this time.

MR. PAULLEY: We'll forgive him, Mr. Speaker, he knows not what he does.

MR. DESJARDINS: That red herring is getting pretty old, dragging it up and down.

MR. LYON: Persons who read this transcript of debate in years to come may well consider that the understatement, Mr. Speaker, of this whole debate. But in any case he talks about duplication because the Federal Government has a concurrent commission studying into the status of women in Canada. Did he not hear what the First Minister said when he moved the amendment, namely, that one of the main purposes of an inquiry in Manitoba or some study of the status of women in Manitoba would be for what purpose? To gather together sufficient information to give to the Royal Commission which was studying the status of women for all of Canada with respect to the situation in Manitoba.

Now does he find any harm in that? Is there anything objectionable to that at all? Of course not, and yet my honourable friend is searching for some elusive needle in some political haystack that he just can't find in order to -- he wants to be on the side of goodness and yet he says, I don't want to be on that side because I didn't think of it first and anyways the Tories are introducing it. So I really can't help my honourable friend in this political balancing act that he's trying to undertake this afternoon. I can only say that we're going to . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I hope the results are better than the enquiry into the Vegetable Marketing Board.

MR. LYON: I'm only going to say that we're going to do what we think is right in this matter and we're going to vote for this review.

MR. DESJARDINS: When are you going to start?

MR. LYON: My honourable friend from St. Boniface, there's another one who didn't think of it and who wished he had.

MR. DESJARDINS: Wished I had?

MR. LYON: Really you know, I think that's it, I think that's the touchstone of this minor little bit of braying and barking that we're hearing from across the way. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I'm happy that I have, because as I said at the outset I really didn't want these two speeches to pass, particularly the one from the Leader of the New Democratic Party, without making these brief, these few brief and I hope enlightening and awakening comments for my honourable friends, and to assure them that if this resolution is passed it will be carried forward as we have said.

I urge upon all honourable members to re-read what the First Minister said when he introduced this amendment, and I am sure that when they re-read that they will see that this is for the good of the people of Manitoba, particularly for the women of Manitoba, and that this is something that deserves the support of all sides of the House and I am sure, when the vote comes,

(MR. LYON cont'd.) will get the support of practically everybody in this House - of practically everybody in this House. So I thank my honourable friends for seeing the light eventually and trying to weasel their way back on to the path of righteousness through voting the right way.

MR. PAULLEY: What was that word?

MR. LYON: We welcome their support, begrudgingly as it may be given, we welcome it nonetheless and I hope that this political balancing act that they've been trying to carry out sees them righted before too long.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Would the Honourable Minister permit a question? -- (Interjection) -- I wonder, yes.

Would the Honourable Minister be prepared to tell the House, if we pass this resolution, will the government introduce a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor to provide the necessary funds to set up the commission, or whatever you're going to do, to study into these matters.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I've already mentioned that isn't necessary. It is not at all necessary until we determine the form of the inquiry, the form that the inquiry is going to take, and having determined that there is already statutory authority for it.

MR. HILLHOUSE: But you have already told the House that the reason why this resolution was brought in in the abstract form was because you didn't want to introduce it with a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor. Now my question is this, if this resolution is passed in its abstract form, is it the intention of the government to follow up with a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. LYON: But it isn't necessary.

MR. HILLHOUSE: It will be.

MR. LYON: No, it won't be.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if I might ask my honourable friend then why was it in the abstract?

MR. LYON: I think I've mentioned already we're discussing the principle of the matter. It's a tiny procedural matter. We're discussing the principle as to whether or not there should be. We've consulted the House, the Premier did, as to whether or not the House in principle thought that this would be a good matter, and I hope very shortly we'll have an indication as to whether the House thinks this is a good thing to do.

MR. HILLHOUSE: . . . the First Minister to act on the recommendation of the House?

MR. LYON: To which?

MR. DESJARDINS: I'd like to ask a question of my honourable friend. If he's so interested in this motion, can you tell us why you didn't leave the NDP motion alone and bring your own? Then you could have both received credit and I would have been perfectly satisfied, I could have voted on both.

MR. LYON: If my honourable friend doesn't understand that he doesn't understand anything, because if he will read the resolution that is before him he will find that he is voting - and I'm sure he will - he will vote for a thorough-going study into the status of women, including the question of day nurseries which is only one part of the status of women. -- (Interjection) -- Well, that's your opinion and I don't value your opinion too highly.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'd like to speak, Mr. Speaker. -- (Interjection) -- You mean you don't approve?

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I was listening with great attention to the speech of my honourable friend but I was hurt by the last remark when he told me I didn't understand, because I understand very fully why they made this amendment. Now he tells me that we'll have a chance to vote for everything together. This is what this government has been doing for years and always the hatchet man or the red herring boy is always my honourable friend.

Now I've got last year's Journal here and the members of the New Democratic Party had moved the same motion. What was the reason last year? This was the amendment brought in by the Minister of Welfare who is not in the House this afternoon, and the amendment was on Page 193: "The resolution be amended by striking out the word 'therefore' in the 12th line thereof and all the words thereafter and substituting the following: Whereas the Manitoba Government is already providing financial support on the basis of need to mothers who find it necessary to place their children in day nurseries; and Whereas a community survey of social welfare, health and recreational needs and resources recently established as the social service

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) audit will, among other studies, consider the need for the role of, and the responsibility for financing day nurseries and will be reporting on these and other matters; Therefore be it resolved that the government at this time continue its present form of support for children in day nurseries." This was last year on the same motion, and now the government can not face this resolution. It can't even -- at least this was some kind of an amendment, that was the usual one of patting themselves on the back and evading to vote on this, but this time it's a long kick in the pants and we're going to wait a long time.

Now the Attorney-General can play games with this as much as he wants. He can tell us that we're too stupid to understand here, that all the brains are in that head of his out there, but I think it would be . . .

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I didn't make that remark. My remark was confined entirely to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, that's fine, that's fine, because I remember he made this remark before. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface didn't know when he was speaking -- when he fought the pension, and all of a sudden we don't hear about this at all from my honourable friend. He's not so brave about this now.

But as I say, I understand that I'm not in the same level as he is when we're talking about intelligence, but after seven or eight years I'm starting to catch on. I realize it's always the same member that's always swinging this little hatchet and it's always my honourable friend. I would say that if he wants to make a survey, this has nothing to do or very little to do with the original resolution. It is a difficult one to vote against and I would be against the resolution. If I had a chance to vote on it, I would vote against the resolution of the New Democratic Party, but I think that they have the right to introduce it and I think that we should have a chance to vote on this, and if the government wants to set up a committee they can go ahead now.

They repeat this year after year, resolution after resolution. They did this on one of my resolutions on voting at 18. I suppose the honourable member will tell me that -- no, he'll tell me that I didn't think of that first or something. There's another study -- this government has done so much studying that I think it's time that it does a little bit of action. It seems that when it should study it doesn't study, and I think we have the Marketing Board to substantiate this.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the government is asking us to vote on this survey. You can't go against this, this is like voting against motherhood, especially with these people who are bringing this in across the country. They'll tell you that you're against this and you're against that, but I think that they should have enough gumption to let the other members on this side of the House bring in resolutions, and if you're against it, if you want to oppose it, vote against it; it's just as simple as that. You have enough ways now to curtail or to try to curtail debates on certain things. You have the Throne Speech, you're using that now to the -- well, it's getting to be ridiculous when you're talking about anticipating -- you put in a word here and there and we can't cover anything at all. In a resolution like this, you can't face it and you've got to bring in an amendment that doesn't mean a thing.

Mr. Speaker, I for one would like to say that I would have liked to have seen a resolution brought separately; the amendment brought separately. I would have opposed the first resolution but I would have liked to have had a chance to vote on it. I would have voted in favour of the government's resolution, but it doesn't make it right for them to try to hide behind this amendment not to face the responsibility of voting for or against the resolution of the New Democratic Party.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bjornson, Cherniack, Cowan, Craik, Dawson, Desjardins, Doern, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Fox, Froese, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hanuschak, Hillhouse, Johnson, Johnston, Kawchuk, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Roblin, Shewman, Shoemaker, Stanes, Steen, Tanchak, Uskiw, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

NAYS: Mr. Campbell.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 47; Nays, 1.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution carried.

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.)

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Elmwood and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Emerson in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, on the outset I want to make it quite clear to the Minister of Education and to the Honourable Member from Elmwood that we on this side of the House certainly are in full agreement with the resolution in principle, and as I go along I hope that I can explain why it was necessary, or we thought it was necessary for one of our members, the Honourable Member from Emerson, to make the amendment.

It was discussed in our group as long as five years ago that the type of community colleges proposed in this resolution were an excellent thing for the people of Manitoba. This was even brought in at our last Liberal Convention which was held here last November. It was discussed fully and approved at that particular convention, but since that time we have had some second thoughts about whether we are ready for this type of community colleges throughout the Province of Manitoba without more investigation. It is our belief that this type of community college does exist to some point in the City of Winnipeg and probably in the City of Brandon and Flin Flon. It is also my opinion that this is probably the only three places in Manitoba that are able to support this type of a college.

We believe that we should go very slowly in this particular approach. If we recall, in 1960 we had a crash program which was very successful in many areas but we did make a number of mistakes. Some of these mistakes are beginning to show up in my own constituency. Just the other day I was advised that a high school that was built in the year 1960 at the cost of \$150,000 will be closed up this fall. This school has four classrooms, a lab and a gym. They find that they no longer have enough students to necessitate the cost of the four teachers that have been employed in there over the last six or seven years.

There is another school not too far from me that faces the same problem and one a distance of about twenty miles in the other way that faces the same thing. It is another four room high school. Now this is a total of about \$400,000, and unless we find a use for these particular buildings that we have, well to be plain, that we have wasted. As everyone knows, we're facing a real problem in the rural areas with the dwindling of our population. Unless we can bring some industry into our rural areas it will not even be necessary to have the schools that we have right now, leave alone to institute community colleges throughout the rural areas. We have tried to come up with many ways to increase the population, but I think everyone knows that we are facing a brain drain in the Province of Manitoba.

It is well to say that the area around Brandon could probably support a community college, but what will happen in two or three years? Will we be able to afford this particular type of community college then or will the same thing happen as what has happened at the school at Oak River. The need was there six years ago; it is no longer there now.

It is our belief that the type of amendment that was offered by the Honourable Member from Emerson is the type of amendment that will give us a chance to study the situation and not make some of the mistakes that we have made in the past. It is also our belief that we have to stop building the costly type of building we are erecting these days and start to use the same buildings for more than one thing. There is no reason why we can't do like they are doing in England. They use the school in the daytime as a public school and in the evenings it becomes a community college. The same building is being used not five days a week but seven days a week at about 16 to 20 hours per day.

The type of resolution that the Member from Emerson proposed is the type of resolution that would be very popular with the citizens of Manitoba I am sure. I believe that in the Department of Education the citizens of Manitoba would like to see the type of committee that he has proposed in No. 4 of his resolution where it reads, "that the Council avail itself for presentations from interested members of the public on matters within its terms of reference." This would simply mean that the public, mothers and fathers, teachers, would all have the opportunity to make representations through the type of council that he proposes. This would be, in my opinion, an excellent idea because the people of Manitoba want some say in the terms of education more than what they have had in the past, and I'm sure that if we would adopt something like this we would not have the type of thing happening that has occurred with some of our schools where, as I mentioned a little earlier, they will no longer be used because of the lack of young people to fill the classrooms and the lack of teachers to handle the pupils that are in these particular classrooms.

(MR. DAWSON cont'd.) .

I would strongly urge that everyone support the amendment as presented by the Honourable Member from Emerson.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate for the Leader of our Party.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague the Member for St. George. I was unfortunately out of the House when this came last and I wanted to speak briefly on this motion. As I spoke on the opening day of the Session this year at the time that you were selected Speaker on this subject, I did not want the resolution to go by without speaking briefly.

As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, when I opposed your choice on the opening day of the Session, it was not a matter of personal opposition but one of the method by which we are proceeding with the appointment, and I indicated then that we would be introducing a resolution during the course of the Session proceeding towards the appointment of a permanent Speaker for our House.

My colleague and the previous Premier of the Province, the Member for Lakeside, had done some work on this some years ago when he was the Premier of the Province and had consulted at that time with the present Premier and the then Leader of the CCF Party. A number of studies were undertaken actually by people outside of this House, some university professors and others, to see what method could be adapted to our system here of arriving at, if not a fully permanent Speaker, because I recognize that the House must still remain master of its own rules and of its own structures, but at least to move towards more permanency for the Speaker and to remove the Speaker from the straight political and partisan position in which he naturally finds himself at election time.

It is for this reason that I wished to see this resolution brought forward at this Session, and that instead of proposing a final decision here in the House which may be a little difficult to get, that we recommend that it be sent to this Committee, a Committee of the House, where we can have very useful discussion I believe, hear other presentations by people outside of the House, and hopefully come back with a recommendation which could be put to effect before the next election comes along.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is important insofar as the people in the Speaker's constituency as well, because I would visualize that it would be difficult at times for the people in your constituency, for example, to feel that they have someone speaking for them here in this House. The very position in which you find yourself precludes you from participating in discussions, much as you might want to, but you can't do so and you cannot stand here in this House and speak for the people of the Swan River valley as I know you would want to do on many occasions. So to that extent, while they are no doubt honoured by the position that you hold, I think that there are times when they may feel that they do not have the voice in the deliberations here that they are entitled to.

It seems to me then that we might be able to arrive at a solution which would fit in with the British parliamentary structure which would still mean that the House would have to choose the Speaker - quite obviously it cannot be someone who is in my opinion completely outside of the House - but which would provide some permanency. While I don't necessarily hold fast to the proposals that we have made in the past, I'm prepared to look at other potential solutions.

One of those that we had put forward was the possibility that the grounds of the buildings here become a constituency, that the members of this House would be the electors of that constituency, that they would choose from amongst their own a Speaker who would then become the representative for this particular constituency and not represent, as in your own case, the electoral division of Swan River. If this had been followed, then naturally there would have to be a by-election in Swan River, and provided that the Speaker did a good job, I would think that on that sort of a basis when the next election came along there would be every likelihood that the House would choose again the individual who had been chosen the Speaker the first time. No guarantee, of course, as there isn't in human matters, but every likelihood that this would be so depending on the qualities of the individual quite obviously.

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.)

Well this is, I say, only one of the possible solutions and I'm not saying that it's the only one. But it seems to me that there is merit in looking at this structure and adapting to our practices here the means of giving the Speaker full independence and at the same time ensuring that his constituents are not deprived of representation in the House itself.

And so it is in that spirit, Mr. Speaker, that I support the resolution proposed by my colleague the Member for Lakeside. I think we should approach it with an open mind; that we should seek advice from every possible source that we can; that we should ask those people, at universities in particular, who have dealt with constitutional matters and with the historical structures of our nation, to present us with their views and that hopefully we can arrive at what I'm sure all the members would like to see, and that is permanency in the office of Speaker, a non-partisan position, and proper representation for every constituency in the province.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, my contribution to this debate will be rather short and sweet since the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition has seen fit to steal all my thunder and quote my prepared speech pretty well thought by thought if not word for word, because I agree with him that the resolution proposed by the Honourable Member from Lakeside should be referred to the Rules Committee because I believe that this is the Committee that might be able to find a solution to the various problems adherent to this principle of the permanent Speaker.

The Leader of the Opposition has highlighted the two most important ones, the fact that we in the Legislative Assembly must or should elect from our own the person who will occupy the Chair that you occupy with such distinction; and yet we must not overlook the responsibilities that a member of this House has to his own constituency such as you yourself have to the good people of Swan River valley, and anybody who is honoured by the elevation to the office of Speaker of this Chamber is naturally divorced somewhat from the ability to deal with many of the problems of his constituents and especially of speaking on their behalf, not only on their particular problems as they come up before the Chamber but in expressing their views on other matters that come before the Chamber.

I agree very much with the Leader of the Opposition in the principle behind a permanent Speaker. It has worked to considerable satisfaction in the Mother of Parliaments at Westminster; it has been talked about for many years in the House of Commons at Ottawa but they have the alternating principle of a French-speaking Speaker and an English-speaking Speaker in various parliaments and they follow the same rule in the Senate, but we do not have this particular problem in the Manitoba Legislature. But we do have to come to grips with the particular problem that I did mention and the Leader of the Opposition mentioned, and I think that this Rules Committee, consisting as it does of some of the senior members of this House with a great deal of accumulated experience over the years, might be able to sit down and find a solution to this problem in view of the good nature that has been expressed in the last 10 years by members of this Chamber on both sides in supporting the principle of trying to add some permanency to the office of Speaker.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, that the resolution of the Honourable Member for Lakeside be amended by striking out all the words following the word "that" in the first line of the second paragraph of the operative part of the proposed resolution and substituting therefor the following words: "This resolution be referred to the Special Committee of the House considering the rules, orders and forms of proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba for consideration and report."

MR. SPEAKER: There's a similarity here. As a consequence, I'll take the matter under advisement.

We'll go on with the next item. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Wellington. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I rise to close the debate on this particular resolution which has been mainly conspicuous by its presence on the Order Paper and lack of debate for these many weeks, and while I have what I feel is a sincere concern in connection with the use and abuse of tobacco and the advertising of it, I can't but feel that pretty largely it's an exercise in futility. But in any event, I do have a few things that I would wish to say.

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.)

In spite of what the Honourable Member for Brandon said in his contribution to the debate the other day, falling back mainly on the article that appeared in MacLean's Magazine, I still feel that I would rather place my dependence upon the reports of medical men and medical commissions that have been studying the problems involved in smoking and so on and the results of the use of mainly the cigarette, than to place my dependence on statisticians who are good as statisticians but to whom I would not turn if I wished to receive medical advice.

The article in MacLean's, for instance, leaned very heavily on a book entitled "You May Smoke" by C. Harcourt Kitchen, and while I read the article that appeared in MacLean's Magazine I don't recall the name of the man who wrote it, but the reference is given in Hansard on the Honourable Member from Brandon's address - reference is given to the writer of the book rather than to the writer of the article. He says that he has read the book as well as the article and he places a considerable dependence upon the information that he finds there.

Now I have, as opposed to that one article, I have booklets, condensed reports from various authorities, clippings and so on from medical sources, all of which indicate that smoking and cigarettes are a source of such things as lung cancer, arterial disease and other diseases, heart difficulties as well as others, and the charges that the statistician - the man who wrote the article in MacLean's - the charges that he makes about the medical men as making generalizations and not pinning themselves down to facts very much applied to the same article because he makes references without any substantiating proof and acts more like what he describes the doctors to be than what he proposes to be himself, or represents himself as being, a statistician. As I say, I would rather place my dependence upon the medical men than upon the information that he provides.

Another thing is that while there have been literally hundreds of articles written on the subject of the relationship of cigarettes and cancer, there have by comparison been only a very few, so that you could count them almost on the fingers of one, maybe two hands, that have endeavoured to refute the evidence that the doctors have found of the relationship between this use of cigarettes and these diseases that they delineate.

Not only that, these are not individual medical men who are giving these reports, they are giving them as members of competent and capable study commissions that have been set up in different ways and at different times by various authorities such as the American Government, the Royal College of Physicians in England, and there is another one that I have here - it doesn't matter, it's of equal stature - and they all come to the same conclusion.

The teachers in Manitoba recently in convention passed a resolution in which they deplored the advertising of tobacco and urged restrictions on tobacco advertising. They were going to do the same with alcohol but a couple of very - well, I say young - at least aggressive teachers entered into the debates on these questions urging the teachers that concern with tobacco use, the advertising of tobacco, as outside their particular interest as teachers, that they should confine themselves strictly to teaching and to teaching methods, and were successful in persuading the teachers to lay the advertising motion that they were preparing to pass on the table, thus killing it as far as any effectiveness was concerned. They revived the ban on the smoking advertising that the teachers had raised in their convention, and although it had already been passed, in some way they were able to exert such influence on the teachers that the teachers decided also that this too was outside of their concern, and that resolution was laid on the table as not of a concern to teachers who are professionals in their particular field and who are therefore to live in an ivory tower with no relationship or recognition of things that go on outside of the teaching field in which they are involved.

Now advertising is a rich source for many agencies which specialize in this particular field and they are interested in increasing advertising in magazines, in periodicals, newspapers and other media, and to such a degree have the advertising agencies become interested that they see little more apparently than the profits to be derived from it and sometimes appear to take on an attitude of not being too scrupulous in the methods which they use.

I was interested in reading an article from the Winnipeg Tribune of the 20th of April this year, an article written by Stanley Frank, a veteran sports writer, and he speaks in this article of the "fast buck" gang and the "TV sellout". He says that they are, in effect, prostituting sports to their particular wishes or needs as advertising concerns, and the writer of this article says in one place, "With the sole exception of the Olympic Games conducted by an international organization beyond its control, television has corrupted every sport that it has touched," a statement I think that many of us in one way or another can recognize.

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.)

He goes on in his article to show how he feels that sports have been corrupted to the need and to the wishes of advertising, and this applies probably more strongly to such things as cigarettes than to many other products, perhaps to some of these products also but very definitely as far as tobacco and the use of tobacco is concerned because the use of tobacco is represented as being a manly thing to use and that it gives the kind of image that individuals wish to have.

The writer of the article, Stanley Frank, quotes Carl Lindeman, Vice-President of the NBC Sports, as saying, "Maybe I'm a sucker to give you fuel for your argument but it's a cinch TV will be stepping up its demands." And he says, "Why try to kid anyone? A vicious circle is in operation. The more promoters ask for their attractions, the more commercials we'll need to get off the hook." And CBC already is charging the National Football League sponsors - national, is that it? - NFL sponsors, \$70,000 a minute, and how much higher can the price go? The only answer is, "more commercials," and therefore, I would imagine, more corruption of the media which are being used for the purposes of the advertising agencies.

Now, I'm not specifically speaking against these agencies as such but I'm speaking against the uses and the abuses of advertising to persuade people, and mostly young people, to take up the practice of smoking and particularly the smoking of cigarettes. I don't think that I need go over the statistics that I quoted earlier on when I introduced this resolution, showing the incidence of deaths from smoking as compared to the incidence of death among those who do not smoke. I have this book here which is published by the Department of National Health and Welfare for Canada, the Information Services by the authority of the Minister the Honourable Judy LaMarch, and in here we have quoted the references to the findings of the studies made by the Surgeon-General's Department in the United States, a study made in England and studies made in other parts of the world, all of which point to the same thing.

I can quote another article that appeared in the Free Press on the 19th of April describing a survey which finds that smokers are dying earlier, and it says in part: "Cigarette smokers among Canada's ex-servicemen are dying at a rate 54 percent higher than normally expected for non-smokers, the Federal Department of Health and Welfare study reveals." It goes on to show that in a six-year study of 92,000 veteran pension recipients it was found that the death rate for heart and circulatory diseases was the biggest among veterans who smoked. It was 68 percent higher for cigarette smokers than for non-smokers, and at the same time the study found that the death rate for pipe and cigar smokers was not appreciably different from that of non-smokers. The article concludes with the statement that the most striking statistical finding was the figure of 853 deaths among the 7,014 non-smoking veterans, exactly the figure that was expected in that kind of a group, but the 4,153 deaths among the 35,199 cigarette smokers was 1,452 times higher than the ordinary death expectancy in that particular group; that is, if the death rate had been a normal death rate as among the non-smokers.

The study found death rates among cigarette smoking men increased with the quantities of cigarettes smoked. Mortality rates dipped when cigarette smokers stopped smoking but still remained 36 percent above the rate for non-smokers, and so on. So it goes, on and on, and while I'm not trying to persuade anybody to stop smoking, as I said on the earlier occasion and I quoted I think it was Abraham Lincoln: "Any man has a right to go to hell in his own way if he wishes," but no man has a right to persuade other people to adopt an activity which will be in the long run detrimental to his health and his well-being.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if I might take the opportunity and remind the honourable member that it's five minutes to the half hour.

MR. PETURSSON: I was just thinking, Mr. Speaker, of bringing my remarks to a close. I have several things that I have here that I could quote to substantiate the figures that I have already quoted, but as I said in my opening remarks, I think that largely it would be an exercise in futility and therefore refrain from burdening the House with any more statistics.

The Honourable Member from Brandon told a little story about a woman who became so depressed by reading articles about the sad effects of smoking that she decided that she would stop reading. It reminded me somewhat of a man who decided to carry on a little experiment - this enters another field, but very briefly - an experiment of finding out the effects on himself of the consumption of alcohol. This probably comes into the Alcohol Bill which already is out of the way. So one day he drank Scotch and mixed water with it, a considerable amount, and woke up the following day with a heavy hangover. He tried the same thing with Rye and water, the same thing with Vodka and water. Each time he found the following day he was tremendously

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.) ill. He came to the conclusion that water, being the common element in each instance, that he should drink his liquor without water.

Now I don't know what the common element is in tobacco that causes the great increase in the incidence of cancer in those who use cigarettes, but people would be wise to leave cigarettes alone and they would be still wiser if they were to clamp down on the advertising outlets which persuade young people who do not smoke, to begin to take up smoking, and I say young people advisedly because it's they mainly who are pictured in the often most attractive ads.

I have no high expectations about any kind of an overwhelming majority or a unanimous vote on this thing, but I do feel that one of the least things that the government can do, and I repeat what I said on the earlier occasion when I presented this resolution, that the least the government could do, regardless of what else is done or not done, would be to enforce the regulations that now are on the statutes of this province and are also on the statutes of the Federal Government. In the statute on tobacco, tobacco sales, Revised Statutes of Manitoba dated 1954, it is stated there that a person who sells, or gives to, or causes to come into the possession of a child under the age of 16 years, cigarettes or cigarette paper or tobacco, is guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding \$200.00, and in default of payment of the fine or in addition thereto, is liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year. It is regarded as a serious offence for anyone to sell or to provide in other ways, tobacco to children who are under the age of 16 and I think that the government, knowing that this is on the statute books, has simply done nothing, neither to enforce it nor to have it removed from the statute books. I think that the least that could be done, no matter what is done with this particular resolution that I'm introducing, the least the government could do would be either to now begin to enforce this act - there is more to it than what I read but you have the gist of it - enforce this act or otherwise have it removed from the statutes. If it has no meaning in the statute books then the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30. Order, please. I expect the honourable gentleman wishes to carry on, does he?

MR. PETURSSON: Ten seconds. . . the government would avoid the appearance of being hypocritical in the statute that it retains on its books by removing this one if they do not want it on there, do not want to enforce it. Thank you very much.

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

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