

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, March 29, 1966

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, I present the second report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders beg leave to present the following and their second report. Your Committee met on the 28th day of March 1966 and considered certain of the regulations referred to it, being Manitoba Regulations 12/65 to 127/65, both inclusive, and Manitoba Regulations 1/66 to 13/66, both inclusive.

Your Committee makes the following comments on, and recommendations with respect to, the regulations examined by it: 1. Manitoba Regulation 12/65. This regulation is made under The Social Allowances Act, which contains a general authority to make regulations for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Act according to their intent. However, there is no specific authority to make regulations with respect to the subject matter of this regulation. The Committee recommends that the department consider the advisability of seeking an amendment to the Act specifically authorizing the making of regulations respecting these matters.

2. Manitoba Regulation 33/65. This regulation is made under the authority of The Highway Traffic Act. Section 16 creates a restriction on the use, for driving instruction purposes, of areas or streets designated by the registrar for the purposes of administering driving examinations to applicants for driver's or chauffeur's licences. Your Committee recommends that the areas or streets on which the restriction is to apply should be specifically designated under the regulatory section of the Act by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council rather than by the registrar, whose designation would, at best be administrative regulation.

3. Manitoba Regulation 43/65. This regulation, under The Taxicab Act, authorizes the board to endorse, condition, restrict or qualify a drive yourself booking office, or a drive yourself motor vehicle certificate or registration in such manner and for such period as it may require. In view of the fact that section 6 of The Taxicab Act authorizes the board to determine the terms and conditions of licences issued under The Taxicab Act, the Committee is of opinion that the regulation is redundant and recommends that it be repealed.

4. Manitoba Regulation 11/66. This is a regulation of The Motor Carrier Board made under The Highway Traffic Act to fix the tariff of tolls for motor carriers in Manitoba. The Committee feels that the regulation is ambiguous and imprecise and recommends that it be re-drafted, so that it might be more easily understood.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that the report of the Committee be received.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that I have not seen the report, it may not be customary, but I'd like to have an opportunity to move adjournment of debate. Is that a procedural. . . Yes, well, then I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Logan that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I present the second report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg leave to present the following as their second report. Your Committee has considered Bill No. 47 - An Act to Amend The Manitoba Teachers' Society Act and has agreed to report the same without amendment. All of which is respectfully submitted.

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

Introduction of Bills. Before the Orders of the Day I would like to attract your attention to the gallery - the gallery on my left where there are some 24 Grade VIII students from St. Ignatius School under the direction of Sister Robert John. This school

(MADAM SPEAKER cont'd)... is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce; and on my right where there are some 34 Grade IV students from Ramah School under the direction of Mr. Benron and Mrs. Huss. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Provincial Secretary. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you.

Orders of the Day.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to address a question to the First Minister. In view of the fact that I understand that certain European Countries have treaty arrangements with Canada regarding corporations that operate in Canada and their payment of income tax on profits made here, could he inform the House whether or not the corporation with whom the government is dealing with regard to a northern pulp development, will be paying income tax on its profits in Canada?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): I'll just have to answer this question subject to revision, Madam Speaker, but as I understand it the corporation that will actually be conducting the operation at The Pas is a Canadian Corporation namely, Churchill Industries Limited, and they will be the ones, to the best of my knowledge, that will be paying the taxation and thus will be paying it in Canada to Canadian and Manitoba governments.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I would like to address a question to the First Minister. Could he indicate to us what the cost is going to be of the preparations that are presently being made in connection with the impending flood of the Red River?

MR. ROBLIN: I cannot give an exact figure, but our estimates indicate it will be several million dollars.

MR. MOLGAT: I would like to address a question to the First Minister. The other day I asked him regarding the school tax rebate and the position of the recipient of that rebate and income tax. He advised me then that it would not be included in income tax. Would this be the case for the farmers of the province? I am under the impression that the farmers will have to report this. Is this not so?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, it's always dangerous to set oneself up as an expert on the income tax because it's a pretty complicated matter and when one is asked questions on the Orders of the Day, it sometimes perhaps might be a better policy to produce an answer in writing later on rather than try to give it off the cuff. I think I had better do that in this case. But I'd like to give the honourable member my impression as to what the income tax situation is. If you are able to deduct your municipal, your local property tax as an expense in the course of making out an income tax return, either as a corporation or as a farmer or a rancher, then obviously the school tax rebate is bound up in that calculation. If you're a private citizen filling out a personal income tax form and you're not entitled to deduct your local taxes as an expense, well then the school tax rebate does not enter into the income tax calculation.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Education. Would the Minister of Education table the report that was given by his department regarding the Fannystelle School investigation.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, that report of the inquiry is a report which I discussed with the Board concerned. I'd be glad to give a statement which I gave to the Board and to the individual who made the complaint, but as a matter of routine in investigating complaints from time to time, the result of the inquiry by those who conducted it is usually kept on departmental files. If that would be satisfactory to the honourable member?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I have one further question that I would like to direct to the First Minister. It's in connection with the Swiss Company that is developing a pulp and paper mill in the north. Is the agreement reached between the government and this firm covered by an Order-in-Council, and if so, when can we expect it to be tabled?

MR. ROBLIN: I think, Madam Speaker, that that was the subject of an Order for Return which the government accepted and we expect the answer to be available soon.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question - I presume it will come to the First Minister. I understand that the City of Winnipeg have been discussing the possibility of asking for a Bread Board similar to the Milk Control Board because of the rising price of bread and the fact that bread produced here is actually sold at

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd)... higher price in the City of Winnipeg than it is in other areas, although produced here in Winnipeg. I wonder if the First Minister can indicate if he has given any consideration to action in this regard?

MR. ROBLIN: My recollection Madam Speaker, is that the City of Winnipeg requested the Federal Government to take a look into the price of bread - or maybe it was the Government of Saskatchewan that requested the Federal Government to take a look into the price of bread. We do not think that at the present time that the question of bread prices is a matter for the control of the Provincial Government.

MADAM SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House. The Honourable, the Minister of Public Utilities.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, before we put the motion to go into Committee of the Whole House, although it is private members day the government would like to dispose of the Bill for Supplementary Supply which is adjourned by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. I understand he's ready to proceed but it would need unanimous consent for us to deal with this Bill now, and if we could do that then it would be dealt with by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor; otherwise we will have to ask His Honour to come back on another occasion. But I ask whether there is any objection to dealing with the Supplementary Supply Bill now particularly if the honourable member who has the adjournment is happy about that suggestion.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I was just in the act of getting to my feet to raise a point of Order in connection with the business that already appears on the Order Paper on private members' day. I know that this has been discussed before but I still have the feeling that on private members' day that we should not be accepting the government motion which is entailed in moving this for the Committee of the Whole House, and that brings me to a discussion of the point that the Honourable the First Minister has just brought up.

I can recognize the wish of the government to get Bill No. 69 proceeded with and passed as soon as possible. On the other hand I understand from discussion with my friend and colleague the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that he has somewhat extended remarks, he is prepared to proceed that is true, as far as he is concerned he is quite prepared to proceed. On the other hand I realize that this being a matter of some considerable interest that it might easily initiate a debate and so I was going to suggest that under these circumstances, so as to not take too much of the private members' time, that - and I have my leader's agreement with this - that we would be prepared to give the undertaking that it would be proceeded with on public business tonight - government business. - There's certainly no wish at all to hold up the proceedings but it might mean that it would be quite a debate. So under those circumstances, Madam Speaker, we would suggest that it be held until tonight.

Madam Speaker, before my honourable friend, the Provincial Secretary makes his motion, I raise this point of Order that this being a government motion that it should not be moved on private members' time in the afternoon.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I'm naturally bound by my honourable friend's observation respecting the Supplementary Supply Bill and we will not proceed with it if it does not secure the unanimous consent it needs.

Respecting the point he raises now, I am aware that this question has been before the House before, but my impression is that third readings of any Bills do come in the place in which it's indicated on the Order Paper. I have no further comment to say except that I think this has been our practise, and I believe is in conformity with our rules at the present time. However, Madam Speaker, it's a procedural matter and one upon which you might wish to rule.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, on the point of Order, it definitely has been our practice in times past that the third readings of Bills took precedence, but one of the things that I think you will recall that we did in our Rules Committee, Madam Speaker, was to try and get this matter, among others, clarified, and while I'm sure that it is the fact that under the the section that it says that the proceedings of the day shall be so and so, and this is at the beginning of it, yet I think you'll find that it also says "unless otherwise provided," and it is definitely otherwise provided in the section dealing with private members' business, private members' day, that government motions come after private bills after private business.

MR. ROBLIN: As far as the government is concerned, if you wish to take this matter under advisement and leave the order stand while we proceed with the ... (Interjection)...

MADAM SPEAKER: They are prepared....

MR. ROBLIN: Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: We are of the opinion -- I am of the opinion that Rule 22 applies

(MADAM SPEAKER cont'd)... here, "The day to day precedence on the Order Paper except as otherwise provided shall be as follows: (a) Third readings of Bills (b) Reports received from Committees of the Whole House." The Clerk has furnished me now with a ruling of Mr. Speaker in 1962 where he ruled it was clear in his mind that Rule 19, (1) of our rules, applies in this case. It was on a motion of the Honourable Mr. Paulley, the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party, and in my opinion, the Order Paper is in order and we proceed with the Committee of the Whole House. The Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills: No. 8, An Act to amend The Gas Pipe Line Act. No. 44, An Act to amend The Manitoba Telephone Act.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

#### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Bill No. 8 was read section by section and passed.) Bill 44 Section 1 passed; 2(19) passed; 2 passed; 3 --

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, when we were discussing this Bill in the second reading stage, my colleagues and myself made some points here regarding the people who will be put on this Committee, and we were seeking from the government then assurance that it would not be used to place members of the Legislative Assembly or ex-members of the Assembly on the Committee. We felt that it should be a non-political committee. I wonder if the Minister has anything further to add to our request.

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, we had the debate on this matter, I thought, rather fully, and I don't recall any assurance of any kind being given on the part of the government. The Bill is quite clear in that the intent is to appoint people who are capable of administrating the problems and the workings of the Manitoba Telephone System.

The operation of the Telephones has gotten to a point where it is felt that additional people are required; it's also thought advisable to have a broader representation both from the public at large and on a regional basis. I did mention at that time that the members of the present Telephone Commission have been appointed for their ability to contribute to the welfare and the best interests of the Telephones, and it shall be the intent of the government to continue to appoint those types of individuals.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, there was no commitment from the Minister who's presenting this Bill, in fact it was very much to the contrary. When he was asked the question by one of my colleagues, the Member for St. George, whether he would give the House assurance the government will not appoint any present or former members of the Legislature to that Board, his reply was, "I have no intention of doing that, Madam Speaker. It may be they'll be the best people and they will be appointed." Which led me to believe that the intention was in fact to appoint those people, that is, present and former members of the Legislature; and I was merely seeking clarification to see if the Minister had a change of mind since that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The remainder of Bill No. 44 was read and passed.) Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee has adopted Bills No. 8 and 44 without amendments and asks leave to sit again.

#### IN SESSION

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. STEINKOPF presented Bill No. 8, An Act to amend The Gas Pipe Line Act, for third reading.

MR. STEINKOPF presented Bill No. 44, An Act to amend The Manitoba Telephone Act, for third reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, may we have this matter stand, please.

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

MR. PATRICK: In his absence, may we have this matter stand, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the proposed resolution as amended by the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I adjourned the debate for the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that the resolution be amended as follows:

(a) by striking out the third paragraph - out of the third paragraph the words "urgent need for a policy" in the first line thereof, and substituting therefore these words "in existence a program".

(b) by deleting everything in the last paragraph after the word "government" in the first line thereof, and adding the following: "be requested by the Province of Manitoba to give consideration to the expanding of the designated area program in Manitoba, so as to remove existing inequalities of opportunity between similar communities".

MADAM SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia . . . (Interjection) . . .

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, I believe we have a point of Order here, that I understand the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie is amending a motion that stands in his name at this point -- since we do seem to be taking advantage of technicalities this afternoon.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I think it should be pointed out that what he is speaking on right now is the motion, as amended. He is . . . (Interjection) . . . No, it's not standing in his name, it's standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. Surely a member who moves an original motion which is subsequently amended, can speak subsequently on that amendment can he not?

MADAM SPEAKER: I'm not sure of the rights of whether you can amend your own resolution here. I will take it under advisement and give my decision at a later time.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains. The Honourable the Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, this resolution is a very straightforward one, and I adjourned the resolution, or the debate, hoping for some information to arrive here before now. This information has not arrived, arrived from this source, but I was informed where I could get the information. It would take a long time for me to get this information from this new source, so I do not think I'm going to wait for that. I'll say a few words on the resolution, express my own feelings.

I've listened to all the arguments for the past few years pro and con on this subject in this House and now I'm more convinced than ever that this resolution is a very good one, that an Auditor-General should be appointed by this Legislature, the Legislature of Manitoba. We know that other governments in Canada, governments across the world have appointed such an officer in respect to their own governments, and I believe that it would be worthwhile here in Manitoba. I think that just knowing that such an officer would have the power to make spot inspections and audits would make any government more democratic and would make the government, any government that has an Auditor-General, more alert.

We haven't heard too much from the government side this year, but I cannot see how the government could oppose such a resolution. In fact, I would say that if the government has nothing to hide, nothing to be afraid of, I think that the government should not oppose it.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert-Plains.

A standing vote was taken with the following results:

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

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Bazley, Beard, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 15; nays, 30.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne, and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Member for Gladstone. The Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, the first thing that I would like to mention with regard to this resolution and the various amendments offered thereto, is that as printed in the Orders of the Day there is a mistake in my opinion. The proposed amendment reading from the top of Page 5, the proposed amendment of Mr. Shoemaker in amendment thereto as follows: "THAT the amendment be amended by striking out all the words after the word 'that' in the first line of the operative portion 'as corrected'" -- those two words should not appear. It should read "after the word 'that' in the first line of the operative portion thereof and substituting the following:" -- and then going on to this . . . I don't know how the words 'as corrected' got in there, but they are there. I would suggest that in order to keep the records straight that we should agree to have them stricken out.

I shall refer you, Madam Speaker, to Votes and Proceedings No. 33 wherein you will find that in this connection - and I'm reading from Page 3 of that Votes and Proceedings, about the middle of the page: "Madam Speaker informed the House that the sub-amendment of the Honourable Member for Gladstone should have been worded as follows: "That the amendment be amended by striking out all the words 'that' in the first line of the operative portion thereof and substituting the following:" That was the suggestion that you made, Madam Speaker, and it was duly incorporated in the Votes and Proceedings and it is the way I suggest that this one should now read.

Taking it as being agreed that that is the proper form, I would like to take a few minutes of the time of the House to mention on the general subject of gasoline tax, a little bit of the history of this tax. Some of my honourable friends think that I'm very interested in history, and I am. Some of them think I'm very interested in taxation, and I am; and I think it's a good thing for a lot of the people, the taxpayers themselves and particularly governments, and especially this government, to be reminded once in a while of who these taxes build up.

It was in 1923 I believe, Madam Speaker, that the gasoline tax was first imposed upon the people of this province. That happened to be the first Session that I attended here and I suppose that I was rather concerned about it even then, but it's too far back for me to remember very clearly. It may be interesting to recall that it was a one cent per gallon tax with no refund. In the first year of operation it produced just almost exactly in the neighbourhood of \$100,000 of revenue. It was only two years later -- and this is what happens once you get the taxes introduced -- just two years later that it was raised to three cents, but so far as the farmers and lumbermen, fishermen, that is commercial fishermen, and mine operators were concerned, the tax remained at the same, because two cents of it was refundable to those groups of primary producers. In 1926, it was amended to give the full refund of three cents to approximately the same groups, although there were some differences at times.

In 1930, just at the beginning of the real depression, it was raised to five cents - all refundable to practically the same people as before but a time limit put on as to the time which the refunds could be claimed. In 1932, right in the depths of the depression, it was raised another seven cents, and to the group to which the exemption applied, and it has been somewhat changed at that time, it was not an increase because five cents remained refundable. It is interesting to note that it stodd at that level of seven cents per gallon for a long time - right from then I believe until 1947. A pretty long stretch.

It is also perhaps interesting to note that in that whole 14-year period, from 1923 to 1936, inclusive, that the total revenue to the Province of Manitoba was just in the neighbourhood of \$10 million. It is perhaps interesting to compare that with what the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer is estimating as the return from the gasoline tax in the year that we're just providing for now in the Supply Committee, because the expectation is that he is going to get almost \$36 million.

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd)...

But, Madam Speaker, to continue with the sad story of tax increases, I've mentioned that it stayed at the level of seven cents per gallon from 1932 until 1947. In that year it was stepped up to nine cents. I'm not taking the time to go into the different changes that were made in the exemptions. There were several changes, and I won't weary the House by mentioning them and of course I don't remember all the changes that were made. It stayed at nine cents from 1947 to 1956, and I am sure that my honourable friends will realize that it makes me very sad to have to admit that there was one tax increase during the time that I had the honour to head the government of this province, because in that year 1956, we raised it from nine cents to eleven. It started at one cent in 1923; it reached eleven cents in 1956 -- 33 years it took it to gain ten cents. This government inherited the tax at eleven cents and it raised it to seventeen cents in just six years. In our last year, the last year that the predecessor government was in office the tax return to the revenues of the province, less than \$13 million. As I mentioned a minute ago the estimate for the coming year is almost \$36 million. I mention that to try and encourage my honourable friends opposite who have a penchant for raising taxes to consider the error of their ways and to project their thinking into the future if this kind of additional spending should go on.

If we take the wholesale price to the farmer on an average of 25¢ a gallon of gasoline across the Province of Manitoba - and I'm told that that is a fair average province-wise - then the 17¢ tax on 25¢ is in the neighbourhood of 68%. And surely that's a pretty high rate of taxation, even for this government, Madam Speaker. When we get up to where we're taxing a vital commodity, a necessary commodity, these days an essential commodity, at the rate of 68%, I think it's time that we took a pause and gave some consideration to some amelioration of the situation.

If I dared to take the time of the House at this Session, I would like to go into the figures of the comparative expenditures and revenues as between the former government and this one that were made on highways. Perhaps I shall be encouraged to do that a little later on in the Session to put those figures on record once again and bring them up-to-date. But in the meantime, I would just like to say this, that in the latter years of that former government, not during war-time it's true, but in the years succeeding the years, that if you take the four taxes that I think can appropriately be regarded as those that should contribute to the highway system of the province, that is the gasoline tax, the motive fuel users' tax, car licenses and chauffeurs licenses, and add them together and say those are the revenues that we'll designate as highway revenues and then take the expenditures that were made upon highways, this is true that we spent millions of dollars more on highways than we took out of those four forms of taxes. The present government right since it came into office has taken millions of dollars more out of those taxes than it has spent on highways. And I without going into details now think perhaps I will take the opportunity to put the actual figures on record some time again.

Well, Madam Speaker, that's so far as the general position of gasoline is concerned and something of the history. The amendment suggests that we urge the gentleman who has been chosen to make this study to complete it as quickly as is consistent with the importance of the subject so that the government won't be able, or won't have the excuse, to once again delay some program that will help the farmers in these difficult times. Now, I know that some of my honourable friends will say they're not difficult times, but by their own admission freely made and frequently made, the cost-price squeeze has continued to get worse not better. And here is one method of doing something concrete and valuable as a contribution toward easing that cost-price squeeze.

And what are these things that Dr. Gilson is to be studying? I read from Item 3 of the referenceto Dr. Gilson. Item 3: To determine the significance of the tax paid on gasoline used in farm trucks for operation "on the farm". I stress those words, Madam Speaker, on the farm, as a factor in farm production cost. Well it won't take Dr. Gilson very long to decide on the significance of the tax paid on gasoline; it's a mighty significant amount. It's 68% of what he has to pay for the gasoline and I think in any man's language that's significant. He won't spend much time on that. It's significant. But these words "on the farm" intrigue me, Madam Speaker. Are they there deliberately? Is the intention of this reference to Dr. Gilson to suggest to him that he is to consider only the gasoline that is used right on the farm. Isn't he going to look at the truck situation in general? Is he going to say that only the gasoline used on the property that is owned by the individual farmer is going to be considered? That would be a real

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd)... miscarriage of justice, Madam Speaker.

And then No. 4: To examine alternative methods of handling a gasoline tax rebate to farmers for trucks used for operation "on the farm". Surely, Madam Speaker, surely my honourable friends have not gone to the trouble of getting an expert in this field like Dr. Gilson to make a study of the cost just on the farm. Surely if they're thinking at all about an alternative program they're thinking of one broader than that. I would suggest to the government that they do a lot better so far as alternative programs are concerned than what they brought before the House a year ago.

My honourable friend the Member for Springfield was very optimistic when he suggested an alternative plan. It was a good plan. He thought it would be even better than the tax-free purple gasoline. I don't share that view with him, but it would have been at least a good healthy step in the right direction if it had been implemented; and my honourable friend with great enthusiasm seemed to suggest that it would be implemented if we would only go along with a program of that kind rather than continuing to suggest a gasoline refund. Here was some hope. It wasn't only my honourable friend the Member for Springfield but a senior Minister of this government gave us his blessing and said that it was a good proposition - it was a good proposition said he. Madam Speaker, what are we coming to in this Chamber? What are we coming to so far as representative government is concerned in the Province of Manitoba if we are going to get propositions presented by a member of the government group with lots of facts and figures as to how good they will be, as an alternative to something that's been proposed to help the farmers, and get a senior Minister of the government benches standing up and giving it his support and saying it's a good proposition and indicating that it's going to be done. And then nothing is done. Is this the way that government should be carried on?

Now I'm well aware, Madam Speaker, I'm perfectly well aware of the fact that in order to conform with the rules that we have to make our resolutions read "consider the advisability" or something of that same import; but I'm also well aware of the fact that members of the government bench don't stand up and give their support to a motion unless it's intended for the government to do something about it. I maintain, Madam Speaker, that this was a snare and a delusion that was perpetrated upon this House last year by my honourable friend leading us to believe that there was going to be something done of a practical nature - not as good as the one we'd suggested, not by any means as good, but something worthwhile.

My honourable friend the Member for Souris-Lansdowne, for whose voracity I have the very highest regard, would not I am sure willingly lead this House astray, in spite of the representations that he made regarding how well fixed the farmers are - and I concede that he is. But in spite of that he was a party along with my honourable friend from Springfield and particularly a Minister of the Crown, in leading this House to believe that something was going to be done. And something was done. The licenses were increased not decreased. Well, now, Madam Speaker, no wonder we're concerned about this.

And so I join with those others who have spoken in saying to the government, let's repair the damage to the extent that we can now. Everybody knows we're being overtaxed; the First Minister himself has admitted it in his budget speech. Everybody - the government no less than the rest of us agrees that the farmer is in a difficult and continuing price-cost squeeze. Well then let's do something practical to give some relief. My honourable friends say they have a surplus coming up. Then use some of it in order to give this proposal some active support this year. The farmers need this relief. Their costs of production have been rising; they're still rising. The government admits it doesn't see any end in sight to that situation. Here is something practical that can be done and I commend it to the members of the front bench and to all of their supporters.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member from Emerson that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood. The Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, this motion proposes that the government consider the advisability of establishing a department of consumer affairs and with a new government department it usually means a new Minister, a Deputy Minister and all the staff that goes with the department. This is a cost that I think is unnecessary and would result in an unnecessary burden upon the consumers of Manitoba who this resolution seeks to help.



(MR. COWAN cont'd)...

There is in Manitoba a great deal of work being carried on for consumers now and there is no need for a government body, a government department to be set up to duplicate the work that is going on. However, there are some things that could be done and one of these things might be the appointment of a Consumer Consultant perhaps in connection with the office of consumer credit which was recommended in the consumer committee report which has been adopted by this House. If the telephone number, the address of the consumer consultant was given considerable publicity and inserted in the phone book, it would be a phone number which anyone could call in respect of any matter dealing with consumers and that person could direct the person enquiring to the best source from which information or help could be obtained. A Consumer Consultant would be of great value to the consumers and would give an opportunity for our people to get information about the various facilities that are available to help them. And there are many facilities. Facilities which this government doesn't need to duplicate. Perhaps the most important is the information and help provided by the Better Business Bureau. The Better Business Bureau is a well-staffed, long-established organization in Greater Winnipeg, sponsored and supported on a voluntary basis by responsible business firms who believe their greatest asset is the public confidence in the integrity and responsibility of honest business. They also believe that education can alert many people, many of the public, to pitfalls that they might encounter, and in their work they are dealing with a minority of irresponsible business concerns when they find that things are not as they should be.

This Bureau each month of the year deals with about 2,000 inquiries mostly concerning the reliability of business firms who seek to deal with members of the public. The services are available not only to the citizens of Greater Winnipeg but to the citizens of all Manitoba, and they have letters from outside of Winnipeg and long-distance phone calls inquiring about various firms who seek to do business with consumers in this province.

Besides this large and long-established organization, there are many other organizations which benefit the consumer. There is the Canadian Association of Consumers which is established all across Canada, and we have a Manitoba branch here which seeks better protection for consumers and better understanding of consumers' problems. They are concerned with deceptive advertising, with deceptive packaging, with prices paid by consumers, with prices set by various public boards in respect of various food products, and very many other matters. They also do some testing and that information is available to the public through their publications. The active ladies in this organization have made a presentation to our Consumers' Credit Committee, and they have made presentations to other committees that have been established by this House.

In addition, there is the Family Bureau, which seeks to help families which run into problems of various kinds. Many of these problems are to deal with finances and they seek to help families with their budgets, and also to get their finances on a basis which the family can afford, so that the family can have sufficient money left to pay for food, clothing and rent after they have made their payments on their various commitments that they have unfortunately undertaken.

Then in Winnipeg we have also the Credit Grantors' Association, which will help people in difficulty with trying to arrange their monthly payments so that they can make payments which they can afford.

We have in Winnipeg, and in four other centres of Canada, large offices of the Food and Drug Directorate of Canada. In Winnipeg we also have, with this directorate, laboratories which conduct many tests in connection with foods, drugs, medicines, and cosmetics. This organization also has a representative in Brandon, and if there are consumers who feel that they are not getting what they should with regard to these products then they can get in touch with these offices. They are continually making inspections and testing various drugs and foods available in this province.

In addition we have the Legal Aid Committee of this Manitoba Law Society, which is available to help people with legal problems, and meets once a week, and will help people without charge, giving advice, and many times take court cases without charge in order to help people get out of trouble.

We have also Weights and Measures Department of the Federal Government. We have our own City Health Department which inspects restaurants, factories. We have the C.S.A. label of the Canada Standards Association helping to protect consumers. We even have our radio and T.V. programs; our Beefs and Bouquets; our Bee Lines and our View from Here, from time to time telling consumers of the different unreliable programs, unreliable services, unreliable

(MR. COWAN cont'd)... goods that are being promoted by various companies. So we have a great many organizations which are now giving help and which have help available if only the consumers knew where they could be obtained.

In addition, there is literature available from the Extension Department of the Manitoba Department of Agriculture, on such subjects as fabrics, meat costs, vegetable storage, and so on; and various other pamphlets available from our Health Department and from the various Federal Departments. If we had this consumer consultant available, consumers would be able to get in touch with the consumer consultant and be able to find out where information and help can be obtained with their problems.

The other aspect in which the Government of Manitoba could help a little more is in connection with education, for it is education that will mean the greatest amount of help for the people. Dean Tallin, in his report when he investigated the mortgages, said it would be impossible to enact enough legislation to protect everyone, and so we must put more emphasis on education. I am sure that the members of the Canadian Association of Consumers who have had lots of education through their work with regard to consumers problems, will seldom run into difficulties, and it is our job to try and make sure that more people know of the various ways in which consumers can protect themselves from fraud.

We can certainly have a pamphlet printed in that regard, but I don't think that is quite enough, because many of those who need the protection most wouldn't likely ask for the pamphlet. Perhaps if we published some short ads every six months, which set out in brief things that consumers should be careful about, this might have more effect upon the public, and have a greater benefit. For instance, the ad might contain about ten points such as (1) never sign anything until you have read it and understood it. If people follow that rule alone there would not be very many complaints. Another might be to refuse to sign a blank contract or any sale contract in which the blanks are not filled in. (3) Guarantees given verbally are usually useless, and if you are to have a guarantee be sure that it is in writing and in detail so that you know what is guaranteed. Next, buy only what you can afford. Next, shop around when you are borrowing, or when you are buying, as to where you can get finance, where you can get a finance deal at the lowest cost. Refuse to deal with stores using bait and switch advertising gimmicks; stores that advertise a well-known product at a great reduction, and then when you go there they try to sell you a higher priced product, and in that way they make a sale.

Next, before you buy anything that costs considerable money, get two other prices. We know in so many cases that the person who has been sucked in by an unscrupulous salesman, only got the one price. We have perhaps, this among the farmers today in Manitoba, who are being sold these steel granaries. They have not got a second price and they've been paying through the nose for the steel granaries that they have been buying. Next, contact the Better Business Bureau to determine if a company is reliable. And the last notice that might be in one of these ads that would be published every six months would be to contact the Consumer Consultant in Winnipeg at such a phone number and such an address.

We could have other education through literature. I think it would be a good idea if we did publish two other pamphlets, perhaps similar to the pamphlets that were published concerning laws to protect women; a Consumer Credit pamphlet. Already one has been published by our Department of Agriculture, but it is quite a long book, a book of some 30 pages; but we would like, I think, a Consumer Credit pamphlet that was much shorter, and would give the information in language that was easy to read.

And then another pamphlet outlining the laws for the protection of consumers. We could let people know that false advertising, with regard to food and drugs is against the Dominion Food and Drug laws, and that false advertising of most kinds is contrary to the Criminal Code. I point out to members of this House that Section 306 of the Criminal Code reads in part as follows: "Everyone who publishes or causes to be published an advertisement containing a statement that purports to be a statement of fact, but that is untrue, deceptive or misleading, is guilty of an indictable offence, and is liable to imprisonment for five years, if the advertisement is published (a) to promote directly or indirectly the sale or disposal of property or any interest therein; and (b) to promote a business or commercial venture.

We might also in this pamphlet, tell consumers of other laws that are there for their protection, such as the Act that we have recently passed, The Unconscionable Transactions Act; the Act giving the 48 hour cooling off period in respect of sales made by door to door salesmen, The Act providing that when you buy on time now, if the goods are seized, then you don't have to pay the balance of the purchase price; and the fact that we have in Manitoba, laws which provide

(MR. COWAN cont'd)... for payments of Judgments by instalments, which would be of help to many people who formerly were helped by the Orderly Payment of Debts Act.

And then, when we have the laws that are in this latest report of our Consumer Credit Committee, these could be added to the list, and these are laws which certainly will be of benefit to the consumers of this province. Control over certain practices of collection agencies; requirement that both husband and wife must sign chattel mortgages covering household goods; exemptions of certain goods under seizure, under chattel mortgages, unless the consideration shown in the chattel mortgage was for the goods covered by the chattel mortgage. Registration of conditional sale agreements covering motor vehicles.

Other proposals; after two-thirds of the contract price is paid in the conditional sales contract, then, the goods would be exempt from seizure, The fact that we are going to have a standard form of conditional sales contract and a standard rate for rebating carrying charges if a contract is prepaid; relief against acceleration and forfeiture clauses, so that if there is default in a payment the person defaulting only has to make up the arrears and doesn't have to pay all the balance owing on the contract; and the disclosure of mortgage costs in respect of mortgages.

When these laws are passed and the committee's recommendations are put into effect we will have in Manitoba many laws to help with the protection of consumers. Then we should also I think in Manitoba have something more in education, something in our schools, perhaps in Grade 7 and 8 before many of our young people drop out, telling them of the problems that they will meet with regard to credit and with regard to consumers' difficulties. They should be taught, too, how to compute interest and be told something of the laws that have been passed to protect them.

The Committee on Consumers Credit recommended the establishment of an office of consumer credit, and if it also had the job of advising the public as to where information can be obtained about the many matters affecting consumers, including the enforcement of laws, much would be done to help the public. Most of all, we need an educational program; but we do not need a new department of consumers affairs with the resultant cost and duplication of services now being provided.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

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

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): My comments on this resolution will be brief because the resolution itself does not permit them to be very long. If you read the resolution you will find that in the resolve portion of the resolution, Madam Speaker, that there are three suggestions made -- makes a suggestion that the government urge the Federal Government to establish a national plan of comprehensive universal health services, or that there be a joint provincial scheme of universal comprehensive health insurance, or failing both that the Province of Manitoba invoke one for itself. Now in effect when we made an announcement before my estimates the other day, it said that the Province of Manitoba will meet the Federal Government's proposals for a program of medical health insurance by July 1, 1967, and thus I feel that it is only necessary to amend the resolution to actually review what is being done which in effect is similar to that that was suggested by the honourable member as his second proposal that he had to make.

Therefore, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that the resolution be amended by -- I beg your pardon, the Attorney-General -- that the resolution be amended by deleting all the words of the first WHEREAS and all the words after the word "recommends" in the second WHEREAS and substituting the words -- if you'll excuse me -- "THAT the Federal Government enter into agreements with the provinces to provide grants on a fiscal need formula to assist the provinces to introduce and operate comprehensive, universal, provincial programs of personal health services; and WHEREAS the Government of Canada has announced its intention

(MR. WITNEY cont'd)... to implement on July 1, 1967 grants for medical services programs administered by the provinces; and WHEREAS the Government of Manitoba has announced its intention to implement such a program; THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House urge that such a program be implemented by July 1, 1967."

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Perhaps we should take this amendment under advisement; there are indications that it might not be in order.

MADAM SPEAKER: In my opinion, the . . .

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I might ask my honourable friend to indicate the grounds on which he thinks it might not be in order?

MADAM SPEAKER: In my opinion the resolution is in order. Are you ready for the question?

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Arthur. The Honourable the Member for Emerson.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, the amendment to the resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Arthur does not materially change the original resolution very much. Something that strikes me odd in this resolution is the disagreement between the Honourable Member for Arthur and the Honourable Minister of Agriculture as is evidenced by this amendment. We on this side quite often disagree with the arguments and the ideas of the Minister. It is not very often that members on the government side or the backbenchers disagree with one of their ministers, but here is a clear indication of it. We have a government backbencher quarrelling with the language of his own Minister.

If you look at the first line, the honourable member in amending his resolution quarrels with the minister in the very first line. He says: "Delete the words 'to produce cheaply enough'-- delete these words. We on this side thought that this phrase was relevant. We agreed this time with the Minister of Agriculture, but the member didn't. And I have proof here. These are the Minister's own words. I have here Farm Outlet, 1964, where the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture was speaking, and here is the exact quote -- I'll quote from his speech: "Only by improving efficiency can farmers hope to produce cheaply enough to maintain or improve their standards of living." And you've got that phrase word for word, "to produce cheaply enough". And here what does the Member for Arthur do? He quarrels with his Minister. He doesn't think that the Minister was right. We on this side did, but he doesn't. I don't think that this resolution was too well thought out. I would say that there should be a little more discussion among the government benches and people who try to refute the words of the Minister. I think that the former resolution, the original one, was a good one, and the honourable member in part agrees that it is because he doesn't make any substantial change; but the government wants to attach itself to the resolution and simply says, "Me too" with a very minor change to it.

About the only real value in this amendment is in the very very last paragraph which recommends that this committee after it had studied asks the Federal Government to consider its recommendations. Well, I propose that even the resolution in its original form would have accomplished this, because surely the members here and the members of the committee know that this would have to be referred to the Federal Government regardless; so it doesn't change it too much. But we had an inquiry into the machinery industry by the Federal Government some years back, and they found four relevant questions that they asked there. The first one was the price competition in industry was largely non-existent, that's the finding of that committee. The second one, sales and service in this industry was not economical. That's the second point that they disagreed with. Three, that too many machinery dealers were operating in the prairie provinces; and four, too many changes in design were made which did not improve the efficiency or the performance of the machine in question.

Now if we go back to No. 1 and check it, the price competition in industry was largely non-existent, this committee after it was formed could check into that and find out. Maybe there is price fixing. I'm not accusing the companies of doing so, but maybe there is, and if there is price fixing or even if it was before the committee could make its recommendations. And the second one was, sales and service in this industry was not economical. Well, this commission

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd)... can look into it and if the situation is still the same, this committee can make recommendations to make improvements. And the third one was that too many machinery dealers were operating in the prairie provinces. It might still be the case, although I'm sure that there is a change, because we are all aware of the fact that most of these large machinery manufacturers have been cutting down on the dealers throughout the province; but if there is still too many, the committee I would presume would make recommendations here. And the last one was, too many changes in design were made, which did not improve the performance. Maybe there are too many changes in design, and probably, as the case is in the sale of cars that these changes did no good to anybody except to give the salesman a new talking point every year, because the change, the car or the implement was a 1967 instead of 1966. And if this is still so, I would say that it is foolish and benefits neither the farmer nor the manufacturer in this case. We know that our farmers are not -- they read a lot. We know that the farmers can recognize value in a machine when they see it, and they know that a new grill or a little bit of fancy paint here and there does not improve the efficiency of the machine. Probably the Committee could recommend that all this lace and frills be eliminated in that. The farmer needs up-to-date labour saving machines, we'll all agree, in order that he can produce as cheaply as possible and make a profit on his yearly operation. He is very well aware of his expenses here. So the Committee can make a recommendation here.

But in my opinion, this amendment does not go far enough. We could accept it as it is, but it seems to kind of deaden the effect it would have had the first time. I think we should go further than that. Since the request is made to the Federal Government, or is to be made to the Federal Government, I think that it is essential that the urgency of this matter be dealt with in a most expeditious manner. So therefore, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon, that the amendment be amended by adding at the end thereof, the following words: "And be it further resolved that this Committee be empowered to sit during the present Session of the Assembly and during recess following prorogation; AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the House urge this Committee to so arrange and complete its meetings, hearings, deliberations, decisions and recommendations that it shall report thereon at the next Session of the Assembly, so that action so far as it lies within the power of this province shall not be further delayed; AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT this Committee be composed of Honourable Mr. Hutton, Messrs. Campbell, Froese, McGregor, Paulley, Vielfaure and Watt."

MADAM SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable the Member for Emerson, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Carillon... I would like to take this amendment under consideration. I am not sure of the money cost that might be involved here. I'll take it under consideration and give my ruling at a later date.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Logan and the proposed amendment thereto of the Honourable the Member for Springfield, and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party:

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, could we have permission to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. John's and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MRS. CAROLYNE MORRISON (Pembina): Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre, could we have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable the Minister of Labour.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Madam Speaker, I was invited the other day to take part in this debate and to add my words of commendation of the honourable members opposite to the Minimum Wage Board for the work that they have done on behalf of the citizens of the Province of Manitoba.

I might say that I was somewhat surprised to hear the Honourable Member from Elmwood suggest that labour should withdraw from this Board, that they were pawns, and that the contribution that they were making - that they had to arrive at consensus and they shouldn't have any part in it. I had to reject this and I think the honourable member himself, if he were here as he reflected on the suggestion that labour should withdraw from the very responsible role that they have been playing on the Minimum Wage Board, would see that this is not the answer to help the low wage earner.

I think the other thing that is quite clear to all members of the House is that there is a very definite concern by all members in the community, and particularly in this House, for minimum wages - or concern for the low wage earner. But I must point out, Madam Speaker, that the general minima in the Province of Manitoba as of the end of November will be comparable to the minima in the other provinces in Canada with the exception of the Province of Prince Edward Island, who, I am told, will have a minimum wage of \$1.10 an hour, but only for males. You want to remember now that the minimum wage in the Province of Manitoba applies to ladies and gentlemen and it will apply, come the end of November, to the complete geographical area of the Province of Manitoba.

I might say, Madam Speaker, that it is rather interesting to look at comparisons between the Province of Manitoba and the other provinces of Canada. I think it would be interesting if I related to the honourable members here the position of the various provinces as it is related to the minimum wage here.

In the Province of Alberta, the nature of that Minimum Wage Board is a board of industrial relations and it's administered under the Labour Act, Part III. The composition of the Board in Alberta is that it shall not be more than five members and the Chairman is appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. The term of membership of the Board in Alberta is at the pleasure of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. The basis for determining the rate of the minimum wage in Alberta is after such inquiry as the Board considers adequate or they may make recommendations without any inquiry at all, and the recommendations do require the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. The frequency of the rate of change - or changes in the minimum wage, there isn't any legislation in any province that lays down by statute the frequency of changes. However, Madam Speaker, I must point out that changes do occur as the legislation is reviewed every 24 to 30 months.

In British Columbia, the nature of the Minimum Wage Board is a board of industrial relations. It's under The Male and Female Minimum Wage Act and has labour and management representatives. There are five to seven members - one is a woman, and the Chairman is an officer of the Department of Labour. Term of membership is at the discretion of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. There is no direction given to the Board and the recommendations of the Board require the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

In Manitoba, the Minimum Wage Board is under The Employment Standards Act. We have two labour representatives; we have two management representatives; and we have an independent and impartial Chairman. I think it would be fair at this time, Madam Speaker, to once again advise my colleagues that the Minimum Wage Board is going to be enlarged. We are going to add to the Minimum Wage Board two female members, one supporting a labour point of view and one supporting a management point of view. Members on the Manitoba Board serve for two years and their term may be renewed by Order-in-Council.

Now the guideline to the Board in Manitoba is the cost to an employee of purchasing the necessities of life and health. The recommendations which the Minimum Wage Board submit to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council require the approval of that body. I might say that the Board in Manitoba, as honourable members well know, travel throughout the province and hold hearings and discussions; they study benefits; and they study the needs submitted to them by welfare councils, by the YMCA. I would like to make it quite clear that we are not talking in Manitoba about a going wage; about fair wages; about wages paid under the construction industry; about commissions or professional fees; and we're not talking about contractual wages;

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd.) . . . . we're talking about the least amount of money that an employer is required to pay an employee.

I think, Madam Speaker, rather than continue the review in that area and burden the members of the House with this information, that I should make comparisons -- I might say that I could table this information for the honourable members or would they like me to read it all. It's your pleasure, but I'd be quite happy to table it for the honourable members and save you that time, but I did want to give you some indication of what occurred in other jurisdictions. I think it's quite interesting because it has been suggested that we are falling behind, that there really isn't any concern, other provinces are racing ahead of us, and this just isn't true. For instance, let's compare the minimum wages, and I'll just take two or three provinces here as they are in this chart.

In Alberta for instance the minimum wage for males and females in cities over 5,000 is \$1.00 an hour, and they have exemptions in farm labour, domestics and municipal constables and that \$1.00 an hour will become effective in the other areas of Alberta the first of July.

In British Columbia it is \$1.00 an hour throughout the whole province but then there are industry rates, as honourable members know, or minimum wages in British Columbia. It's rather interesting as you look at some of those. For instance, in Manitoba we will have a minimum as of the end of November of \$1.00 an hour. Examples of some of the minima in some of the areas in British Columbia that have been pointed out as such a high wage area, and this is true, but it is not a high minimum wage area. For example, our Christmas tree cutters will be paid \$1.00 an hour, British Columbia 50 cents; theatre ushers \$1.00 an hour, British Columbia 75 cents; bicycle and foot messengers over 18 - Manitoba \$1.00 an hour, British Columbia 50 cents; so it's really not fair to say that the high wage areas are high minimum wage areas because we in Manitoba have a general minima that is as high as the other provinces in Canada, and again I must reiterate that we are not talking about fair wages or going wages. We are not suggesting that the minimum wage is the extravagant amount of money that we would like to see people have, but it is the amount of money that is based on study of what is needed to keep a single person.

Now the Honourable Member for Elmwood mentioned the other day that \$3,000 is the least that a person needs today, and I think he has this confused with a \$3,000 family income as being indicated as the minima to meet the need of the family unit.

There are special areas and special minimums in the different provinces. For instance in Alberta there are special minimums in seven areas. In British Columbia there are special minimums in 22 areas. In Manitoba, I'm happy to say, we have three sets of special minima and this is in the construction industry. And here again it is interesting, Madam Speaker, to note that in the construction industry, the minimum range for journeymen in the City of Winnipeg - \$3.05 to \$3.09 an hour. In British Columbia, all areas, city areas - \$2.00, rural areas - \$1.85. Now Manitoba has a rural urban area as honourable members know - Brandon, Flin Flon and Portage - and the journeymen range there is \$2.45 to \$2.90; the rural range for journeymen is \$1.50. In British Columbia the minima in the rural area is \$1.25, and in the city area - \$1.30. In New Brunswick there are three special minima. In Quebec there are 24 separate minima. As I said, Madam Speaker, I will table that, and if there are any honourable members that would like that information I would be glad to provide it for them.

So while we are not content, while we are not completely satisfied with the minimum wage, the Minimum Wage Board has made substantial improvements which have been accepted by this government and which will be of benefit to the individuals who do have to work for these low wages. I think it is fair too to point out that the percentage of people in Manitoba who work for the minimum wage is very small. Surveys have indicated to us that come December 1 and the minimum wage is \$1.00 throughout the province for both men and women, that over 90 percent of our work force will be receiving wages higher than this minima. It has been suggested here that we have a large percentage of the work force in Manitoba who work for minimum wages, and, Madam Speaker, this is not true.

I hope that I've helped to clarify for honourable members the situation of the Minimum Wage Board and again to pay tribute to the Minimum Wage Board and the members thereof for the work that they do. It is not easy, and all of us realize that the special interests in the community find it very awkward to accept the findings of the Minimum Wage Board, and I think it is a tribute to the calibre and character of the men who serve on this Board that regardless of the extreme pressures that their respective constituents place upon them that they can arrive at a consensus, that they are able to make responsible recommendations which we have

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd.) . . . . seen fit to pass by regulation to become the minima in our province.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I am very pleased that the Honourable Minister spoke on this matter because until he did I felt justified in concluding from the words of the up-to-then spokesman for the government, the Honourable Member for St. James, that this government was not enthusiastic about a minimum wage at all, and when I say that I of course am interpreting the words of the Honourable Member for St. James who, until the Labour Minister was prodded into speaking, was the only spokesman on behalf of the government. So I think that he has rejected the philosophy that runs through the speech of the Honourable Member for St. James, which to me is a clear indication that he denies the need for a minimum wage, saying, well now these are for the marginal people who through no fault of their own lack skill and let's go and give them skill because with automation they will acquire it.

Well the Minister has now assured us that not only do we have a minimum wage and not only does his department and the government intend to keep it up, but he's even not content with it, which is an indication that he thinks it should be improved. He says we are not completely satisfied, which is a good promise for the future. It shows that he does value the minimum wage in some respect. Of course he minimizes it by saying there are very few people that are being paid only the minimum wage. But I'm sure he knows better than that because certainly the minimum wage becomes a floor from which people can bargain and certainly he knows that there are many labour agreements that are arrived at where the discussions start at the minimum wage and go up, and I'm sure the Minister of Labour knows that if the minimum wage were less than what it is now, the bargaining point would be less for that, because people have to start with something when they start debating wages and certainly the minimum wage is that indication. So I think it would be foolish and I certainly don't think he would say that because there are even only five percent involved that that isn't important, because that affects many many more people than just the small percentage that are covered by the minimum wage and who receive only the minimum wage.

Then the Honourable Minister draws comparisons with a few provinces, notably - I shouldn't say a few - with two provinces, Alberta and British Columbia. I don't know why he didn't go into more but maybe he didn't have that information or maybe it's not quite as good an example of comparison as B. C. and Alberta, but whatever the reason, that's what he gave us and shows in some way that we are better. Well the COMEF Report which is now - I think which we received about two years ago and I don't think there is any substantial change - reads on Page XI 1 - 2 as follows: "The analysis of minimum wage regulations shows that in the past Manitoba employers have been faced with certain disadvantages as a result of legislation. These disadvantages by and large have been eliminated."

Now my reading of the COMEF Report is an indication that the advantages to the employer discussed here in regard to minimum wage was the fact that in the COMEF Report they thought the minimum wage was too high and therefore was not attractive for industry to come in and develop in Manitoba because the wages were too high, but the COMEF Report said, "These disadvantages by and large have been eliminated," which indicates to me that the stage at the time of the writing of this report had been reached where the minimum wage was no longer a factor in driving off or dissuading employers from coming into the province to go into industry because it was no longer a burden for the employers to measure up to the minimum wage.

On all of Pages 2 and 3 in Section XI - 1 of COMEF, the whole structure - our wage structure is considered advantageous where the wages are low, and this I suppose is a good selling point to employers, just like we had reference before to the Honourable Member for Burrows who said let's do something Interlake, let's go ahead in Interlake, we have a labour force there which is happy to work a partial week or something like that.

Now I think that the influence of the thinking of the COMEF Report is reflected really in what the Honourable Minister had to say about that, that the low wage earner is the one he says we're concerned with, but yet the COMEF Report appears to be happy at the fact that the disadvantage which had faced employers in the past in relation to minimum wage regulations has been eliminated.

Now the Honourable Minister indicated that the purpose of the Minimum Wage Board is to use a guideline and study it, to study the cost to employees of purchasing necessities - I think he said of health - and he then complimented the Board for arriving at a consensus in spite of the pressures that are put on it from each of the two sides. This relates again to what I had occasion to speak about and that is the attitude of the government which seems to be: boys,



(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) . . . . we're not making decisions; you fight it out; you meet; and when you arrive at a consensus we will enact it. This to me is the method by which this government and this department operates, and I need only remind the Minister of what was said by the Honourable Member for Logan when he cited the statistics - or rather the measuring stick by which it was determined what the poverty level is considered to be in Canada, and when \$3,000 a year was established as a poverty level, certainly the minimum wage today, even the minimum wage proposed by the Liberal Party spokesman is below that poverty level, and today we hear the Honourable Minister use the expression that the intention is to establish a minimum wage to keep a single person.

Now apparently he means a person who is single, and I am not aware that the minimum wage applies to persons who are single. I am wondering if he intends to bring in an amendment or a change to provide a higher minimum wage for persons who have the responsibility of a family, because if the government intends to do that, then clearly it justifies his mention of that this is the need to keep a single person. Surely he does not justify their decision as to the minimum wage on what it does to keep a single person from starving or from hardship when he knows full well that the minimum wage affects married people, people with children and people who must support others, not just a single person. I would suggest that he ought to back away from that expression he used earlier about supporting a single person or else that he bring in legislation to protect a married person and a person with additional dependents other than himself, otherwise he's not being consistent with what he himself said.

I think, Madam Speaker, that the point has been argued and has been made, and I'm looking forward to hearing from the Honourable Member for Wellington who I gather is getting ready to speak on this issue because he will no doubt clarify the Minister's statement on government policy. He may of course not speak until after this amendment is dealt with, but I hope that I will have an opportunity to speak after the amendment is dealt with. Meanwhile, since the amendment of course reduces this amount of \$1.50 that was proposed to us to \$1.25, I spoke on what the Minister had said in order to indicate that even the amendment of \$1.25 is below the poverty level, and the Honourable Minister - I reject his suggestion that this would not apply to a single person, but it's below the poverty level which has been accepted and we cannot therefore support it, and when I say the poverty level, I figured it at a 44-hour week.

Now the suggestion that the review of minimum wages be at least every two years is also not acceptable to us because we feel that it should be reviewed as often as is necessary, and the way prices are rising these days, it is necessary more often and not just every two years. We feel that this is a constant government responsibility and that it shall be seized of the problem and the government should be in a position where we can on this side pressure them year by year - what is the situation in regard to the minimum wage. So it's not a question really of leaving it to the Board to review it at least every two years, it's a question of the government to deal with this constantly and at least every time we have a Session to be able to deal with it then.

So, as I say, I'm glad that the Honourable Minister spoke on this amendment because he did clarify the confusion which was in my mind created by the suggestion that we heard earlier that there was no real need for it, that it would be better if there were no need - that was clearly said - but also, I think, the suggestion that a minimum wage is something that we could best do without. The time will be long hence before we can do without a minimum wage as was suggested.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I would like to add a few comments to what has already been said this afternoon on the matter of minimum wage. I think we have to be practical about this. No doubt all of us would like to see our people who are salaried people, wage earners, better off here in Manitoba. I have repeatedly brought this to attention as far as farm help is concerned in the province and that I would like to see better wages paid. Wages have come up somewhat, but as long as the cost-price squeeze is on, I can't see where our farmers are able to pay more and much more than what they are now paying. We would as farmers like to see and retain experienced help on the farm. We would like to pay our wage earners more, but we are limited with the means that are at our disposal as farmers to pay our hired help, and at the same time we do not like to see our rural industries hamstrung by a high minimum wage if this means that these industries will have to go out of business or close down. It would be worse than to have a lower wage and at least make a living, and therefore I cannot subscribe to raising the minimum wage too high so that our smaller businesses will be driven out of business.

(MR. FROESE cont'd.)

I do not mean to say that I would not like to see our people get more in the way of pay. I would like to have it that they would all get more and that we would have more purchasing power in the hands of our people in this province. Certainly this would give them more turn-over, this would lead to the advantage of all people, but as long as the situation is as it is today, I don't think we can increase the minimum wage beyond what they're proposing to do this fall, that is raising it to \$1.00. I would not be able to support this motion on this basis if I want to be practical and this is what I want to be, so I will not support the motion as it stands.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Logan and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, The Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. CHERNIACK: In his absence, may we have this matter stand, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, may this matter stand, please?

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

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I suppose the members will be tired by now of hearing me speak in the House but I'll promise that I'll be very short this time as I was the other two times.

We all know that within a short period of time, if not already so, most of the people residing in Canada will be under the age of 25 and this is very important when we are discussing this resolution. There is an important element in this age group between 18 and 21 years. This group is being denied the right to vote. We are not permitting them the right to vote or not giving them the right to vote. The age 21 actually in itself does not mean anything. As was mentioned formerly by another member on the opposite side, it is an arbitrary limit on suffrage and it doesn't seem to bear any relevancy to maturity whatsoever, and if you go or examine the different voting ages in different countries, you will realize why I say this. Does it mean that a human being, a boy or a girl under 21, is not mature? Does the boy under 21 or the girl under 21 not understand enough of our ways of life to be able to vote reasonably well?

The most common age of voting is 21, but 18 is the minimum in many Latin American countries. We have quite a few of them. In about four different countries in Latin America they have different ages where they permit the voting between 18 and 21. In USSR the voting age is 18; Yugoslavia, Indonesia and Turkey likewise give the same privilege to their 18-year olds. Even in the North American continent we have states like Alaska and Georgia. The former, Alaska, they permit voting at 19; in the State of Georgia at the age of 20 years. Even here in Canada, five provinces of Canada have already lowered the voting age to different levels, some at 18, some at 19 and so on. Two of these, Quebec and Saskatchewan, give suffrage at the age of 18 years; others at different ages.

Now we can go farther abroad. The voting age limit is 23 in the Netherlands, but if we go farther east it is 24 years of age, and we here in Canada also know that it wasn't so long ago that people were not given suffrage unless they were 30 years of age, and it was consistently lowered until we have now 21 years of age. By these comparisons I am just trying to prove the fairness of offering 18 as an age limit of maturity, and there seems to be no real age limit for this whatsoever.

Now what would qualify any person for the right to vote. We'll come to that later, but we know that suffrage is a precious right which has been vigorously sought by those to whom it has been mostly denied. We know what happened in Canada or in Manitoba here when our women-folk were not permitted to vote. They vigorously fought for it, and we also note that any group which is disfranchised is at a disadvantage. They cannot speak for themselves. They cannot claim the same measure of public service, the same opportunities for public employment, the same chances of rising to some usefulness, and they cannot claim the same self respect as that claimed by those people who are given the right to vote.

We all know that many of the 18-year olds and up to 21, they work, they pay taxes, but

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . still they have no voice as to the distribution of the revenue that they themselves help to build up, and I don't think this is fair. We can say that this element is thus deprived of a vote affecting an important aspect of their life.

I mentioned before what the qualifications of a voter may be. Of course some may disagree with me, but in my opinion I would say that it's honesty, intelligence - or competency if you would like to call it so - maturity and loyalty to the country and the community, and I would say that the denial of the right to vote to those of 18 implies that these people have violated either one or all of these qualifications. I'll go over them again - honesty, intelligence, maturity and loyalty to their country, and I do not think that we have a right to point fingers at them and say that you are not honest, you are not intelligent, you're not mature enough, or you're not loyal to your country. I for one believe that the greater majority of our 18 years - between 18 and 21 - are honest, intelligent, mature enough to make a good decision, and that they are loyal to the country, therefore I will support this resolution. I have no right to deny them this privilege.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, I got the urge of doing today that I should say a few words on this resolution because I must confess that I do not find myself in sympathy with the idea proposed, and I propose later in my argument to bring out one point that I think no member of this Assembly has considered.

Now first of all, the Honourable Member for Selkirk pointed out that in previous years he had looked at the question of voting at the age of 18 and suggested that there should be some examination of the legal age of maturity, the present age of 21, and I would ask him - I'm sorry he's not in his place - if he would seriously consider lowering the age of maturity to 18 from 21. I rather imagine that if this question were the question posed to this Assembly, there would be very serious consideration.

Now the fact that there would be serious consideration of this problem suggests, at least to my mind, that there must be some lack of maturity under the age of 21 serious enough to consider a person a child to that age, so if there is question of giving them all the rights, the legal rights of an adult previous to that age, I would propose that voting is a serious matter and I have that hesitancy. Now I believe the last speaker suggested that in the USSR they could vote at 18, and I think with one party running, I think you could lower the voting age to five for all the difference it might make.

The Honourable Member for Selkirk, if I can return to what he said - and I now have Hansard at hand - says, "I felt to lower the voting age without changing the legal disabilities that people of 18 were under, that I would be rather foolish," and then further down he says, "I came to the conclusion that due to the apathy which exists among adults that we would have to do something if we wished democracy to survive, and the only way we could do that would be extend the franchise to people of 18 years of age." Well I think that's a terrifically extravagant claim, and I suspect that democracy will survive whether 18-year olds are permitted to vote or not. A little further down he suggests that he maybe concludes that he was going a little too far and a little too fast, and I suggest that reason of thinking lies in the matter that should be considered, whether he would want to reduce the age of maturity from 21 to 18.

But I have another reason for being concerned about the lowering of the voting age, and I took the trouble just before the House opened to go in and get some DBS census figures, and while I can roundly make this statement, I have only these figures to provoke people's imaginations a little further than what I'm going to suggest, that probably since the time of the French Revolution an advantage had been given in the ratio of rural and urban votes to the rural areas, because it has generally been concluded that the rural areas were more stable. Now at the last redistribution in this province, or at least certainly a previous one, we removed some of that advantage.

Now I fully recognize that there would be those who say that we should have rep by population, one vote for one person, but I think thinking people would agree that in a country as widely diversified and as wideflung as Canada, and then again within the province, as sparsely settled as some of our areas, that there certainly should be some recognition given to the rural area in the voting ratio, I would like to suggest that if the vote is lowered to 18 in Canada at large, this will give a greater advantage to the more densely populated areas - the urban centres - at the expense of the rural areas, and the same is relatively true in Manitoba because there will be more young people in this age group in the urban centres. And here again I think every member of this Assembly would be concerned about further reducing the influence of the rural areas.

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd.)

We find - and the latest figures I could get available were 1961 figures, that Canada in general - 69.6, so you can almost say 70 percent of the population is urban; 30.4 percent of the population is rural. Now I couldn't get the precise age breakdown. The breakdown was 15 to 19 years of age and 20 to 24, and that doesn't fit the particular resolution we have at hand, but I give these figures because they're relative and they can show the reason for my concern in what effect this would have on representation from rural and urban seats. We find that in all of Canada in the age groups 15 to 19, there are 1,432,559 young people in that age group. Of these, 938,534 are urban dwellers; 494,000-odd are rural in their domiciles.

Now I only singled out various provinces and I did it for no particular reason except that it illustrates, particularly from the point of one province and in an exaggerated manner what I'm trying to say. Ontario - all the people in the province - the total population is six million-odd. Of these, 4,823,529 live in urban centres and only 1,412,563 live rurally, so you see if we lower the voting age to 18 there is going to be a definite shift in voting power or authority in favour of the urban centres, which I think - certainly the members should consider very seriously. In our own Province of Manitoba, the population given in the DBS census figures of 1961 showed the total population to be 921,686, and of these, 588,807 were urban dwellers; 332,879 lived in the country.

Now in the 15 to 19-year old group, and again I want to emphasize that this isn't the exact group that we're considering, but these figures should be considered in relative terms and I think it will give you a good indication of what I'm trying to convey. In Manitoba in the 15 to 19 year-old group, 42,000 of these young people are urban dwellers; 28,784 are rural. Now in B. C. - this is the province that exaggerates and maybe places the emphasis on the argument - the total population of British Columbia, 1,629,082. Here we find, of the total population, 1,181,925 people live in urban centres and only 447,157 dwell rurally. Now in the 15 to 19-year old group in B. C., 78,835 of these young people live in urban centres and 33,818 dwell in the country.

So I think, Madam Speaker, that members should see from at least this one point of argument that there is a bit more concerned than just simply the giving of the voting franchise to younger people, and like in so many things, when you change one factor you upset two or three other important factors in a total over-all problem. I think that this should be borne in mind by members of the Legislature and they should ask themselves if they want to further reduce this rural vote in the province - and the western vote you might say in the rest of Canada - and give the advantage to the more densely populated eastern provinces of Upper and Lower Canada. I think this is something that probably the proposer of this resolution never considered, and I feel this is something that should be considered in a discussion of this type.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MRS. MORRISON: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Lakeside. The Honourable the Member for Burrows.

MR. GUTTORMSON: May we have this matter stand. If anyone else wishes to speak, Madam Speaker, we have no objection.

MADAM SPEAKER: Anyone wishing to speak?

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: May we have this matter stand please.

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

MR. JOHNSTON: May we have this matter stand please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. John's. The Honourable the Member for Roblin.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Madam Speaker, I hope the member for St. John's won't be surprised to find a great deal of unanimity with his resolution because I find a great deal of merit in it. The statutes, as far as the standards and regulations and controls of professional groups, is one that is necessary and vital in the interest of the public and in the protection of the public, but I know it is one area which I, as a layman, have a great deal of

(MR. ALEXANDER cont'd.) . . . . difficulty handling. Life today, Madam Speaker, is becoming more complex, where we're getting into an age of specialists, and coming on top of this we have a proliferation of specialists, and all these people today, Madam Speaker, seem to be seeking professional status. This then proposes a real problem for Legislatures; it proposes a real problem for us who are laymen to try and legislate in this area; and I think, in view of that, that there is a great deal of merit in the resolution and I would urge all members to support it.

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

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

MR. GUTTORMSON: Can we have this matter stand please.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 43. The Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Can we have this matter stand please.

MADAM SPEAKER: The second reading of Bill No. 45. The Honourable the Member for Swan River.

MR. RICHARD SEABORN (Wellington): Can we have it stand, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 63. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. WRIGHT: May we have this matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading on Bill No. 64. The Honourable the Member for La Verendrye.

MR. VIELFAURE: Madam Speaker, the bill before us asks to permit the French language as the language of teaching. It is not the first time that it is brought in this House and at this time I would like to congratulate both the members who spoke on it this year and made what I think is a very good presentation which is warranted by such a bill.

I have read these two speeches very carefully specially the one made by the Honourable Member from St. Vital, and I want to say that I did this not with the idea of punching holes in his speech or of trying to find points to argue, but rather to try and understand his reasons for not supporting this bill. And if I understand right, by reading his speech I find that on Page 958 his main concern is that he is of the opinion that if this bill was passed the French people of this province would use it exclusively and would produce people that would speak only French. And in the first paragraph of Page 958 he says, "As I have said, even if it's at the expense of restricting the future of these French Canadian children who are going to under his proposal be brought up and educated solely in a French language and French cultural background." In the third paragraph, "If we 40 boys had graduated from a school in a predominantly French Canadian community in this province, where the teaching was entirely in the French language . . . ." and then further on in the third paragraph, "This is because I think that they refuse to recognize that you cannot in an area so large as North America expect equal opportunities to those who insist that we create small islands of non-English-speaking people in little corners of this province where opportunities are limited because of language handicaps."

I am of the impression that the member thinks that we who are in favour of this bill would want the French language to be taught exclusively to our children. Well certainly this is not our intention and I can use myself as an example. I certainly would not want my children to speak French only in the Province of Manitoba or anywhere in Canada for that matter. I am too proud of the fact that I can express myself in both French and English and that I can address my English-speaking friends in English and my French-speaking friends in French, that I would want to deprive my children of the same privilege.

And certainly this is not the intention of the bill. The acceptance of the principle of this bill would be to allow those who want to learn the French language to have the chance to do so under the existing public school system, and certainly not restrict it to only to French people, and by the same token not force it on anyone who doesn't want to learn it. I think the experience we had in this House a little earlier in the Session when the Honourable Member from St. Boniface in a speech in here pointed out that he did not think that it was right that the situation existing in Windsor Park at that time was the right one, that it should be permissible to anyone who wanted to, not only those who were French speaking. And there again, it was a matter of good understanding I think on the part of the Minister and the Honourable Member of St. Boniface and many others that this was changed to include people not only who are of French

(MR. VIELFAURE cont'd.) . . . . mentality, or call it whatever you like, but people who want to learn the French language.

I am sure that I represent the idea of most French-speaking people when I say that I would not want my children to learn French only; definitely in the Province of Manitoba, this is not possible. However, this is a matter I think that is more national than provincial in a way and we have to consider the facts that in Canada there are nine provinces one of which is 90 percent French-speaking and which comprises right now about a little more than a quarter of Canada. And this is one of the reasons why I for one, think that it is important for those who want to learn French -- and again may I stress that I am not of the opinion that we should force it -- by trying to do this, to force it we would just create more trouble -- but those who want to should be provided the opportunity of learning the language.

Another point that I would like to bring up is, the members of this House might be surprised when I say this, but there is right now quite a drain from people in Manitoba here who are moving outside of this province and mainly to Quebec because of the fact that in their opinion there is not the opportunity here in this province to learn the French language as well as they would like their children to. I - no longer than last week for example, I met a friend of mine who was asking me about this bill - and my friends in this House would be very surprised to know the gentleman's name - but who told me privately that within two years if there was no change he intended to move to Quebec. And I said, "Why would you want to do that." "Well," he says, "I am proud of the fact that I can speak both French and English. I want my children to learn both and I can't see how they will learn French properly in Manitoba." And this was one of the reasons why he thought he would move. I'm not saying this to force anything, but stating this as an example.

Now again, speaking about this bill, I would be the first one to be against compulsion on this subject. I would just ask the members of this House to recognize the principle and leave it up to the Minister to apply this in a way that would not aggravate anybody and would be only for those who want to. Certainly now we have many large schools where a certain percentage of the children there would like to learn French and I'm sure after some discussion and understanding it would be possible to have some classes where French would be the language of teaching for certain subjects. This would be just like children taking one course instead of another.

For example, let's take social studies - that certain group who again in a large school would want to learn French could take for example social studies in the French language. They would be in my opinion learning the same thing as their counterparts would be learning in the English language and would be serving two purposes at the same time by learning to speak French and by learning the same subjects. Because let's face it, it is impossible in my estimation to learn another language if you do not hear certain matters discussed in this particular language. Just learning phrases and words - *fermez la porte*, *comment allez-vous* and so on - is practically impossible to develop the conversational French. On the other hand, I think if certain subjects were being taught in the language, the pupils that are learning would learn to develop the subject in the language.

Another point that I would like to make in my opinion is that such a move would certainly help create unity in this country and develop a point where I think we would develop a better understanding of one another. My experience on this subject is that most of the criticism in most times has been by people who have not treated the particular subject together. For example, take the exchange groups that have been going on between Quebec and the rest of Canada. I think they've done an enormous amount of good. There has been student exchange groups; there have been business exchange groups lately; and there has been the municipal people exchange groups. Every time when I had a chance of asking these people their opinion, and I like to do that as I said before, because of the fact that I can speak French and English, I personally enjoy very much meeting friends who speak either. When I go to Quebec I like to think that this puts you in a preferred position to judge both sides, and there also, like here, you find a lot of French-speaking people who are very very interested in learning the English language and it's vice versa.

For example, lately I was asking some of the people who were down on the municipal people exchange and I don't think they -- I see the Minister of Municipal Affairs is not here today, but I don't think there's anything wrong in stating something he said to me in a personal conversation. I was asking him his impression of his trip and he said he was very pleased with it. I was also asking him what the general reaction was of the people that were on the trip with

(MR. VIELFAURE cont'd.) . . . . him, and he was saying to me that many of them had told him, "My gosh we never realized, we thought these people were just a bunch of separatists down there, and after spending a week or so with them, we find that they're no different than us." Well this is a matter of getting together and discussing these different subjects together and I think this is very very good.

Now as I said again, and I want to make sure that I do not create the wrong impression here, I asked the members of this House to consider this seriously, not just to stand up and say "No." I would ask him to consider this bill, get all the information he can, discuss it with whoever wants to, and give it some serious consideration. And again may I repeat that it is just like the Honourable Member from St. Boniface said when introducing it, it is not a matter that we want to force this but just to give those who want to learn the French language an opportunity to do so, because as far as I am concerned, if we want to be continuous in this we will have to do something more than is being done now.

I would even suggest that - again where it is wanted - for example if the principle of this bill was introduced where certain people want their children to learn French, that in certain kindergartens for example where a certain group would be big enough to warrant that their children could learn French in kindergartens, again only if they want, that this would have them ready for their courses of Francais un and Francais Deux, and if the principle was ever recognized or ever introduced that later they could learn certain subjects in the French language, I don't think that this would harm our school system in any way or would create problems. On the other hand, it would be very beneficial to whoever would participate.

Now in closing I would just like -- I should have explained this before -- I don't think we're too far apart on this subject - I really don't - and as I read from the speech from my honourable friend the member from St. Vital, and again I want to congratulate him on a very good presentation, and before I close I would like to read the last - not the last two but two paragraphs in his speech which I think shows that between his thinking and my thinking we're not that far apart, because as far as I'm concerned, if I didn't say that I was reading from his speech there would be very few that would say it was anybody else but I that said it, and I'll just read here on Page 959 of Hansard. "Madam Speaker," - and I'm quoting from the Honourable Member from St. Vital - "Madam Speaker, the honourable member closed his remarks with a brief reference to the situation in Windsor Park School which the Minister dealt with yesterday, and I would close with just a very few remarks on the same situation. I say that the School Board and the French teachers in the proposed school in Windsor Park have an opportunity that no other school division in this province has, to show what can be done in helping people who are interested to become bilingual and to help solve some of these French-English problems which we have been reading so much about lately. They have this opportunity to open up the doors of their new school when it's built to those young children of non-French background whose parents are willing to send them to this school to learn the French language and to graduate from Grade 11, perhaps completely bilingual.

"So the opportunity is there for the School Board and the teachers in St. Boniface to show what can be done in cementing the good relations that should exist between peoples of two languages and two cultures living closely together in a small community. And I do hope, Madam Speaker, that some members of the St. Boniface School Board will grasp at this opportunity and will show us the leadership that they only at the moment are capable of showing, to help solve this very difficult problem. There's no reason, Madam Speaker, why it cannot be done. There is no reason, in my opinion, why English-speaking boys and girls cannot be taken into a school such as the one that is being built in St. Boniface.

"In fact I'll go further than that, in my opinion there is no reason why English-speaking children couldn't be taken in and taught French, taught in the French language in this country, not only in the Province of Quebec, provided there was the will on the part of the French-speaking School Board and the French-speaking teachers to do it."

Well, Madam Speaker, I don't think that I differ too much from what my honourable friend said, and I would just close my remarks again by asking the members of this House to not just vote against this bill but give it some serious consideration, discuss it in a manner that is appropriate for this kind of legislation, and I am convinced that if we do that we can use this to promote the teaching in both languages in this province and I am sure this will only help to unite us all in this country.

MR. HARRIS: Madam la presidente, si vous regardez dans cette chambre vous voyez plusieurs personnes qui parle la belle langue Francaise.

(MR. HARRIS cont'd.) . .

Madam Speaker, if you look in this Chamber, you will see several persons who can speak in the beautiful French language. Now, Madam Speaker, I will say this. These few words I said, I'm ashamed to say I had to break them down in the hardest possible manner. I had to put them in phonetic words, but I got down to it and it just shows you that anybody can go ahead and speak French or any other language that they need to speak. Now I am bilingual myself, and when I say that I would just say a few words in my own language just to show you how beautiful it is to speak your own language.

Ffarwel e plwf Llangower a galon dyriondeg, Ffarwel fy anol cariad nid wyf ny enwy neb rwyn myd i wlad y saison a galon fel y plum e dancio flaen y dalyn ac e chari o flain y drom.

TRANSLATION: Farewell to the Parish of Llangower, I go with a broken heart. Farewell my beloved, I don't blame anyone. I go to the land of the Saxon with a heart that is heavy, to dance to the tune of the harp and play the drum.

So you see when you phrase your own language, it sounds so beautiful.

Now, Madam Speaker, not many Canadians - - I was disturbed recently by a report from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics which shows that the percentage of our population that speaks both English and French have hardly changed in the last 30 years. At least that was the case at the time of the 1961 census. It may have changed a little since then. There are some more facts which should bother English-speaking Canadians. About three quarters of the bilingual people in Canada are of French origin. While about four percent of the English-speaking Canadians can also speak French, 30 percent of the French-speaking Canadians can also speak English. It seems clear that if our two founding races are ever going to understand each other, then the people like us who live in English-speaking provinces will have to make a real effort to understand French.

The will to make the rapport, the effort, now seems to be there. The Federal Government and some provincial governments are trying to get people to learn and use French. Many businesses and social organizations have made strong statements about the need to be able to speak in the two official languages. The idea of bonuses for bilingual civil servants has been suggested. Some governments and private industry are encouraging their workers to learn French - sometimes - sometimes during working hours, but there's still a gap between the will to do it and the way to do it.

Now, can we close that gap? We must begin with our children. Doctor Wilder Penfield, Canadian specialist in work with the brain, has shown that very young children can easily learn to speak two or three languages at the same time. At this age, the brain is better able to take new sounds. Dr. Penfield has also shown that even if the child just hears the sound of another language, then the child has a real head start when he later begins to study the language. It seems to me by this that in English-speaking areas French should be easily available, an optional subject from kindergarten on, and that the same policy should apply for English and French-speaking areas.

It is just as clear though that it will take quite a few years to train the number of teachers that the program should need, and Canada cannot afford to wait that long. I think that it is time that this province made a full study of the use of special aids in the teaching of French. Television could very well be used in the teaching of French. Maybe if the children learnt useful ways from television there would not be so much noise about violence in cowboy movies shown in the evenings. Television, records, tapes and films must be our stop-gap to teachers. The goal of this province and the whole country should be to build the kind of country in which a person could travel anywhere and make himself understood in either English or French. If it is not possible to do this by regular teaching methods, we must use new and different teaching methods. We want to gain real understanding between the French and English in the second century of Canadian history. We won't make these gains unless we venture to use new methods.

Now I have not struck very closely to the topic of this bill, but I think it is clear that the things I say should be done, cannot really be done in Manitoba unless this bill is passed. I think that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface was right in not introducing religion into his bill. All he wants is that Manitobans of French origin should have the same rights as English Manitobans.

One further thing about the bill. We should make it clear that no one will be compelled to get instruction that they are not familiar with, that is no English-speaking Canadian should be forced to have his subjects taught to him in French and vice versa. Thank you very much.



March 29, 1966

1391

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could ask my honourable friend the question as to whether, in case the Hansard staff should have some difficulty with one part of his speech, would he be willing to assist them.

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. EVANS: Do you want to call it 5:30, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: It is now 5:30 and I leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock this evening.