

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2: 30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 22, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to introduce our young guests. We have 40 students of Grade 7 and 8 standing of the Varennes School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Barry Stattleman and Miss Franzmann. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Youth and Education.

We also have with us today 90 students of Grade 8 standing from the Beliveau School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Pitcairn, Mr. Katz and Mrs. Ragher. This school is located in the constituency of the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Agriculture.

HON. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Minister of Agriculture) (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, could I have leave of the House to withdraw this Bill?

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed) Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, if I may address a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. I'm informed that he has been approached to give approval, or otherwise, to the use by the police in Manitoba of a chemical defensive spray. It's apparently manufactured or distributed by Avco Protective System. Has he formed and/or given an opinion as to whether or not same shall be used or may be used by the law enforcement officers?

HON. STERLING R. LYON Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'm not personally aware of the matter but I'll take notice of the question and see what information we can get.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. Is he maintaining contact with the Manpower Department with respect to employment of university students for the summer months?

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Youth and Education) (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, we have direct dealings with Manpower on a very very regular basis, pretty well daily, and the summer job situation at the university is one that we do check on, but it's not the one which we're usually dealing with them on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Government Services. I wonder if she could inform the House now whether or not the option on the Macdonald Airport has been taken, or whether or not the Macdonald Airport property has in fact been leased or sold?

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Government Services) (Cypress): Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to report to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the House Leader. When discussing Bill No. 15, the South Indian Lake Bill, the other night I made a suggestion that we should call the Public Utilities Committee and proceed now so there would be no delay in having a discussion of the issues involved, and then deal with the Bill at a later date. Could he indicate whether or not the government intends to call the Public Utilities Committee immediately?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the government intends some time during the course of the Session to call the Public Utilities Bill. I understand Bill No. 15 is consigned indeed to that

April 22, 1969

(MR. LYON cont'd) . . . . Committee, after second reading. I, however, do not have the conduct of the bill and I presume that when the Minister is summing up second reading of the Bill, closing the debate, he will comment on my honourable friend's suggestion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question on this matter. Could we not have though the intentions of the government. Whether or not it intends to proceed with second reading or whether its prepared to call Public Utilities Committee before that, so that we will know when the Bill comes up, because once the Minister speaks he's closing the debate.

MR. LYON: So far as I am aware, Mr. Speaker, the government intends to proceed with the second reading of the bill and then have it consigned to the Public Utilities Committee.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE Q. C. (Selkirk): . . . the Attorney-General would give consideration to the advisability of referring this bill to Law Amendments instead of to Public Utilities. There are more members of the House on Law Amendments than there are on Public Utilities, and I am sure that a number of the members of this House who are not members of Public Utilities would like to be able to sit in at the public hearings.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, just commenting on this point of procedure. I believe that the Minister felt that it was more proper to refer it to Public Utilities because it was at that Committee that of course Manitoba Hydro would be called - as it is called annually to answer any and all questions concerning its operation. One facet of its operation certainly would be the South Indian Lake matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Since the government has now announced that it has changed its policy in regard to tuition fees for the special summer session of Education I, and some students may have already dropped out of that program - I've heard rumours to that effect - I wonder if the Minister could investigate and find out whether in fact any students in the last few weeks have quit that course as a result of the announcement that they would have to pay tuition fees. Could you look into that question?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge the students - I don't think any of them were informed by the university until last Friday.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. There was an announcement on April 1st that may have gotten through to some of them and some may have dropped out even in the last few days since the course is limited. Could you investigate and find out were there any people who have dropped out recently as a result of that announced intention. Could you look into that question to see whether they can get back in - if there were any?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the First Minister. In view of the serious amounts of flood damage caused to farmers and townsmen, not only in Western Manitoba but along the Assiniboine River and other isolated places, would he be willing to indicate at this time that the Government of Manitoba is prepared to enter into a flood compensation program as has been carried out in previous years in the Red River Valley?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, the impact of the situation is being considered. I'm sure at the present time, and that when all of the information is available why the policy of the government will be announced at that time. I think it's reasonable to determine that there will be some policy in this direction.

MR. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I take it then, by the indication just given, that compensation will not be based on the numbers of people affected but on the fact that some people are affected?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, it's the privilege of the Honourable Member for Portage to take my statement any way he sees fit.

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

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Dr. Shaw, speaking to a rotary club recently said that the facilities at the old Grace Hospital were closed and that four wards of Deer Lodge were closed. In view of the bed shortage that we have in Winnipeg, is the government taking any steps to use the facilities that are now closed so that the bed shortage which exists now can be eased?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Social Services) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker,

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) . . . . It's one of the problems facing the Commission, namely that the number of acute beds per thousand are within the national average. Certainly the Commission advised me they've had many many meetings with the Grace Hospital Board determining the future of the present facility, and also in connection with Deer Lodge they're still working with the Federal Government on the takeover. Apparently quite a bit of renovation is required to make economic use of the beds that would be freed at the Deer Lodge, and also negotiations concerning keeping a certain number of those beds free for veterans. But no formal takeover has occurred at this time. The University of Manitoba's involved, the Hospital Commission and D. V. A. in connection with Deer Lodge. With Grace it's a continuing study. That's all the comment I would have to say at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health and Social Services. Could the Minister inform us how many Czechoslovakian doctors there are in Manitoba and what the government is doing to assist them in working in the Manitoba medical scheme?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge off hand how many Czechoslovakian doctors are in Canada, but I know that my Deputy Minister advises me that the profession and the Winnipeg Medical Society themselves are most interested in these people - these physicians. As you know, it's a requirement of practice of medicine in Manitoba that the licentiate medical council of Canada examinations are passed, and I believe the profession are trying to give every assistance to these gentlemen in establishing themselves in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. DOERN: A supplementary question. In view of certain problems that these people have, is the medical profession or the government making any concessions to them? Or do they simply have to take the exams like anybody else?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I know that they can receive internship or appointment in our teaching hospitals and through there and other means learn the English language and be in a position to write the required examinations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services. Is there an office in Manitoba which provides free drug analysis to the people of Manitoba, an office to which one could take a sample of a pill of an unknown quantity and have it analyzed at no charge? And if there is one could the Minister outline the procedure to be followed or where to turn to for such information?

MR. JOHNSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe the Federal Government under the food and drug administration have the main responsibility for the policing of drugs. You mean the analysis of an individual specimen? This I would have to check into. I'm not just going to say anything on my feet without looking at that further, but the food and drug administration do survey and analyze all drugs that are sold on the market. But a particular drug, I think there are ways and means of finding out what's in it if someone doesn't know.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Government Services. When will we receive the report of the study or committee on operative productivity?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Finance) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I think it's a mistake to refer to it as a report on operation productivity. I've already indicated to the House that there is no such report. I've indicated that at some time the government will be providing some information on the subject.

MR. DOERN: A supplementary question. Will we receive it before the end of the Session?

MR. EVANS: I'm not able to make any announcement at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to my honourable and respected friend, the Minister of Health. In consideration of the fact that everybody in the Province of Manitoba is now paying a premium for Medicare which includes chiropractic treatments or care by chiropractor, is it now possible for this group to use the services of the lab. and x-ray units in the province? - (1); and (2), is it possible at the request of a patient in a hospital for them to attend at the bedside?

MR. JOHNSON: Terms of services to be offered by the Corporation are being negotiated

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) . . . . by the Corporation with the chiropractors at this time. They at the present time do not use the public facilities - at this time.

MR. SHOEMAKER: A supplementary question. Did I understand my honourable friend to say that "at the moment" they could not use the services. They can or can't?

MR. JOHNSON: It has not been the practise to this date - no.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Then - at what future date does my honourable friend envisage that they will have this privilege?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, the nature of the services to be offered are under negotiation at the present time. As soon as I'm aware of what these will be I'll announce it to the House if it's sitting at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Education.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I indicated that I would examine some documentation presented by the Member for Portage la Prairie regarding the debris and flooding on the Assiniboine River. I've had a look at the documentation which he provided in the newspaper, and I must say that my original statement that his charges were unfounded and unwarranted must stand. I've had a look at this information and first of all, I'm not aware that the bridge which the picture is taken of is actually on the Assiniboine River. In fact it indicates here in the article that it's on a tributary to the Assiniboine on Highway 26. This is the main reason for the statement that I cannot change the original statement that the allegation is unfounded and unwarranted.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I have other pictures for the Minister if he'd care to look at them, and one is a picture of debris floating on the Assiniboine River near the Portage Diversion. Would he care to examine them and comment? I can obtain other pictures as well.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I will examine the honourable member's pictures if he so desires. I would point out to him that I've never seen a river yet that didn't carry a great amount of debris when it was in the flood stage.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

#### MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked that this matter stand over so that I just might say a word of introduction to this Order and perhaps the reasons for it.

We've already had a considerable debate over the question of bursaries and scholarships available to the students. The Minister and I have exchanged views which almost wind up being simply a dialogue, the Minister apparently denying that there wasn't adequate assistance to students in terms of bursaries and loans, and my position arguing that this was inadequate and I raised statistics to the Minister from various sources - D.B.S. statistics, statistics that were gathered by the university students' union - and presented them to him and the Minister did not appear, at least in my judgment, to take recognition of these statistics, so I am asking the government to dig in on their own and to see if we can have some fresh material.

I myself did some general checking, and although these figures are approximate, they do come from the Registrar's Department, but I would like them to be harder statistics and I would like to also see a breakdown. For example, it was estimated that from '66 to '67 roughly 500 students dropped out, in a sense of complete and total withdrawal, out of 12,000 students, and some 350 in '67-'68, and some 250 approximately in the last year, so although we have sort of general statistics we don't know the reasons for the dropout. I myself tend to think that a very major factor in dropouts and in people not even getting to university is the economic barrier. So for that reason I request that we have a look at these statistics and then maybe we will be able to carry on a more informed debate and I would suspect, convince the Minister that there is a need for more financial assistance.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, there are two Orders for Return standing in my name.

MR. SPEAKER: I see that now.

MR. SHOEMAKER: And I have them both on the desk to read. I'm expecting . . .

MR. SPEAKER: We'll deal with the first one then on Page 1.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the number of persons in the year 1968 who applied for technical and vocational institute courses...

MR. CHERNIACK: On a point of order. Hansard reveals that the motion was made and that Your Honour presented the motion and that then the Member for Burrows indicated that he wished to speak on the Order and that it stand over.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. I don't recall whether I indicated that I wanted to speak on this one. The other one, I think I made some gesture that I would not be speaking on it, but can I speak on this one, if I read it, because I did want to .....

MR. CHERNIACK: .... from this side Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: First of all, I would like to express my appreciation to the Honourable Member for St. John's for his alertness and it seems that the Honourable Member for Gladstone may proceed without any interruption.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, will I finish reading the... okay.

Well, Mr. Speaker, on this particular Order for Return the purpose of me putting the Order, or asking for the House to issue this Return, is simply this, that for many years it strikes me that there are altogether too many students barred from entering our technical schools, MIT, - we have one of the best in Canada - simply because of a lack of academic standing. I recall on so many occasions where Bobby Bend has said that he himself could see no reason, no good reason -- (Interjection) -- who is Bobby Bend my honourable friend wants to know?

MR. SPEAKER: I would appreciate it if the honourable gentleman would stay within the ...

MR. SHOEMAKER: I will if they will stop interjecting, but I would love to make a political speech on his behalf. --(Interjection)-- Okay, I'll see him later. Are you supporting him? Well, I'm getting lots of encouragement, Mr. Speaker, but I think I'd better get back to the subject at hand, namely the young people of the province. But Mr. Bend has said on so many occasions -- this has got nothing to do with the leadership that's about to -- Mr. Bend has said on so many occasions that he saw no good sound reason why a barber for instance should have to have a Grade 10 or 11 or 12 education, and therefore why insist on a student, why insist on a student that is contemplating entering a barber's course to have Grade 12 standing, or Grade 10 standing or Grade 11 standing - why, when all he wants to do for the rest of his life is make a good job cutting hair? My guess is that I will learn upon the receipt of this Order that there were a great number of persons who made applications and were rejected because of academic standing or space or any other reason.

Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that so many of our private schools, trade schools, still seem to thrive in competition to MIT? --(Interjection)-- My honourable friend has just said carpenters when they're entering the carpenter class at MIT they insist on having a Grade 12 education. Surely they don't. Well if they do, why I can see no sense in that either and these are some of the reasons that I will be delighted to receive the information that I'm asking for in this Order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, my first reaction to this Order for Return was to move an amendment to clarify or make more specific a certain point of information which I feel should be brought out. However, on rereading the Order for Return, it may well be that under (c) Other Reasons, those could be given that I'm seeking, and in particular they are these: One of the matters that concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is the lapse of time that students are forced into between leaving their academic course of training in a public school or a high school and the entering of a course, of a vocational course at the Manitoba Institute of Technology. I believe that the regulations do specify that to qualify for admission under the plan subsidized by the federal government a student or an applicant must show evidence of having been out of school and I believe unemployed for a certain period of time. I'm not quite certain about the latter but I am quite certain about the requirement "to have been out of school" for a period of time. In other words, to qualify for this type of assistance it is impossible for a student to leave a public school of instruction and go directly into the Manitoba Institute of Technology, into the division of it offering instruction of this type and qualify for assistance.

I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that if we're talking about technical and vocational institute

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . . courses in the broadest sense of the term, that it would also include schools such as the R. B. Russell School. Now there are some problems in enrolling students in there, I'm not quite sure whether the requirements as presently set out are in the best interests of the student. A student must have a certain minimum age requirement, must have experienced a certain degree of failure or lack of success in his academic program before he qualifies for admission to that school, and I would hope that that type of information or statistics relating to that type of information would be indicated in the Return to this Order.

The other two points that I'm concerned about, Mr. Speaker, is the number of students who were unable to take advantage of the courses offered at the Manitoba Institute of Technology even despite the financial assistance, because of their family commitments, family financial responsibilities and perhaps the place of residence of their family that may have made it difficult to the extent that it was impossible for them to enroll. I would like to know how many applicants fell into that category.

The other, I'm not sure whether the Institute of Technology would have this information, perhaps the University would, but I'm sure that you are aware, Mr. Speaker, that to qualify for the federal assistance that is presently offered the student must be enrolled at a school such as described in this Order for Return. In other words, if one were unemployed and wished to upgrade his skills, upgrade himself by means of a university education, then one does not qualify for the financial assistance that is offered and I am wondering how many, if any, applicants there were who had originally applied for a technical or vocational course and upon being interviewed by the Institute of Technology discovered that they could qualify for admission to university and elected to go there rather than to pursue a course of training such as described in this Order for Return. If there is a sizeable number of individuals of that type then I do believe that's all the more reason why pressure ought to be brought to bear on the federal authorities to extend a similar type of assistance as is being available here to those enrolled at university with a view to upgrading their skills.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think I mentioned the other day we would provide the information as far as it was available. I should add that that is for Institutes operated by the Province of Manitoba.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order for Return. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, this Order concerns the question of students who have received Canada Student Loan Plan loans or were turned down by the government for federal student loans. I think this is a very serious question because if you talk to university students you find out that there are quite a few who are graduating with very large debts. I've spoken to some people in the last few days and found out that several of them, 21 years old graduating from university this year, have \$4,000 debts. Some of these same people approached me in regard to this question I raised yesterday with the Minister concerning the fact that there was inadequate notice given to students who were registering on a summer program, people who were enrolling in education believing that there was no tuition fee being charged, suddenly being faced with the prospect of having to come up with a few hundred dollars in a couple of weeks. These people were in very serious financial difficulty and complained that they would now have to seek additional assistance, that they were at the breaking point financially, so that it is not uncommon to speak to students who are fortunate enough in receiving these loans and who owe vast amounts of money. Although it's desirable that they should be able to get loans, I think it's a very serious thing for a young person 21 years old to graduate with a sizeable debt because it will take years to repay. I think some people might be fortunate in repaying in two years, but I think five to ten years is going to be more realistic.

I'm also interested in this Order for Return because Canada Student Loans are not available to certain groups of students. For example, the very people who are registering in this summer school program in education, or any other student as I understand it, who takes a summer course, is not eligible to receive not only a loan from the federal government but is not eligible for any provincial loan. And if you consider that again students are taking this course, this 12-week education course, many of them with sizeable debts; they're not going to be able to work during the summer which they normally did, they're not eligible for a loan, they are in serious difficulty. Also, students at the Adult Education Centre - every year their enrollment is going up, they're now I think up to 400, going up to 500 and projected

(MR. DOERN cont'd) . . . . to 600 - they are not eligible for this type of a loan, they're not eligible for Manpower assistance; these people are in trouble. I mentioned this to the Minister and he did not react in any visible means to taking any action in that area.

I might point out that on this very point there was a representative from Toronto, the National Director of the Canadian Association for Adult Education who attended a conference at MIT and MIAA just the other day, written up in yesterday's paper, who pointed out that students in Adult Education were not eligible for loans or for Manpower assistance. So I think that by receiving some information here we can get into this whole area, find out who is receiving the loans, how much the amount is, how much students owe, and in particular what the needs of university students are. I think with that information it points up to the obvious answer and that is that there is a desperate need for more provincial assistance to students and that relative to other provinces Manitoba is lagging behind. So I look forward to seeing the results of this Order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: The last speaker referred to the very large loans that some students are carrying. I must say that those students who have come to see me have not really been complaining about the size of their loans. Obviously if they could have had the funds on a free basis they would have preferred it, but in most cases those who approached me were really quite appreciative of the loans that they've had. They recognize that their earning ability was going to be substantially enhanced and were prepared to take this risk.

The complaints that I have had is that in the past year, there appeared to be a restriction on the loan and that many of the students who had previously had higher amounts of loan in each year found themselves cut down in the last year apparently and much tougher circumstances. Now when this was coupled with the fact that summer employment was very much more difficult last year and that the indications are that this year it will be very difficult again, I think the important thing is to make sure that we do not leave students in the position that they have entered into a course and then find themselves half way through with insufficient financial assistance to carry it to its conclusion. This would be disastrous indeed if we left them in a position where they had established a reasonable degree of debt and then were unable to complete their course and get their degree to put them in a position to repay this.

So I would hope that the information which we will be getting from the Minister will put us in a position to assess whether or not we are not in fact at this stage restricting when because of employment conditions it should be the reverse that we be doing, we permit students who are showing the capacity and who want to proceed to get the loans to in fact be able to get additional loans rather than a restriction. This has certainly been the complaint that came to me and it came from a number of students. In fact I was in touch with the Department on a number of occasions on some specific cases where it seemed to me that there was in fact hardship and the possibility that a student would be denied continuing his education.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, on these points that are being made here I would point out that first of all the upper amount in the loan fund is set by what we can draw from the Federal Government on a per capita basis. I don't have the exact figures at hand but it's of the order of \$3 1/2 million in the last year and I think there were about 4,000 people that were awarded loans under the scheme. With regards to the Order, I mentioned yesterday that I wasn't just quite clear on what the honourable member meant in the (f) section of it, in that it's a little difficult to assess what is required in parental contribution over and above that he receives through the loan. That part -- (f) part will be awkward. Other than that we'll attempt to get the information required.

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

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is agreement in the House that we would proceed now to the Bills on Page 15, the five bills appearing at the bottom of Page 15.

#### SECOND READING - PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Commencing with Bill 34. The Attorney-General. Commencing with Bill 34?

MR. LYON: Bills 34, 43, 30, 35 and 46, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): I adjourned this debate for my honourable friend the

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, there is a few questions we'd like clarified in this bill - really one major one. It's a bill making possible the Town of Morden to enlarge the town by the addition of some land adjacent to Morden. I wonder if the mover of this, or the introducer of this bill, the Honourable Member for Pembina, could tell us why this bill calls for the requirement that Morden, the Town of Morden, pay to the Rural Municipality of Stanley a sum to cover the equivalent of tax arrears which may be outstanding on the lands to be acquired by Morden. I can understand that the tax arrears become payable to Morden, and this is quite in order, but it seems to me that Morden should simply undertake to repay to the R. M. of Stanley the money if and when Morden receives it. I can't see why Morden should be required to pay out monies in advance of the monies being paid to the town itself. So I'm wondering whether the Member for Pembina could clear this matter up either when she closes debate or perhaps in Municipal Affairs Committee when it's being dealt with there. Of course it's possible that there are no lands on which there are arrears of taxes, I don't know. But in the event that there are I question why Morden should have to come up with ready cash to turn to the R. M. of Stanley and then simply have to wait perhaps for years to recover and maybe never to recover because the lands may simply go to tax sale. So with that one question we're prepared to let the bill go to Municipal Affairs.

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

MRS. CAROLYNE MORRISON (Pembina): I thank the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks for his interest in this bill and I can tell him that with regard to the matter he referred to, the amount of taxes involved is a very small sum, just \$860.70 to be exact, and the town wished to have this little matter cleared up and have a clean slate. I would say again, Mr. Speaker, that I think this bill is a very clear cut bill. Everybody involved is anxious to have it passed and I would hope the members would give it their support.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a question from the Honourable Member for Pembina. I believe in her introduction of the bill she mentioned that there had been agreement negotiations between the town and the municipality, did she not?

MRS. MORRISON: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill 43. The Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Services.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this occasion I'm aware of the tremendous interest and concern of every member of this House in the bill that is before us and I will try and present a point of view toward the matter being recommended -- or the bill which has been brought in by the Honourable Member for Selkirk. He has spoken eloquently on this in years past and again this year and certainly every time he makes a contribution to the House I know it is well thought out and said with conviction and real concern. However, Section 131 of The Child Welfare Act is concerned with the religion of a child to be placed for adoption and over the past several years, as we've said, it has been recommended that this be repealed on the assumption that the religion of the natural parent or parents acts as a deterrent in the placement of children for adoption. Now our experience does not support the assumption. The child's need for a suitable permanent home is of course paramount, but the natural parents' wishes concerning religion are respected insofar as possible even when the child has been relinquished by the parents with no preference to religion.

In the fiscal year 1967-1968, 607 decrees of absolute adoption were granted. It may be interesting for the House to know that of this 607, 260 were surrendered by the parent or parents for adoption placement with no preference as to religion. This left the Department and our delegated Children's Aid Societies to place these children into the most suitable homes. Even in this group the majority of children were placed in adopted homes of the same religion as the child. Three hundred and forty-seven of the children were surrendered for adoption with specific preference by the parents, parent or parents, that the child be placed in an adopted home of the same religion as the child. Of this number it was possible to place 307 children with adopted parents of the same religion as the child. In 40 cases this was not possible and it was necessary for the Department and our delegated agencies to apply to the courts under Subsection 4 of Section 131 of The Act. After a reasonable time and intensive efforts to place the child in a home of the same religion as the child we can apply to the court for permission to place the child in a home of any or no religion. The court does not change



(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) . . . . the religion of the child, it simply declares that the child has no religion and clears the way for placement of the child into a home of any religion or no religion. Section 131 as it now stands has been reviewed many times with various religious groups. It is fully accepted by them and supported by them. Our problem in adoption placement is not the religion of the child. Our major problem is the adopted placement of children with physical and mental impairment and particularly children of mixed race.

At this point I would like to direct my remarks to some of the specific points made by the Honourable Member for Selkirk in his address. In his opening statement the member notes the need to restore to The Child Welfare Act its main purpose, the welfare of children. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that the present Act, including Section 131, has as its paramount purpose the welfare of children. I know that we're all concerned and our total concern should be for the child and the Honourable member quoted that -- I quote him: "I don't believe any government should enact legislation which favours one religion against another." I don't believe as it's presently written The Child Welfare Act does favour one religion over another in the administration of the Act. Our Department delegated agencies do not show preference for one religion over another. I don't know if we have any evidence -- it hasn't been brought to my attention -- that difficulties in adoption placement are presently being encountered because of the child's religion or no religion. The Honourable Member for Selkirk said, "I am of the sincere conviction and belief that a child has no religion, that religion should not be made a predetermining factor in the adoption of a child and that the sole and only consideration should be the welfare of the child."

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that members of this House would agree that there are two schools of thought in this issue. One school of thought states that since the natural parent or parents of a child relinquish total rights of guardianship they also relinquish the right to give the child a religion. I think this is one school. This appears to be a very logical school of thought. The second school of thought notes that there are many unmarried mothers who regardless of the reasons or circumstances for having a child out of wedlock, have very strong convictions about the religious upbringing of the child. They express a very real need to at least give something to their offspring. The present law permits the mother to at least give the child her religion. We believe it is important to try and meet this need as far as possible. The statistics I quoted earlier have already indicated how this operates and how this is done in practice.

I would also point out relative to this second school of thought that our Department is frequently faced with the task of removing a neglected child from its home and taking permanent guardianship and being faced with the problem of placing the child into an adopted home. In many instances these children are six, eight, ten years of age and may have been brought up in a particular religious faith, be it Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Buddhist. I think members would agree that in these situations we should do everything we possibly can to place these children in an adopted home that is of the same religious faith as the child. It would be I think unrealistic to state that these children have no religion. This is a practical matter. To repeal Section 131 of The Welfare Act the net result would be that children available for adoption placement have no religion, in that broad overall sense. I think we have to say to our community we do have some concern about the religion of the child, religion of the adopted parents, the importance of religious upbringing regardless of the religious faith. I think religion is an important factor in the family and I know we all believe this. I don't want to construe anything in the wrong sense there, I just say these are the schools of thought and they're well held by both sides.

The Member from Selkirk suggested the child's welfare will be adequately protected if the social worker responsible for that child's placement sincerely and conscientiously carries out the trust imposed, and if that trust is so discharged we will have no cause to worry in respect of the spiritual or material well-being of that child. I would agree with the Member from Selkirk, that our staff and the staff of our delegated agencies, children's aid societies, carry out their responsibilities sincerely and conscientiously I believe in every single case. However, I have discussed with many of our senior people who have spent years in the adoptive field - our present Director of Welfare was an authority on adoption, and was formerly head of that division in the Province of Alberta - I've spoken to other people in the field and still feel that it's better as we have it in our Act to have the courts decide, or the Judge decide on the matter when placement can't be made rather than the Director or the Minister.

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd)

I believe that the Member from Selkirk also said, "I do submit that we must do everything in our power to see that these children are eventually placed in good foster homes and the best way to achieve that objective is to remove from our adoption laws all artificial and arbitrary restrictions." This would imply that the religion of the child may act as a handicap and a deterrent to the most suitable placement of that child. Now all the evidence that has been provided to me indicates that the difficulties in finding a suitable adoptive placement are the matters I mentioned earlier, namely, physical or mental impairment and mixed race. I think the House should know that there are many infants and older children that are wards of the government or the society that are waiting adoption but cannot be placed because they are of Indian ancestry or mixed race. In recognition of this problem, our Department has deliberately gone out to the community to seek their help in resolving this problem. We have in our community an organization called the Open Door Society whose sole objective is to interest couples in adopting the mixed race child. The organization is made up of adoptive couples who have successfully adopted mixed race children and are prepared to share their experience, their happiness and their success with these children with other prospective adopting parents.

I don't really believe myself that our present legislation as amended in 1961 and again in 1963 and which is on our Statute Books, deprives a child of suitable adoption placement. Our problem in adoption is not so much the religion of the child but the attitude of our society towards certain mixed race children. This has been our practical difficulty - not the religion. In my research, I think if I could put it carefully, the gut issue here that the Honourable Member for Selkirk has brought forward once again -- and I know his sincerity in this matter, and I know of his desire to do what is right for the child and remove all barriers -- but the basic point I think is should the mother or the parent of the child who gives up a child have the right to declare the religion of that child?

Now I turn to the Royal Commission on adoptions which was made up of three lawyers and the Honourable Judge Patterson as Chairman, when they reviewed The Child Welfare Act of that province with respect to the religious factor in adoption. It might be interesting if I could read this into the record to point out the results of that Commission's work. They said here, and I'm taking a page about to read: "Different provinces have approached the problem of the religious factor in legislation in different ways. In several recent Child Welfare Statutes there is no reference in the adoption provisions to the religion of either the parent or the child. This does not provide the full answer because the Judge might still consider religion a factor governing the exercise of his discretion". In all the cases that have come before our courts where the placement has not been found, there has been no difficulty. "In Manitoba, a 1961 amendment to child welfare legislation enabled a surrendering parent to state that she had no religious preference for her child. A 1963 amendment provides that if after a reasonable time a child for whom there is a stated religion has not been placed in a suitable home of such faith, an application can be made that the provision regarding religion be waived to permit placement with parents of a different religion. Apart from any other considerations the possibility of a new and further delay in the adoptive process because of a further court reference does not commend this procedure. However," they go on to say: "A very large number of persons making submissions to the Committee contended that religion as a factor in adoptive placements should not be considered at all. Under questioning it was clear that a number of these persons meant that they did not wish the religion of a child or a parent to form an actual barrier to adoption but they did not wish to rule out a statement as to parental preference. They were unanimous in favouring the opportunity for a parent to state that she has no religious preference." This is in our Act. "Various percentages were suggested as to the number of parents who would state a preference. The Manitoba experience as reported in 1964 is that about one-half of all surrendering mothers state they have no religious preference in the adoptive placement of their children. The result has been that the religious problem as such has been quite effectively resolved. The legislative changes have however failed to resolve the problem of mixed race placements. Briefs submitted by Roman Catholic and Jewish organizations both through clerical and lay representation stress the position of these organizations that children of these faiths should be placed with parents of the same faith. Protestant clergymen of several denominations at the hearings were questioned as to whether they would think it desirable that a Protestant

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) . . . . mother surrendering a child should be able to state a denominational preference. They emphasized that they would not wish a statement of religious preference to operate as a barrier or even as a deterrent to adoptive placement, but with this reservation they thought it would be desirable that a Protestant mother be able to state a denominational preference. The members of the Committee are of the opinion that the principle of religious preference of surrendering parents should be recognized. If there were no other reason for its recognition, one compelling argument should settle the issue. Undoubtedly many mothers who would be best advised to surrender their children would keep them if they could not state a religious preference for them." I think this was a significant document after much study and for the interest of the members of the House, the Alberta Act - it's a little better written than ours, I'll have to admit. We'll have to look at it in the coming year - but basically wrote these principles into that legislation.

So I do want to say that while the law doesn't say how long we should try to place a child, the practise of the societies and the department, as I am advised, is to give a target of four to five months, and certainly within a year. And as I say, to remove the whole section we might have I would suggest, difficulties by many groups in our community who would want to be assured that there would be no abuse, that in fact societies and the department and all those placing children -- as it's written now there is the requirement where the person states that they want their child adopted in a certain faith if possible -- it does give direction to our groups to try and place these children in certain homes of certain religious denomination.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would again, before I sit down, commend the Member for Selkirk for his contribution again this year and to tell him that in voting against his resolution I nonetheless feel that there is probably no more important work that we do in the Welfare field in a rehabilitative and preventative sense, than that of concerning ourselves with the welfare of our children.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, if I might just add a word to this debate. My feeling as I listened to the Honourable Minister was that while he was favouring the retention of some mention of religious preference, that he would not be wholly opposed to the deletion or the repeal of this particular section, and this is what I would wish to address myself to.

I had the experience on one occasion - I think only one - in which a worker from the Child Welfare Society called me and said that application had been made for adoption of a child by parents or prospective parents who gave their religious denomination as Unitarian. And she asked me, she said: "Is the Unitarian Church a Christian Church?" - indicating to me that if I were to say it was not that the prospective parents would not be able to adopt this child. I referred her question to the Director of Welfare and he took it in hand and completed the arrangements that were necessary. This is one instance in which religion would have stood in the way of the adoption of a child; and I feel that this one instance need not be the only one. Some changes have, I believe, been made in the Act since that time. The Minister refers to the change in 1963 and I think he said 1966, which may relieve the situation somewhat. But if there's any inclination to retain a religious difference, then it isn't a case -- as far as I'm concerned, if they wish to retain it, this is up to them -- it isn't a case of having too much or making too great a demand, but not of making enough. If there is to be some religious differentiation reference is made to Roman Catholic and to Protestant. Now as we all know there are more different Protestant denominations than I think we could really count if we were to begin to run down the list. The most prominent among them of course are those that we are all aware of: Baptists and Lutherans and Anglicans, Presbyterians, United Church and there are groups such as Seventh Day Adventists and Jehovah's Witnesses, and I might add Unitarian. If a child or the adoption of a child were to be held up because the religious preference were for one of these denominations then the adoption policy or program would be grounded, it would run aground and pretty well be wrecked - stalemated. Fortunately I don't believe that this thing happens, but theoretically it could. The mathematical chances are that it could. This is one reason why I would rise to support this bill, and support the honourable member's proposal of it.

We know that every religion teaches very much the same thing. There are theological differences but ethically and morally they are all pretty much alike. Every religion teaches love, teaches ethical living, teaches kindness, peace, morality, truth, sympathy, charity,

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd) . . . . understanding, magnanimity, justice and so on down the line. The main differences are our theological interpretations of some basic or fundamental religious teachings. I feel that in this time in which we live where increasing co-operation is beginning to make itself felt among churches where ecumenicalism and co-operation between faiths - not only Christian faiths, but Christian and non-Christian, Roman Catholic and Protestant - is on the increase, where none claims to be completely right in its religious teachings and observances, although none professes to be completely wrong. They are all partly, at least partly right, and they all teach the same principles which are common to them all. And if this commonality could be the determining factor in the adoption, or non-adoption of a child, then we would be going about as far as we would have right or authority to go.

How can we bind a small child within the narrow and narrowing limits of some faith that wishes to stand off by itself and alone without relation to other religions? I feel that if we are discussing the welfare and the well-being of the child, that if an adoptive home is ready to receive this child and it passes all the usual qualifications or it has all the usual qualifications for being an adoptive home, then the child should go into that home without reference necessarily at all to the faith of the people who are going to adopt and to bring up, and to love and to care for this child that will be coming into their home and becoming part of their family.

If Section 131 stands in any way in the way of this being done, then I feel that it should be repealed and I support the Honourable Member from Selkirk in his endeavour to have it repealed.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. HILLHOUSE presented Bill No. 30, The Veterinary Medical Association of Manitoba Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker I'm bringing this in as a matter of courtesy to a fellow colleague - a member of the Manitoba Bar. The reason why this Bill is being introduced as a complete new bill is due to the fact that it became necessary to make certain amendments to the old Act, and in the process of making the amendments it became quite evident to the draftsmen that the best way to effect the changes that were desired and necessary was by rewriting the whole Act. This matter was discussed with the Minister of Agriculture on the 23rd of January, 1968.

Now the instructions that I have received from the solicitors of the Manitoba Veterinary Medical Association is this: That in considering the amendments the association was impelled to seek the revision of the Act due to the fact that the association is required by law, as other professional associations are, to police their own Act, not only against their own members but also against the public. And in considering the amendment that would be necessary to give effective policing they came to the conclusion that it would be much easier if they revised the whole Act. Now in revising the whole Act there were four things that they took into consideration. They wanted to give to the association greater control over its own members guilty of unprofessional conduct or malpractice. Secondly, they wanted to clarify the definition of veterinary science or veterinary medicine, and who may practise same, in order to protect the public and the association against unqualified practitioners. Thirdly, they wished to clarify some procedural aspects of the existing Act in order to facilitate the implementation of such procedures. And fourthly, to deal with the areas and problems which did not exist at the time that the existing Act was drafted and to give formal legal approval of some long-standing practices within the association which were technically in breach of the existing Act. Now reading the Act will show that they have tried to achieve these objects and on the question of suspending or expelling a member for malpractice or professional misconduct there is a right of appeal from the Association's decision to the Court of Queen's Bench, and that appeal will be a trial de novo.

I would urge the members to allow this matter to go to the Agricultural Committee at which time the members from the Association will be present and will be prepared to answer

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd) . . . . any questions that any member may have relative to the Act as proposed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I first indicate my complete confidence in the members of the Agricultural Committee on those matters which come within their orbit; but I would like to suggest at the outset that a bill such as this does not really fit properly into the work of the Agricultural Committee, in my opinion, of course. We're dealing here with a body which wishes to have an Act giving it certain rights of discipline, certain, what we call "professional" rights, and I see no difference between the structure of this type of an organization and the structure of any other professional body, be it the Law Society, be it any other in the health field, architectural, accountants or any other, so that the first suggestion I would like to make is that this ought to be dealt with by the committee on professional associations. And when I use the word "suggestion", it's because it is still not clear to me the extent to which this House controls the designation of where committees go. I seem to recall now that we discussed it but we did not clarify it. I think you, Mr. Speaker, suggested that this might well be a matter for the Whips to discuss in order to arrive at an agreement as to how we can decide in the House where a bill shall be sent on second reading. But to whatever ears I should be addressing myself, I am now suggesting that this really belongs in the field of the committee dealing with professional associations, and I urge very strongly that if I am persuasive in this respect that that committee must meet and that committee must deal with matters referred to it and not sit around twiddling its thumbs as it has done in the past - and I'm not now going to embark on a repetition of my attack on the government for failure to call meetings of these committees. But I would like to indicate my reasoning behind this by running through the bill and discussing in principle certain aspects.

The Honourable Member for Selkirk who is a member of the committee on professional associations and has participated in the discussions that we had may, and I hope does, agree with what I am suggesting. He certainly, as indicated he hasn't drafted the bill, he's doing a favour to another member, another colleague of our profession, and has brought it forward. But I would like to draw his attention and that of members of this House to certain aspects of the bill. I will start in almost a facetious manner, Mr. Speaker, by wondering just what a creature is, because if one looks at the bill to begin with one sees that an animal under the bill means any creature not human; and my next question was, what is a creature, and my own thought was a derivation having to do with creation probably would be something that is God made, and one of my colleagues to whom I asked and who has the closest relationship to things ethereal that I find as I look around our caucus, just what a creature was and he went to the trouble of looking it up. So for possibly for the benefit of my friend from Selkirk who probably would be interested I will indicate to him that two dictionaries give the following: "A creature- (1) Anything created; creation; (2) A human being; (3) An animal especially in the United States, a farm animal; (4) Something produced by a developing from something else; a resultant product; (5) A person who is completely under the influence of another," and it goes on. Another dictionary says that it is anything created, anything not self-existent, a creation whether regarded as the work of God, of the human mind or of natural forces or conditions." And there's a quotation from Bacon saying: "God's first creature was light." Therefore I would just draw to the attention of whoever revised the bill that one should have taken a better look, I think, in the original Act from which this is copied, which does give the same definition that an animal means any creature not human.

But now let's step to more important matters. Firstly, I hope that whatever committee deals with this will learn how many members there are of the Veterinary Association, what are we dealing with in terms of numbers of people in Manitoba, because in my opinion a council consisting of seven is small unless of course the entire membership is small. A quorum of four I think is small unless the membership is small. An election of three members to the council annually I think is small unless the entire membership is small.

Now, the new bill gives to the association much broader powers in the passing of by-laws than the former Act did, and it gives the power to the council to pass by-laws. Now the by-laws cover as you will note more than one page, including a code of ethics, examination, admission and registration of members, which is vital; the definition of professional misconduct, the definition of gross negligence, the definition of incompetence, all comes within the orbit of the by-law. And here I find something important missing, Mr. Speaker. Under the old Act passed in

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . . 1957 there is a section dealing with the qualifications of a member, and I'd like to read it into the record because I don't find it in this bill. Under the old Act it states: "A person is qualified to be a registered member who (a) is of good moral character and temperate habits" - I suppose that's important for a Vet (b) is a graduate in veterinary science of a college or university recognized by the Canadian Veterinary Medical Association; (c) is a Canadian citizen, or if not has filed a declaration of intention to become a Canadian citizen under the Canadian Citizenship Act; (d) pays the prescribed examination and annual membership fees, and; (e) passes the examinations prescribed by the council." So that here we have in the former Act eight sets of qualifications. I might want to question them, to challenge them in some way, but regardless of that the fact is it says something. It even says what I had occasion to refer to sometime ago, that to be a veterinary medical person entitled to practise, one has to be a citizen of Canada, but that does not apply to a medical person who deals with humans rather than with creatures other than humans. But this bill before us says nothing about qualifications.

And incidentally, Mr. Speaker, this bill says nothing about the purpose of the Act, and I think that that's interesting because one reads the entire bill consisting of a number of pages, and I think that the real purpose of the Act is expressed in two lines which read: "No person shall practise veterinary medicine unless he is a registered member." I think that's the purpose of this Act. It doesn't say so of course. But the old Act does give objects of the association. Section 7 says: "To study veterinary science, to enforce a code of ethics of the association, to confine the practice of veterinary science in the province to properly qualified persons," and several others. I think that it might be a good idea that there be an object set out.

The proposed bill gives under the by-laws the power . . .

MR. SPEAKER: . . . honourable members of the House for the last ten minutes there has been a gentleman addressing the Chair and the conversation around the House has just been coming in to me like thunder. I wonder if it's entirely necessary at this particular time. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, I'm not as interesting or as entertaining as I might be in order to keep their attention. But I'm assuming that someone is listening. I know the Honourable Member for Selkirk has been listening and you certainly have, Mr. Speaker, through - maybe not through choice but through duty. Nevertheless I appreciate I can hear myself think a little better.

Under the by-laws which the council is permitted to pass it has the right to set certain qualifications of certain lesser members of the association and of specialists. And then the bill says that "every by-law shall have force until the next annual meeting". So now we have a seven-man council of which a quorum is four, the majority of whom can pass a by-law which will remain in full force and effect until the next meeting, which under the bill need not be called more than once a year. That's pretty great power I think. Under the old Act any by-law required two-thirds approval of the membership. Here there's no mention of the size of a majority approval.

This bill provides that the Registrar shall issue a certificate of registration to any person qualified to be a registered member under the by-laws of the association. This is crucial, Mr. Speaker, because you cannot practise in this field unless you are registered, and you can only get a certificate if the Registrar issues it to you by reason that you are qualified under the by-laws. So the by-laws are of course basic and we don't know what they are. We have no idea what the qualifications are and really once the council passes them and until the next annual meeting maybe only four people will be involved in making that decision. And there is no provision made for an appeal from an arbitrary decision of the Registrar as to whether or not a person is qualified. There is appeal provision for discipline but there is no appeal for a person coming into Manitoba with any qualification, the greatest let us assume, and coming to the Registrar and saying "I want to be certified" and the Registrar then says no, for good or poor reasons, and there's no appeal provision and I think there should be. That's the kind of thing we have been discussing in the committee on professional associations.

Then, Mr. Speaker, under the suspension and cancellation of membership, that is the disciplinary section, it will read if I omit some of the subsections of this section, "where a member has violated any provision of this Act or the by-laws of the association, the council may after due enquiry suspend or cancel the certificate of a member and thus remove his rights". Now there is appeal provision which seems adequate, but I am a little concerned even

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . though it does say an appeal shall be a trial de novo, I'm a little concerned whether the Judge has the power to say that he disagrees with the by-law itself with which the member is charged a violation. In other words, suppose the court finds that the member has violated the by-law; is the court then bound to confirm the decision of council even though he feels that the by-law itself was contrary to good principles of justice? I frankly think that the court would have that power, but it doesn't say so and I would personally feel more secure if indeed the Act said so so there would be no question.

There's a section dealing with limitation of liability which says that "no action shall be brought by any person against any member of the association in respect of proceedings taken in good faith." And frankly I don't know what that means, "proceedings taken in good faith." I don't know just to what it applies, and it relates to any person being barred from that type of proceeding.

I might also notice in passing there has been one revision, which I am sure will interest the Member for Selkirk, the fine has been increased, and I suppose that's a sign of inflation, that where formerly in 1957 the fine for a first penalty was \$100, now it's \$250; and for a second it was \$200, now it's \$500.00. The incarceration on default of payment is the same but money is up, and I think it's an indication of pretty strong inflation to go to two and a half times what it was up to now. But that is, as I say, just in passing.

I believe therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the work of the Committee on Professional Associations has proven the need to look at bills of this kind with a more practised eye, and I think only the committee charged with that responsibility will have acquired the questions that one should ask and the conclusions that one should come to in dealing with a professional bill of this kind. So that, Mr. Speaker, I have thrown out the suggestion, I have tried to indicate why it's important that it should go to that committee, I've thrown out the suggestion that it should, and I'm hoping that that decision will be made before second reading is completed so that we'll know, because should it not be directed there then I will try some other means of bringing back the question for consideration, at least so that there should be discussion and decision and not just a casual routing through agriculture or law amendments or whatever committee it might possibly go to.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask whether there is an indication now as to where it's going. The honourable member said agriculture, but we don't yet read out where it goes and I don't know . . .

MR. HILLHOUSE: . . . to that very point that the honourable member has raised, and briefly it's this. We have no assurance as to when the association dealing with professional services or acts will meet. As a matter of fact, we were told a couple of nights ago by the Honourable Member for Wellington that the report of the Manitoba Bar Association was not ready and it might not be ready for several weeks. Now we have no assurance whatsoever that if we referred this matter, this bill, to that committee that it would meet while this House was in session, and furthermore, and this is an objection which I raised last year in connection with The Manitoba Land Surveyors Act when they tried unsuccessfully to refer that Act - the amendments to that Act to the Committee on Professional Associations. My feeling is that the way the Committee on Professional Associations has been set up, it only deals with Acts already in existence, and until this Act is passed by this House that Association would have no jurisdiction to deal with it whatsoever.

Now I don't like to raise a technical argument like that but I think in this particular case it's more than technical, it's actually a substantive argument. But what I'm anxious to do is have this Bill referred to a committee, and usually such bills are referred to agricultural committees, with the hope that it could be dealt with this session. We have no assurance that even if the Committee on Professional Associations had jurisdiction to deal with this matter before it becomes law, we have no assurance that that committee will sit during this present session and it may not sit until fall.

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, might I remind the Honourable Member for Selkirk that there have been several bills of this nature which in the past two or three years have been referred at second reading by this House to the special committee.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I would remind the honourable member who has just spoken that none of these bills have been dealt with yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, which I presume is what we are speaking on. There is of course a problem that arises by virtue of the fact that the Committee on

(MR. LYON cont'd) . . . Professional Associations is not a standing committee of the House, and in the ordinary course of events neither the Clerk nor the mover of a Bill would be expected to refer a Bill of this nature to a committee that is not a standing committee. However, arrangements can be made always to accommodate the wishes of members of the House. I heard the remarks made by the Member from St. John's, and do I take it from what the Honourable Member for Selkirk has said that he would not be averse to this being referred to the Professional Committee provided there was some undertaking that that committee would meet during the course of the session and deal with this Bill.

MR. HILLHOUSE: If they were going to meet during this session and that committee could properly deal with the Bill, I would have no objection. But my point is that we have no assurance that it will meet; and secondly, I don't think that it has any jurisdiction to deal with this Bill, although perhaps the House by resolution now could refer it to the committee.

MR. LYON: I would think that if the House in passing this Bill, and by agreement, or at the suggestion of the Honourable Member for Selkirk agreed that the Bill should go to the Professional Committee, it would immediately confer any jurisdiction on that committee that was necessary to permit the committee to deal with the Bill. The only other procedure that I can think of would be for someone to move that the Bill be not read a second time but be referred to the Professional Committee, which has the effect of voting against the principle of the Bill, which many members might not like to do, and then referring it to the committee and then having to start the whole procedure all over again. I presume that my honourable friend from St. John's did not utilize that available weapon because he did not oppose the general principle, he merely wished to have it reviewed in another committee. I think - I don't know if this will help the situation at all - I think I could give the undertaking on behalf of the government that if it were the wish of the sponsor of the Bill to accede to the request of the Member for St. John's to have this referred to the Special Committee on Professions, that we can give the undertaking that that committee would be called during the current session in order to deal with this Bill.

MR. HILLHOUSE: The other thing, Mr. Speaker, is this. I don't know whether the change would have to be unanimous because we're dealing with practically the rules of the House, but so that the matter could be referred to this Committee on Professional Associations by direction of the House and that that committee, notwithstanding its present jurisdiction, would be given jurisdiction to deal with the subject matter of this Bill and report back to the House.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I certainly accept the principle, there's only one thing that I would question. You are directing -- you would be directing the committee to look into this Bill, and I think that two of them last year that were referred to this Bill and I think we suggested that they should wait. I don't think it's quite fair to just suggest that this Bill, that there's a special meeting just to deal with this Bill if there are any others waiting, any new ones. Maybe there aren't any, but if there's any new association and so on I think we should study all of them. I don't think it would be fair to just look at this one now.

MR. CHERNIACK: May I be permitted to speak, Mr. Speaker? My recollection is that it was the prior year, not last year but the year before that two bills had been referred and I think they died in committee - that's my recollection - by the fact that the committee died with making its report. My impression is that we didn't but we may have. But that was two years ago. There are no existing bills, I am sure, with which the committee is charged. I think that's correct.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . Mr. Speaker, if there are any. If not, well that answers that question and I'd be satisfied.

MR. HILLHOUSE: . . . of those two bills that died two years ago. Have the proposers got to go through the same rigmarole as they had to bringing it into the House, or could we as a House now unanimously agree that those two bills that did die a premature death in that committee two years ago should be brought back in so that we could deal with them.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to get on to that point, I think we've got enough trouble with the point that is in front of us. I think that we're in a bit of a box in this sense, that the notice of the second reading indicates that this Bill is to be referred to the Agriculture Committee. I'm not aware of any means, other than by voting against second reading and referring it to the Professional Committee, whereby anything can be done at this stage to accede to the suggestion of the Honourable Member from St. John's. What we could do - and



(MR. LYON cont'd) . . . . this is only a suggested course of action subject to advice from you, Mr. Speaker - what we could do is agree to hold the Bill here today; the Honourable Member from Selkirk, if he was agreeable, could agree to adjourn it for instance; and in the meantime a resolution could be brought forward moving this Bill from the Agriculture Committee to the Professional Committee, a resolution which could be debated and passed by the House. The Bill would then be moved on by resolution of the House to the proper committee or to the committee that the House agreed to.

MR. DESJARDINS: Would it become law this year?

MR. LYON: Well that's then up to the committee and this . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Would it become law this year?

MR. LYON: Yes, if possible.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order if I may. I think it's a new point of order, because the Honourable the House Leader has suggested that because there is a reference in that slip of paper which you received saying that this Bill would go to Agriculture that we're bound by it. I wonder just how that happens, because you, Mr. Speaker, never read it into the record. It is only if the mover happens to mention where the Bill is being directed that we learn about it, otherwise we don't know and how could . . .

MR. LYON: You do in Votes and Proceedings, you know.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the Votes and Proceedings haven't come out yet, and therefore, after the fact, we learn what was said on that little piece of paper. I've objected before to that in principle that this is something -- the fact that it appears in Votes and Proceedings is only information as to what has happened.

MR. LYON: That's right.

MR. CHERNIACK: But what has happened has happened without our concurrence or even knowledge, except in this case the honourable member mentioned it. So I don't see how this House can be bound by something that doesn't appear at all.

Now may I also clarify one other point while I'm on my feet. I have before me the Journals of 1968. The report from a committee - that is from the 1967 committee - says, if I may just read the one paragraph: "Two private bills referred to this committee at the last session, an Act to Incorporate the Certified General Accountants Association of Manitoba and an Act respecting Occupational Therapy, were not considered until additional information is gathered and made available to members of the committee." That's what it says about those two Acts, and then we of course know that the committee died on making its report. Now the resolution appointing the next committee, which was presented on March 28, 1968, does not refer any bill to the committee. Therefore, I think I was correct when I told the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that this committee as of this last year did not have any bills currently referred to it.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the same point of order, in the past during the dying days of the session it has been the decision of the House to refer some bills which might normally have gone to another committee to Law Amendments and dealt with all of them in Law Amendments, so couldn't that same principle apply here? We could change it here as we do on other occasions.

MR. LYON: The problem there is that this is done usually after an announcement is made that there are bills referred to two or three other standing committees of the House, and for the sake of expediency would the House agree to have them into Law Amendments. That agreement is usually given and it's done just that quickly. But I would disagree slightly with my honourable friend from St. John's. I think that the convention of the House - you don't find it in the rules anywhere because it's part of the internal operations so far as I'm aware of the Clerk's Office - but the convention that applies is that the bill is referred to the committee which was specified on the second reading motion, and that so far as I am aware the mover of the motion is consulted if there's any question about it; if there's no question of it, it automatically goes to the committee that appears to be the closest to it in content. I think a resolution is the only other suggestion that I have had any useful advice on, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps you've got the answer. We've been doing all the talking.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, may I, in a hope that I can remove the dilemma from which we've found ourselves, I did inadvertently during my remarks refer to giving this Bill second reading and referring it to the Committee on Agriculture. Now the Honourable the Attorney-General and House Leader has suggested that perhaps we should hold the Bill in

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd) . . . committee and bring in a resolution at some future date - tomorrow, I presume - referring this Bill to the Committee on Professional Associations. So if it would assist matters and expedite matters, could I have leave of the House to delete from my remarks the reference to the Committee on Agriculture and suggest that this Bill be referred to the Committee on Professional Associations?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I don't think we need to continue the debate. The Clerk has pointed out to me most emphatically that for the record it will possibly be necessary for it to go to the Agricultural Committee and a resolution then be created in order that it can be transferred from that committee to the Professionals Committee in order that the continuity of the record and the journals follow past procedure.

MR. HILLHOUSE: In that case, Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, would you give me the right to adjourn this debate and then the resolution be brought in tomorrow, or at a later date, referring the matter to the Committee on Professional Associations.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed.)

Bill No. 35. The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. LYON: I believe the Honourable Member for Selkirk is adjourning the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. D. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden) presented Bill No. 35, an Act validating By-law No. 1756 of The Town of Virden, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Speaker, in regards to By-law 1756, I'll try to bring you up-to-date as to how the water and sewer was constructed without advertising. On this extension I'm referring to the words of the Town of Virden. We received a petition of 100 percent of the owners and we're therefore proceeding under Section 691, subsection (3) of The Municipal Act, whereby an improvement may be undertaken by Council without any advertising or notification to any persons if the cost of the improvement is to be charged entirely against the land referred to in the petition. This work was to be done by our Town of Virden waterworks group and we had obtained an estimate on the extension which would have amounted to approximately \$3,000, and that this cost would be paid 100 percent by way of frontage by the property owners benefitting from this extension.

We encountered some unforeseen difficulties in construction the extension and as a result the total cost of the extension amounted to \$4,491.90, and this over-expenditure of approximately \$1,400 was more than could be raised by the frontage, by the property owners benefitting. As soon as we discovered that we could not raise the total amount by the property owners benefitting, I notified the Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs who at that time was the Honourable Thelma Forbes. It was in August, 1967. She advised us in her letter, which I personally have on file and the Town Council has, of September, 1967, that due to the fact that the extension would not be paid for by the property owners who had petitioned for it, that we should have advertised in accordance with Section 691, subsection (2) of The Municipal Act. Mrs. Forbes also advised that there would be no way to relieve the situation other than to have Council's Act ratified by an Act of the Legislature. We had finally planned to have the bill prepared in time for the 1968 Legislature but we were unable to do so. We also notified the Director of Budget and Finance, Mr. Richmond, and our auditor, Mr. O. F. Thorsteinson, of this situation. I hope that answers any questions of the honourable members of the Assembly.

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

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 46. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I propose that this bill be referred to the Municipal Affairs Committee.

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 46, an Act to validate By-law No. 2259 of The Rural Municipality of Rockwood, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, this bill would validate By-law No. 2259 of the Rural Municipality of Rockwood, which was given first and second reading on November 8th, 1967.

(MR. COWAN cont'd) . . . . Because of the provisions of the Liquor Control Act requiring that local option votes only be held when a municipal election is being held, this local option could not be voted upon until October 23rd, 1968. The advertising that was required was pretty well done in accordance with the Act, excepting for one of the ads I understand was a little bit late in appearing, and the ballot was drawn up so that the electors could only vote in favour or against all of the outlets set out in the by-law, instead of being drawn up so that they could vote against or for each one of the outlets separately. Accordingly, the Act was not followed exactly and, while there is a provision in the Liquor Control Act under Section 274 to validate irregularities, it has been thought that it would be advisable to have the by-law validated by the Legislature because one party is intending to make quite a substantial investment in a motel in that municipality if this by-law is validated, and the party and the municipality don't want to take that chance that if it was validated by the authority of Section 274, that then later on that validation might be questioned in the courts. When the by-law was submitted to the electors, in spite of the fact that the electors had to vote yes or no to the six outlets in one ballot, they voted "for" by a vote of 470 to 132. At each of the 10 polls there was a majority in favour of the local option, so that when you consider the large majority that resulted, of 470 to 132, there should be no hesitation on the part of this House in validating this by-law. The only other alternative is to have another vote of the electors, but because of the provisions of the Liquor Control Act such a vote could not be held for another three years - or rather, until the fall of 1971, and the municipal officials - and of course the proposed owner of the motel - certainly don't want to wait that long a time in order to have another vote. So we would ask the support of the House to have this by-law validated.

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

..... continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: I take it we go back to proposed resolutions.

MR. LYON: Yes Mr. Speaker, please.

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolutions. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, on Friday last when I introduced this resolution on the need for a market research department within the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Trade and Commerce, when I suggested that there was a need I tried to indicate that the production and distribution of food in this country was a major problem and has been with us for many years, and that to date we have never developed policies to cope with the problems related to both the area of production and distribution.

Now in my resolution, Mr. Speaker, I suggested that we ought to have a market research committee or a section of a governmental department to deal primarily with studies and research into the total world food need, for example, to determine what the picture is throughout the world, to determine what the developments are in terms of food production, and thereby to determine what our role should be in the either increase or decrease of various food commodities. And indeed, Mr. Speaker, with recognition of the fact that there are countries that have a very low standard of living throughout the world, and in recognition of the fact that they are not going to remain that way forever, hopefully, that there will be changes, in recognition of those two points, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we should have someone always acquainted with the changes that are taking place so that there is some advantage to both the countries in which the changes are taking place, and indeed more so to the producers of food commodities in Canada that might be in a position to take advantage to expand their market opportunities as a result of those kind of changes.

Now one other thing that is important, and I have noted it in the resolution, and that is that one must recognize that there is also a change in total world food consumption. People's diets change. They place more emphasis on different food commodities, and in accordance we ought to have our research people have the producers of these food commodities well prepared in advance to make sure that they take the best opportunities of these developments throughout the world. Mr. Speaker, there has been no real work done in this field. I think it's quite safe to say that Canada spends something like one percent of its research dollars in marketing distribution in international trade. Now that is hardly sufficient, Mr. Speaker, to provide us with some kind of a reasonable program that will be meaningful to the country as a whole insofar as its export position is concerned but indeed to the producers of the respective food commodities. If you compare that with the American figure, Mr. Speaker, you will find that they spend about 10 percent of their research dollars in this area, so there is a tremendous lag in market research as far as this country is concerned. And this is probably one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, that we have problems in moving surplus commodities, that we haven't really involved ourselves in the promotion of food items.

For example, I would suggest that if we know that we have a particular surplus situation with one or two commodities, or whatever the case may be, that I would want a special promotion throughout the world to move that particular commodity. And if that involves more than one department, Mr. Speaker, if that involves in fact the area of governmental responsibility that ties in with the development of a better trading pattern, for example, maybe we have to make some concessions somewhere to some country that requires this additional food, but that there has to be a trades concession somewhere along the line. I think it's something that is very comprehensive and that we must work together in an effort to try and distribute the abundance which nature and the good management of our farm people in this country have provided for our total benefit, Mr. Speaker - the benefit of the entire nation.

The improvement of our trading arrangements of food importing countries is something that ought to be scrutinized on a continual basis. We must recognize that we are in competition with many countries in the world; in fact, we are probably at some disadvantage in that we have to compete with countries that have a much larger treasury than we have, and countries which lend the support from their public treasuries to the financing of trade arrangements, credit arrangements, and in fact in the way of subsidies to the producers for certain commodities. So I recognize that we have these disadvantages, Mr. Speaker, but more so, because we have these disadvantages, that it is important that we have a co-ordinated effort on the part of one single authority that will do nothing else but promote sales and trade development in

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) . . . . areas which most require this kind of promotion.

We must take into account, Mr. Speaker, that there is economic development of under-privileged countries and that this development will change their particular need, that where you have people on one diet today, ten years from today they may have changed completely and have adopted a new recipe or a new menu for their kitchen table. And I'm thinking of the dark countries, the continent of Africa, Asia, Mr. Speaker, and of course South America, where we do have a great need for increased food supplies, and it's a question of how fast those countries are able to purchase these food supplies that in connection with that it is our opportunity to try and fill that need, and in that area to improve our trading relations with those people so that we will have the jump on in the export market. Let's not wait till someone else develops these areas. Let's try and co-ordinate our program so that we will have development in such a way that will be beneficial to both the country that is receiving this type of assistance and also the people in Canada that are in the production of these products.

One other point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that there is a need to appraise our contribution in foreign aid, and this is an area in which I think not enough has been done. I feel that Canada has been somewhat negligent, in that when we have large surpluses that we don't know just what to do with, that this is an area which we might pursue in hopes that we will be charitable on the one hand as much as is possible, and I recognize that there are problems in that connection, but that we ought to have a concentrated effort to see if we can channel some of our surpluses into the areas of need, and that as a result of that our relations with these countries will bring benefits to us at some future date.

I want to refer to today's Winnipeg Tribune, Mr. Speaker, where there's an article stating that "wheat experts see dim sales outlook." And there is some criticism here of our performance in the promotion of wheat sales in the past few years, and the criticism comes from the James Richardson people. They feel that Canada moved too slowly; that we should have acted a long time ago in trying to meet the competition in the world; but again, Mr. Speaker that brings to mind the need for someone to have an eye open at all times to make sure that we see the changes that are taking place and to make sure that we can take full advantage of the changing patterns in world trade. We must recognize, Mr. Speaker, that in Europe there is a great shift. There is the Common Market - countries that are heavily involved in the subsidization of agriculture. We must take a look at that and determine how that affects our producers, and what steps we ought to take to try and minimize the detrimental effects that may accrue from the arrangements in Europe.

We must, Mr. Speaker, have an aggressive sales policy. We must be like the salesman that is depending for his bread and butter to -- that is depending on the amount of sales in any given day, week, month or year as to whether he has a good standard of living or not. We must approach it on that basis and I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that members of the House would endorse this resolution in the sense that it isn't a political one. I don't see that it really ties into any one particular philosophy. I think it's one of the good common sense proposals that have been recognized by many people in the country, and indeed, Mr. Speaker, the recent conference on agriculture in Ottawa brought out some position papers on this particular subject, and I would hope that our government takes a good look at these proposals and that we do endorse measures - strong measures, Mr. Speaker, not just recommendations but strong measures to make sure that we move in this direction and try and unload some of the agricultural problems that we have through the means of proper research and development of markets throughout the world.

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

MR. GREEN: Ayes and nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. For the benefit of the honourable members that were not in the House, we're dealing with the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member from Brokenhead, Number 27 on the top of page number 3.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Borowski, Cherniack, Dawson, Desjardins, Doern, Dow, Fox, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Johnston, Kawchuk, Molgat, Patrick, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Bjornson, Carroll, Claydon, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Graham, Hamilton, Johnson, Jorgenson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 21; nays 29.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost.

The adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for Kildonan. The proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Labour in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JOE BOROWSKI (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I don't know that there's much point in arguing this bill here after seeing the one just defeated. If they can't vote for anything as simple as that I don't really know how they're going to vote for the one, the amendment I'm going to bring in.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I don't think that -- the honourable gentleman appreciates that something that's been immediately dealt with, I wonder if it's reasonable to discuss it at this particular time.

MR. BOROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wasn't going to speak on that. I just said that in passing. I listened to the Minister of Labour on April 11th and I could have sworn, Mr. Speaker, I was listening to the President of the Chamber of Commerce rather than the Minister of Labour. All that was lacking was the background music. I don't think this House has been treated to such a nauseating spectacle of a Minister of Labour getting up and speaking on behalf of the rich.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't believe that can be accepted quite as parliamentary language, referring to the Honourable the Minister of Labour as he did, and I don't think it's particularly necessary. I wonder if the honourable gentleman could govern himself accordingly.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, when you see a Minister of Labour that's supposed to be in this House passing a bill or passing legislation to help the poor, when he gets up in his pulpit and he defends the rich, it would make anybody sick. I see nothing wrong with using that word and it made me sick. I've been in this House a month now and all I hear from that side there is every time any bill comes in, whether it's proposed by our side or by the Liberals, all they do is get up and say, well think of the rich people, think of the doctors; and now they're saying think of the companies, the rich companies, the businessmen. On Medicare they were talking about the doctors; they weren't worried about the people who paid the bills. Now he's getting up there and he's telling us: "Well, we don't want the three weeks' vacation after five years because it's going to hurt the businessmen." They don't want overtime, four percent in overtime, because it's going to hurt the businessmen. And now he's arguing he doesn't like this amendment that we've brought forward because it's going to hurt the businessmen. For once can we hear somebody from that side get up and say something for the little people or pass some legislation for the little guy? You're not paid by the Chamber of Commerce to sit there. We've been treated with this nonsense from every minister that's gotten up there, Mr. Speaker, and always preaching the same garbage -- okay, I'm sorry.

Well anyway, he spent half an hour, Mr. Speaker, telling us about the great society we live in and he brought in a bunch of figures to try and prove how wonderful it is to live in Manitoba, and at one point he even went as far as Japan, half way around the world, and he tried to bring in some figures to prove that really things aren't so bad here, and I'd just like to quote from Hansard what he said about Japan: "The Manitoba Federation of Labour came up with a resolution that the minimum wage should be increased to \$1.75. The question was asked of this man," and this apparently was somebody from Japan, "'Do you have a minimum wage in Japan?' and the answer came back 'yes, and then the question was asked, 'Are the employees satisfied with it?' The answer came back, 'No. Some employees think it's too much and some employees think it's too little.'" So there's some people that think it's too much, which I'm sure you couldn't find one in this province or in this country.

And then he goes on to talk about that there's a constant debate going on between the government and the unions and the workers, and when you start comparing you've got to be pretty desperate, Mr. Speaker, when you start comparing Japan and Canada. It's just like comparing wheat to rice. You know in Japan they have laws and I wish the Minister would read something about Japan. Being an old union man, I know something about the working conditions in Japan, and they not only pay you a decent wage but they even go out and find you a wife, in case you're not aware of this. That's right. That may seem funny but you've got all kinds of fringe benefits that you wouldn't even give to your own brother. Well, that's right. It's called a fringe benefit. Whether you need it or not, that's right. Most of them need it. But they have all kinds of fringe benefits in Japan. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker -- there's no children in the gallery so I guess I can say it -- this is serious, Mr. Speaker -- they have

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) . . . . abortion clinics down there and should some of their women on the job become pregnant they have an abortion clinic right on the plant where they can go ahead and have a legal abortion performed. This is part of the contract, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . . subject, I believe.

MR. BOROWSKI: Okay. Further on down the page, Mr. Speaker, the Minister takes exception to the word "dissension." Well it's such an important subject we're arguing about and he picks a word like "dissension" and he argues about it. He spends a whole page arguing about the word dissension. And then after, he presents a resolution; he presents a resolution to take the word "dissension" out and then later on he goes and he speaks against the resolution, which makes sense - it was proposed by the Member for Kildonan. "And the resolution talks about a certain criteria. I'd just like to read part of it here: 'To meet normal living conditions consistent with the standard of shelter, food, health, education, recreation and such other amenities of life as are considered basic to the enjoyment of life in Manitoba.' This is the criteria that is used by the Minimum Wage Board at present. It has been used in all its deliberations and therefore, if we were to allow the second Whereas to remain, it would be inconsistent because the Minimum Wage Board does use the very criteria that are outlined in the word Resolved."

Well Mr. Speaker, if this is true, how in heaven's name is the wage still \$1.25? If this is really the criteria you're using, how come it's \$1.25, \$400.00 below the poverty level, and the poverty level we're talking about was established by the Economic Council of Canada in 1965. Well if this is really the criteria that's used, I can't understand how come this wage is so low.

Further on, the Minister goes on and contradicts himself by making the following statement, that this was set up by --'an Act of this Legislature set up a Minimum Wage Board composed of union representatives, management representatives and chairman, and the board carefully enquires into the matter of minimum wages. It hears the parties concerned; it weighs the relevant factors and recommends to the government the minimum wages it feels are," -- and I underline -- "possible, practical and feasible."

Now isn't there a contradiction there? Which criteria are you using, the possible, practical and feasible or the other one? It's like giving them, as the Member for Inkster said, a pad of straw and a glass of water, and if you're going to use the second one, then you're going to have half a dozen criterias, because rich companies like General Motors or International Nickel, they can pay five and ten dollars an hour, and there are some companies, I am sure and some small businessmen that probably have a hard time paying a dollar an hour, so you're going to have to make up your mind which criteria you're going to use and you're going to have to make up your mind which one you're going to give to this board. And I'd like to say a couple of words about this board, Mr. Speaker, because here it tells of the union representatives and management representatives, and of course we know what they do down there. The union representatives want the wages to go up and the management wants it to stay down. We expect this thing just as we expect you to vote against most of the things that we bring forward. But the chairman, Mr. Speaker, the chairman is a chap named Campbell MacLean. Now, just in case anybody doesn't know, I believe he's the president of the Progressive Conservative Party, I think it's the same party.

SOME MEMBERS: No, no. It can't be the same McLean.

MR. BOROWSKI: I know it's hard to believe. I couldn't believe it myself. -- (Interjection) -- Well it just happens by sheer coincidence, Mr. Speaker, it's the same party that sits on that side. Isn't that a disgrace? -- (Interjections) -- He may be very capable but he's also very biased like you, Mr. Premier, and it's an insult to the intelligence of the people of this province and an insult to this Chamber and to those hearings to have a party stooge sitting in as the chairman in an impartial position. I understand this same person - and he may be very capable for the interest he represents. I don't think he's very capable when he comes out and recommends \$1.25. The point is, Mr. Speaker, that they put in a chairman that's a member of the party and they expect to come in with a decent minimum wage. He's not going to do it, and obviously he consults with the government, and this is one of the reasons the minimum wage is that low, and as long as this is the situation there's just no point calling any more minimum wage hearings. Last time they sat, I think they spent about a year running around the province like a circus and having hearings at various places. They had a hearing in Thompson, as a matter of fact, and I presented a brief at that time, and this is a couple of

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) . . . . years back and the minimum wage as a result of these hearings went up to \$1. 25.

The Minister seems to be obsessed with almost a pathological fear that the minute we raise our minimum wage to \$1. 50 that somehow we're going to wreck the economy, and he's gone out of his way to make these statements. We listened to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and he keeps telling us that the reason he's got to give these incentives and these low interest loans to industry is to get them in here, because if we don't we're not going to get them in any other way. They talk about the taxation. The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources keep telling us the reason they have to have these give-away taxation policies, special tax incentives and low taxes is because if we don't it's going to somehow ruin the economy because these people won't come in.

I'd like to read, Mr. Speaker, a quote from a Winnipeg paper, and it's dated March 1, 1924, and you'll be amazed at how similar an argument was used at that time to the one that we heard last night from the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Industry and the Minister of Labour. The headline on this quote is: "Fear income tax will effect serious injury," and it goes on to say: "Enforcement of income tax would produce disastrous results not only for Winnipeg but for all of Manitoba. It would discourage, among other things, development capital from coming in to Manitoba's development." Isn't this the same argument we've been hearing right along? This was in 1924, and if this is true, then Manitoba shouldn't really exist today. There should be no such place as Manitoba. Obviously it's not true. And both of the Ministers - as a matter of fact the three of the Ministers - have been putting forth this stupid argument (I hope that's parliamentary) since I am in this House, that somehow all these people are going to pull out, are going to leave their mines and factories and just going to pull out and leave us high and dry; we've got to give them these special incentives. And I think when I spoke on the Budget Debate, Mr. Speaker, I quoted some figures of some of the high rates that these other governments in various parts of the world charge these very same companies, and for some strange reason that this government hasn't taken the time to explain, these companies still go in there, and those that are in there they stay in; they're not leaving; and there's a good reason for it. And this nonsense that they've been coming out with, the same type that was used in 1924, they're using it today, and it's a lot of nonsense, Mr. Speaker.

The Economic Council of Canada issues a report annually. I think there was one issued this morning, Mr. Speaker, and it's the type of report that really should make any speech from this side unnecessary, because they were talking not about the lay-abouts, the bums and the people who won't work or the people that are sick or too old, but it was talking about the one-fifth of four million people in Canada, the working poor - four million of them. And they had some suggestions to make, Mr. Speaker, and one of the suggestions was that we have to increase the wage to these working people. Increase the wage. Now here - this is just this morning. If this government is serious about doing something, don't take our resolution; don't take our advice; listen to the Economic Council of Canada that was set up by our government and is being paid for by our government to put out these recommendations.

There's another recommendation that I'd like to read that was put out in September 1968: "Poverty in Canada is real. Its numbers are not in the thousands but in the millions. Its persistence at a time when the bulk of Canadians enjoy one of the highest standards of living in the world, is a disgrace." Further on, Mr. Speaker, it goes to tell of the consequences of this type of condition in our country, and it's getting worse. And one of the things it points out is that since 1951 - there was a study made between 1951 by the Economic Council of Canada and 1965 - that the real purchasing power and the condition of these working poor, the working poor - underline that, Mr. Speaker; I'm not talking about the bums and the winos. I'm talking about the people that are working, trying to meet their family responsibilities with dignity - that their real purchasing power has been declining since 1951, and I wish you'd read that report by Dr. John Deutsch.

Further on this report -- this is the price we pay for this type of legislation that we have before us. "Much more serious and more widespread is the kind of low-income situation that carries with it a sense of entrapment and helplessness. Even the best statistics can only hint at this. They cannot capture the sour atmosphere of poor health, bad housing and accumulated defeat, alienation and despair which often so tragically are inherited by the next and succeeding generations."

Further on in the page he says that "its most grievous costs are felt directly by the poor themselves but it also imposes very large costs on the rest of society. Those include the



(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) . . . . costs of crime, disease, poor education; they include the costs of low productivity" - and this is a favourite word of the Minister of Industry. He says if you want to build a great society we must increase productivity. Well, if he wants to do something about it, here's some suggestions. ". . . and the lost output of controlling the social tensions and unrest associated with gross inequality, and of that part of total welfare expenditure which is essentially a palliative made necessary by the failure to find more fundamental solutions. It has been estimated in the United States that one poor man can cost the public purse as much as \$140,000 between the ages of 17 and 57."

I don't have the figures, Mr. Speaker, for Canada, but I would think that they're quite high in this country too, and I'm not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that by passing the minimum wage to \$1.50 that we're going to somehow magically have all this thing that's talked about disappear. But it's a step in the right direction, and as the Minister of Labour, surely he has a responsibility to do something - and he can do it. It's not enough to say we've got to be competitive. He likes to trot out the figures from the various provinces and point out that Ontario is the only province that has a minimum wage of \$1.30 an hour. And I like the expression that the former Premier, the Member for Lakeside, always used to say in the House and still does: One wrong or ten wrongs or 100 wrongs don't make a right. Just because they have economic slavery in some other province or they're doing something bad, there's no reason for you to say, "Well, what the heck, I can do it too." It's just not right and I think it's a poor argument to use in defence of your policy, and I would hope that the Minister would look at these matters and consider doing something in this area. We heard the Minister of Transportation talk about serfs away back in England several hundred years ago, and he tried to point out to this House that every time we bring any social measures, that you're really somehow infringing on the rights of a person and that you're not doing them any favours. The Minister implied that this thing was as a result of some socialistic measures, but the fact is when these serfs existed and lived in England it was a free, rugged, wheeling-dealing, free enterprise system, just as we had, Mr. Speaker, in the States when they used to have slavery, when they had the Negroes brought in by ships from various countries around the world. It wasn't a socialist system that enslaved them. It was a free enterprise system; and today in Manitoba, and as a matter of fact across Canada, we see it. It's not called that any more; they've got a different name for it; but the end result and effect on these people, Mr. Speaker, is the same, because when you're living in a shack, a filthy shack; and you get a pay cheque of \$50.00 a week and you pay all the deductions - unemployment insurance, pension and now Medicare is added on to that and a few other exemptions - what have you got left? And really, what good is that right to vote, this political freedom, when you get that kind of pay cheque? This is economic slavery and I think, if I was faced with the prospect of choosing political freedom or economic freedom, I think I would choose economic freedom. What good is a vote when your family is starving? -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? I beg your pardon?

A MEMBER: He says you don't understand . . .

MR. BOROWSKI: Well I've listened to his ship-wrecked ideas for the last month and they're a lot of hogwash, as they are of the other Ministers down there.

MR. LYON: When you're here longer, we'll listen to you.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well I really don't care, Mr. Speaker, if he listens to me. It wouldn't make any difference. His mind is closed to all ideas from this side of the House. He's indicated and shown that by the way he votes, so when I make . . .

MR. LYON: You Marxists haven't had a new idea for 200 years. What are you talking about?

MR. BOROWSKI: Well a Fascist should know and you're a good expert in that field. Do you see how successful he is, Mr. Speaker? He's got me all lost.

There's one other item I'd like the Minister to consider and this is, when the minimum wage is adjusted, to have a different wage for northern Manitoba; say a borderline of the 53rd Parallel. I think we've talked about this in other areas and it's recognized by all levels of government; it's recognized by various companies; and I would like to see the Minister consider bringing in legislation that would set whatever the minimum wage is - and I hope after today it's \$1.50 - but whatever it is, so that there would be a higher scale for the north. And I think your Department should be the first one to recognize it because I know a lot of the government people working up there are being paid a higher rate, so I hope that, if nothing else, your government would consider bringing in a wage differential for northern Manitoba.

I had a few other things to say; I've forgotten them, Mr. Speaker, thanks to the red herring

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) . . . . sitting over there, so I'll sit down. Thank you. Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I have a resolution here.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the amendment be amended by adding thereto at the end thereof the following: "And Be It further Resolved that in recognition of the fact that the present minimum wage is wholly inadequate to meet the criteria set forth herein, that as an emergency measure and as an initial step to realizing the above-stated objective, the minimum wage be raised to the sum of \$1.50 per hour immediately." -- (Interjection) -- I'm a reasonable man unlike yourself.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, ever since I first entered this House I have heard members opposite complain that the members on this side of the House have turned down consistently resolution after resolution that has been proposed on Private Members Day by the members opposite. In this particular resolution -- the main motion that is before us -- that was proposed, the Minister of Labour saw fit to make some minor adjustments to the preamble of the resolution, making the wording acceptable so that the members in this House presumably could join with all members of this House and unanimously support the motion, the main part of the body of the resolution, which we all agreed with supposedly. The Member from Churchill got up this afternoon and he made a speech in which he made one good suggestion which I liked hearing, at first, and I hope that the Minister and his Department and the Minimum Wage Board might give some consideration to it, and that is the suggestion that there might be a higher minimum wage for that area of the province north of the 53rd Parallel.

At that point of his speech, and I'm talking about one of the latter sections of his speech, he and I ceased to agree. I thought that the Member from Churchill would have welcomed the support of the members on this side and the Minister of Labour to the resolution proposed by his colleague, the Member from Kildonan, and I gather they don't. I'm quite surprised, Mr. Speaker, that when the government does do what has been plead for year after year by the members of the Opposition, when we finally get around to doing something that we might agree with one of their resolutions and support the very points that they would like to make, my God we're condemned all over the place. And suddenly the Chairman of the Minimum Wage Board, a fine, decent, intelligent, practical soul, because he happens to be president of the same political party and is the same stripe as this government and the same stripe as myself, suddenly he is a stooge, I believe the word was.

Now any Minimum Wage Board that is set up in this province or in any other province or any state or any jurisdiction throughout the world, is going to be composed of citizens, human beings. There are going to be some representatives from one side, some representatives from the other side, and supposedly an impartial and intelligent chairman. I think that we in Manitoba are most fortunate in the selection of individuals that have occupied this particular position for many years. I think the present incumbent is certainly an outstanding example of that impartiality and that intelligence that we look for. But I am surprised that this resolution and the speech that the Minister of Labour has made in supporting the resolution of the Honourable Member from Kildonan, supporting it in essence, basically and in principle, has been used to condemn this government and the members on this side. And I'm surprised that no credit is given to this side of the House when in the last two years and some months the minimum wage has (1) increased from 85 cents an hour to \$1.25; (2) it's the same in rural Manitoba as it is in urban Manitoba; (3) it's the same for men as it is for women. And it's gone up -- and I think the Minister used the phrase of 66 percent since I was elected to a member of this House, and I haven't been in here and I haven't been elected for three years. Now I think that that is some bit of a record that the Minister and his colleagues can take credit for. It is not the ultimate and I am not going to for one moment try to explain it away as a fair wage because it isn't, and it never was intended to, and it never will be. It's a minimum wage and that means subsistence, and I don't like it either. But we as a Legislature cannot go ahead and enact a fair wage law because what you say and what you say and what I say is fair, is never going to be. We are doing nothing more than a basic bottom wage -- at least this is my understanding of the minimum wage, and I stand to be corrected. But I haven't, in three years of speeches on this subject from members opposite, been altered in my view on this subject.

(MR. STEEN cont'd.)

Now we have an amendment moved by the Member from Churchill, a sub-amendment, which brings in something which says that the minimum wage should be \$1.50. Now the year before I came into this House I believe there were resolutions saying the minimum wage in Manitoba should be \$1.00 an hour. That's 1966. In 1967 it was \$1.25 an hour, and 1968 - well, it was a dandy that year. It was \$1.25 an hour, then it was \$1.50 an hour, and we played a little game back and forth. Now I don't know why we need a minimum wage board at all if we're just going to have resolution after resolution coming before the House saying no, it should be \$1.50; it should be \$1.75; it should be \$2.00; and especially in an election year I can see this going to some extreme -- (Interjection) -- Oh, I'm only anticipating next year for you - that we should be able to legislate it somewhere around \$3.00 an hour with this little game back and forth. But I can't support the amendment that has been made from Churchill and I cannot support the bulk of his speech but, like the rest of the members on this side of the House, I was willing to support the principle embodied in the resolution proposed by my good friend the Honourable Member from Kildonan. And for this I am being penalized.

MR. GREEN: Will the honourable member permit a question?

MR. STEEN: No. Wait until I am through and I'll be only too glad -- maybe. Now, like my good friend the Minister of Labour, I reiterate that I support the body of the resolution that has been proposed here. I continue to do it. I can't support the sub-amendment and I'm not even going to try to, and I cannot support the reasons used by the Honourable Member for Churchill for either introducing his sub-amendment or speaking on the resolution in its original state. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, will the honourable gentleman now permit a question?

MR. STEEN: Oh, gladly.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, will the honourable gentleman not agree that in 1968 there was no amendment for a specific minimum wage and that the only wage moved by the members of this party in 1967, which is the first year we were in the House, was \$1.50? So that in the three years there was one moved for \$1.50, one move which your party rejected last year in the exact terms as is now moved by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, and this year the same resolution.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, do I get it right that I am now being condemned for supporting something I didn't support last year?

MR. GREEN: The member said that there were progressive changes in the moves made per minimum wage and I'm asking him whether he will not agree that the first year we were here we moved \$1.50, last year we moved no amount whatsoever, this year we moved no amount whatsoever, until the member's resolution.

A MEMBER: Is that a question or a statement?

MR. GREEN: I'm asking him whether he will agree with that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if the question isn't rather lengthy. There were two questions there and I had a little difficulty following it. However, the Honourable Member for St. Matthews is going to attempt to answer, I take it.

MR. STEEN: Well I was only going to say, Mr. Speaker, if I was inaccurate in some of my figures and statements I'd be only too glad to correct them with the record.

MR. GREEN: Thank you very much.

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

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Logan, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Virden in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member from Morris in further amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's not often that I'm able to agree so wholeheartedly with what is said by an honourable member sitting on the government side of the House, but there is a phrase that was used by the Honourable Member for Morris which I think clarifies much of the differences of opinion that possibly exist between members and with which I want to indicate I wholeheartedly agree. And I want the Honourable the Attorney-General to listen particularly to this phrase because I have used similar phrases in the House on previous occasions and every time I talk in this vein, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . Attorney-General does just what he did to the Member for Churchill today. He shouts: "Marxist; Doctinaire; Socialist."

MR. LYON: You don't like it either, do you?

MR. GREEN: Now I want the members to listen to what the Member from Morris said.

MR. LYON: The truth hurts. The truth hurts.

MR. GREEN: I have mentioned some -- I'm reading from Page 1433 of Hansard. I just want you to turn around and start shouting the other way. "I have mentioned some of the difficulties that we are going to face but there is one that keeps nagging in the back of my mind all the time, and that is, if you are successful in finding a means whereby some stability in wheat prices can be achieved, what good is it unless you can find some way of finding stability in the prices of things that the farmer has to buy? If the price of wheat was to be raised \$3.00 today, tomorrow somebody will have figured out a way to get that extra dollar out of the farmer's pocket and you are even worse off than when you began."

Now Mr. Speaker, there are numerous occasions when I have suggested that economic power in the last analysis is able to defeat many well-intentioned programs of the Legislature, and that economic power is used by those who have it as against those who haven't got it, and the Attorney-General will usually say: "Marxist; Doctrinaire." But here's the exact reference, Mr. Speaker, made by the Honourable Member for Morris, and I agree with it. And therefore, when the Member for La Verendrye and the Member for Emerson get up and say that the feed mills -- they wouldn't dare do what the Member for Ethelbert Plains said that ~~they would~~ do, that where there was a farmer who was in trouble and had to sell his grain, that they wouldn't dare pay any less than what they thought that he was entitled to; that they wouldn't take advantage of the poor farmer. Well what has the Member from Morris said? That if you raised the price \$3.00 today, tomorrow somebody will have figured a way to get that extra dollar out of the farmer's pocket.

Now Mr. Speaker, I want to tear a leaf from the Honourable the Minister of Finance's book and read and quote for myself - which is what he did yesterday - and I want to quote, Mr. Speaker, a passage which I happen to agree with. It must have been said, as the Minister of Finance joshingly said yesterday, "it must have been said by someone with some intelligence because I agree with it," and Mr. Speaker, by coincidence it's the first speech that I made in this House. It was when we were bringing in the legislation to ratify the federal-provincial agreements with regard to income tax. And I was quite upset because I said this will not leave us flexibility in taxing, and that we were going to have to impose a 5 percent sales tax if we didn't up the income tax that year. And in speaking of the income tax, Mr. Speaker, I made the following remark. It's page 209 of 1967.

"Now Mr. Speaker, I'm not in love with an income tax. I don't think that an income tax does what many people hope it will do, because it's been my experience that those people who are in the position of being able to afford to pay income tax, who have the power to pay income tax, often are the very same people who have the power to avoid paying income tax. And I don't mean by unlawful means, but I remember speaking to a medical friend of mine - and I have medical friends - and he said one third of the year . . . ."

MR. DESJARDINS: Not any more.

MR. GREEN: Not any more. "One third of the year I should go to Florida because I work for the government. One third of the year. And he was telling me that one-third of his income is paid to the Federal Government in taxes. So I asked this medical man: 'Tell me, in which year did your net income go down, your net income go down by virtue of payment of income tax?' And he looked at me and he thought for a while and he said: 'Come to think of it, it's never gone down by virtue of payment of income tax.'

"Because, Mr. Speaker, everybody who has the economic power to do so" - and here's where I want the Member for Morris to pay particular attention - "everybody who has the economic power to do so, and that includes corporations who are not engaged in competition; that includes lawyers, doctors, and it includes, Mr. Speaker, as well trade unions that have a good economic bargaining position, whenever an income tax is levied they either increase the price of the services they are selling, they increase the price of their product, or if they're lawyers they increase their fees to the extent that the income tax will not affect them. Income tax works out in many cases in the long run to a form of sales tax, and we recognize that. We're not deluded about it but at least income tax can be collected by virtue of the existing tax machinery."

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)

And what did the Attorney-General -- that was the first time, Mr. Speaker, that I heard the Attorney-General speak in the House. He got up and he said: "We heard this Marxist, doctrinaire type of language before." Well Mr. Speaker, he's hearing it again but not from this side of the House. He's hearing it from his own side of the House which indicates to me, Mr. Speaker, that it's true, and sometimes, Mr. Speaker, you have to bring people along slowly. People don't believe that there are economic forces in society that work against each other, and that's why, Mr. Speaker, I sometimes have arguments with members of my own group, or people in philosophical discussions, and they say that economic controls may work, or income tax may work. And I've always said that people with economic power in the last analysis will have the power to avoid those controls or use them for themselves. And this is what the Member from Morris is saying.

Well Mr. Speaker, with the Member for Morris you don't have to work that slowly. You don't have to bring things along. You have to get to the root of the question, and every time I've got to the country, I've said to the farmers that what you have to do is not criticize the lawyers; not criticize the trade unions; not criticize the doctors. These people have decided that they are going to make things as well as they could for themselves by co-opting economic power, and I said to the farmers, "You should do the same thing." But what do most of the Conservative members tell the farmer? They tell him, "You are the bastion of free enterprise," and there's something wrong with standing together for the purpose of regulating the markets. There's something wrong with entering into marketing boards. And if we are going to legislate for marketing boards, we're going to do it in such a way that it will make it almost impossible to achieve, and I wonder whether the member for Morris, in view of his knowledge as to what will be done to people who will not protect themselves, what will be done to people who do not take economic power to the extent that they can get it, what does he tell the farm population? Is he telling them what he said on page 1433 of Hansard? And more important than that, Mr. Speaker, more important than what he is telling the farmer, what does he suggest we do about these people who will go after the extra dollar that the farmer gets into his pocket?

First of all, who are these people? I suggest that he tell the Member for Souris-Lansdowne who they are. For one, Mr. Speaker, they're the insurance companies. They're the manufacturers. They're - I repeat - the doctors, the lawyers, the trade unionists. Everybody who is able to consolidate their bargaining position does it. And I want to know what the Member for Souris-Lansdowne thinks about this statement that any time that they get a chance there's going to be somebody who's going to pick the farmer's pocket for the extra dollar. What does he think about that? And who are the people that we are talking about? What does the Member for Morris suggest that we do about the situation that some of the people in our community have economic power, some of the people in our community don't, and that we are engaged in an endless struggle between those who have it and those who don't. And those who have it are continually preying upon those who don't. What does he suggest we do about that, and what is he suggesting to the Attorney-General about that particular state of affairs, because I think he's gotten to the root of the problem. I think he should tell us - I repeat, the Member for Souris-Lansdowne - that when the insurance companies, when the automobile insurance companies charge what the traffic will bear, charge whatever they can get, they are taking any extra money that the farmer happens to have in his pocket and, what's more, they'll do it every time. That's what he said. They'll do it every time. And I want to know, Mr. Speaker what does the Member for Morris recommend to this government that we do to overcome the position that there are people in our community who cannot . . . take whatever additional funds we are able to give to the farmer by virtue of enacting some legislation such as is being suggested.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Youth and Education, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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