

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, April 2nd, 1965

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
 Reading and Receiving Petitions
 Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
 Notices of Motion
 Introduction of Bills

The Honourable the Provincial Secretary.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights) introduced Bill No. 107, an Act to amend The Mortgage Brokers Act.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Virden.

MR. DONALD M. MCGREGOR (Virden) introduced Bill No. 109, an Act to amend An Act to incorporate Virden and District Elderly Persons Housing Corporation.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 43 Grade 10 and 11 students from Glenlawn Collegiate under the direction of their teacher Mrs. Gemmil. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for St. Vital. There are also some 30 Grade 8 students from St. Ignatius School under the direction of their teacher Sister Sheila Margaret. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. There are some 85 Grade 5 and 6 students from the Robert H. Smith School under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Bahuaud, Miss Scott, Miss McQuire and Miss Corbett. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Provincial Secretary. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly I welcome you. Orders of the Day.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has he planned any changes in the plans for setting up a council at Thompson as a result of the representations that he has had?

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): No, Madam Speaker.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I regret I didn't inform him. I requested an Order for Return dealing with certain agreements between International Nickel and the Province of Manitoba, also copies of correspondence between the Government of Manitoba and International Nickel respecting the development at Thompson and also in relation to the matter just raised by the Leader of the Opposition. I wonder if the Minister could give me any indication as to when I might be receiving this information.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, I'm sorry I can't be of too much help to my honourable friend right now. So far as I know the Department is working on it and we will attempt to get it in to the House as soon as we can.

MR. PAULLEY: A supplemental question, Madam Speaker. I would appreciate receiving the information prior to consideration of your departmental estimates if at all possible.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I'd like to ask a subsequent question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is it the intention then that the Minister himself will decide who will be the members of the advisory council?

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, this matter was I think set out quite thoroughly in a letter that I sent to Mr. Borowski as a result of the petition received from him yesterday. With your permission Madam Speaker I would like to read this letter to the House. It is addressed to Mr. J. P. Borowski, President of the Thompson NDP Association, Box 813, Thompson, Man. "Dear Mr. Borowski: re advisory committee, Local Government District of Mystery Lake. Premier Roblin has asked me to write to you concerning the petition which you left with him on Thursday, April 1. The election of an advisory committee at Thompson is not

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd) within the sole control of the Province of Manitoba. This matter is governed by the agreement which was made with International Nickel Company Limited in 1956 by the previous government. By this agreement it was provided that no form of local government would be established in Thompson without prior consent of the company. During the last 18 months representatives of the Province of Manitoba and INCO have been attempting to reach agreement on this and other points. The agreement that we have been able to make provides in part as follows: '1. That the Minister of Municipal Affairs appoint an advisory committee to the Local Government District administrator for a period of not less than two years to advise the Local Government District administrator on affairs concerning the townsite only. 2. That at the end of the two-year period of the advisory committee, consideration be given to the incorporation of a town and at the time of such incorporation the advisory committee of the Local Government District be disbanded. 3. That the official trustee continue to operate the school district of Mystery Lake for one more year and that a regular school board be elected in the fall of 1965 to take office at the beginning of 1966.' I think it should be pointed out quite clearly" -- oh, this is the end of the quotation -- "I think it should be pointed out quite clearly that the present situation is a marked improvement in the matter of local authority and responsibility over anything that pertained before. Although the advisory council will be appointed this community will have an elected school board to take charge of school affairs in the community in the fall of this year. It is quite probable that at the end of the two-year period described in the memorandum of understanding with the company that incorporation of the town may become a fact. Yours very truly." And it was signed by myself.

I think, Madam Speaker, that we should take some cognizance of the fact that at the time that this agreement was originally made the company were concerned that they would have to provide the capital for all of the ordinary municipal improvements in that community and that in the early years of a mining town that the population of that town was liable to be more or less transient population with a large proportion of single people who had really no firm stake in the community. This situation is gradually changing. Thompson is becoming a fairly well established town and I think the company have recognized this and I think that probably by the end of the two-year period for the advisory committee the company will be quite happy to see the town incorporated and take over the administration of their own affairs at that time. In the meantime the company will have the opportunity to complete the last of the capital commitments they have for providing municipal services and schools and that sort of thing in this community and they will have no extra responsibilities then to the community which might be controlled by another body, other than the administrator.

MR. MOLGAT: a subsequent question to the Minister. Could he indicate how many nominations have been received to date?

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, I couldn't tell you the exact number of nominations because nominations won't close until sometime this afternoon. The nominations for the advisory council are being taken in exactly the same way as nominations for an ordinary municipal election and the provisions of The Municipal Act have been followed in every respect with such changes as were necessary to change the forms to Local Government District and so on. As of this morning at about 9:30 there were seven nominations in. It was expected that there would be several more before nominations close this afternoon.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, if I may, on this matter direct another question to the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Are copies of the agreement or understanding of agreement that he referred to available? If so, I would appreciate receiving a copy; also a copy of the letter which he sent to Mr. Borowski, President of the New Democratic Party at Thompson.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, I'd be glad to table at this time a copy of the letter to Mr. Borowski and I will obtain a copy of the memorandum of understanding for my honourable friend if he wishes, or perhaps he might be advised to put an address for papers if . . . --(Interjection)-- It will be in the Return that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources will be filing.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker I'd like to address a question to the First Minister. In view of the fact that it is now almost a week, in fact I think exactly a week since the Federal Government made their subsequent offer on the Pan-American Games and that there appears to be some possibility that the local committee may disband unless a decision is made soon, could the Minister inform the House as to the Provincial Government's position in this matter?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker the government is in constant communication I may say with three other parties in this agreement and, while I have no definite agreement to announce, I would like to say that I am hopeful that we will ultimately, and soon, get a satisfactory agreement. Members must remember that one of the parties to the agreement is the City Council of the City of Winnipeg and according to their constitution they have certain procedures that must be followed before they can give their consent or their views on this matter as a Council and that is one of the factors in the situation. I trust it will be soon clarified.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, could the First Minister indicate whether the province has gone beyond the previous commitment it made of \$1 million flat?

MR. ROBLIN: I think I would prefer to withhold any statement on that until conclusion of negotiations.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, a subsequent question on the same subject if I may. News reports this morning indicate that the federal government have been prepared to go another step further, that is, in addition to their previous offer of a million and a quarter matching the province's offer of a million, that instead of making their next step a million and a half against a further quarter of a million from the province that they're prepared to go on the basis of 50-50 sharing of possible deficits over those two figures. Could the Minister indicate whether this is correct and whether the province is prepared to accept that?

MR. ROBLIN: I would not care to comment upon a newspaper report.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the House Leader. I'm not sure if that's the First Minister or the Attorney-General. It has to do with the order of business. I would ask when the government intends to introduce legislation having to do with protecting the citizen against the state which was intimated in the Throne Speech; also legislation regarding public legal aid, etcetera.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, the resolution respecting legal aid is on the order paper, and I expect an item respecting the public protector, or whatever you want to call it, will shortly be on the order paper as well.

MR. MORRIS A GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wish to thank the Minister of Public Works for solving the door problem. Instead of fixing the doors, he keeps them open.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister who is also the Treasurer of this province. In view of the fact that the Federal Government has given notice that they will be proposing legislation excluding the provinces from investing in chartered banks, does this government, or has this government made protest, or do they intend to protest this legislation when it comes about in the new session?

MR. ROBLIN: It is the opinion of the Government of Manitoba that under the constitution this is a matter for the Federal Government to decide.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, may I address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour? Is he now in a position to answer my question of the other day regarding whether or not the Minimum Wage Board are in the process of holding hearings respecting the minimum wage in Manitoba?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Madam Speaker, in reply to my honourable friend the leader of the New Democratic Party, I would like to tell him and members of the House that the Minimum Wage Board have held one meeting, January 19th, 1965, at which time they requested and solicited budgets for single girls from the following organizations: The City of Winnipeg Welfare Department, The University of Manitoba, the YWCA an agency of the Community Chest, the Winnipeg Welfare Planning Council. The Board at the present time is in receipt of budgets from the following organizations: The Family Bureau, the Sisters of Service Girls Residential Club, the City of Winnipeg Welfare Department, the Winnipeg Welfare Planning Council. The Board is presently awaiting a brief which is being prepared jointly by the School of Social Work and the School of Home Economics, University of Manitoba. It is planned to hold a meeting the middle of next week after consideration and due deliberations on the reports that have been submitted. They will start holding public hearings in May.

MR. PAULLEY: A subsequent question if I may, Madam Speaker. Is the Minister or the Board aware of the fact that there is now a Dominion minimum wage of \$1.25?

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, for those employees under federal jurisdiction. And that seems to be question (2).

MR. PAULLEY: The Minister is aware of that.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister could tell us why the change of procedure in his negotiation in regard to the Pan-Am Games. The first negotiation was done by newspaper, this is where we found out, and now all of a sudden everything is a big secret. I wonder why the change in this procedure.

MR. ROBLIN: I think that question should be addressed to somebody else because as far as the Province of Manitoba is concerned, we've not been negotiating through the newspaper.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well Madam Speaker, I'd like to know who we should address it to, because -- you see the report from, the offer made by the First Minister came out of the newspaper and I wonder where. I guess it's just a change in attitude.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, please. The proposed resolution

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I'd like to ask a -- before the Orders of the Day, ask a question to the Honourable the Minister of Health. The Chairman of the Manitoba Hospital Commission is leaving, I believe, at the end of this month. Is there any replacement? Has any replacement been announced or made yet?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, I will be making an announcement of the changes when we consider the estimates.

MR. GRAY: Madam Chairman, may I ask the First Minister or the Provincial Treasurer whether he has any intention of selling bonds this year.

MR. ROBLIN: The matter is being given consideration, but no final decision has been reached as yet.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture and Water Conservation. In view of the fact that there may be a quick thaw this spring and a resultant rapid run-off in some of the watersheds, is his department taking any steps to protect against flash flooding, particularly on the Assiniboine River?

HONOURABLE GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, there is a standing procedure for meeting these emergency situations, and although the flood forecasting committee has sat on two occasions and considered the probability of a flood, and in both cases have forecast that barring any unforeseen emergencies there would not be any flooding, that the flows would be well within the dikes in the Assiniboine River, in spite of this, they will continue to keep a running reconnaissance and if there is any change in the pattern of weather that could contribute to flood conditions, naturally emergency measures will take place.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I would ask him if he has received any communication regarding a National Wheat Policy Meeting which was requested by this government -- as to time and place.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I believe that question could probably be addressed to me as I was the one that wrote the letter. I've received no answer as yet.

MADAM SPEAKER: Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I would ask for leave to have the matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable the Member for Pembina.

MRS. CAROLYNE MORRISON (Pembina): I would ask the indulgence of the House, Madam Speaker, to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for St. Matthews. The Honourable the Member for Brandon.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, I thought I should say a word or two on this resolution, particularly in support of the amendment, because I've always been rather critical of old age pension schemes which pay indiscriminately to individuals regardless of their financial position, because I can see that in certain instances, people receiving even a maximum pension such as the government would set, could still be in need, and I do believe that our money for welfare purposes and for assisting the aged would be better used to

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd). the benefit of all if consideration were given to the factor of need and then even if one were receiving the full amount of any given pension and were still in need, that need could be covered.

Secondly, I thought I should like to say a word on this matter, because I have had a few thoughts recently that, and because we are dealing with dollars and cents on a very broad interpretation, Madam Speaker, you could say that what I am about to say is quite within the range of the resolution, because I would like to deal with our treatment of the aged. It may be that what I am going to suggest may be regarded by members of this legislature as completely Utopian and something for the future, but I would like to at least plant the idea for people to consider and sometime in the future some of these thoughts come into practical usage. We have been considering our elderly people, people who go into Homes and are retired, largely I think from the viewpoint of the people who have to share the load, rather than thoughts of these people, the aged themselves. Now, at one time, as all members will agree, it was customary for children to feel a responsibility to parents and grandparents and keep them within the family enclosure and responsibility. This probably --assuming of course that it was within the financial ability of the young people to do so-- this probably gave the most reasonable and liveable life for these older folks, because they were certainly within the family circle and still had some degree of usefulness. Now the procedure appears to be to more and more look to the state to look after our aged, and because --and I don't want to be misinterpreted here, because I know that this wouldn't, you can't make blanket accusations-- but there is the possibility that young people now as a salve to their conscience for having looked to the state to take care of the elderly people, then want those homes in the community close to them, with the viewpoint that, "Well, we can visit them once in a while". But I suspect old people who are visited once in awhile, whether it be once a day or once a week or once a month, still have many hours of lonesomeness and a complete feeling of uselessness, and because of this and one or two things I've observed and some further things that I have read, sometimes these ideas crystallize in your mind and even though they appear to be Utopian and something for the future, there may be something useful within it that is worth general thought and consideration, and I thought that rather than our present method of planting these small homes at various points in the country, and remembering first of all the reason why people have to retire is because their physical capacities are failing and they no longer can meet the tempo of the day-to-day world which forces their retirement --and this is obvious, you don't put an old fighter into the ring against a young man. And I came up, largely because of one item I read and certain parallel instances that I've seen, where there was an instance of a --down in California they have quite a progressive Old Folks Home in San Francisco, I believe it is-- and there was the instance of a chap who had been a stage manager in New York. He was in his late sixties and his relatives had almost given him up, that he was on his last legs, and the discovery was made that he had been a stage manager, and this old folks home had a theatrical entertainment group connected with it and they suggested he become stage manager. The individual writing the book saw this man ten years later and he looked twenty years younger and was full of vim and vigour because he now had a use in life. So I begin to wonder if rather than continually building these isolated old folks homes, why not build, and start off of course on a small scale, build a village or suburb geared particularly to the tempo of these older folks. I am sure that there are all kinds of professional men, retired bankers, storekeepers, who could take their little daily chore of maybe only an hour or two a week, but run this village themselves. Have all the hard work done in the village by of course young vigorous people, and they would be the only young vigorous people allowed to be living there, but that in this place the tempo would be geared to the old folks who have to retire and would live there, and I think ultimately the costs to the state would be much less because they would be providing a great deal of the services for themselves. A bank of course in a village like this wouldn't be a bank in the normal sense, it would be more or less a clearing house. I think any number of people would like the chance to gossip with friends and work for an hour or two in the village store and provide their useful service. The libraries could be run on a similar basis; they might have their places of entertainment, the theatre and so on. This thing is entirely practical although as I say it may be a long time in the future.

Locally I know there is at least one person in my home town who came up with the idea that when a certain number of us reached the age of retirement it would be well worth considering the idea of putting up a certain amount of capital each and starting a business, and among twenty or thirty people you could certainly see that you would find people who could do all types

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd), of work; such a business would have no labour problems and would make and give a usefulness and a purpose to life even beyond retirement. I think that the future will --sometime we will have to think more of the people that we are retiring into old folks homes and give them something to live for, some useful purpose. I know as a boy I can recall that railroad workers particularly and particularly workers who had no outside interest, no hobbies, you could be almost certain that three or four years after retirement they would likely be dying off, whereas people who have an interest and a purpose in life and that feeling of usefulness which our type of enforced retirement takes away from these individuals, this is literally destruction.

There is much to be gained from older people. I often feel it's such a pity that about the time an individual acquires a certain amount of wisdom and judgment that he's just about ready for the scrap heap, but in villages such as this, that were geared to the tempo of older folks, give them a place and a purpose, a usefulness in providing for each other and because the pace would be leisurely it would be not just putting them off in a room to exist, it would be putting them into a rather sunlit era, age, which people might look forward to rather than dread.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, if nobody else wishes to speak, I'd like to say a word. As a dream for the future, I would agree with the Honourable Member from Brandon. My

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member is not closing the debate, he is speaking on the amendment and he has already spoken on the amendment, so . . .

MR. GRAY: It's up to your rule, Madam

MADAM SPEAKER: You won't be able to speak at this time. You have already spoken on the amendment. --(Interjection)-- We are on the amendment; we are not on the main motion.

MR. GRAY: In other words I cannot say a word any more until the amendment is carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Right.

MR. GRAY: . . . or defeated. Oh well I have to obey your ruling.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

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

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, the other day when this motion was almost closed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I was able to move adjournment in order to say a few words on the resolution itself. Being a farmer myself naturally I'm interested in resolutions of this kind, because I think all members are interested in seeing a better return given to the farmer for his products and especially wheat, since wheat is one of our main commodities that the farmers even in Manitoba grow and sell, that they derive a large part of their income from the sale of wheat, and as we all know the deliveries this year are down from other years by about 10 percent. Coupled with this is the decline in price so that the farmer is going to take a beating in the year 1965 because of this, both on deliveries and on the price of grain, so that our economy no doubt will be affected by this very matter. Surely enough we should as a government in Manitoba, do everything in our power to bring about better prices for wheat.

I was very interested in the contribution the Member for Souris-Lansdowne made. I always get the feeling when they express themselves in the way he did that they treat the Canadian Wheat Board as though it's a sacred institution that should not be criticized in any way. I feel very differently about this. In fact to me the Canadian Wheat Board is some kind of Crown agency for which no one is responsible. The Federal Government set up a monopoly in this country by creating the Canadian Wheat Board. All sales have to go through that board and yet when the sales are good and the prices are good, the government wants to take credit for it -- that's the Federal Government. We've seen this happen time and again. But if the reverse is the case then no one is responsible for it because this is a wheat board and not a government commission, the government feels that they are not responsible. I think this is one of the most foolish ways in having an agency taking over a commodity of this kind where the economy depends so much on, not only on Manitoba but all of the western provinces, and Saskatchewan and Alberta more so than Manitoba, because they produce more. Our production I think runs around 50 million as an average whereas the other western provinces produce much much more, and therefore

(MR. FROESE cont'd).....are more affected than we are. So I find that here we have a board that is given the duties of selling our wheat and yet when it comes to brass tacks they don't have to answer, and no one answers, so I feel that we should have some protection. What this resolution is dwelling on is to give them a guaranteed minimum price.

Now they have an arbitrary figure set out in the resolution of \$2.00. Whether this is a good figure or not that's debatable. Personally I feel that we should have a parity price. This is one of our basic policies of the Social Credit Party in Canada, namely that produce be sold under a two price system: (a) internal based upon parity and (b) the external based upon what can be obtained in competitive markets or through international agreements, to work in conjunction with an international commodity clearing house, in the event of the price being below parity, the Canadian Government to make up the difference. This then would give the farmer the purchasing power that he would need and require because it would be based on parity, it would be based on the commodities that he in turn has to purchase and there should be some relation.

Naturally we see today that we have other industries, especially the textile industry in the east and other manufacturing concerns, where we protect them to a large degree. We place high tariffs on the commodities coming in. If this were applied to wheat, that we would be selling wheat to other countries at the world market price but when the return was made to the farmer that he would receive parity price instead and that the balance would be made up by the Canadian Government though the Bank of Canada, I think we would have an ideal situation. This is what should be done in Canada. The protection given to these other industries in turn also affects our wheat and other commodities and the cereals that we have to sell, because we find today that countries like Japan, they have to restrict their exports to Canada on a voluntary basis. I can't go along with that very well because I don't think this is voluntary, I think this is imposed on them by the Canadian Government. Were these people able to have free trade with Canada we would be able to dispose of our surpluses of our grains much more readily and as a result the Canadian farmer would benefit by this. We have seen that in the last number of years large sales were made to the Communist countries of the world and the Canadian farmer as a result was able to dispose of his wheat. Whether this was good or not I think is in some ways doubtful because I have the feeling that we should be able to sell to the countries that are friendly to us in the same way as to the Communist Block. But because of the Bretton Woods Conference Agreement we are restricted in giving credit to nations that want to purchase and import the wheat from Canada and that we cannot as readily extend credit to those nations as we do to the Communist nations. Actually the Communist nations today are a preferred class in that respect and I think this should be reversed. This should be done away with. The countries friendly to us, many of them who have large populations, millions are starving, yet they cannot get hold of our wheat because of our financial arrangements and I feel that certainly we as Canadians, calling ourselves a civilized country, should be able to create means and bring means about whereby we could distribute this wheat to those countries that need it so badly. We have the necessary machinery through the Bank of Canada. We've seen that the Bank of Canada can be used for that very purpose and has been used on one or two occasions in the past. Recently when the United Kingdom needed stabilization in their currency, what happened? --we advanced them the necessary funds from the Bank of Canada, without interest, so that they could stabilize their currency. Surely now if we can do it for one country we can do it for another country and we can do it in a different way. Why not extend credit to other countries that need the wheat so badly and thus bring about sales for our wheat in this country.

Madam Speaker, I think the resolution is a good one because it will bring about discussion and certainly we are interested in bringing about better returns to the farmer so that while as I say this is an arbitrary figure, the \$2 support price, I would rather see it to be parity and along the lines I have expressed myself. However not being in complete accord however I will support the resolution because it involves the two price system and it involves a better return to our farmers.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker if no one else wishes to speak at this time, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. George, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for St. Vital, and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Member for Gladstone. The Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, two things about this resolution have completely amazed me. The first is the failure of the government to defend by direct means this resolution rather because this resolution actually is aimed at a policy of this government and if this government is not prepared to defend its own policies in this House I think it is in very bad taste for this government to use the weasling tactics of amending a resolution and rendering it completely emasculated and completely eviscerated.

The second thing which amazes me about this resolution is the attitude of the Honourable Member for Churchill. This resolution is directed against the discrimination which this fuel tax imposes on the people of Northern Manitoba, and here we have a man from Northern Manitoba whose loyalty to his party is far greater than his loyalty to his constituents. There are a number of people in this House, Madam who rode in on somebody else's coat tails but I wish to assure those that did that if they are going to come back into this House they'll have to come back on their own merits. Now I was amazed as I say when I heard the Honourable Member for Churchill defend the action of the government in respect of this fuel tax, particularly on the nil effect which it had upon his own constituency, or his own constituents, and I have here Madam which I will file, or table, a copy of a telegram which was sent to the Honourable Member of Churchill by the United Steel Workers of America Local No. 6166, a copy of which telegram was sent to my leader, and this telegram reads as follows: March 27 - copy of telegram sent to Gordon Beard, M.L.A. "We in Thompson protest the statements made by you in the Legislature in relation to the new five percent heat tax. We would therefore like to take this opportunity of reaffirming our original stand that this tax is indeed a vicious, unfair and cruel one. Furthermore, it is our contention that this tax is discriminatory against the people of the North. We maintain this stand because of the fact that we experience a more severe climate and have longer winters in the North than other residents of Manitoba who live in a location geographically south of ours. The imposition of this tax places you and your government in the position of taking a retrogressive step in the opening of the northern areas of Manitoba for development. The tax on telephone long distance charges would also appear to be heavily weighed against the people of the North. Because of the isolated nature of the Northern communities residents of these communities find it more necessary to use telephones to keep in touch with families who may reside elsewhere in Manitoba and indeed in the rest of Canada. This of course makes these people liable to a disproportionate share of this new tax. In view of the expressed sentiments embodied in this communication we find that we have no alternative to challenge the authenticity of your recent statement in the Legislature. Therefore we expect you will support any move to repeal this odious and discriminatory tax. Stuart Consul, Local 6166, United Steel Workers of America." In addition to that Madam, my leader also received from United Steel Workers of America Local No. 6166 a copy of a petition which was circulated in the Thompson area, petitioning against the viciousness of this tax. This petition Madam is signed by 1211 constituents of the Honourable Member for Churchill, and this too I wish to table.

Now I hope Madam that in view of the statements that I have made and the contents of that telegram and the contents of that petition that the Honourable Member for Churchill will have a change of heart, support the resolution that has been moved by the Honourable Member for St. George and let the people of the North know that he is truly their representative in this House.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker I ask the leave of this House to allow this motion to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution as amended by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside. The Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I would prefer that the Honourable the Attorney-General should be in his seat when I am speaking on this resolution but in the interest of getting the business of the House advanced I shall not wait for his reappearance but we'll hope as the Ministers say that if there is someone within the sound of my voice who can

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd).do anything about it, that appropriate action will be taken. The reason that I make that suggestion Madam Speaker is because it was the Honourable the Attorney-General who apparently represented the government forces in dealing with this resolution. My recollection is that he is the only member from the government side who spoke upon it and I did want to make some comment upon his disposition of the matter.

I think we have arrived at the right solution but it's the method by which we've arrived at it that I would like to comment on. I think under the circumstances that it is well that we should reconstitute a committee Madam Speaker with you as the one person that is named already in the amendment and nine other members which would seem to be an appropriate number, so that we could once again give consideration to the rules --and not only the rules but the forms of proceeding of the House-- in an effort to benefit by the experience that all of us get in the House here and try and get those rules and proceedings to expedite the business of the House and to see that it moves along efficiently. So the end result of the resolution I think I am quite satisfied with.

But I certainly have not qualified for the compliment that the Honourable the Attorney-General seemed to pay me, and I am glad he included my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party as well, and I think perhaps he is deserving of the compliment that was paid him by the Attorney-General. But I am not, because here's what the Honourable the Attorney-General said: "Now we have had excellent presentations of the viewpoint as expressed by the original motion and of the viewpoint as expressed by the proposed amendment which is now before this assembly." Well the amendment was proposed by my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party --I think he must have made a good presentation of his case-- but I certainly did not make a good presentation of my case because the Honourable the Attorney-General completely failed to understand my case. He couldn't compliment me on the presentation I made of it when he failed completely to get the point of it. Because here's what he says, and I'm quoting now from page 1004 of Hansard: He said "Madam Speaker, it was not my privilege to be a member of this special committee which sat in 1960 to consider the rules and orders and forms of this Assembly and I therefore am unable to contribute anything as to the reason for any difference between the report of the committee and the adoption of the new rules as they appear in our rule book at the present time." A modest statement. "However, I would be bound to observe this, Madam Speaker, that it would not seem unusual, to use the words of the original motion moved by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that there could be a variation both in language and principle from Rule 33 as recommended by the committee and as adopted by the House. What I'm saying Madam Speaker, is that oftentimes recommendations or reports of committees are not necessarily adopted by the House in their exact form or that these reports or recommendations find their way into legislation, or in this case, into the Rules, in the form that they are recommended, and it would seem that this Assembly must always be sovereign in such matters. So I make that observation as to the general problem that's posed by the motion moved by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside." That's the end of the quote of my honourable friend.

Now my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party did me the courtesy of at least reading the resolution that I had gone to the trouble of placing upon the order paper of the House here to the extent that he understood what the problem was. He didn't agree with my suggestion regarding it, but at least he studied it well enough to understand what it meant. But my honourable friend the Attorney-General --I'm sure this can only be laid to the door of the fact that he was so busy and didn't take the time to read it-- because his understanding is not so wanting that he would have made the mistake had he done so.

The point that I've been trying to make all the time Madam Speaker, is that while I agree completely with what my honourable friend says in this paragraph, of course the House must always remain sovereign, of course we sometimes have reports made here that we don't agree with in total and of course we sometimes get variations, but the point is that in this case the report was made and it was adopted by the House, and it was adopted by the House exactly with the section that I quoted in the original motion in there. This is not a question of a variation between what was reported by the committee and what was adopted by the House. The House adopted the report exactly as it was presented to it and the whole pointed issue is that while the House had adopted it exactly as it was recommended by the committee, someplace between that adoption and the printing of the rules, this particular rule was changed. It didn't appear as it had been both recommended and adopted, and the sovereignty of the House is not being exercised at the present moment because I submit to you Madam Speaker that Rule 33 as it appears in our

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd). . . . rule book is not our Rule 33: Our Rule 33 is the one that the committee recommended and the House adopted. I've said time and time again I'm not interested greatly in what slip occurred and where it occurred, why it occurred, as to where the change was made and another rule got into our rule book, that's not what I'm saying. What I'm saying is that the logical and sensible thing to do was correct the mistake in the Rule Book and put back in the one that is our rule; it is already our rule. I'm sure that my honourable friend the Attorney-General as a qualified lawyer would agree with me if he thinks this over that rule 33 as it was recommended by the committee and adopted by this House is our rule regardless of what appears in the rule book itself. There was a mistake made in getting it into the rule book.

Now my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party, as I say, read the motion and understood that that was the case, but he said even so, the rule's in the rule book and it's working all right let's adopt it. And you decided Madam Speaker, that that was in order even though it appeared to me to be a direct negative of what I had said. I had said this isn't the rule; my honourable friend's amendment said let's make it the rule and you agreed that it was in order and so we have the amendment before us.

Well now my honourable friend the Attorney-General struck out the operative part of my resolution -- the part that makes it very plain that there was no difference, there was no difference in what was recommended by the committee and what was adopted by the House. It quotes Rule 33 as the committee recommended it, as this House agreed with it and suggested that it be reinstated. Well as I say, the best way to settle the matter is go back into the committee and let us decide whether we want to keep the Rule 33 that now shows in our Rule Book wrongly, or, decide that we want to put in the one that we had previously decided to leave there. It wasn't a case of changing it, it had been that way in the 1951.

So why I wanted to be sure that my honourable friend the Attorney-General was here was to say to him that he and I have both been in the House too long for our feelings to get hurt over any misunderstanding like this, but I would like to suggest to him that the next time that he goes to correct me and to read a perfectly proper lecture to me about the sovereignty of this House, and that there frequently are differences between the way a report is put in and the way it's finally adopted by the House and all that sort of thing, that he read the terms next time of the resolution and thereby know exactly what he's talking about. In this case I regret to make the submission Madam Speaker, that he failed to do so and I put it down entirely to the fact that he was too busy to take the time to read it. But I would suggest to the government that the next time that they're going to commandeer someone to express the government's position on a matter of this kind, that they pick on someone who isn't so busy and consequently he can have the time to read what the original motion said. And with that kindly and well meant word of advice to my honourable friend I agree with the net result of what has happened.

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

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

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, the role of opposition at times gets discouraging because we have seen in our little group here where we have steadfastly supported good legislation and we have said so on quite a few occasions and we have also criticized legislation which we think is not good. But when we look at the amendment to this resolution by my honourable colleague from Logan, it's to my mind a good example of what I consider to be more or less government arrogance. It seems to me that it's the type of arrogance that it gets with power.

Now my honourable colleague's amendment, and I wish to read it, it's very simple, it doesn't criticize the government to any extent. It merely says that whereas automation has and will affect the employment opportunities of every Manitoban, now and in the future and, Whereas the problem is beyond the ability of any one group of society to solve, Therefore be it resolved that the Provincial Government give consideration to the advisability of establishing a committee comprising representatives of government, management, labour and agriculture to consider the effects of automation and recommend such measures which will enhance the moral, economic and sociological wellbeing of Manitoba in relation to the effects of automation. I submit that when I say that it is discouraging at times in the role of opposition to find an amendment like that because it's pretty hard to understand just why this should come about. I think if there ever was an innocuous and straightforward resolution, this is it. This amendment in my way of thinking is a good example of the smug and conceited way in which the government regards a good

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd).....suggestion to this House, because the amendment just oozes with self-righteousness and it suggests we should applaud what is being done and the government should be encouraged. Well isn't that just what the Honourable Member for Logan is saying in his resolution Madam Speaker, that he thinks the government should work together with industry and the other things, and I think he means encouragement in this regard. This amendment to my mind is picayune, it's contemptible and petty and in its preparation I think there was much grovelling and floundering in the verbiage of semantics.

The honourable member talks and he quotes two authorities and he is a good example of dealing in black and white. He quotes Mr. Goodman of the Labour Organization as saying, and I quote "workers are unemployed because of automation and are going to fill the madhouses of the nation". Then he goes to the other extreme and he quotes Mr. Hunter, Secretary of the Great-West Life Association, who says that "this is just a bogey to think that two percent of the population can produce for 98 percent." These are the extremes Madam Speaker, and I suggest that the truth lies somewhere in between.

I watched the TV program the other night Madam Speaker, "This Hour has Seven Days". It dealt with the typographical union and the Toronto newspapers dispute and as I watched it I was hoping that the Honourable Member for Roblin would be watching it too, because here we saw a complete breakdown of communications. Here we saw just what the Honourable Member for Logan was suggesting in his resolution, that there should be better communications. There was no need in my opinion for that unfortunate set of circumstances in Toronto, because I think that if the government had appointed such a committee to enquire into the effects of automation, this could have been avoided. I think that nearly every one who saw that on television would agree with that. This surely was a sad case of not being able to negotiate. While I said that the honourable member dealt with black and white because he said that Mr. Hunter said that two percent of the population --It's a bogey to suggest that it can produce for 98 percent, I also noticed in last night's paper, Madam Speaker, that Professor Bellan quoted as saying "automation is no threat to Manitoba in the near future." Well, Professor Bellan is a well respected man but I wish to suggest that he's not just entirely right when he says --he said, and I quote: "The railways which automated yard services here between 1957 and 1959 and laid off large numbers of workers in the process are now pleading with their people to come back to them because there is more work, due to wheat exports, increased passenger traffic, a recent prairie potash development, than they can handle with reduced staff". Madam Speaker, while we know that we have a fully automated yard with the Canadian National Railways, we also know that we haven't carried automation on into the railway shops to this extent. I suggest that the other railway hasn't had the co-operation of management and of labour that we have enjoyed on our railway, I think if the story were told of the hard thinking and the long study that was given by both union and management in order to accomplish what we have done on our railway. So I say that the Professor I believe is somewhere half-way between the truth. The Honourable Member, Madam Speaker, I believe is getting to be a bit socialistic when he talks here of --when he quoted, Madam Speaker, Anne Du Moulin, the--he abhorred the fact that she took a different slant on culture. I'd like to --oh, I said that he was turning socialist, Madam Speaker, and I wish to quote from him. He said that, "In other words, we must use, I feel, automation to increase our production. Some people say there's no point in doing this, we can't distribute what we're doing now. I feel that this is a great challenge. I feel that necessity is the mother of invention, and if we produce, I think we must force our society, we must force our society and we must force our economical theorists to devise methods of distribution. It must come". I'm just wondering what he had in mind, because it looked to me as if --he always seemed to object to the word "force", but here he is using it here now. I would suggest that it wouldn't be necessary to use this type of force that he's talking if we would go along with the sensible resolution submitted by the Honourable Member for Logan.

He also said that he deplored the fact that Miss Anne Du Moulin, the Executive Director of the Community Welfare Planning Council, had called for a change in attitude which would cease to make a god of work. And he said that, and he quotes: "That society has an attitude of snobbery about the way people spend their free time". And he quotes her statement where she's supposed to have said: "What makes beer drinking any worse than basket weaving if that person gets satisfaction". And here again I'm thinking, if you read the complete statement that she made that he is dealing in black and white.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Madam Speaker, I'd like to point out to the Honourable Member that I was

..... Order. Order.

MR. WRIGHT: I quote further, Madam Speaker. He says that, "Well, Madam Speaker, this is the attitude, part of the attitude that I'm talking about, where we feel that our goal today is personal, selfish, self-satisfaction. I couldn't disagree more. I don't think basket weaving might be a productive means of passing one's time, but I certainly think that there are other means of production which must be available to the individual where he feels that he is doing something of value, producing something of value for somebody else, for the community and the world in general."

The Honourable Member for Logan, Madam Speaker, realized this and he said that "automation issues a great many" oh, the Honourable Member for Roblin said, Madam Speaker, "automation issues a great many challenges to us all, a challenge to our social institutions, a challenge to our churches to try and get people to develop a sense of value, a sense of worth, a sense of worth in what they are doing. I think in many ways we've fallen greatly behind in this, that we haven't yet managed to adapt to the changes of the assembly line brought about in working conditions, where a person could no longer identify himself with the ultimate end of his product." Well, Madam Speaker, I suggest that the Honourable Member for Logan is aware of that and that was probably what prompted him to suggest this resolution. The Honourable Member for Roblin also said that "automation challenges labour, management and government", and this is exactly what we're saying that the honourable member's resolution says that. He wants to see labour, management and government just sit around the table and study this business of automation because there hasn't been too much study given to it yet.

I'd like to quote, Madam Speaker, the honourable member from page 864 of Hansard when he said: "I think the increased emphasis on technical vocational training in this province is one area where the government is taking positive action to help people to adjust and adapt to the conditions that might or are at the present time being brought about by automation. I can remember in the brief presented by the Premier in 1960 to the Federal-Provincial Conference where he said at that time, over four years ago, that the demands for technical and vocational training brought about by automation required immediate and increased assistance to the province from the Federal Government. I think we have to give them credit for accepting this principle; we have to give them credit for the help that they have given us; but I think we have to also emphasize that the problem is still with us and much work still remains to be done". The other night, Madam Speaker, when I spoke on vocational training, I said that, and I said that out of a federal expenditure of 643 millions of dollars, only 56 thousand dollars had been requested by industry to study this business of automation, and to train people for the new skills which they will need. I stressed the need for communication because this seems to be the thing that's needed most. Apparently business doesn't seem to understand or appreciate the assistance that's available to them in this all-important thing of training for people.

Madam Speaker, I think that the emphasis has to be on culture, and whether the honourable member agrees with the member from the Welfare Council or not, the emphasis in the future will be more on our intellectual and cultural life, rather than on production techniques. I have an article here from "Think" magazine which is the IBM magazine for June '62 and it is called: "Education in the New Technology". This author who is a widely known management expert and his article is entitled "Education in the New Technology", says that in the future we're going to have to place more emphasis on what people do with their leisure time, because the great group will be the middle group, the technological group, where there are neither bosses nor workers, but what he calls them "knowledge" employees, the accountant and the public health doctor, the sales manager and the chemical engineer, the industrial psychologist and the operations researcher. He goes on to say that a generation hence he says we may for example, have no engineering schools as such, and no medical schools as such. We may find out that technology, that is the application of systematic knowledge to work is a common and universal concept which has to be understood by the man who applies knowledge to inanimate matter, just the same way as by the man who applies knowledge to the living body. We might therefore well have schools of technology, and yet obviously both the engineer and the doctor need increasingly specialized knowledge in their own fields. He goes on to deplore the fact that we are placing far too much emphasis in some cases on education. He points out the fact that the China of the Mandarins did this and failed. He said at least this was the fate of one society that based itself on higher education and proven intellectual ability as a dominant qualification for leadership. This destroyed the creative ability of the Chinese within a few centuries from being original and creative inventors. And he said we owe after all such things as gun powder, printing and paper

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd).....making among many other inventions to the genius of the early Chinese technologists, and China became completely unproductive technologically, completely frozen in its tools and techniques. The very great art of China, and few peoples have equalled the painting, poetry and ceramics of Sung period China, and they became equally sterile. So I say that's it's not foolish, Madam Speaker, to talk about such things as what people do with their spare time. I think this is of the utmost importance.

I think what the Honourable Member for Logan had in mind, Madam Speaker, was that we are trying to get this gap of misunderstanding to close a little and the idea of having business, labour and government sit down and try to study the effects of automation was a sensible one. And I think that --getting back to the program I saw on Sunday again, Madam Speaker, I think that there was quite a lesson to be learned there, for both labour and management, because this in my mind showed a complete breakdown of communication as we would envisage it by the resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan. And I would say that should the majority support the Honourable Member for Roblin's amendment, the government would be deserving of censure, because in their eagerness to pat their own backs they would be ignoring one of the most pressing problems of this or any other country. They would be dooming the people of Manitoba to a period of insecurity, uncertainty, and labour-management strife such as has not been equalled for quite a long time. One cannot blame in any great measure either management or the unions for these sort of situations, because of the dislocation at the present time of the effects of automation, but if the government sees fit to avoid its responsibilities, the responsibilities of a stewardship with such facetious statements as the amendment by the Honourable Member for Roblin, then I would be very disappointed indeed, Madam Speaker, and I would ask this House to seriously consider the defeat of the amendment to this what I consider sensible resolution.

MR. JAMES T. MILLS (Kildonan): Madam Speaker, I would like to rise and take part in this debate, and I would like to speak in favour of the amendment by the Honourable Member from Roblin. I would like to give you the view that I feel that the government is doing in the form of help to the small businessmen of Manitoba. Automation Madam Speaker, has become a catch word to cover the many aspects of a technological change, while such a change is not a phenomena peculiar to this particular decade or even to the century, certain conditions do exist today that enable us to better understand our circumstances and to be more deliberate in our planning for the future.

Madam Speaker, you may ask what are these conditions. The growth of our educational facilities as a key institution in our society today. We have more elementary and secondary schools. New schools for teaching, the teaching of trade and technology courses and expanding university are examples of this growth. Communications have so improved in recent years that we are no longer able to isolate ourselves and our activities into a dependable political or economic shell. We cannot be content to compare this decade's progress with the previous decade. Today we must be prepared to measure our progress against the Swedish record, or the German or French or even Japanese achievements. The inevitable movement towards universal education combined with impressive developments in technology have created a new set of attitudes towards our world. We are forced to examine how adequately we are prepared to keep up with these changes and how successful we can be in maintaining and helping to accelerate our rate of growth. These problems are not exclusive occupations of government and giant corporations, changes as basic as the ones we have discussed affect great and small alike. Indeed my particular concern Madam Speaker, is with small business. For such establishments have neither the knowledge to comprehend the consequences of the change nor the resources to make the adjustment necessary for survival. Small business is far from small in the aggregate. By a wide margin Madam Speaker, the largest number of our business establishments today would be classified as small business, however the term is defined. Approximately three quarters of our Canadian business establishments have less than four employees. It is a fact however that the relatively small number of large establishments provide the bulk of our total assets, employment, payrolls, and value output. Nonetheless, Madam Speaker, small business has continued to survive and in some instances is prospering in this changing world. This has been in part because small businesses do not always compete with giant corporations. The concentration in large establishments are particularly apparent in these industries where there are advantages to large accumulating profit rather than capital: Heavy manufacturing, mining, transportation, communication and public utilities. Small business on the other hand particularly in those areas where personal knowledge and personal services are important, thus in the

(MR. MILLS cont'd). professions, in the wholesale and retail trade, in the construction sub-trades and in all industries producing personalized products like clothing and custom furniture, small businesses have done well. Nevertheless, the small business like its large counterpart must keep abreast of these developments: new knowledge, new techniques, new products, new markets and so forth.

Madam Speaker with a small commitment and a fixed capital the small business has less flexibility, but this at the same time gives rise to certain disadvantages. We have difficulty in financing expansion, difficulty in keeping abreast of new developments because of the heavy reliance of the knowledge and capacity of a few men already overburdened with detail responsibilities of day to day operations. It is in these very areas that the mounting pressure of newer and more efficient methods has caused the managers of small businesses to express their greatest concern and it's in these areas that the government should be striving to relieve some of the pressures.

Madam Speaker you ask what is the government doing today? There are two levels of government programing. First there are the familiar undertakings that provide a broad basis of support for the entire community, and at this level we have selective expenditures, programs to stimulate economic activity in slow moving areas. The extention and maintenance of roads and other means of travel to developing areas, and perhaps most important of all the construction and operation of schools and institutes with progress designed to satisfy the needs of the community. However, the government functions at another level wherein. special services, these are the personal services it renders to the businessmen of Manitoba. Broadly speaking these services fall within three areas: management counselling, engineering and technical services and marketing assistance. Management counselling services, most of these services are offered through the business development branch of the Department of Industry and Commerce. In addition to providing immediate advisory assistance to business, the branch will help businessmen identify new opportunities and thereby profitably expand their existing facilities. Engineering and technical services are provided by the government through several departments and pseudo government agencies. Again the Department of Industry and Commerce provide direct services to small businesses unable to afford private consultative work. These services are offered in the anticipation that they will encourage the implementation of new productive techniques. The economies of volume production were possible through increased productivity. New product design and development and general efficient management is a control constitutional to efficient and for profitable business operation.

Specific services are of course offered by the Department of Agriculture and Mines and Natural Resources in problems peculiar to their particular various prime industries. To help businessmen adapt to the rapid changes in manufacturing processes, distribution methods, communication techniques and so forth, the Government of Manitoba has established a special product development fund. Loans from this fund Madam Speaker will help many Manitoba businessmen to finance outside research assistance, to forecast trends, develop new products, adopt new processes and to promote the efficient operation of production facilities.

The Manitoba Research Council has been established to evaluate the need of, and for, the provision of personnel and facilities, to enhance the. research and development capabilities of existing industries. The program developed in this province Madam Speaker, to assist industries in locating and developing markets has been most valuable to the small business. Two branches within the government, the business and economic research branch and the trade and marketing branch are both active in promoting sales for Manitoba products. The former one investigates local and domestic markets while the latter is wholly concerned with foreign markets. In this endeavour Madam Speaker two specialized agencies, the Manitoba Export Corporation and the Manitoba Design Institute are particularly active in assisting Manitoba businessmen to employ the most modern and newest techniques in the production and thereby assume a competitive and prominent position in the industry. Apart from these specific areas of assistance the government is investigating the overall patterns of change with attention to the possible effect of automation systems in business. The Economic Consultative Board will be examining this subject in several specific areas.

The labour branch, they have their research branch also. We are approaching the subject with a great deal of interest in methods by which we may maximize the production potential of the labour force. Today Madam Speaker, the essential effort is not to support the inefficient small business against the imagined threat of the giant automation industries but to assure small business of our continuous assistance to help them become more efficient in those

(MR. MILLS cont'd).enterprises where their size, their ingenuity and their energy can contribute to a more profitable and continuing operation. The government has done much but there is still more to be done. The progress thus far assures us that we are moving in the right direction.

Madam Speaker I have summed up what I feel that the government is trying to do for the small business in Manitoba and I feel we have no fear of automation if one principle is followed and can be carried out, that we can have full employment and everyone will be happier and more leisure time.

MADAM SPEAKER: I am rather hesitant to stop a member when he is giving a deliberation but I must remind the members of the House that they should try to co-operate and not read their speeches. I am rather of the opinion that the last member was reading his and I would like to seek his co-operation and the co-operation of all members of the House to please refrain from reading your speeches.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): My MLA should have picked up his notes; he would have been able to read them better.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, please.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Elmwood that debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. DESJARDINS: In his absence I wonder if we could have the matter stand.

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

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): May I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Morris and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Gladstone. In considering this amendment proposed by the Honourable the Member for Gladstone, I would like to say that in my view the main motion of the Honourable Member for Morris, although presented in a very serious manner and with good intentions, has provoked a degree of frivolity and in my opinion the main motion has been debated in the House in somewhat a frivolous manner. The amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Gladstone seems to carry out this same theme of frivolity. In order to preserve the decorum and the dignity of this House attention should be given by the members of this House to the motions which they present and which will be recorded in the Journals of this Province. There are other ways and means by which a member may bring along a want of confidence motion in the government. This may be done in Supply or by way of a substantive motion. Therefore I must rule that the amendment of the Honourable Member, in my opinion, is out of order. Are you ready for the question?

HONOURABLE GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, in taking part in this most important debate, I will restrict my comments at this time to the question of medicare to the amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member for Wellington. And may I say at the offset Madam Speaker that there has been occasions in the past, after listening to orations from my honourable friend the Member for Wellington, that I have taken advantage of the opportunity to comment in reply as caustically as the presentation of my honourable friend. However, I think Madam Speaker that my colleague from St. John's adequately replied to that aspect of the presentation made by the Member for Wellington.

So I say it will not be my purpose at this time to endeavour to refute the propositions of the Member for Wellington, although I must confess that while listening to him my blood pressure did go up and I felt inclined at that particular time to attempt to give him what-for, and may I say that I think my honourable friend the Member for Wellington would agree with me that he certainly deserved that type of a reply. However, may I say to him that I appreciate very much the time and study that he must have given to the preparation of his oration, if indeed that is the proper term to use. But it seems to me Madam Speaker that as we listened to the Honourable Member for Wellington he was attempting to establish a case whereby the state would take no part whatsoever in the field of medicare, in the field of making provision for the health care of the citizens, for he derided almost every step that has been taken by nations the length and breadth of this universe of ours, and suggested in his remarks that these nations basically were in error in attempting to make provisions healthwise for their citizens. And then however, Madam Speaker, lo and behold at the conclusion of his resolution he proposes the amendment which establishes that there should be measures of health care for the people of Canada, for the Province of Manitoba, and he in his amendment to the amendment suggests that we should consider the representation that was made to the Royal Commission on Health Services by the First Minister and the former Minister of Health; we should consider those resolutions and submissions; that we should urge the Government of Canada to call a Dominion-Provincial Conference with a view of establishing a federal-provincial plan of health insurance that would be comprehensive, universally available and consistent with the principle of need.

May I respectfully suggest, Madam Speaker, that if I did not know the psychology of my honourable friend that I could find a lot to agree with him in his amendment, even to the degree of accepting the last few words "consistent with the principle of need." Because we are convinced, Madam Speaker, that there is a need for a comprehensive and universal scheme of medicare in Canada, in Manitoba. But I am very much afraid however that the interpretation of the word "need" is different as between my honourable friend the Member for Wellington and myself. Because I am convinced that by the use of the word "need" in the resolution and the principle of need as it is stated in this resolution that my honourable friend means a needs test or a means test before the benefits of medicare, comprehensive and universal, will be made available to the people of our nation.

It is in this context that I wish to oppose the proposition of my honourable friend, because I can see if my interpretation of his presentation is correct, he means that in the field of health, as in the field of welfare under the present administration, that the provision of health care shall be a continuation of the cap-in-hand basis insofar as the individual is concerned before they would be able to receive the benefits and the advances that medical and allied sciences are making available to humanity today. But Madam Speaker, because my honourable friend referred to the presentation of the Government of Manitoba to the Royal Commission on Health Services, commonly known as the Hall Report or Hall Commission, I wish to let the House join with me in a survey of what those recommendations were. For I think I could establish, notwithstanding the remarks of my honourable friend, that even here in the Province of Manitoba the First Minister and the former Minister of Health disagree with my honourable friend on the question of need, disagree with his presentation leading up to his amendment which presentation basically meant a lessening rather than an increase of governmental participation in the needs of the community.

And I want, Madam Speaker, to take this opportunity of going over some of the recommendations and submissions made by Manitoba to the Hall Commission in January of 1962. May I first of all refer to the submission of the Honourable the First Minister of the Province of Manitoba to this commission. On Page 4, the First Minister refers to the opening statement

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) made by Mr. Justice Hall at the hearings of the Royal Commission at Ottawa, and he states as follows: "Mr. Chairman, you stated as follows: 'The view appears to be developing, taken into account increasingly by governments that opportunity for good health is a right possessed by all, and should become available in one form or another to every citizen of Canada.' " Mr. Roblin's comment to the Commission on this was as follows: "Your words, Mr. Chairman, represent the philosophical approach of the government of this province to the problem of health and medical services for our citizens." Further on, on Page 4, the First Minister states: "Subsequently, with the further development of society and the emergence of more complex problems, the role and function of the state itself underwent a change," and he went on to deal with The Social Allowances Act of 1959 and stated that this Act is premised on two essential considerations, first and most important, it is that freedom from disease and freedom from the fear of disease for our citizens is equal to freedom from other basic wants.

Is not this, Madam Speaker, the purpose of the main resolution that we have before us, before the amendment of my honourable friend and I repeat, first and foremost is the freedom from disease and freedom from the fear of disease for our citizens. So I say that even our First Minister, in his presentation to the Hall Commission, firmly establishes the basic right of alleviation of the fear of disease in all of our citizens. We maintain, as opposed to the contention of the Member for Wellington, that this should be done on a comprehensive, universal basis. My honourable friend, the First Minister again, on page 5 in his presentation says that, "nevertheless the physical and mental well-being of the citizens of Canada is and must continue to be of concern to the Government of Canada." He goes on to say that joint action by the federal and provincial authorities must be processed in order that the common good can be achieved. What common good? The absence of disease, the absence of the fear of disease. Then he, in his submission, again on page 5, quotes a former Prime Minister of Canada, the Right Honourable Louis St. Laurent, who stated that of all the nations resources, its human resources are most precious. The preservation in health and strength of its population is surely the best of all guarantees of a nation's power, of its progress and of its prosperity.

The First Minister of this province joined the former Prime Minister of Canada in expressing these sentiments, not on the basis of whether they've got a dollar or whether they have not, Madam Speaker, but on the basis that this is the right of every individual in this great nation of ours; and also based on the correct premise that unless the health of the nation is adequately taken care of, we cannot guarantee -- to paraphrase the Right Honourable Louis St. Laurent again -- "we cannot guarantee that our nation will be powerful, that we will be progressive, and that we will be prosperous." This then, Madam Speaker, I suggest is vastly different than the approach of the Honourable Member for Wellington in this most important debate.

Then my honourable friend, the First Minister, in his presentation to the federal authority on pages 7 and 8, raised before the Royal Commission on Health a proposition of more federal participation in the programs of the province. He didn't say in his presentation to the federal authority that we should pull in our horns and not continue to supply services, but if only you in the federal arena, or if only the federal arena will take greater participation in this, then we in the Province of Manitoba will be able to do more for the people of our province. Madam Speaker, in substance isn't this what our original resolution suggests, that a joint action between federal authority and provincial be undertaken in order to achieve, not what the Honourable Member for Wellington is suggesting on the basis of need, but on the basis of what is the entitlement of people only because they're resident in this Dominion of ours. The First Minister in his presentation to the Hall Commission suggests, and I think properly so, that mental and tuberculosis hospital care, as the First Minister said, seems to us to be properly part of a comprehensive hospital insurance program. When did he say this? Did he say in effect, Madam Speaker, that this should be on a basis of need, because these facilities of tuberculosis and mental care are not based on need at the present time in the Province of Manitoba, which I say to its credit. But the First Minister says that these should be joint programs. Not on need. We recognize the need for the physical well-being of the people, in the words of the First Minister. We've recognized rights for those who are unfortunate to be suffering tuberculosis and from mental fatigue, that there isn't a dollar tag attached to it. And our First Minister in the presentation to the Hall Commission said, we recognize this, we want you to join us in this, and I respectfully suggest that this was the tenor of the presentation of the First Minister at that time. He didn't say, Madam Speaker, to the Hall Commission, would you please ask the Federal

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) Government on the basis of need of the province to supply us with additional finances for this program. He said, will you join with us and share in these programs which we have at the present time.

Then at the bottom of page 7, my honourable friend, the First Minister of this province said, "There is no reason either in logic or in practice for the present distinction"; this distinction of course being, Madam Speaker, that mental and tuberculosis cases are outside of our hospitalization scheme. Here, Madam Speaker, the First Minister of Manitoba was prepared to ask for financial assistance to join together, not on basis of need, and I must of necessity continuously refer to the question of need, because that is the basic point in the amendment as proposed by the Member for Wellington. The need of treatment has been recognized, but not on the basis of financial need, and this I respectfully suggest should our province's approach be.

Again on page 8, the First Minister in his submission says, that the province has made a start, but the Federal Government must assume its proper share if the program is to succeed. Again, not based on the financial needs of the province, but based, Madam Speaker, that all must assume their proper share if the program in health is to succeed. My honourable friend, the First Minister, on page 9 made reference to the fact that we do have here in the Province of Manitoba a Manitoba Medical Service and states, properly so, that this service is in effect a partnership among the doctors of Manitoba, and recently has been made available to any person able to pay the premiums, and what we're asking for is that the services that are presently being provided for those who are able to pay be readily available irrespective of need.

The First Minister does also inform the commission, for those unable to pay for essential services, the government and municipalities under The Social Allowances Act have made arrangements since July of '60 to provide medical, dental, optical services, drugs and other medically prescribed services. True. But I suggest to you and I suggest to the Honourable Madam Speaker, and I also suggest to the Honourable Member for Wellington that he scrutinize objectively the regulations of the Department of Welfare of the Province of Manitoba and he will find I am sure, on a close analysis, the restrictions are so great as to give opposite conclusions to that suggested by the First Minister in his presentation.

Again Madam Speaker, the presentation of the First Minister of this province to the Hall Commission on page 9 makes a certain number of recommendations on behalf of the Province of Manitoba in the field of medicare and health services. And what do they say? I'll list a few of them. Public health service grants should be increased to reflect increased costs; the cost of the treatment of mental illnesses should be borne on a 50-50 basis between the federal and provincial authorities; the cost of the operation of tubercular hospitals and care should be shared on a 50-50 basis; the cost of providing medicare in the Province of Manitoba should be shared on a 50-50 basis. And if perchance, Madam Speaker, the only arrangement that can be made between the Province of Manitoba and the Dominion of Canada, is the provision of medicare on a 50-50 basis, then let's accept it and let us give to the people of Manitoba a medicare scheme that we can be proud of; not the chiseling type of medicare provisions that we now operate within the Province of Manitoba, but a medicare scheme by right and not as a result of a cap-in-hand approach as we have at the present time. Surely, surely in this enlightened age, in this progressive or presumably progressive community in which we live, we no longer have to apply such stringent needs or means examinations on the citizens of this province.

So I say Madam Speaker, and I will pass on over the recommendations, the submission of the First Minister to the Hall Commission, to page 11. My honourable friend the First Minister speaks of MMS and Social Allowances Act and care in the province; he states, again I quote page 11, "Moreover it is our view that there are many individuals who are subscribing to MMS and other plans who find it difficult to bear the ever increasing rates." A frank admission at that time by the First Minister of this House that there are people in this province who are finding it difficult to bear the cost of ever increasing rates. Then he goes on to say, "What then is the solution? It is our opinion that medical coverage should be available to all citizens of Manitoba. It is our further opinion that any such scheme must be based on three essential principles, that it must be universally available, that it be at a stipulated premium within the range of the great majority of the citizens of Manitoba, that it be voluntary." I differ with his submission in some respects at this venture. But Madam Speaker, his general premise I respectfully suggest, the general tenor of his whole submission to the Hall Commission was that everybody in Manitoba should be adequately cared for. I disagree with him on the voluntary aspect of the plan because I don't think that it is possible to have a scheme that is voluntary and still at the same time have a scheme that will take care of all of the needs of the people of

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . the Province of Manitoba.

The First Minister then went on in his submission to say, he made a comparison between the situation in Manitoba with MMS and other schemes; he had this to say, "During the course of your hearings you will have placed before you the two extreme viewpoints on the current discussion of medical coverage. One view will assert that the only successful plan is the plan that is compulsory. This is the view of those who during the past generation have come to the conclusion that there is some mystical significance in the use of compulsion and compulsion of itself will guarantee success. The opposite extreme; you will hear from those who say that no government initiative is required on this matter" -- and I don't know if he had this quote from the Honourable Member for Wellington or not. To go back to the script the First Minister says, "but in fact the present situation is working admirably and that any individual who wants to meet the cost of medical coverage can do so on his present income basis." How ridiculous! It's just simply not true; just simply not true. Then he went on to say, "The Government of Manitoba agrees with neither of these extreme views. It is our conviction that compulsion is not necessary in this case, that compulsion will not create facilities, that compulsion will not provide essential necessary personnel. We also disagree however," he went on to say -- "we also disagree with those who allege that the present schemes are all encompassing and available to all." In effect, in that sentence alone I suggest Madam Speaker, the First Minister of this province gave lie to the assertions of the Minister of Welfare and his utterances on occasions in this House when he said that anybody in the Province of Manitoba can get medicare if they need it. We say such is not the case. We say, contrary to the amendment of the Honourable Member for Wellington, the question of need on a financial basis should not be a consideration in the provision of health. The only need should be the need of medical attention; only the need for services of these great sciences which are doing so much for humanity.

So I respectfully suggest that if the Honourable Member for Wellington or any member of this House would take the time to review the submission of the First Minister of this House to the Hall Report, Hall Commission, he could not help but come to the conclusion that in the Premier's submission he does not reject the necessity for expansion of sharing of services between Ottawa and Winnipeg; he does not reject that, not on a basis of need of a financial nature, but on the basis of need due to a physical condition that those unfortunate enough to have a mental disease, that those who have a tuberculosis condition, are now providing. He admits. There's no necessity. It's a fact. But I respectfully suggest to you Madam Speaker and to members of this House why and where do you draw the line? Why on one hand can this government or any government say, we will make so-called free provision for those unfortunately to be mentally ill, for those who unfortunately may have tuberculosis. We even make provision for sufferers of V.D. on a so-called free basis, Madam Speaker, but we reject, at least up until now, the provision of the same type of services to the sufferer of cancer, to the sufferer of chronic arthritis, and many of the other diseases. I ask you Madam Speaker and members of this House, where is your justification? I say to the Minister of Health, what constitutes the line of demarcation in the health needs of the people of this province and of this nation? And Madam Speaker I make this offer, I make this offer to the government, that if they can show me any real justification for these lines of demarcation as I am calling them, then I'll desist in any further efforts to attempt to bring to sufferers of all diseases a comprehensive and universal medicare scheme and not based on means but based on the synthesis that the Honourable the First Minister agreed to in his opening remarks and may I refer once again to them when he states that without, or in effect, that without a population that is healthy and of sound mind and of sound body this nation and this province will not be powerful, it will not be progressive.

Then Madam Speaker, following the presentation of the First Minister the former Minister of Health added materially to the material that was presented on behalf of the Government of Manitoba to the Royal Commission headed by Mr. Justice Hall. I have gone over the remarks or presentation of the Honourable . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: I'd like to remind the Honourable Member that there are four minutes left . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Thanks kindly, Madam Speaker, I want to say to the Honourable Member for Wellington, I want to say to all members of this House, that it would be well for them, as I have done, to go over the submission of the Honourable the Minister of Health, former Minister, Dr. George Johnson. I must compliment him on his presentation to the Hall Commission. Time does not permit me to give the benefits of his submission to the House at this time. I invite all members of the House, however, if they feel so inclined, to sit down with me and look over

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . some of the recommendations of my honourable friend to the Hall Commission. He reiterated the general sentiment as expressed to the Hall Commission by the First Minister. He stated almost page by page throughout his presentation that we here in Manitoba need more adequate protection against disease. There is an area in Manitoba that is not covered under any plan at the present time and while it would not be proper for me to suggest that the former Minister of Health suggested as we are suggesting a comprehensive compulsory universal care scheme, but I respectfully suggest, Madam Speaker, that it wasn't too far out. He recognized the needs, that is the physical needs, of the people of Manitoba; he recognized that there had to be a greater partnership between Ottawa and Manitoba. He recognized that at the present time many services are being provided for the citizens of Manitoba without a dollar sign attached and that these programs should be continued and expanded and I suggest Madam Speaker that the approach is right for this government, with one main exception. And here's where our ideologies apparently part company, for while my honourable friends in government here in Manitoba today recognize the need of medical services in some cases and not in others, we in the New Democratic Party recognize that irrespective of the type of disease these provisions should be available to all citizens irrespective of any needs test, irrespective of any means test.

Mr. Hall has suggested in his second volume of his report that there should be a conference between the provinces and the Dominion respecting his report. I understand that the Right Honourable Lester B. Pearson has stated in the House of Commons that there will be a conference on all aspects of the report of Mr. Justice Hall. I enjoin the Province of Manitoba to desist from the suggestion of the Honourable Member for Wellington that these services should only be made on the basis of a cap-in-hand or a needs basis. I ask the Province of Manitoba and this Legislature, in the interests of humanity and the well-being of all Manitobans, to reject the amendment as proposed by the Member for Wellington and support the original motion as laid before this Assembly for consideration by the Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. RICHARD SEABORN (Wellington): Madam Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the honourable member a question? Did he see the article in the London Times for February 17, 1965, in which it states that the Labour Government is going to recast their whole social security program so they will direct aid to the most needy by means of a means test?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Madam Speaker, I happen to also have received a copy of that which was sent incidentally by the Manitoba Medical Service I believe, or the Manitoba Medical Association, but Madam Speaker, unlike my honourable friend and his excerpt that he asks his question to me on today, I've read the whole article and when you have read the whole article you come to a different conclusion to that that has been attempted to be read into the record of Hansard by my honourable friend the Member for Wellington.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker I rose on a point of order to ask you on what basis you warned the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party that he had only four minutes left.

MADAM SPEAKER: I would refer you to our rules, limiting speakers to forty minutes where it says -- it refers to a recognized Opposition Leader in the House or a Minister moving a government order or a member making a motion of no confidence in the government, or a Minister replying thereto, shall speak for more than 40 minutes. The Honourable Member was speaking to a resolution.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, on the point of order this is exactly the point that has been under discussion before. My reading of this 33 as it appears in our rule book is that it exempts my honourable friend the Leader from the operation of the 40 minute rule at all times. I'm positive that, if this is not the interpretation then the way that I've been reading it is certainly not correct.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, on that point of order may I thank my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside for raising it. I had for a fleeting moment a thought of drawing this to Your Honour's attention when you told me that I had four minutes, I thought however that I had substantiated my case within the 40 minutes and that it possibly would be to the advantage of the House for me to desist at this particular time. I believe however that the point of order raised by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside is a perfectly correct one. I'm sure Madam Speaker on reflection that you would agree that that is correct.

MADAM SPEAKER: I will take this under consideration as to what the Honourable Member for Lakeside has suggested:

MADAM SPEAKER put the question.

MR. PETERS: I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member from Brokenhead that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Brandon and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable the Member for St. Vital.

MR. GROVES: Madam Speaker, first of all I should like to make the same request as the Honourable Member from Lakeside did at the beginning of one of his addresses earlier this afternoon. I'm sorry that the Honourable Member from St. Boniface left his seat just prior to your calling this item on the Order Paper. I hope, because of some of the things that I must say, that he will be in his seat during most of my time on this resolution.

I would like first of all to congratulate the Honourable Member from Brandon and the Honourable Member from Pembina for presenting this resolution. Citizenship to our new Canadians, particularly those that are coming from far off lands, is something that means a great deal. It is very important to them and I think that it's appropriate that the ceremony of the presentation of their papers should be dignified and impressive. I think also that this ceremony should be one which they will remember for the rest of their lives and one of which they can be proud for the balance of their lives.

I'm sorry that the Honourable Member from St. Boniface used this debate as a means of talking about something that only a few evenings before he was complaining about not having the chance to debate in this House. I'm sorry that he chose once again to inject into this debate a personal vendetta to deliberately, in my opinion, start the controversy and once again, Madam Speaker, in my opinion he has done, by some of the statements that he has made in this debate, irreparable harm to some of the causes for which he claims to fight. What did the Honourable Member from Brandon say that caused the Honourable Member from St. Boniface to get so excited over this resolution? I think Madam Speaker that it's worth re-reading into the record what the honourable member said, and I quote: 'And it is unfortunate that in times such as presently exist that we have this threat to Confederation. At times I am inclined, having gone through the process, to relate this to a parallel of a couple getting along in the early years of marriage and little things which appear to infringe upon the other's rights assume disproportionate emphasis and quarrels and differences result but with good-will on both sides and the eternal trying to understand one another then contentment and happiness can result and I have the feeling that this will be the story of our country when those who follow us look back maybe 50 or 100 years from now. The one thing I am tempted to regret is the suggestion of threats from one group or the other, and I think it is unfortunate that a province which certainly with some degree of voluntariness at least chose to live in it -- what would you call it -- a withdrawal, a seclusion, a sort of a parochial type of existence -- now, rather than placing the blame where it should lie really, maybe upon themselves, tend to blame the other segment of Canada. This I think is maybe understandable, with hot-headedness and an awakening to the potentials of the country and their rightful place in it. But I would remind members that early settlers in Manitoba, the various other ethnic groups didn't have a very rosy time of it.'

And then I'm going to skip a little bit. And I quote again: 'Of all racial groups when they come to live side by side with other groups, but they won their place in the sun and I think we would all say, 'more power to the French element of Canada if they would just simply get on with the job of winning their place in the sun, with our understanding and blessing.' I think this is the way the nation will come to greatness. I know, Madam Speaker, you must forgive me this -- an aside from the actual matter under discussion -- but I can't help but draw some reference to it, with the forecast that I think in time, because time cures all, this will become a great nation, and so with this thought, I think that we should be placing emphasis upon the value of Canadian citizenship.'

Madam Speaker, I ask you how much more diplomatically or graciously or inoffensively could the Honourable Member from Brandon have said what he did about a problem which we have in this country at the moment, and a serious problem I am sure, and one which is on all of our minds at this time. The Honourable Member from St. Boniface must be pretty thin skinned, and he doesn't face up to facts much of the time, Madam Speaker, and I think at times when he takes offence and shows the thinness of his skin, at statements such as were made by the

(MR. GROVES cont'd) Honourable Member from Brandon, that he can be compared to an ostrich, who prefers at these times to bury his head in the sand. The honourable member referred in his address to these words that were made by the Honourable Member from Brandon as "lined prejudice". Now, how any person, Madam Speaker, could interpret what the Honourable Member from Brandon said as "lined prejudice", I just don't know.

I would like, Madam Speaker, to refer to some of the other portions of the address of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, and I'm not going to quote long paragraphs but I think some of the words which he used are of interest. On page 884 of Hansard, commencing about the middle of the page, he says this and he's referring to the Honourable Member from Brandon, I think. "Now, he seemed to give me the impression that all the problems that we have in French Canada, or all the problems that we have in Canada because of biculturalism and bilingualism and so on, should be placed squarely on the shoulders of the French people. He also stated that the French Canadians should follow the other racial groups that came to Manitoba, and get busy with the job of winning their place in the sun, as he said, and then he added, 'with our understanding and our blessing'." Then he goes on to say, "these words hurt me deeply, it cut so deeply, if he could be so completely blinded by prejudice. I thought of nothing else all weekend." These are words of the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, when he was referring to what the Honourable Member for Brandon said. When one reads this portion of the honourable member's speech, Madam Speaker, it sounds like a speech that might have been made by Castro during the revolution in Cuba. I think that there are veiled threats in much of what the Honourable Member for St. Boniface said, which I am sure are not shared by those on whose behalf he pretends to speak in this House.

Madam Speaker, the Honourable Member from St. Boniface is a Roman Catholic. He's proud of it and so he should be. He has strong feelings on the matter of such things as government aid to parochial schools, and members of his particular faith may think that he is doing a good job for them in continuing to fight for those things in which he feels they believe. And I, Madam Speaker, am not in a position to be able to judge that. The honourable member is also a French Catholic and he's proud of that too, I am sure, and so he should be. With the matter of biculturalism and bilingualism being so prevalent today in our country, this is a matter that is of extreme interest to the public at this time. He also has, and he has expressed in here, strong feelings on this matter, and he'll get no criticism from me on this, because this is perhaps as it should be. And perhaps the French Canadian minority in this province feel that the Honourable Member from St. Boniface is doing a good job on their behalf, and again, Madam Speaker, this may be so, and I'm not going to put myself in the position of having to judge that for them either.

But I think the Honourable Member from St. Boniface should keep in mind that other people besides those on whose behalf he claims to speak are judging his people, his religious minority which he refers to, and his ethnic minority which he refers to, by his statements and by his conduct; and I can tell him on behalf of many of these that he is not making a very good impression. Also, Madam Speaker, I can tell him on behalf of many of these that he is accomplishing much less than he thinks he is accomplishing by making the statements which he does in this House. And Madam Speaker, I claim and I say that he will not make progress as long as he continues to attack the way he does and as long as he continues to act in this House in the irresponsible manner in which he tends to act at times during our debates.

Going back again to the honourable member's speech on this resolution, on page 885 -- starting at the bottom of 884, and again I'm not going to read large paragraphs, but I think that the language again is of some significance. "I realize that to succeed", and I'm quoting the honourable member now, "in a cause, this cause must have many people working for it, all kinds of people, different people", and I skip some, "would be to continue fighting for what I believe are my rights and the rights of others, and to try to correct these injustices. Sometime when you are told to wait too long, you must rock the boat. Generations and generations will grow up with the same fellings, the same prejudices, transmitted from generation to generation. Maybe I should be ashamed of my people", says the honourable member, and then again I quote him. He says, "If he wants to expose certain injustices," and may I remind the honourable member again, Madam Speaker, that these are the words of people that we could imagine making speeches during the revolution in Cuba, and I honestly and sincerely suggest to the honourable member that he give some serious consideration to what I said earlier about how others are judging his people by the way he conducts himself in the debates in this House.

Again, on page 885 of Hansard, the honourable members says, "I will continue to insist

(MR. GROVES cont'd) . . . on the rights of the minorities, " Madam Speaker, I think that we should all be concerned and interested in protecting the rights of all of the minorities, not only in Manitoba but in Canada, but let us not forget that this is a democracy and that decisions are made by majorities, and they have rights too, and these are rights that should be just as vigorously defended, for in protecting these rights, the rights of the majority -- without taking away from what the honourable member says is our responsibility to the minority -- in protecting these rights of the majorities, we are protecting the democratic process itself.

I think, Madam Speaker, that on examination one will find that minorities in Manitoba have fared pretty well. The Honourable Member from St. Boniface likes to tell us of the treatment that the Protestant minorities receive in Quebec. We know I think of this, and we appreciate the fact that these people in this province do receive the consideration that they do; but there is another minority in Quebec which the Honourable Member for St. Boniface always conveniently forgets to mention, and that is the French Canadian Protestant minority. Now I don't pretend to be an authority on the Province of Quebec, nor on the rights or the problems of the French Canadian minority in that province, but I do suggest to the honourable member that they have a serious problem, and he might do well to do a little bit of research on this and perhaps deal with both aspects when he tells us the type of treatment which particularly in the City of Montreal, that the French Canadian Protestant minority have received in that province.

Madam Speaker, what I am going to read into the record now, I do so not because I want to create any ill feeling between the Honourable Member from St. Boniface and myself or between the religious groups which he and I represent but I think it does well sometimes when we're speaking of minorities and when we look around in our own province and our own country and see, despite the fact that they have problems, how we do treat our minorities, to make some comparison from time to time with how minorities are treated in other countries. And I have Madam Speaker here some photostatic copies of an article from the London Economist dealing with the Protestant minority in Spain and I would like to read into the record some of this article so that we can compare the type of treatment which we accord despite the problems that we have in this country to our minorities compared to what treatment minorities get in other countries. And I'm not going to read this whole article Madam Speaker, I'm just going to read the parts of it that I think are cogent to this discussion and I'm quite willing to table it if anybody so wishes. I have copies here for myself. "Spanish villagers no longer believe," and I'm quoting from the article now, "no longer believe that Protestants have tails, the police no longer break up Protestant services; the last such incident known to this correspondent occurred in Majorca in 1962. The British and Foreign Bible Society, whose depots in Spain were forcibly closed in 1940, was allowed to reopen them last December. The same month at the request of the Primate of Spain, the practice of forcing non-catholic political prisoners to attend mass was discontinued. The Spanish army's custom of beating and imprisoning Protestant conscripts who failed to genuflect at mass appears to have lapsed during the past eighteen months. But thousands of Spanish children are still taught by school book and catechism that protestantism is the product of corruption and vice and that . . ."

MR. SCHREYER: . . . point of order, I would ask you to determine if the member's remarks are relevant or germane. I submit that the honourable member appears to be dealing with irrelevant subject matter. He's talking about Spain etcetera. There's a rule I believe.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is it the wish of the House that the honourable member should continue? Agreed. The honourable member may continue.

MR. GROVES: Now I forget where I left off. "Thousands of Spanish children are still taught by school book and catechism that protestantism is the product of corruption and vice and that the divine punishment for Protestants is a horrible death and eternal damnation. They are warned against foreign propagators or Protestantism, generally English, who are like birds of prey always ready to seize a victim. All these quotations come from fairly recent publications bearing the imprimatur of the Bishop of Barcelona. Padre Venancio Marcos . . . religious commentator of the official Spanish radio declares that the English Protestant inquisition committed more crimes in one year than the Spanish inquisition in the whole of its history. He adds, if only the times would permit a revival of the Holy Inquisition. There are only about 30,000 open Protestants in Spain, there are probably more undeclared ones. Protestant meeting places tucked away down back alleys may bear no outward indication of their function and the stranger who asks the way to one will embarrass respectable passers-by as much as if he enquires about the red lamp district. Protestants are barred from the teaching profession,

(MR. GROVES cont'd) journalism, nursing, the civil service and the police. They may neither be nor marry army officers. Protestant marriages are illegal and applications for civil marriages are subject to episcopal veto. Spanish Protestant pastors say that their relations with officials have improved during the past two years but that despite the Vatican council the attitude of most bishops and priests has not changed. More than once civil officials and police officers have turned a blind eye to Protestant burial services and other illegal ceremonies only to be denounced to higher authorities by the Catholic clergy. The Bishops of Toledo and the Canary Islands have declared that Catholic truth and Protestant error cannot be put on an equal footing. The Bishops of Bilbao and Lerida have both asserted that no true Catholic can defend freedom of religion. A Dominican publicist has written in the Falangist Daily Arriba, it is to be feared that many good simple Spaniards will succumb to Protestant teaching'."

Now again Madam Speaker, I want to make it quite clear and I will when I'm through, table this article from which I have been reading. I want to make it quite clear that I do not know the author of this article. It comes from a newspaper which I think one would tend to respect and I read this into the record in this debate solely for the purpose of making a comparison between how we in Manitoba treat minorities, religious and ethnic, how we in Canada have over the years treated our ethnic and religious minorities, by comparison to how they are treated in other countries and I did not read this into the record -- and I want the Honourable Member from St. Boniface and those others who are Roman Catholics in this Assembly to believe me -- I did not read this into the record for the purpose of making any disparaging remarks about their religious beliefs.

Going back again to the speech of the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, he says, and again I am sort of taking him out of context because I only want to refer to the words which he uses to which I take exception: "Because they are hurting the cause of those who want to do the right thing. And I say Madam Speaker to the member from Brandon and to other members in this House, please do not judge all the French-Canadians by these people." Should we in Manitoba, following up those words of his Madam Speaker, should we and should the people of Manitoba judge those for whom the honourable member says he speaks by his conduct in this House? I think not, I agree with the honourable member that we shouldn't do that but I want to warn him that people are. Again back to the honourable. . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . the honourable member permit a question . . .

MR. GROVES: I only have five minutes left Madam Speaker and . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: That's just the point. I think that after some of these accusations I think he should be fair enough to answer my question before he runs the clock out. I don't think that this should be allowed to go . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member has the right to say whether he wants to answer a question or not.

MR. GROVES: I'm sorry I would prefer not to answer any questions.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from St. Vital.

MR. GROVES: I did not intend to make any accusations and if I did, if he thinks I did, then I apologize.

The French Canadian -- going back to the Honourable member's speech again, he said, about the middle of page 885, "They want to treat certain people like second-class citizens. They also would resort to anything to discredit the French Canadian." Now Madam Speaker, I think that the French Canadian in Manitoba is doing very well. I don't think that he's being prosecuted or persecuted; I don't think that he is considered a second-class citizen, nor do I know of any serious attempt on the part of any responsible person to try to discredit them. The reverse Madam Speaker, I think is true. We look up to what the French Canadian, many of them, have accomplished in this province and the contribution which they have made to our community life, and I need only refer Madam Speaker to many of the prominent citizens of this province of ours. There was in the first cabinet of this government a very well-known and well-liked French Canadian. An effort was made a short time ago to have another French Canadian represented in the cabinet of this government and the French Canadian of Manitoba was very well represented in the previous government by the person of the Honourable Member Mr. Prefontaine, I forget his constituency -- Carillon. There are three French Canadians in this province that are high court judges, there are four French Canadians that sit in this Legislature and not all of them represent predominantly French Canadian constituencies. The French Canadian is well represented in the professions of law, medicine and in the other professions. And no matter where we look in the government or the business or the cultural life of this province,

(MR. GROVES cont'd) we see French Canadians prominently and well represented, as are the other ethnic groups that make up the population of this province. And I think that we can be proud of what we call our Manitoba mosaic and I think that we should not accept statements such as are made by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface in the manner in which they are made, inferring that we are treating our minorities in this province shamefully.

I also take very severe exception Madam Speaker, to what the Honourable Member said on page 885 of the speech, where he said, "There are some politicians who try to divide and conquer, when you hear statements made by people such as Gordon Churchill who on many occasions stated that English Canada did not need French Canada." And then he goes on to refer to statements that were made by Douglas Fisher and others. Well, Madam Speaker, I can only say to that, look who's talking. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface didn't look very far when he was looking for examples of that, because I have with me an article from the Tribune of March 31st, 1958, and it's entitled "Race, Religion, Issue raised by Liberal." And I'm going to quote from it. "Race and religion became an eleventh hour election issue Sunday night when two French Canadian MLAs charged here that a vote for the Conservatives is a vote for the Orangemen. I don't like to bring up the question of race and religion said Gildas Molgat, Liberal MLA for Ste. Rose, but others are bringing up the question and we must make the situation known. Mr. Molgat joined Municipal Affairs Minister Prefontaine in a last minute weekend tour of Provencher riding in an attempt to unite the French Canadian vote behind Mr. Prefontaine's son the Liberal candidate. At a meeting conducted almost entirely in French and cheered by the parish priest Father Leon Roy, Mr. Molgat quoted from a letter sent Orangemen in British Columbia. 'The Conservative Party under the leadership of John Diefenbaker is the only party an Orangeman can conscientiously vote for,' the letter said -- 'get out and vote Conservative on March 31st.' This is the Orangemen's opportunity. The Orangemen are anti-Roman Catholic Mr. Molgat told the 200 people, mostly French Canadian; the Orangemen believe that national unity in Canada could be gained only by the use of a single language. When a party opposes what we hold sacred" and these are the words of Mr. Molgat -- "what is there to do but oppose them? Municipal Affairs Minister Prefontaine continued the attack on the Conservatives and the Orangemen after Mr. Molgat left for another meeting at St. Jean Baptiste. 'Do you want to support the party which is supported by a group of Orangemen who are opposed to what we want,' he asked"

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GROVES: "attacking the"

MADAM SPEAKER: It is now 5:30.

MR. DESJARDINS: Can I say just this that I had some questions to ask but the time is past, I can't speak.

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