

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 6th, 1965.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Trafalgar Savings Corporation praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Trafalgar Savings Corporation.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Carl Alvie Nesbitt and others praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate Thompson General Hospital.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of the Synod of the Diocese of Rupert's Land, praying for the passing of an Act respecting the Temporality of the Anglican Church of Canada.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Frank Wiens and others praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate The Company of the Cross.

MADAM SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, I wish to present the third report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments begs leave to present the following as their third report. Your committee recommends that Bill No. 29, an Act to amend The Garnishment Act, be withdrawn from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments and that it be referred to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

Your committee has considered Bills: No. 41, an Act to amend The Official Time Act; No. 79, an Act to amend The School Attendance Act; No. 94, an Act to amend The Change of Name Act; No. 98, an Act to amend The Charities Endorsement Act; and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your committee has also considered Bills: No. 28, an Act to amend The University Act; No. 47, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act (2); No. 50, an Act to amend The Insurance Corporations Tax Act; and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments, all of which is respectfully submitted.

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

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

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that Bill No. 29, an Act to amend The Garnishment Act, be withdrawn from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments and referred to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, the explanation is that the Committee on Law Amendments considered this matter at its meeting this morning in the light of the representations that were made at the previous Law Amendments Committee when this bill was considered, and agreed to a motion that the matter be deferred to the other committee when it might have a more leisurely consideration.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): I don't know how we stand as far as the rules are concerned, Madam Speaker, on a motion of this nature, but I want to apologize to the Committee on Law Amendments that I was not present this morning when this matter was dealt with. Had I been in the committee I would have objected to this action being taken. My objection would be, Madam Speaker, that we have heard representations from persons concerned with The Garnishment Act. May I say that I think there is some validity in regard to the objections that were raised by a number of the persons who appeared before the Committee of Law Amendments -- which meeting I did attend -- and I recognize this. On the other hand however, Madam Speaker, it was my understanding at that time that we would take into consideration the objections that were raised in the consideration of the bill in the Law Amendments Committee. By taking the step as suggested by the committee, which of course is within their jurisdiction however, and referring this to the Committee

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . on Statutory Rules and Regulations, to paraphrase my honourable friend the Attorney-General: "This can be done at their leisure," and I respectfully suggest, Madam Speaker, that this is a matter of importance and should not be treated in a leisurely fashion. This particular bill, or the contents of the bill, were -- the objectives of which -- were to give relief to individuals who find themselves in an unfortunate position at the present time as the result of the amount for which their wages may be garnished, and this is creating a hardship on many persons who find themselves in this unfortunate position whether because of their own actions or the actions of their creditors. While I would have no objections at all to deferring the bill for further consideration at this session, I must make protest, Madam Speaker, to the approach to the consideration of this bill on the basis of leisurely time to consider the same. I think we could consider this bill at this session and I think that this should be done, Madam Speaker. I want to raise my voice in protest at the actions that have been taken.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, is it the intention of the committee to hear representation that was there this morning on Thursday when the committee meets -- the Statutory Regulations and Orders Committee meets?

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, I think that this is very important legislation and I think perhaps that it should be dealt with during this present session, and I hope that by referring it to the Committee on Statutory Rules and Regulations that that result will be achieved. As a matter of fact, Madam, I feel that there are a number of statutes on our statute books that should be referred to the same committee -- statutes dealing with debtors and creditors -- and I intend later on today, if a certain bill comes before this House, to suggest to the House that that particular bill be referred to the same committee as the bill on garnishment is being referred to, because I think the time has come for us in Manitoba to take a look at all of our statutes that deal with the rights of creditors and the protection of debtors because we have a lot of statutes in this province dealing with these particular matters that are a bit archaic and out of date and should be brought into line with modern trends and modern values.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Ayes and Nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The question before the House, that Bill No. 29, an Act to amend The Garnishment Act, be withdrawn from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments and referred to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

A standing vote was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cowan, Desjardins, Evans, Froese, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Jeannotte, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Molgat, Patrick, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Cherniack, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Paulley and Wright.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 44; Nays, 6.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 60 Grade 5 students from Faraday School under the direction of their teachers Mr. Laycock and Miss Stadnyk. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Inkster. There are also some 40 Grades 10, 11 and 12 students from St. Charles Convent under the direction of their teachers Sister St. Renie, Sister St. Gabriel, and Miss Marlene Hogue. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you.

Orders of the Day.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to bring forth a matter of privilege.

MADAM SPEAKER: . . . the privilege.

MR. GROVES: I feel that I have been insulted, Madam Speaker, and that my good faith in my conduct as a member of this Legislature has been called into question.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for St. Vital.

MR. GROVES: Madam Speaker, I would like first of all to lay upon the table of the House a copy of the final edition of the Winnipeg Free Press dated Monday, April 5, 1965, and refer the

(MR. GROVES cont'd) members of the House to the article appearing on the top right-hand corner of the editorial page.

Madam Speaker, I have been one of those who over the years has not been afraid to enter into the debates in this House, as a result of which I have received my share of comments on my sayings in the newspaper. I have never, since I have been a member of this House nor during the four years that I was a member of the council in my municipality, complained to any newspaper or to any employee of any newspaper of the treatment which I have received in its pages. I have of course had the usual complaints that we all have in public life of being misquoted at times, and sometimes of having my remarks condensed to accommodate the space which is available so that full justice perhaps had not been done to something that I had said in many more words. I have also had newspaper editorials written disagreeing with my point of view and chastizing me for holding those points of view. All of these things, Madam Speaker, I consider part of being in public life.

The article to which I make particular complaint at this time I have before me, Madam Speaker, and it comments on a speech which I made in this House on the 2nd day of April, 1965, and which is reported fully in our Debates and Proceedings commencing on Page 1185 and ending on Page 1189. I might point out at this time that there is one correction that should be made in this report in Hansard, Madam Speaker. On page 1189 of Hansard, where I referred to the matter of a meeting -- and I will read this: "At a meeting conducted almost entirely in French and cheered by the parish priest." That should read: "chaired by the parish priest."

How anyone, Madam Speaker, reading this speech, could come to the conclusion arrived at in the article which I have tabled, is beyond my comprehension. I wish to state at this time that two other persons listening in on this debate, who listened to this speech and whose job it was to report and comment on it, did so very fairly in last Saturday's issue of both the Winnipeg Free Press and the Winnipeg Tribune.

The references contained in this article -- the article of which I complain -- are untrue, insulting and unfair. Over the years, the writer of this article of which I complain has made a practice of using this column to poke fun at the proceedings in this Chamber, to belittle the efforts of its members, and generally to bring into contempt the proceedings in this House. With the appearance of the article complained of in the paper, which I have tabled, this conduct has now sunk to an unacceptable level. Madam Speaker, the indulgence in this sort of practice is like indulgence in alcohol -- it usually becomes progressively worse until you reach an unacceptable depth. That has now been reached in respect of this article. Only a deliberate misreading of the contents of my speech and a complete misunderstanding of my views could permit a person to make the charges which have been made and the comments which have been made in this article. The contriver of this comment says, and I quote: "Inside the building another citizens rights drama was being played, but the two stood in violent contrast, for what was happening inside the velvet and velours Chamber, that ultra-civilized shrine to tradition and the humanities, was as clawingly primitive, uncivil, as any would-be enlightened democratic body should have to suffer." Madam Speaker, is this not more than just an insult to myself? Is this not an insult to the proceedings of this House? Surely no member of this Chamber would have permitted anything to go on in this Chamber that was clawingly primitive and uncivil, nor would they have permitted any conduct that they thought no democratic body should have had to suffer. But not one member of this House, Madam Speaker, raised this sort of complaint during the course of my speech.

The writer of this article goes on to refer to my speech as "a nasty piece of business"; and goes on to say that I vowed last year that "every time Mr. Desjardins had anything to say about the separate schools and the rights of French-speaking Roman Catholics, etcetera, he was going to speak." Madam Speaker, nothing could be farther from the truth. These were not my words, and only a deliberate misreading of their context or complete ignorance on the part of the person making the statement could have come to this conclusion. My words at that time, reported on Page 412 of Hansard dated February 24, 1964, are as follows: "And as I said the other evening when I spoke, I refuse to sit back and see only one view on this matter expressed. And I intend each time that the Honourable Member from St. Boniface brings this subject up, where he makes statements with which I disagree, where he makes statements which I think are biased towards his own point of view, then I intend certainly to put forth the other point of view."

Further on in the article, Madam Speaker, the contriver states that "on Friday", and I am quoting again: "On Friday he spoke, and members of all parties turned away their faces in shame." Perhaps, Madam Speaker, this columnist and her employer should be asked to substantiate

(MR. GROVES cont'd) . . . this apparent statement of fact.

The third paragraph in the second column of the article goes on to say this: "Then he re-read for the record large sections of a recent speech made by his colleague from Brandon, R. O. Lissaman. His intention was to prove that Mr. Desjardins had been thinking very strangely when he accused Mr. Lissaman of displaying blind prejudice. This was a valid point. It has been suggested that Mr. Lissaman's political career has suffered because of his affinity for looking at all sides of every issue. To accuse him of bigotry sounds far-fetched indeed." Madam Speaker, I want to emphasize from this paragraph these words: "It has often been suggested that Mr. Lissaman's political career has suffered because of his affinity for looking at all sides of an issue." It has often been suggested by whom, Madam Speaker? The writer of this so-called article should be asked how one's political career can suffer because of an affinity for looking at all sides of every issue. This, I would think, could be a very creditable attribute to one in public life and one which might well be encouraged. To state these words in the context in which they were used and to twist them to achieve a vicious partisan and biased purpose, is degrading to say the least, Madam Speaker. "It is impossible," she says later on in the article, "in a summary to convey any real impression of the whole of the cumulative effect, for example, of Mr. Groves' consistent distinction between just plain people and his -- Mr. Desjardins' -- people, French Canadians of Roman Catholic persuasion."

Madam Speaker, Hansard does report my speech and reports it in the way that I said it, without the insinuations of which I am charged. Madam Speaker, I defy anyone to find in my words a consistent distinction between just plain people and French Canadians of Roman Catholic persuasion. The writer of this article might also be asked if this is what is meant when she refers to my "well-known and oft-stated views." She refers in the article . . . I read about Spain. She states that the way it was used in the context of the rest of my speech and in the context of some of my well-known and often stated views, that it sounded like an indictment of the Catholic religion itself. Now, Madam Speaker, I thought I went to great pains to explain on two occasions -- once, prior to reading this article into the record; and the other time, at the end of the reading -- to explain that I was not making disparaging remarks about any person's religion. If members thought at the time that I was, surely they would have protested. I did not indict the Roman Catholic religion nor any other religion, Madam Speaker, and no intelligent person can come to this conclusion in reading the report of my speech in Hansard.

Later in the article the columnist reports, and again I'm quoting: "and Mr. Groves was allowed to continue by House consent, presumably because no one could decide whether it would be more embarrassing to let him continue or to dignify the speech by making an issue of forcing Mr. Groves to shut up." Again Madam Speaker, I would suggest that this is an affront to the proceedings of this House. We have not hesitated in this House in the past, even at the expense of embarrassing a member, to ask him to cease making a speech which was out of order or offended the privileges of this House, nor have we hesitated, Madam Speaker, to ask a member to "shut up" -- although not in those words -- where we thought he was offending the dignity of the House or breaking the rules. No such decisions were necessary in my case, Madam Speaker, and no member rose to protest on these grounds.

The article ends up, Madam Speaker, by stating dramatically banged the gavel -- which you have not got and could not bang. I protest, Madam Speaker, what has taken place because I am included in these excesses. I am aware of my rights under the law. The protest that I make at this time is of the abuse of the members of this House which has been repeated by this same person over the years and which should not be encouraged or permitted to continue by our silence.

Madam Speaker, I could also have asked you, as the protector of the rights of the members of this House and of the privileges of this House, to consider whether in addition to the matter of personal privilege the matter of the privileges of the House itself are also involved. I could also have asked you to consider this after having read the article to which I have referred and the remarks which I have made. I am not an expert on the rules of procedure. There are many here including yourself who are more qualified than I in this field. I would ask you however, to refer to the following citation from Beauchesne. First of all, Page 93, Citation 103 states: "The privileges of Parliament were first demanded as a protection against outside interference." On Page 100, citation 110: "On the 26th of February, 1701, the House of Commons of the United Kingdom resolved that to print or publish any libels reflecting upon any member of the House for or relating to his service therein, was a high violation of the rights and privileges of the House, but to constitute a breach of privilege a libel upon a member must concern his character or conduct in his capacity as a member, and the conduct or language

(MR. GROVES cont'd) on which the libel is based must be actions performed or words uttered in the actual transaction of the business of the House."

Again, on Page 100, Citation 111: "The Journals of the United Kingdom House gives the following examples of speeches and writings which have been held to constitute breaches of privilege." And then skipping over a few paragraphs, Madam Speaker, Item L and I quote: "Wilful misrepresentation of the proceedings of members is an offence of the same character as libel. As early as the 22nd of April, 1699, the Commons of England resolved that the publishing of the names of the members of this House, and reflecting upon them and misrepresenting their proceedings in Parliament, is a breach of the privileges of the House and destructive of the freedom of Parliament." On Page 102, Citation 113: "A question of privilege ought rarely to come up in Parliament. It should be dealt with by a motion giving the House power to impose a reparation or apply a remedy. There are privileges of the House as well as privileges of the members individually. Libels upon members and aspersions upon them in relation to Parliament and interference of any kind with their official duties are breaches of the privileges of the members." And later on in the same citation: "An attack in a newspaper article is not a breach of privilege unless it comes within the definition above given, and then a member is bound to lay on the table the newspaper in which the article complained of appears."

Madam Speaker, I have laid upon the table of the House the newspaper in which the offending article appears. I have dealt with this, however, mostly on a matter of personal privilege and I will not make a formal motion with respect to the privileges of the House for two reasons: First of all, because I am personally involved; and secondly, because the columnist's employer has not had an opportunity as yet to deal with this matter.

Madam Speaker, because I am involved personally and because I happen to be the one that is bringing this matter up, I feel that it must be dealt with in a different light, but I serve notice that if this happens to any other member of this House, of any party, that I will move, second or in some other way associate myself with a motion of contempt, not necessarily on behalf of the member, but on behalf of the privileges of the House itself.

With respect to the journalist concerned in this article, I would not even ask for an apology. From her such an apology would be meaningless. I will await any action that will be taken by her employer who has a high standard in the newspaper field in this city to maintain. There is no use talking to this woman, Madam Speaker. Irresponsible journalism insofar as it deals with the proceedings of this House -- and I consider that this is such -- can be curbed in three ways. Firstly, by self-discipline on the part of the journalist concerned; secondly, by discipline on the part of the journalist's employer; and if either of these two fail, by assertion by this House. Manitoba over the years, Madam Speaker, has been well served by the press. Fair and informative accounts in the press have contributed towards the democratic process in Manitoba and have served it well. The column that I refer to at this time is a disservice to the honour of the press and to the dignity of this House. The sense of fairness and good taste on the part of those who report our proceedings has been maintained over the years on a high standard. When a journalist displays neither fairness nor good taste, then the duty of restraining any tendency to lapse falls on his or her employer. Only as both of these fail, as I say, should the House have recourse to its proud but important privilege of defending its own honour. And Madam Speaker, if this becomes necessary we shall have reached a sad state in our relationships with ourselves and in our relationships with the press, who have so important a role to play in the democratic process in this province.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, I'm not too sure what the rules are in the House. Am I permitted to say -- answer on this or is it against the rules?

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, may I ask a question of the honourable member who just raised the question of privilege? Did the honourable member say that no protest had arisen from the House during the time that he was speaking?

MR. GROVES: Am I allowed to answer this? No protest was made along the lines that are mentioned in this article. There were two interruptions to my speech; one by the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, who sought to ask a question; one by the Honourable Member from Brokenhead who claimed that I was introducing irrelevant matter; but no protest was made along the lines that were referred to in this article; that I was being uncivil, and that sort of thing.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, might I ask my honourable friend another question? Was it not perfectly self-evident that the protest that was made by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead was because of the subject matter of my honourable friend's address?

MR. GROVES: . . . honourable member said that he was protesting because I was introducing irrelevant matter.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order, because the honourable the member who introduced the question of privilege, in my opinion immediately violated the very rule that he correctly read to us from Beauchesne. Our own rules, as I understand them, are very limited so far as privilege is concerned. I think they confine themselves to one simple statement and that is that if a question of privilege arises it shall be taken into account or consideration immediately -- something to that effect. Therefore we have to go back to Beauchesne in order to get the ruling, and the ruling is as my honourable friend read from Beauchesne that, Number 1, that question of privilege should rarely arise, and this I think we're all agreed with, particularly after the exhibition that my honourable friend has just given here. It should rarely arise says Beauchesne, but then he makes it equally clear that if it does arise it should arise by way of motion, and my honourable friend does not make any motion and consequently he prevents any of the rest of us from following up the argument that is raised, and that's why I rise on a point of order because I insist, Madam Speaker, that unless my honourable friend, or anyone else who raises the question of privilege in this way, is prepared to follow the rule through and present a motion, how can the rest of us express ourselves on the question? I consider -- and again I am speaking, Madam Speaker, on a point of order -- I consider this to be perfectly unfair to the other members of the House because my honourable friend not only raised his question of privilege, not only his so-called question of privilege, he not only failed to follow the rule and present a motion with regard to it, but he did something else that I think would be quite unpardonable under any circumstances. He proceeded to re-debate the speech that he made here before, and that particularly at a time when there's a motion on the Order Paper still that would allow my honourable friend to debate this question if he wanted to do so. He has, I believe, spoken on the amendment, but I think he has not spoken on the main motion so he'd have an opportunity to do so. So my point of order simply is to reinforce once again what Beauchesne says, which in the absence of our own speaking becomes our rule, and that is that a question of privilege ought rarely to arise. When it does arise we should follow the rule completely and make a motion.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, on the same point of order, I must say that my perusal of Beauchesne does not seem to me to support the contention entirely of the honourable member about this question as to whether or not it should be dealt with by way of motion, and I think the matter is important and that perhaps it should be reserved for decision, but I must say that on a quick look at Beauchesne I'm not as convinced as my honourable friend that his point is actually as he states it. It is true that with respect to the privileges of the House a motion is concerned, but whether that applies to a point of personal privilege something which is not clear to me from what I am able to discern at the moment, so I think that no sudden decision should be made on that point.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, on the point of order, would my honourable friend answer me then this question, that in the absence of a motion how would the other members of the House have the opportunity to express themselves on a matter such as this that comes before the House?

MR. ROBLIN: If it's a question of privileges of the House I can see the point, but the question of personal privilege I don't see it, because personal privileges often are brought up in the middle of a proceeding without any such thing as a motion at all being before the House, so I think this point has to be looked into. I don't put myself forward as an expert on this particular point of the rules of our House but I think it requires the . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: I will take under consideration the question of whether a motion should have been presented in this particular case.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, is it your ruling that the statement made by the honourable member is not debatable at this time by any members of this House?

MADAM SPEAKER: The ruling is not debatable. There is no motion before the House.

MR. MOLGAT: And his statement is not debatable? You will not entertain any other speakers?

MADAM SPEAKER: Not at this time. Orders of the Day.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to make an announcement concerning the birthday of a

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd) . . . gentleman living in our community who has just celebrated his 100th birthday, and nearly 500 friends and relatives gathered in Steinbach last week to celebrate this event. The gentleman's name is Mr. John B. Toews -- accidentally the "B" stands for Barkman -- but Mr. Toews was one of the original Mennonite settlers that came to Manitoba in 1874. While there have never been great personal honours bestowed on this gentleman, he was then and still is a very great community man. Also while this gentleman has never taken any active part in politics, and possibly this is one of the reasons for his long life, he has however taken a very active part in whatever community he has lived in. As a deacon of his church that he represents, as a fairly prosperous farmer in the district, he has always shown great leadership, wisdom and charity in all of his activities, especially with human beings. This gentleman is still hale and hearty, and those of you who might have watched him on CBW last night celebrating his 100th birthday I think will agree that all of us in this House will wish him many more years of health and happiness.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, I consider it a great honour to have Mr. John B. Toews as one of my constituents, and I would at this moment like to join my honourable colleague the Member for Carillon in extending to Mr. John B. Toews my best wishes for many more years of good health and happiness among his people.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to remind all the members of this House, as well as the members of the Press and Radio, that the evening known as the "Pea Soup Night" held in St. Boniface once a year, will be held tomorrow at St. Boniface College at 8:30. I can assure all the members of this House, including the Member from St. Vital, that they will be welcome. Many of my constituents might feel sorry for him but they will not hold any ill-feeling toward him.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Before the Orders of the Day I have a question I'd like to direct. I thought perhaps the Minister of Agriculture should answer it but in his absence perhaps the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources could do so. I have been advised that the Government has stopped taking levels of Lake Manitoba at Delta and at Steep Rock. This is causing some concern and I wonder if it's true and if so, why?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): I have no information on that at all, Madam Speaker. We'll have to take the question as notice.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (ASSINIBOIA): Madam Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister for Public Works. Is his department still responsible for the Trans-Canada Highway through Assiniboia, or has that responsibility been transferred over to the Metropolitan Government?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): Madam Speaker, the responsibility was transferred to the Metropolitan Government.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Attorney-General.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I'd like to ask a subsequent question. As of what date, and does he feel we'll have better action now?

MR. WEIR: Well Madam Speaker, I don't know what action the Honourable Member is really speaking of. I think that it will be equally as good action as he has had in the past. It was actually settled for April 1st but the advertising in the Gazette was somewhat delayed and I'm just not sure whether it's the 3rd or the 4th or something that the actual date is. It may even be today's date.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. Has he received any representations requesting an appeal in the case of Stratichuk and Walker, is he giving consideration to an appeal, and when will the decision be made?

MR. McLEAN: In the case of one Edwin Walker, yes, there have been representations made with respect to an appeal. The matter is under consideration and will be dealt with in the regular way.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, a subsequent question -- is it not correct that the time limit will be expiring very soon?

MR. McLEAN: I don't know when the time limit expires but the decision will be made before it does expire.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister. Has it been drawn to his attention that there are

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . continuing transfers in respect of Air Canada to Montreal, and did he receive a telegram from the President of the Machinists Local No. 714, Mr. R. A. Peterson, protesting this and requesting that any steps possible be taken to ask Air Canada to cease transfers until such time as the Thompson Inquiry Commission has made its report.

MR. ROBLIN: I have received no communication of this sort as yet.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may ask a subsequent question, would he take it from me that transfers are continuing and will he make representations to Air Canada to have the continuing transfers cease, at least until the tabling of the Thompson Inquiry Commission?

MR. ROBLIN: . . . I'll examine the telegram when I get it. I do hope that if the action proposed is taken by the government that we have more success than we have had heretofore in trying to persuade Air Canada to cease and desist from its piecemeal dismantling of the base in Winnipeg. I thank my honourable friend however for his encouragement.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, if I may, I can assure the Honourable the First Minister he would have my support if none other in trying to bring about the cessation of transfers of Air Canada personnel to Montreal.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: Order of the Day standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. The total amount paid by the Government, its agencies, boards, commissions, etcetera, for legal counsel (outside of the Government Civil Service or those employed by governmental agencies, boards, commissions, etcetera, on a full time basis) in the calendar year 1964. 2. The total amount paid by persons dealing with the Government agencies, boards, commissions, etcetera, to solicitors appointed by the Government of such agencies, boards, commissions, etcetera, for work done as solicitors for such boards, but for which payment is made by private parties. 3. The amounts, in 1 and 2 above, if any, so paid showing: (a) the amounts paid to each individual or firm: (1) as fees, (2) as disbursements, (b) the purpose for which such legal counsel was retained.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, certainly the first part of the Order and that portion of Item No. 3 which relates to No. 1 are quite satisfactory. The second leaves me a little confused. I think perhaps we would accept it although I'd be bound to say that I've never heard of any private person paying any money to a solicitor engaged by either the government or a board or a commission, so that I would think, if I understand the question correctly, that certainly the answer will be nil to that item, and I mention it only because there may be some misunderstanding about the meaning of it and if there is I'm sure the Honourable Member and myself can straighten it out. Otherwise the question is in order.

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

MR. STANES: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the following Bills: No. 45, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate The Convalescent Hospital of Winnipeg; No. 46, an Act to incorporate Manitoba Museum of Man and Nature; No. 55, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate The Ice Club of Greater Winnipeg; and No. 59, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

Bills No. 45, 46, 55 and 59 were read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bills No. 45, 46, 55 and 59 and has adopted all of these bills without amendment.

IN SESSION

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

Bills No. 45, 46, 55 and 59 were each read a third time and passed.

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

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, I would ask for leave to have the matter stand.

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster. The Honourable the Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: Madam Speaker, in speaking to this resolution, I listened with great interest to the Member from St. Matthews the other day, and he spoke quite abruptly to my colleague from Inkster. My colleague from Inkster has been here many years and has tried to do what he thinks is right in his own heart. Now, we each come here to do what we want to do, and I say that a man has to have a great heart. Now I would say that my colleague from Inkster has done quite a job through the years, but he has had to go slow and has been clobbered over the head many a time. He brought in this resolution in this way, to take until 70, 1970, and was asked why he didn't bring it in right away to \$100.00. That is right. Why didn't he bring it in right away? Because he knew it was almost impossible to ask for \$100.00, in his estimation, from the treatment he had received through the years. I am not against any man. That's his privilege to speak as he likes. So I believe this is the way it is, Madam Speaker.

Then again, the Member for Brandon spoke, and he spoke of a village, or houses, or homes for the old age pensioners. I think it was a forward look and I commend him in what he is talking about, but I say this. If he would look around he would see these various community centres, these various places that the elder folk go to. I know in my constituency there is a place called a day centre, and I had mind to bring in some of their literature today to show to you what they were doing. I always notice they prepare a lunch at noon, and it is tabulated down there, 35 cents. To you and I what is 35 cents? It's nothing. You throw it away. Lots of people live out there and for some thing they throw 35 cents or 50 cents, or a dollar away. It means nothing. But to the old folks it means a lot because when we break down what they have got today, as my colleague said, they get \$55 a month of buying power, and break it down to a day and see what you've got. You've got \$1.83. So you figure out, when he has to pay for everything that he needs through the day he hasn't got nothing left, and he has to scratch. And I know myself, I've seen people in the back lanes digging in the garbage. You think that's funny. Maybe, I don't know. As I say I have actually seen that. Well, I can't say whether that man was doing it because he wanted to save -- I can't say it. But I say that's what he was doing. And to think that we have to see a thing like that and to see our people -- they go and buy an overcoat. They go here, they go there. Our elder people who are the people that built this country, and this is what they get.

So they say, if we are going to give a rise of the old age pension, we give to the needy not the greedy. Do you have to give to the greedy? Surely you can make a ceiling there that a man can have -- you don't have to give to the greedy. And furthermore, if you do give to the greedy, so what? He is going to pay it back in taxes anyway if he's got too much. So what's the difference? Are we going to penalize the poor needy man because of -- you say there are few greedy people around here. Well, we're not going to give to them. You don't have to give to them. Give to the needy, not to the greedy.

Madam Speaker, I sometimes get a little bit upset, I suppose. But I say, when I see all of this around me I sometimes think to myself, am I among my people here? Or is my heart too soft? Because I say, there could go my father and mother. Well, Madam Speaker, I would say this. We invite the government to urge the Federal Government to grant our senior

(MR. HARRIS cont'd) citizens at the age of 65, \$100.00 a month immediately. We submit this plan provide \$100.00 a month at the age of 65 for a large segment of the population of Canada will neither be fair nor practical; it will not be fair to the present generation of our elderly people. They would very well become the forgotten generation while we are concerned with making plans for the distant future. This is a generation which probably has worked harder than any other generation in the country in the history of Canada will ever work. This is the generation which survived two wars. We are not trying to get emotional about this. There is no point in that. We are merely pointing out that this is the generation which has gone through probably the worst economic conditions of recent times. This is a generation which the taxes to the province most of the social capital that we have now in Canada. This is a generation that financed our present prosperity that paid for our roads, hospitals and schools. It contributed to the financing of municipal services. We are sure that there are few members in this House who would not be willing to go back to their constituencies and say "Yes, we have raised the old age pension and we have brought the age of retirement into line with the practices of industry and employment in this nation. We have decided to pay for it out of general revenues and the taxation of this nation, because we believe that the people who have made the contribution to this country, that has been made by those who are now reaching retirement age, are responsible for the economy of the country. We shall all be pledged to raise the gross national product to an extent where it will carry in decency the old age people of this nation."

Argument that such an increase would cost \$820 million -- it seems like a lot of money. The fact remains however that the reduction of one percent in unemployment would increase Canada's productivity by over \$4 billion a year. A quarter of this would find its way into the Federal Treasury so that the revenue would increase by a thousand million dollars annually. This would more than pay the cost of raising the old age pension to \$100.00 a month. Apart from the needs of the old age pension there is a great economic argument for raising the pension if Canada is to experience the economic growth necessary to provide the one and one half million jobs which the Economic Council say we must have by 1970. Then the buying power of the Canadian public must be the arguments. The problem is not where we will get the money; the problem is how can we sell the goods or services which our economy is capable of producing. Increased pensions will stimulate buying power and promote economic growth and jobs. We've been challenged to great economic growth. We've been challenged to beautify our cities, our homes, our neighbourhoods, our highways; to conserve our great natural resources. We have been challenged to bring the possibility of enlightenment and education to every boy and girl who wants education. What a wonderful period in which to live! How great it is to live at a time in human history when the major challenge is to the better life rather than a quicker death. So let us in this House accept the challenge and help the old age pensioners. Thank you.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Inkster, as amended.

A MEMBER: Motion as amended?

MADAM SPEAKER: Yes. The main motion as amended, yes.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, am I closing the debate?

MADAM SPEAKER: Does any other member wish to speak on the debate? The Honourable the Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I'll only be very very brief. I'm satisfied in my mind that every honourable member of this House is satisfied that under present conditions under the high cost of living, \$75.00 a month is too little to keep body and soul together. Twenty dollars a month, as I already mentioned, in '27 was much more than \$75.00 a month now. So the main thing is about those who are not in need, may I repeat the argument that I have already advanced to you. Number 1, a means test is very degrading, because after all, the old age pensioners now were not beggars all their lives. They merely worked for a very small wage and had not saved up anything, they were thrown out of the labour market most of them at the age of 60, and they had to look after themselves, probably mortgage their homes, beg from their children who have their own responsibilities, go through the five years, and then of course they had to apply because they were -- for five years they had to live, they had to exist, so they applied under the so-called means test. There's no figures and no statistics available as to the number of men who are making a comfortable living and do not depend on the old age pension, receive it. Personally I'm satisfied that there's a very great percentage of those are not applying for the old age pension. It's not given as a matter of course. Even the rich man

(MR. GRAY cont'd) has to apply for the old age pension at 70 before he gets it, we still have many honest, conscientious people in this country, and if they don't need the \$75.00 they'll never ask for it.

Some claim that they're asking for it and giving it back to charity, and even if they are, some people who do not need it and get it they pay back up to 80 percent in income tax, because in order not to be in need they've got to have an income of \$25,000 or \$30,000 personal income and therefore their income tax is quite high. So we don't need to be afraid. Once we agree that it's not enough money, why should we be afraid it's only those in need. Why should we insult people between those who are not in need and those who are in need? After all, we are going to celebrate 100 years of the birth of Canada. Canada's built up now. A hundred years ago there were very few people here. It consisted, at least in the west, a majority of newcomers where they ploughed the field, cultivated the land, built the railways, built the buildings, and now those who are still alive we should give them a little bit more comfort when we are celebrating our centenary. For God's sake only last night you have approved six, seven million dollars for one province, for what? To see a horse run, or to see a fight, or to see a baseball game.

Now, if actual figures could be obtained, you will find out that you'll have to spend in this province very very much less. It's true that the Federal Government is planning an old age pension scheme. Once they have it, this is all out anyway. They won't . . . in lines in '70, and what should they do in the meantime? I appeal, although the amendment is the amendment does not mean a thing because the people will refuse to accept charity under the Ministers, not all of them, and they'll be left suffering.

Another thing, this is a recommendation to Ottawa. This is not adopted tomorrow. So from all points of view I think that it would be a good deed on our part to approve the motion.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): In the absence of the Minister, may this item stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed motion 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 Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, in taking part in this debate regarding the motion whereby the Honourable Member for St. George started the motion out by asking for rescinding of the tax on heating fuels, I believe it's become most apparent to all members in this House and indeed the people of Manitoba, that this tax has an impact all over the province in all phases of home life and industry of the province. It affects people in business. It affects the home owners with their heating; and I believe it's amply been demonstrated by the speakers to date that this tax is not to be taken as lightly as some members of the government wish it were being taken.

I have here a letter from a constituent of mine who wrote to the Honourable the First Minister pointing out his problem, and it may be insignificant when one looks at the nearly one million people in Manitoba, but this man makes his living from a laundromat, and in his letter to the Premier he points out how the heating tax and the electricity tax affects him.

"To the Honourable Duff Roblin, Legislative Building, Winnipeg, Manitoba. Dear Sir: I would like to point out just how the new proposed five percent services tax will affect me. I own a family-run laundromat, it being my only source of revenue. My gas and power bills for operating my 30 washers and 10 dryers run well over \$200.00 a month -- \$300.00 including water. It is impossible for me to pass this extra cost of doing business on, as all machines are operated at a set figure."

Madam Speaker, I read that letter just to show the impact on one small industry in Manitoba. This means that this man, in addition to his own personal bills in his home, through his business must give up more of his profits. This in itself is unequal. It is not justified in my opinion. While I haven't the letter from the company involved, there is another company in our area -- it's a transportation company and a small one -- and through the imposition of tax on diesel and gasoline their cost of operation has gone up to the extent that they have reduced their staff by one man. Why have they done this? It certainly wasn't lack of effort on their part to increase their business. But in the competitive business they're in with railways

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . and other factors they could not pass on their increased cost of doing business, and they tightened their corporate belt by laying off one worker.

Another firm in our area -- I might add it's a very large firm, employs over 200 people -- their increased cost of doing business was over \$500.00 a month. They are large users of electricity, large users of power and heating fuel. They are selling in a market outside of Manitoba. Fortunately they are big enough to be able to absorb this cost but they are certainly not happy with the way taxes are going up in Manitoba. I was requested by the manager of this plant to supply him with figures on tax increases in Manitoba over the past number of years. On asking his reasons for why he wanted these figures he was very reluctant to say so, but he finally did when pressed. He said that he was sending a report to his head office and he needed figures on taxes to support the statement that he was making. And this in itself is a very bad thing, when we have industry taking second looks at the tax situation in Manitoba.

I believe this next item that I'm going to mention has been covered before, but I will mention and give my feelings on what I think about tax being placed on tax. I have before me a tax statement for the City of Portage la Prairie, 1964 levy. In the statement, on the back of it, it is itemized where the taxpayers' dollars go to. One of the items mentioned is street lighting, \$43,500.00. Because of the imposition of the 5 percent tax on power, this means this figure will go up \$2,200.00. This is what I call "tax on tax". Not included are the costs of welfare that are not being borne by the Province but are being borne by municipalities and cities throughout Manitoba. Where they are called upon to pay or to give social assistance, they must also pay heating and power and items that are carrying this new tax.

But to come back to the resolution that was proposed by the Honourable Member for St. George, if I may remind the members of the original resolution before it was amended by the -- as the Honourable Member for Selkirk says, by the weaseliest amendment he has heard of for some time. It says, "Whereas the imposition of tax on heating becomes a penalty on the people living in this province, especially those living in Northern Manitoba where the burden of this tax falls most heavily on those of fixed income and on lower income groups." Now I think we all saw the article in last week's papers. Part of it was quoted by the Member for Selkirk when he was speaking on the heat tax debate at that time. But I thought there was a passage in the article that he did quote out of that he should have read all of the article, so like my honourable friend from Gladstone, I'm going to quote just a little. This is a statement being made by Local 6166 of United Steelworkers of America, and it's in a telegram to the Premier. It goes on to say, and I quote: "It is the Union's contention that this tax is discriminatory against the people of the North." The statement adds: "The Union bases its view on the fact that there is a more severe climate at Thompson and other northern areas, and longer winters than any other residents of Manitoba who live in a location geographically south of ours." The Union's statement says: "The imposition of the heat tax on the northern population puts Mr. Beard and the government in a position of taking a retrogressive step in the opening of northern areas of Manitoba for development."

Now I myself have had two phone calls and one letter from the people who live in the northern areas, and one of the phone calls I had, the chap who was calling me said his oil bill -- he heats with oil -- his oil bill averages \$50.00 a month for the winter months, which is about six months; and then he averages \$5.00 to \$10.00 a month for the remainder of the year. So his heating bill is well over \$300 -- almost \$350 a year. He tells me that his electric bill averages \$10.00 a month. So when these two are added together we come up with a figure over \$400.00 a year for electric power and heat. I believe members in this House will agree that this is not an equal tax. The First Minister has told us that he has done some research; that people in Winnipeg, in this area, their tax with regard to heat averages out to something like 90 cents a month. But I say to him and I say to other members over there that he should do a survey on what it costs to heat homes in the northern part of our province.

Another person who called me from the north had -- in his words -- "the misfortune to heat his home with propane gas," and in the severe months, it has cost him as high as \$85.00 a month -- in the severe months. So his heating bill is also much above the Winnipeg average, if that is what the First Minister was trying to establish, and I would like those members who represent northern areas to stand up and defend, defend what was said last summer when these taxes were being put on. Is it not a fact that members on this side gave many of the reasons that have been mentioned in this debate. spoke loudly and clearly about the inequality of this tax? Is it not a fact that members from the party on my left did the same thing,

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd) to give them their due and that members opposite who form the government were very strong in their expressions as to why this tax should be put on? I would like the two ministers who represent northern areas -- I see one is out of the House but one is here, the Member for The Pas. He was a party to deciding to put on this tax. The other members who represent northern areas, one member did have the courage to get up and say something about it. He did his best to try and help his frontbenchers out, but I really think it is very unfair that the front bench sits silent at a time like this and leaves it to someone else to try and bail them out of their problems.

I have another quotation here supplied to me by the Honourable Member from Gladstone. He feels I should read it out, and I'll try and accommodate him. This is from the Winnipeg Free Press, November 14, 1964, and the headline is "Fuel Tax Heats up Critics. Attorney-General Stewart McLean said Friday that there had been a good deal of criticism of the government's recently imposed tax on heating fuel. Mr. McLean was asked by a delegate to the Manitoba Conservative Association Convention during a round table discussion why the government had chosen to tax heating fuel in this climate. The reply" -- and I know it was denied, but I'm just reading from a quotation here -- "The reply was that there was no special reason. The government needed a certain amount of revenue, additional revenue and it had been a matter of judgment which items should be taxed and how much. Certain items were chosen and that was the combination that supplied the required revenue." It could have been a different combination, but perhaps when one of the Ministers arises to refute anything I may be saying he could dwell on that. "Mr. McLean said some people claimed it was not fair to put the new tax on something so necessary as heating fuel, but gasoline was also necessary for many people who had to drive, and further increasing the tax on that would hurt them too, he said."

MR. SCHREYER: Would the member table the documents he just read?

MR. JOHNSTON: I'd be glad to, Madam Speaker, I make the rather serious charge and statement that some of the Honourable Ministers in the Cabinet have lost touch with the common people in Manitoba, that in their taxing policies they do not look at the problems that have to be faced by people who are working for modest incomes.

I would like to read now a letter that appeared in the Free Press, and I'm sorry I haven't the date of it, but I think it expresses quite truly, quite concisely the feelings that many people have come to have in this province in the last few years. It's addressed to The Editor. "Sir: I think Mr. Roblin and his colleagues are completely out of touch with the facts of life as they have to be faced by the wage earners of Manitoba. As near as I can estimate, the average head of a family takes home about \$70 to \$90 per week. Roblin and company have taken about two weeks pay from him in a year in heat tax, phone tax, gas tax, cigarette tax, electric tax, and others during this last bite. Now I find that if he owns his own home he can hope to recoup up to \$50.00 in tax rebate (bribe) but that if he rents a house or an apartment the wage earner receives nothing back. Perhaps if Mr. Roblin and his Cabinet reduced their own pay of \$17,500 a year to \$4,500 a year, then they would have the right to impose these heavy taxes. Also, Mr. Roblin's viewpoint on a heat tax would change if he stayed in Manitoba instead of heading for Jamaica for a holiday every winter. I think it is time for Manitoba to be represented by average Manitobans, not wealthy whiz kids who don't have to scrimp and do without to pay taxes.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon, 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 motion of the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert-Plains and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I ask leave of this House to allow this matter to stand.

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

MR. ROBLIN: gentleman isn't there we'd be quite happy to have the matter stand.

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

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I adjourned the debate for the Leader of my group.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wish to thank the House for having allowed this to stand for some time. I was unfortunately out of the House on the occasion when it came up.

My comments on the resolution will be brief. I agree with the Honourable Member for Churchill that this would be a desirable development in northern Manitoba and I intend to support the resolution. I think it's fair to say that those people probably have more need really for television and radio service than the people in other parts of the province. In many cases there they are inaccessible; they do not have the same facilities the remainder of the province has for entertainment or for communication. The normal communications, that is the other communications such as newspapers, reach them late because of their isolation, and to provide them with this service would certainly be a big improvement to the people residing in northern Manitoba.

I think it will also go a certain distance to encouraging people to remain in northern Manitoba and others possibly to go in those areas. I'm thinking particularly of areas like Lynn Lake for example, which, because of the rock structures between them and the remainder of the province, are unable to get presently radio communications even from the other stations, and they must depend on local provision in their own area. I think that it would be very desirable for the Federal Government, in co-operation with the province, to proceed and serve as many of these areas as is possible.

Naturally there will be the question of cost. Some of the areas because of their great isolation, the distance involved and the small population, the argument will no doubt be put up that it isn't reasonable to proceed with the service. I feel however that we might be able to examine, Madam Speaker, the provision of alternate services in a number of these areas, and while certainly all of them would want the very best of service, and this is what they should get if it's feasible, but there may be other means of serving them which would be adequate. I can think for example of what has gone on in Churchill where the local people have organized themselves, set up a local corporation which I understand will be providing, if it has not already started doing so, television services to the Town of Churchill.

I know that in the case of Thompson there is a closed circuit in operation there and has been for some years. I think that this could go further in that other of the centres there, Lynn Lake in particular, that this might be done and that this would be a fair place to ask for contributions from the Federal and Provincial Governments. I don't think that there has been a contribution in the case of either Thompson or Churchill, but I think a fair case can be made for a look at this with three levels involved, that is the local people, the Provincial Government and the Federal Government. Naturally, as I said at the outset, if we can get the Federal Government to accept the responsibility then all of us would prefer that, but I think the important thing is to get going on the service.

Now I'm happy that there appears to be a change in the position of the government in this regard because I recall some years ago, in fact during the course of one of the election campaigns, either in 1958 or 1959, when I had been proposing that we should proceed with the extension of TV to northern Manitoba, and at that time only a small part of Manitoba was served. Even the Dauphin area was not at that time being serviced and obviously nothing further north in the case of The Pas and Flin Flon which presently have service. There have been recommendations made at that time and some starts have been made on a program to provide TV service to all of the Province of Manitoba. I think in fact that the people who are presently involved in providing Churchill are the same people who were then proposing, through the structure of satellite stations, that they would service the whole of the province.

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.)

At that time there was considerable resistance from the present provincial government. The Premier in fact at his speech in Portage la Prairie pooh-pooed completely the idea and suggested that the Liberal Party was going far beyond recommendations of a chicken in every pot, they had gone on to the point where they wanted a television set in every house and that this was entirely unfeasible and should not be proceeded with. Well apparently there's a change of attitude on the part of my honourable friends and I don't criticize them for it. On the contrary I compliment them for it, Madam Speaker. It's a little late in coming. I think if they had shown more enthusiasm back in 1958 and '59 that we might have got further ahead and possibly had the service in more of the centres now, but better late than never and I intend to support the resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, I'd like 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 New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Member for St. Vital.

MR. GROVES: Madam Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand. If there's somebody else that wants to speak, I have no objection.

MADAM SPEAKER: Any member wishing to speak? The Honourable the Member for Carillon.

MR. BARKMAN: Madam Speaker, I would like to make a small contribution to this debate and thank the Honourable Member of St. Vital to let me proceed.

Madam Speaker, in response to the resolution of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party regarding the necessity to relieve the consumers, as he said, "from unfair, deceptive and harsh sales practices", I would like to expound a few views or ideas of my own, and not necessarily that of my Party, regarding the repercussions and basic philosophy of such legislation.

Madam Speaker, our system of free enterprise has produced the highest level of well-being to the majority of people, I think, ever known throughout the world, and at no time in our history, I believe, has the system faced -- our system of free enterprise faced the serious threats and grave perils it does today. World-wide economic dislocation, communism and communistic teachings, commercial trickery, deceit and fraud are pointing up to the necessity of action on the part of business and on the part of the individual to help counteract the enemies of this free enterprise system and those who would change our way of life. Any system suitably fortifies itself against these threats if firstly, the needs of the people are satisfactorily fulfilled; and secondly, the people understand the system and how it works.

My last point, Madam Speaker, is the rub. I have already stated that we enjoy the highest levels of well-being in the world and our people are I believe, generally speaking, having their needs fulfilled possibly more satisfactorily than ever before. Lacking however is the knowledge, the knowledge of how our system of free enterprise functions and the built-in safeguards it has to protect the consumer from exploitation.

Competition to me is the basis of a free enterprise. In this country the consumer, as far as any commodity or service is concerned, has many choices as to price and quality of the commodity or service he seeks and as to where he wishes to secure it. Legislation has already enacted in the form of the Canadian Investigation Act, and it is keeping a watchful eye on business and industry, and for that matter thus protecting the consumer that the Honourable Leader talked of from exploitation by ensuring that our business itself, the manufacturer and the sale of goods and services remain competitive. I believe the very life of a business corporation in our free enterprise society is at stake if it cannot continue to bring reliable goods and services to the customer at fair and competitive prices. This in itself then is a powerful stimulus to keep industry and commerce honest and reliable.

The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party has stated that it is necessary to relieve the consumers of Manitoba from unfair, deceptive and harsh sales practices. In principle, I believe his contention is very sound. However, our business system, which has contributed so greatly to the wealth of this country, has developed only because we live under a ruling, or call it a government if you wish, that permits freedom of enterprise. More legislation to me seems that it would restrict this freedom, but most important I doubt if it might

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) . . . or if it would solve this problem. There is already plenty of law which if enforced would protect the public from fraud and many of these other points that the honourable member has raised.

As far as the standards of business practices are concerned, these are not wholly confined to matters of law. They go far beyond the question of what is legal and what is fair and what is decent. Definitely it is not the job this government could or should do alone. We have already seen in the past examples of law where it is practically and physically impossible to enforce, and instead of curbing potential lawbreakers, only gave rise to many others.

The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party goes on to suggest, and I quote, "Legislation to protect the consumer can be effective without impairment to normal and desirable trade conditions, and indeed restores consumer confidence". I fail to see how such legislation if passed in its present form could help but impede normal and desirable trade conditions, and I shall enlarge on this matter later.

Madam Speaker, he further suggests, and I quote again, "such legislation should have the effect of inhibiting undesirable sales rather than requiring the purchaser to resort to Court action after an undesirable transaction has been entered into". Also, I wonder if such legislation gives credit to the consumer for his natural intelligence and his ability to decide of what, where and when to buy. Are we trying to develop and foster a society of mental cripples without the ability to make the basic decisions of life for themselves? I also wonder if this proposed legislation gives credit to the majority of business enterprises conducting their affairs in an honest and conscionable manner. Also, it raises the question as to how far can a government go in legislating to protect the people against themselves?

Dealing with the details of this resolution in order, the Honourable Leader suggests that, and I quote again, "a three-day waiting period for purchasing of an article by means of direct sales, in which the purchaser shall be permitted to repudiate the contract of sale and to enforce immediate recovery of any money paid", be implemented. This clause in its present form could be faced with serious implications and possibilities of values. Is it his intention to provide that the consumer must wait three days from the time of actually deciding to buy an article until he can take delivery of this article or to re-declare his intentions to purchase? I believe this would be met with opposition from a very high percentage of the population who are perfectly capable of deciding what, where and when to buy, and when they desire to take delivery of their purchases. The public would be seriously opposed to and critical of any government which tried to dictate such laws to them.

On the other hand, if he means that regardless of time of delivery of an article purchased or of signing a contract to purchase or of agreeing orally to purchase, the consumer has the legal right to reverse his decision within three days, it again opens very many avenues of possible misuse. Would it not be possible under these terms of the present proposal for a consumer to purchase a new television set, let us say on Friday night, watch the Grey Cup on Saturday and watch a few other programs on Sunday and conveniently return the set on Monday, well within his time limit. Possibly it might even be possible for somebody to purchase an automobile and travel three or four or 500 miles over the week-end and return it the next Monday, and of course we all know it cannot be resold as a new car after it is returned.

My question here is this: while I also agree in protecting the consumer in every way possible, is it fair to do so only at the expense of the businessman? What safeguards does the Honourable Leader propose to implement for the protection of the honest merchant acting in good faith under the terms of this resolution? I realize the question to a large degree hinges upon the Honourable Leader's definition of direct sales, but almost any transaction between consumer and merchant can be classified as a direct sale, and before such legislation can be implemented, a much clearer definition would have to be arrived at.

If by direct sales the Honourable Leader means the so-called high-pressure sales organization, where does one draw the line to distinguish between high-pressured salesmanship and ethical salesmanship? I also have thought will this legislation limit -- I hate to use the word pressured in this case -- but might it limit the pressured appeals from charitable organizations and churches and the like? Might it not be wise before the implementation of such legislation to scrutinize more carefully to its qualities as opposed to the method in which it is sold. It is common knowledge that a new home salesman or many of the home salesmen try to reach their prospects by signing contracts for a new home possibly in order to take advantage of the Winter Works bonus and possibly other reasons, but in order to eliminate this hurry-hurry, sign on the dotted line, as we hear so often, approach of the salesman to sell a new home and collect

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) . . . his commission, would we ask the Federal Government to repeal this bonus and by so doing deprive the consumer of this advantage? I think there could be other reasons like this.

Madam Speaker, another thing that interested me was how would the sale of articles between private citizens be regulated to conform with this regulation — or if it became legislation. Would the private citizen who has sold an article and has committed himself with these funds to another situation, would he be obliged to return, or possibly after he has committed these funds he has to repute his obligation because of the whim — could be the whim on the part of the person who has purchased articles from him? What powers of contract, Madam Speaker, are left with the businessman or the private citizen in this case, the very one we are trying to protect for that matter under a type of an act such as this.

The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party goes on to suggest that the Provincial Government enact legislation, and I quote again "to provide for the licensing and bonding of dealers who are in trades, where the public is most vulnerable to unscrupulous business practices". To what area of business is this directed? In its present form, could this not be used by government as a tool of persecution against small minority groups or individual businesses? I believe it could.

The City of Winnipeg and most rural locations, at least many of them today, already provide for licensing and bonding of dealers through their own by-laws, and that any business enterprise, be they local or transient, working within their limits must be licensed to operate. I'm at a loss to see what beneficial effect double licensing would be, except that it would place another financial burden on business which can only reflect itself in higher prices to be paid by the very consumer we are trying to protect. But how would the bonding of these so-called areas of business where the public is most vulnerable to unscrupulous sales practices help. Bonding may indeed protect the consumer from outright fraud, but how can it protect — how can it protect him from high-pressured salesmanship where no fraud has really taken place?

The Honourable Leader goes on to suggest in the resolution that conditional sales contracts be registered. This, Madam Speaker, is both commendable and long overdue. While I believe the conditional sales contracts which involve a chattel mortgage are already required to be registered, contracts which involve only a lien should also require registration as a measure of protection against a consumer purchasing an article which is not of a clear title. This for example would protect the individual buying an automobile or whatever article he may wish to buy from another individual, an area far more dangerous I believe than that of an individual dealing with a licensed or bonded salesman.

The resolution further suggests that the government enact legislation "to require advertisers to be able to prove the availability in reasonable quantity of advertised goods, thus eliminating 'lure advertising', " and then goes on to propose essentially the same thing only in a different way, and suggesting that the government provide penalties for false and misleading advertising, and I believe misrepresentation. This, Madam Speaker, I believe is already provided for under the terms of the federal law, specifically the Canadian Combines Investigation Act, I believe under Section 33 Chapter 1, hence there is no need to comment further on this.

Madam Speaker, as I have said, I'm fully in favour of protecting the public from harsh and unfair sales practices. However, I also believe, as I have mentioned, that a free enterprise society offers the greatest freedom to the individual and the greatest return to society of any form of economic organization. I believe a free enterprise society, however, can only work if its freedom to be enterprising is not curtailed too far. It must remain a risk-taking society, and we all know where risks are taken, failures will occur and naturally cause hurt. I believe society must demand fairly that the hurt be tempered to victims within the power — rather without the power — I should say without the power to protect themselves, but not that risk be entirely eliminated. To me, complete security is complete stagnation. The opposite of course is this, risk must be rewarded. A living society giving its members a rising standard of well-being must encourage risk-taking. Rewards to those who take risks, and I think we can look all around us and see them today, are a stimulant to growth and a benefit to us all. What I'm saying is this, it's better to risk something than to have too little enterprise.

I have said, Madam Speaker, that some of the points of this resolution in their present form seek to protect the few against the few to the detriment of the many. Each of us have a good idea of what we want for ourselves. After a while we even learn what is good for us, and that we can only achieve it with tolerance and respect for the rights of others. In conclusion, Madam Speaker, I would like to say this, that society must accept, and I believe they will accept

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.) . . . the conditions that will achieve the greatest good for the greatest number.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, if I might be permitted to say a few words at this time. I certainly haven't got any prepared speech here on the resolution for this afternoon, but hearing the Honourable Member from LaVerendrye speak on the resolution, I thought that I'd bring up a few points. The first whereas says that "it is necessary to relieve the consumers of Manitoba from unfair, deceptive and harsh sales practices." In a way this might be true, that something should be done; but on the other hand, I think there is also fair warning that we be very careful as to what actions we do take in this respect.

When you look at clause (a), "to provide a three-day waiting period for purchasing of an article by means of direct sales, in which the purchaser shall be permitted to repudiate the contract of sale and to enforce immediate recovery of any money paid," it's hard to bring in legislation in this respect that would remedy the situation. Here I think we have a group of people that would come into this category of impulse buying, people who buy on impulse and then later on they feel sorry and they would like to return goods. Well, Madam Speaker, I think we as citizens of this province and of this country have to use a certain measure of self-discipline. We have to discipline ourselves in not doing some of these things rather than try and legislate against it. I'm not too sure whether we can bring in proper legislation in this respect, to rule out impulse buying or to rule out this factor.

To have a three-day waiting period in certain connections might just be all right, but in other directions, as we heard this morning in Committee, this brings in a matter of doubt issue of business agreements and transactions that are being carried on daily. I for one am not satisfied that to bring in legislation authorizing this three-day waiting period, that that would solve the matter. I am awaiting the distribution of Bill 86 in connection with the consumer credit to find out just what the bill will say and what the government is going to recommend. Bill 63 was discussed in Committee this morning and here we heard Mr. Thompson in connection with that bill on this very point, about bringing in this measure of doubt into our business transactions, and I for one would be very reluctant to bring in legislation in a hasty manner in this way.

Going on to the other clauses, the next clause (b), "to provide for the licensing and bonding of dealers," and so on. I think this is very essential, and if this resolution could be split up in some way so that we could pass certain sections of it, I would be wholeheartedly in support of that one. I know of happenings, just last year, when one of our local industries lost \$11,000 in one deal because of a broker who didn't stand up and who later on went bankrupt, and as a result they had to endure this loss. Mind you, they enquired prior to dealing with this firm, but apparently from the bank recommendations they felt that this was a reliable firm, but later on they were taken for a ride and had to suffer this loss. So that in this connection I would be wholeheartedly in favour of having these people bonded.

Going on to section (c) requiring registration of conditional sales contracts, I feel that this -- while the previous speaker thought it was very good, I don't think it is too practical. We have a large number of small lending houses, and credit unions would come under this too as well as department stores and so on, that do lending in this way. This would mean the registration of thousands and thousands of instruments every year. Certainly if we did contemplate such action, I think we should exclude probably all those transactions having \$100.00 or less. It might be valuable to have conditional sales agreements on cars or major machinery to be registered, but for to have all the conditional sales agreements which can run from 25 and \$50.00, and so on, have all those registered, would mean a large expense to these societies, these small loan companies and credit unions. I know for a fact that some of our larger credit unions have many many of these instruments, and -- well they're not registered. In many cases, these local towns do not have registration offices. This means that they would have to go to the nearest point, probably 10 or even 20 miles away, and register such an instrument. Then also, presently some of the credit unions have a chattel lien non-filing insurance whereby all these instruments are insured and therefore do not register them at the present time. So I would be rather hesitant to make a wholesale requirement that all the conditional sales contracts be registered.

I would go along with section (e) which provides penalties for false or misleading advertising. I think this has merit. On (d), I have no strong feelings in connection with that. I think that's a minor item as far as I'm concerned. But I thought I should bring out these points at the present time since we are discussing this resolution that is before us.

MR. SCHREYER: would accept the invitation of the honourable member and speak on this resolution as well.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: I speak now primarily because of the rousing speech we heard from the Honourable Member for Carillon. We heard a good deal about free enterprise and the virtues of the free enterprise system. It is not for me to attack the free enterprise system because first of all I am not a direct opponent of it, but I think I would say this, that for all practical purposes, anyone who talks about free enterprise today is a romantic. What we live under today is by the most accurate definition a mixed kind of enterprise and economy, and if we were ever to return to this romantic kind of free enterprise that we hear so much about, we would be in grave and serious difficulty, the whole national economy, the whole continental economy -- I suppose even the whole of the western world.

Apparently it has still not dawned on members in this Chamber that in the most wealthy economy in the world, last year only 20 percent of the increment of investment was injected by private sector investments -- 20 percent, Madam Speaker -- and the balance of the increment of investment was caused by public sector injection plus public sector purchases from existing industry. Therefore, it's not out of any vindictive spirit that I rise to speak, Madam Speaker, on this resolution, but rather because I feel that the terms free enterprise, etc. are coming to mean less and less. They are high in political emotion or -- emotion-charged political terms that are being bandied about. But I suppose if we are to have a federal election in the next year or two, you may hear the term "free enterprising" quite a bit, but when you analyze the policies that are being put forward by the parties, particularly the old parties, it will become increasingly difficult to find much in it that is in support of the old-type free enterprise system. It will be hard to find anything positive either. It will be pretty hard to find anything, I suppose.

Madam Speaker, the resolution put in here by my leader calls for legislation to give a degree of protection to certain categories of consumers against unscrupulous sales practices, and so on. I think that it can be accepted that as society and the economy becomes more complex, you must have more sophisticated machinery to protect the public, not because the public is incapable of protecting itself -- that's really beside the point -- it's because the methods being employed by many elements in the business community are becoming more sophisticated all the time, more people are ensnaring and seducing the consumer, if you like. In any case there is a trend, a continuing trend toward elimination of competition towards collusion, price-fixing, monopolistic practices and hidden persuasion in advertising, the use of subtle gimmicks, etc., and if multi-million dollar concerns can use this kind of technique against individual consumers, then I see nothing wrong with the consumers, the people themselves asking, or using the state and its legislation as a means of protection. I think that's all what it amounts to. We're asking here that the state and its legislation be used by individuals as a means of protection against unscrupulous sales and business practices.

Consumer protection, Madam Speaker, is something that is very much on the increase. Consumer protection legislation is very much on the increase income of the states of the United States, particularly in California, the State of New York and of the larger states, the State of Massachusetts, although I wasn't personally aware, and others. I think they have learned by investigation the necessity of greater measures of consumer protection, and all this resolution does is to ask that we here in Manitoba look around us at other jurisdictions to the south, to the United Kingdom, and see whether it is not practicable to implement similar legislation. It is my understanding that at the present time, or rather a few weeks ago, legislation of this kind was in fact enacted in the United Kingdom. There was existing legislation before and it has been given additional teeth in recent legislation.

So, Madam Speaker, it's not so much that I want to be vindictive in opposition to the Honourable Member for Carillon, but I feel that this high standard of living that we enjoy and so on -- it is a high standard of living, but there are abuses within it having to do with sales and consumption. Moreover, the high standard of living which we enjoy has surged upward only since we have come under mixed enterprise type of economy. It was not a high standard of living in the days of the absence of government regulations and intercession in the economy. It's only since we have adopted economics that we've been able to keep our standard of living at a fairly high and consistent upward level. And economics, the minute you accept it you have accepted in fact full implications of mixed enterprise, and this resolution is consistent with mixed enterprise. I don't think that anyone should feel obliged to oppose it.

MR. JAMES T. MILLS (Kildonan): Mr. Groves who adjourned this debate was inadvertently called out of the House for a few moments and he asked me in his absence -- he'd like to have the debate adjourned -- continued -- unless any other wishes to speak on it.

MR. EVANS: Unless someone else wishes to speak now, the item will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I think consent should be given by the House in the absence of the Honourable Member for St. Vital. Notwithstanding the previous request, as far as I'm concerned the consent will be given. -- Here comes the culprit. This overcomes the dilemma.

MR. GROVES: Do I have to move that the matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: No. Agreed to have it stand in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. Vital. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Morris. The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: This resolution has had some attention from the opposite side of the House and a good deal of it resulting in rude remarks concerning my department, but I don't particularly intend to pay much attention to them. I think it's really a question of not knowing what the situation is, and if ignorance is bliss then I never saw a happier bunch of fellows in my life, and I can see it to be somewhat my duty to inform the honourable gentlemen concerned as to what the department has been doing on what is really an important subject.

This resolution draws attention to two things: first, the necessity to advertise the high quality of Manitoba foods as widely as possible, and indicates one of the means by which this may be done, namely the publicizing of certain native or local dishes as a means of promoting both the tourist trade and the general food business of the province. I want to thank my honourable friend from Morris for bringing this matter up. I think it's a very important one. I think it's the kind of an opportunity we should take in the Legislature more often to discuss something of general importance and the publicity resulting from which may be good for the province and good for the economy, and so I welcome the debate.

I welcome the contributions that have been made from all members including the gentleman from Selkirk who in a ridiculous little speech flatly contradicted himself by saying that the food already had enough publicity but that the Departments of Agriculture and Industry and Commerce should be condemned for not giving it more publicity. My honourable friend from Gladstone got up and set his mouth working and then went away and left it, and finally wound up with something that was ruled out of order as being rather ridiculous by way of a motion in the House, but lest I be tempted too far along that path, I'll turn now to a more constructive line of approach and endeavour to contribute something on the positive side.

I think it can be said that Manitoba's prosperity probably depends on food in a very large measure. There's no need to emphasize the contribution that's been made to the well-being of everybody by farm products, the grain and the livestock and the special crops that we have now. Perhaps it's not so well known that our greatest raw material in the manufacturing industry is from the farm, and certainly our greatest hope for the future, in my opinion, lies in the further processing of farm products. Our largest factories in the province now, and probably for the future, will depend on farm products, and you only have to think of the livestock processing industry, the flour milling industry, vegetable oils, potato processing, sugarbeet manufacture, and other operations of a similar kind.

But our problem is that we can't eat all that we produce. Consequently, we have to export, and so it becomes a matter of prime importance for the Department of Industry and Commerce to do everything that it can to promote the export of our food products both in the raw state but preferably as far as possible in a further manufactured state. With a population of only a million people here and perhaps only a million to a million and half people coming here by way of the tourist trade, we have a small market on which to depend at home, and so we have to look to export markets such as the 52 million people in Britain, 200 million people in the Common Market of Europe, 90-odd million people in Japan, and markets of that kind.

I think we have to reach out to these vast markets, not to mention the size of the American market next door. We have been doing just this. We have been carrying on a vigorous and widespread campaign for the promotion of foods grown in Manitoba, both in the raw state and in the manufactured state, and I would like to give a few examples. I quote for example the promotion that's been carried on of rather an unusual item, Kosher food products -- or Kosher meat products made in Manitoba which have now been marketed in the United States, Britain, Israel, Holland, Denmark, Norway and Sweden. Just recently 800 cases of Kosher baby foods

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) have been shipped to Switzerland. Now this is a widespread and very interesting distribution of a specialized item. It's very interesting to me that there is a special aspect of quality attached with this particular item. It comes from the fact that the certificate offered here by the Rabbi Service in Manitoba is highly regarded. The Rabbi Service in Manitoba is regarded as being of considerable integrity and the certificate is recognized throughout the world and this has added to the popularity of what is already a very good food product.

I refer to another item which is known as "frozen offal" -- rather an awful word to me -- I've always had another association with the word "offal", but this refers to such items as pork and beef tongues, kidneys and livers. These are products which can be sold at low prices and they are finding increasing markets in overseas countries. These items are now being shipped to Britain and the Netherlands and other markets, and further markets such as Switzerland are being investigated. As a matter of fact, shipments of these are now being made also to the Caribbean area.

I think we all had an example the other day when we went to Carberry of what can be done with a specialized food item from Manitoba when we saw that dehydrated potato granules are shipped from Carberry to London, and frozen potatoes have been sent to Australia, Nassau and Bermuda. As a matter of fact, they told us while we were in Carberry that the shipments of these potato granules to the United Kingdom were in the order of a million pounds last year. They could have shipped three million pounds if they had had the potatoes. They are increasing their acreage from about 4,000 acres last year to some 6,000 or more this year in the hope to catch up to the demand.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C., (Ethelbert Plains): Madam Speaker, on a point of order. The resolution talks about the use of local dishes and the Honourable Minister is speaking about export. We were warned here not so very long ago to stay within the orbit of any resolution that we speak to, and I object to the line of argument that the Honourable Minister is using.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, if I may just address myself to the point of order for the moment. I take it the resolution reads as follows on the Order Paper in front of my honourable friend that "Therefore be it resolved that this House go on record as favouring the utmost efforts by all concerned to promote the development of local dishes in the restaurant trade and the publicity of the high quality of Manitoba food products of the farms and fisheries." I take it that I am giving examples of the results of the publicity of the high quality of Manitoba food products throughout the world where they can find markets. But I await your ruling, Madam Speaker.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Madam Speaker, if I may on the point of order, if the Honourable Minister reads the preamble to that resolution he will see that the publicity is in regards to the use of Manitoba products in Manitoba, and not outside the boundaries of Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: I believe that the point of order of the Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains is well taken. I must say that we do try to stay within the rules of the subject debated. I think that I must ask for the co-operation of the House all through, but I really believe that when we are debating these things that we should take it upon ourselves to call every member to order, and I think I have been rather lax. I believe that a good many people who get up on these resolutions are considerably away from the topic. I would ask the honourable members to try and stay within the range of the resolution and to speak to the topic at hand as closely as they possibly can. I respect your viewpoints too on how you interpret it, but I do ask the members to co-operate and I would ask the honourable member who is speaking, who has the floor, to stay within the range as he speaks -- as he is able to do with the resolution to hand.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I never call a point of order because I don't know the rules, but at the same time he was giving us -- the Honourable Minister of Trade and Commerce has given us a very valuable interesting story about Manitoba foods. Why not have another five minutes and he'll finish it. Every time anybody disagrees with anybody, a point of order is right there.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I accept your guidance on that point and will omit the portion of my address then that deals with the operations, I take it, outside of the Province of Manitoba, and will continue my remarks more narrowly on the subject in connection with the use of Manitoba menus and subjects of that kind.

(MR. EVANS cont'd.)

I wish to make a point, Madam Speaker, that one of the valuable ways we have of publicizing Manitoba's food products and getting markets for farmers is through the channel of the tourist trade. These are people who come to Manitoba, my honourable friend, and who absorb the publicity while they are here and who absorb a good deal of the food while they are here; and in this way, I make bold to make reference to the fact that they do go home having tasted Manitoba food and perhaps the memory lingers on and they are able then to convey back to themselves and their own families and their own friends, favourable impressions of having been here, favourable impressions of the dishes they enjoyed while they were here, and in that way I think the local farmers benefit -- and this is all local. This remains within the Province of Manitoba. This enables our farmers to prosper right here in the province, and so as soon as we got into office we began a campaign which has been big and hard-hitting and widespread for the use of food and local dishes as a means of stimulating the tourist trade and in providing additional markets to our own local farmers.

I have an interesting date here. As early as July, 1958, I caused to be written -- whether I wrote it myself or not, an article in a publication of the department entitled "The Manitoba Tourist Industry Report" under the date of July, 1958 saying, "There are Dollars in the Kitchen. Have any Manitoba Motel or Camp Operators developed their own special recipes? A recent letter received by the Travel & Publicity Bureau asked for copies of game and fish receipts developed by Manitoba Motel and Camp Operators." Here it seems is another possibility for procuring valuable publicity. "There are of course much wider ramifications than those contained in this specific request" -- and I'm afraid that perhaps my thoughts strayed outside the province at that point and I had better discontinue reading that article.

Then in November, 1958 I was invited to make a speech to the Manitoba Tourist Association. Now these are the people I understand that the gentleman from Selkirk thinks are going to be so insulted or offended by the fact that we asked the tourist operators and the restaurant operators and others to consider using local decor in their menus and in other ways to publicize our local dishes. Well far from it. They invited me to come and speak to them. I spoke to them and they gave us the heartiest support for a campaign based upon using as much local colour as possible in the menus as a way of developing the tourist trade and of expanding the markets for our own farmers. We have received nothing less than the enthusiastic support of the tourist association and the restaurant association for this campaign and they have helped us a great deal.

This is really a double-barrelled action because food helps to promote tourism, and on the other hand, tourism helps to promote the market for food. Let me give the House just an idea of the quantities of food involved in feeding the tourist people who come here. It has been estimated -- I won't give the hundreds of dozens -- but there are about 875,000 dozen eggs, about 1,050,000 lbs. of butter, about 2,100,000 lbs. of sugar and syrup, about 3,800,000 lbs. of grain products, about 6,300,000 lbs. of meat, and 11,165,000 pints of milk -- a very substantial market indeed for food products which are consumed by the tourist people who come here.

Well we have taken our own advice and honourable members will perhaps recognize from having attended some of these functions, that we have used our own menus for government banquets in the way that we asked the restaurant and tourist associations to co-operate with us by doing. Those who were in attendance, and many of the honourable members were, will recall that perhaps in a rather restrained way, as befitted the occasion, on the occasion of the luncheon offered to Her Majesty the Queen, we had a menu -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon?

MR. McLEAN: in Manitoba?

MR. EVANS: Yes, I'm advised by the Attorney-General -- this was in Manitoba. This was at the Royal Alexandra Hotel in Manitoba, and reference to it I think is quite proper at the present time and in the circumstances. We featured pan-fried Lake Winnipeg Pickerel. It was on July 24, 1959. I would like to -- I'm sorry I didn't hear that. Would my honourable friend like to make a comment or shall I continue?

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm just suggesting that you clean your glasses so that we can get the right

MADAM SPEAKER: The Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: thank you, Madam Speaker. I point out that the luncheon for the delegates of the 30th Annual Canadian Tourist Association Convention, the host for which was the Province of Manitoba, was held on Monday October 1st, 1962 and we had a menu which featured Manitoba

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) dishes about as follows. The Menu was: Manitoba grown Celery, Green Onions and Radishes served with Prairie Pemmican. I must say that I rather forget what Prairie Pemmican was, but we tried to get some local colour into this. Butter (famous Manitoba award-winning butter); Selkirk Whitefish Saute -- my honourable friend I am sure from Selkirk will be glad to hear that -- Cole Slaw and Sliced Tomato; Red River Parsley Potatoes; Portage la Prairie Green Beans; Buffalo Sundae served with assorted Fort Garry Cakes and Coffee. Unfortunately, the coffee had to be imported, it says here -- right here in brackets.

So we have been trying to take our own advice. I point to the menu of the Manitoba Tourist Association, the 13th Annual Convention dinner tendered by the Department of Industry and Commerce for the Province of Manitoba on November 4, 1964. The speaker on that occasion was the Honourable Jack Carroll, the Minister of Welfare for the Province of Manitoba. The menu itself begins with Morden Cream Soup and Roast Ribs of Manitoba Beef, and so on. I won't stretch out the detail of this too much, but I would like to mention that menus written in a similar way have been a prominent feature of Manitoba's entertainments here tendered by the Manitoba Government. I was

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would be prepared to table the copies that he has been quoting from?

MR. EVANS: I would be glad to table them. They are file copies. If my honourable friend wishes to insist that they be tabled, I'm prepared to do so. There is another one to which I would like to make reference, but since it is a copy that someone has asked me to return, if my honourable friend is going to insist on the tabling as I must do under the rules of the House if I refer to something, then I will not refer to this one.

MR. MOLGAT: No, I would like to see them. I have no particular desire that they become part of the annals of the House. I think my honourable friend likes to keep them in his files and that will be all right with me.

MR. EVANS: It will be a pleasure for me to send them over to the Leader of the Opposition, or to let any other member see it when my remarks are finished.

I was grateful to the Attorney-General of the day when he also furnished a menu for the Canadian Bar Association at a dinner tendered by the Premier and Executive Council of the Province of Manitoba on Wednesday August 30, 1961, and it is similarly written. I see we have a new item at the bottom called "Coupe St. Norbert". Now I'm not much of a chef so I don't know the detail of all these different dishes, nevertheless I did want to illustrate that we have been taking our own advice as well as we could.

I'm making the point I think in answer to charges that we have done nothing in this regard. We have indeed tried to do something. It's a massive job to reach all who might come here as tourists and to publicize, even within the confines of our own province here, the kinds of food that we have. I may make reference to publications which have been published elsewhere intended to be read by tourists to attract them to come here, and I'm going to make the point that this is quite within the terms of reference here, that we are talking about local dishes and the use of them on local menus, and even though publication occurs elsewhere, that reference should be allowed at this juncture.

I have in my hand a copy of the Chicago American for Wednesday, March 17, 1965, wherein there is a picture of our Director of Travel and Publicity, Mr. Organ, dressed in a chef's uniform in the kitchens -- the test kitchens of this great newspaper in Chicago -- and he is preparing a special dish out of Manitoba Goldeye and Manitoba Wild Rice. His picture is taken for publicity purposes. It appears there and a long article appears by Mary Martinson under the title of "Goldeye Fish and Wild Rice are a Gourmet Treat", and it goes on to describe these dishes from Manitoba. So it goes with a good deal of detail in connection with the efforts that we have made -- the efforts that we have tried to make here to publicize Manitoba foods.

I would indicate to members that if they want to take the copies that they already have and look at them, they will find Manitoba dishes are featured in department publications. All the honourable members will recognize this publication -- food plays a prominent part in it. There is a very attractive looking picture of a goldeye right here and reference is made to it in the text of the publication.

MR. PAULLEY: ask a question of my honourable friend. Are the recipes for the preparation of the food also there, so that we might take advantage of them?

MR. EVANS: I think it can be said in the case of the test that was put on in Chicago, the

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) recipe I believe is in the text of the article. If it is not there and my honourable friend will let me know, I'll get him the recipe and a little private coaching if he would like to have it.

MR. PAULLEY: I cannot afford Goldeyes, Madam Speaker.

MR. EVANS: You'll guarantee however to carry out the preparation of this food in Manitoba, I'll be very glad then to provide it in those circumstances.

We have undertaken a program of education and instruction in connection with the restaurant trade, not that the Department of Industry and Commerce thinks that they can instruct the restaurant trade, but they have helped them to organize courses of instruction for themselves.

In 1959 my department brought to Manitoba Madame Jeanne Benoit who is one of the best known domestic commentators on the television in Montreal, and she came here and conducted a course of lectures for the restaurant trade in which -- as described in this same publication, the Manitoba Tourist Industry Report for December 1959 -- in which she urged restaurants and hotels to feature native dishes and drew attention to some of the famous ones that we have here. Well this just didn't happen. The Department of Industry and Commerce discovered who the leading authority was, they issued the invitation that brought her here, paid the lady's expenses, organized the seminar or lecture course, and were responsible for all the administrative arrangements.

At the present time, there is a plan before the Tourist Association of a series of workshops in which their own people will meet and study the use of local foods and local names to publicize their own restaurants and their own resorts. Quite recently there was a restaurant management course organized at Brandon -- that was last autumn. It was organized by the Department of Health for all restaurant operators in the western region. The Department of Industry and Commerce at that course stressed the use of Manitoba foods, imaginative menus, and good service in the service of the tourist industry.

I would like to refer to a very widespread publicity campaign that has been carried on for years, mostly featuring two colourful local food items which are already famous. We seem to concentrate on the goldeye and wild rice, mostly because they are strikingly different from foods that can be associated with other places. You'll find that British Columbia deal very largely in salmon and apples, and if you range the continent, you will find dishes associated with different kinds of places. You have only to think of Boston Beans and Philadelphia Scapple and Philadelphia pepper pots, and various other things that have names associated with various places. I think we have had -- (Interjection) -- and Boston tea, yes, and Boston Cream Pie and all sorts of things. I really would like to travel and taste some of these things myself. But we have featured two rather striking individual different local items, namely the Goldeye and wild rice, to secure publicity for our own food produced here.

I would indicate, if my honourable friends didn't see it, they can find a very fine article written in MacLean's Magazine of December 16, 1961 by Mr. Ross Hedlin, in which he made a tour of Winnipeg's restaurants, mostly in the City of Winnipeg, and gave comments about each one, in which he drew attention to some of the fine local dishes that are made here. This was in a nation-wide Canadian publication.

In American publications, I would like to take a few minutes to describe the widespread publicity that has been attained by our Travel and Publicity Branch in the interests of publicizing Manitoba food as a tourist attraction. I would mention that in Esquire Magazine in May of 1962, there was an article by the travel editor, Dick Joseph, who devotes considerable space to the excellent Winnipeg restaurants. In the American International Travel Magazine in May of 1962, Manitoba restaurants and famous Goldeye and several of their specialties were mentioned in the food and restaurant section. In McCall's Magazine for March of 1963, an article by Horace Sutton on a cross-country Canadian tour which devotes several hundred words to the excellence of Winnipeg restaurants and the Winnipeg Goldeye. In Travel Magazine of May 1963, the cover story and article on the variety of good food to be found here. I'll not read the detail of the other publications except to mention that the Kansas City Star had an article on July 21, 1963; the Chicago American on -- and there has been some others.

Now I mention that at some detail because these things just didn't happen by themselves. These editors were approached and were asked to consider articles on Manitoba. Many of them were brought here, many of them were brought here at the expense of the Department of Industry and Commerce, and have been shown the restaurants and have been told about our local foods, and given an opportunity to try them. As a result of the publicity, we have had a considerable increase in the -- I'm satisfied that this accounts for some considerable part of

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) the increase of our tourist business.

I mentioned, Madam Speaker, that this is one tool -- the use of local dishes and publicity designed or pointed toward, or directed at the tourists when they come, is one tool, and I think an important one, in an endeavour to get a wider and wider market for the products of Manitoba farms that have been carried on over the entire length of the administration of this government. It has been done at some expenditure of money. I think it has been done well and I think that the results have been good.

So I have welcomed this debate and the opportunity to mention, and I draw attention to the fact that I have had -- I think it was quite proper that I should confine my remarks then quite strictly to the very wording of the resolution -- but that there is a further implication beyond the discussion I have had here today, a further implication for very widespread markets for the foods grown and processed in Manitoba, which are aided to a very considerable extent by the publicity enjoyed at home in connection with the tourist trade.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I really enjoyed the delivery made by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and especially the last few words when he seemed to emphasize to us that the department is doing a good job; it was well publicized; and he is happy with it. It seems to me that the resolution moved by the Honourable Member from Morris really and truly points to all, and even the Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the member has no faith in the promotional efforts of the Department of Industry and Commerce, and that the Minister had to get up on his feet and defend his department in spite of what the Honourable Member for Morris has said. He really did a wonderful job on defending the department against this resolution. In fact, the Minister on account of this resolution was prompted to get up -- I don't see any other reason why he did get up -- and I hope that he has convinced the Member from Morris.

I don't think the Minister of Industry and Commerce had to convince me. I have faith in his department myself, much more faith than the Honourable Member from Morris. I have faith in our restaurant trade; I have faith in our hotel trade and their promotional ability. Evidently the Honourable Member from Morris never had that. Now if the Member from Morris would have the same confidence as we on this side, as I, I would say had, it wouldn't have been necessary for him to resort to this resolution. I hope that the Honourable Minister has at least convinced the mover of this resolution.

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Speaker, I would like to speak briefly but

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I would think that if the honourable gentleman doesn't wish to start now, I would suggest you call it 5:30.

MADAM SPEAKER: I call it 5:30 and I leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.