

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA,  
2:30 o'clock, Friday, April 23rd, 1965.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Weather Modifications Limited praying for the passing of an Act to provide for the Disposition of the funds of Weather Modifications Limited.

MADAM SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

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

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments begs leave to present the following as their fifth report:

Your Committee met on Tuesday, April 20th, 1965, and on Friday, April 23rd, 1965.

Your Committee has considered Bills: No. 27, An Act to amend The Trustee Act; No. 42, An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act (2); No. 48, An Act to amend The West Kildonan Charter and to validate by-law No. 45/64/A of The City of West Kildonan; And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered Bills: No. 65, An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act; No. 67, An Act respecting The Unsatisfied Judgment Fund and the Administration thereof; No. 68, An Act respecting Highways and The Highways Department; No. 69, An Act respecting The Department of Public Works; No. 83, An Act respecting The Rural Municipality of Victoria; And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

Your Committee recommends that Bill No. 74, An Act to amend The Judgments Act, be withdrawn from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, and that this bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders. 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: I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education that Bill No. 74, an Act to amend The Judgments Act, be withdrawn from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments and that this bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, I just want to rise in protest to the referral of this bill to the Committee. Incidentally, Madam Speaker, the Committee has not as yet been constituted; that is, the Committee -- as far as I am aware the Committee has not yet been constituted, unless I have missed something, to which this bill will be referred. However, my main purpose in speaking at this time is in protest. I do not find anything in this bill that is objectionable. No representations were made to the Committee in opposition to the bill, and the object of the bill was to bring into more realistic values of property today as opposed to those which are now contained in the Act.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker I will be --

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

MR. JAMES COWAN Q. C., (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 134, an Act to incorporate Canadian Lutheran World Relief.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 35 Grades 1 to 8 students from Neu Bergthal School under the direction of Mr. Driedger. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Rhineland. There are also 9 Winnipeg Girl Guides No. 138 under the direction of Mrs. Routley. These Girl Guides are from the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead; and some 10 members of the Mayfield 4H Club under the direction of Mrs. Kenny, also from the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you.

Orders of the Day.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I asked for an Order for Return yesterday and the Minister of Agriculture replied there was no such agreement, yet in the Department of Estimates discussed yesterday we voted money for an ARDA agreement between the Provincial and Federal Government. Could he explain his answer?

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): There has been an agreement in effect for three years. The new agreement hasn't been signed.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. I wonder if he's aware that there is still no teacher at the Manitoba Institute of Technology as far as the computer and business machines are concerned. I believe it involves somewhere around five or six machines and somewhere of a class of about 60 people, or students. There has been no teacher for almost two months and the situation remains the same as of this morning -- the information that I get direct from many of the students and some of the parents that are seriously concerned about this matter.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, this is not the information I have received from the director of the Institute but I will check once again.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, if I may before the Orders of the Day; on March 17th, I had the privilege of drawing to the attention of the House that that was St. Patrick's Day. I seem to be a loner here today, wearing a rose which is symbolic of that great country of England, which today is celebrating the birth date of their patron saint, St. George. In order that there be no misunderstanding, my people were of English origin and I'm proud to wear the red rose of England today.

HON. STERLING R. LYON Q. C. , (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, yesterday I believe it was the Honourable Member for Brokenhead made an enquiry concerning the possible extension of the trapping season, with particular reference to the Netley Marsh. I can confirm that there have been some trappers in touch with the Department concerning this matter, but the recommendation of the experts and of the Director is that there be no extension because of the quick drop-off in the quality of the pelts. However, in those cases where trappers may not yet be able to reach traps already set due to high water, arrangements have been made that in such cases the traps and any muskrats that they may contain can be picked up after the statutory closing of the season, which I understand is Saturday, the 24th of April.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, I wish to thank the Honourable Minister for his diligence in seeking out this specific bit of information.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste.Rose): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the First Minister. I asked of him earlier this week regarding the cancellation of the tax, the one cent tax on diesel fuel, and he informed me that he would see if the notices had gone out. Have the dealers been informed yet in the province?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): I checked this with the Department, Madam Speaker, and I'm informed that notices went out to all concerned several days ago.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture, and it is in connection with the answer that he just gave to the Honourable Member for St. George. My question would be: is there an annual agreement signed between this government and the Government of Canada in connection with ARDA, or is it necessary to sign a new agreement for every project that is contemplated?

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, there is a master agreement which provides for further agreements or contracts, project contracts, under this program, and so whenever a new program is entered into, a contract or agreement is arrived at in respect to the specific program. Madam Speaker, these are not annual agreements. They're project agreements.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, my I address a question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources -- two questions. 1. Is the Minister aware that there have been fires on the Delta Marshes this spring? And the second question: if he is aware of this, are any steps being taken to stop the widespread firing of the marshes, which are valuable breeding grounds for the ducks?

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I am not aware of that, but I will certainly have my honourable friend's allegation looked into at once.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, there is an article in the Altona Echo commenting on a meeting of the International Joint Committee in connection with the Pembelieu Dam, and I would like to know whether the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture could tell us whether at the time that they are anticipating some meetings in Walhalla in this connection, whether some meetings will be held in Manitoba on this same project?

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I am aware that the International Joint Commission is going to hold local meetings in the general area that is interested in the development of the Pembina River, and anticipate a public meeting in Manitoba.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Chairman, I'd like to direct a question to the Premier; to tell us the amount, the final amount of contribution towards the Pan-American Games; and secondly, whether the Legislature is authorizing a certain sum of money towards the Games. Have they anything to say as to the construction of the so-called permanent buildings during the Pan-American Games?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, the financial arrangements have already been given in the Legislature so I don't think it necessary to repeat them now. There is an item in the Estimates which is being held open, on which there may be a further discussion if members wish. Under the contract, under the agreement with Ottawa, the full authority and control over the actual management of operations of the Games, including the location, structures and that sort of thing, is in the hands of the Pan-American Games Society and not in the hands of the province.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, if I may ask a supplementary question to the one I put to the Minister of Agriculture. I think at the meeting that they had in Washington there was three plans submitted in connection with the Pembelieu Dam. One was for \$26 million and that would involve only one dam at Walhalla. There were also two other propositions; one with another dam south of Morden and a third dam through the west. Does he know whether they have finalized their decision on any one particular plan, or whether there is still a possibility that different plans could be adopted whereby we would have some dams in Manitoba?

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I think the members should understand that in talking about a study, and before any of the projects considered by the study can be entered into, there would have to be an agreement between the jurisdictions concerned, first of all to determine whether they want to do something with it, and if they decide to do something with it, the approach that they will take. Nobody has any idea at the present time what the final decision will be on the part of the parties involved. All we have is a study which sets out the possibilities and the advantages and disadvantages of the various proposals.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for a Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (a) The number of property acquisitions in the Portage la Prairie area, regarding the Portage Diversion; (b) the number of settlements made in each of the months since the commencement of the program of acquisition; (c) the ratio of properties acquired thus far, to the total number of properties to be acquired; and finally, whether any of the acquisitions have been made by expropriation procedure.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (a) the number of community pastures presently established in the area East of the Red River; (b) the acreage involved in each case; and (c) the number of community pastures to be built in the area East of the Red River, according to present plans; and (d) the acreage involved.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd). . . . . Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. The name of the property owners and the location of the property involved in each of the 62 cases where the Department of Water Conservation rejected complaints, and/or applications regarding repair of pumps and wells in the area in close proximity to the Floodway; and 2. The nature of the problem prompting the complaint in each of the 62 rejected cases.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (a) the total number of Crown land grazing permits issued in the area East of the Red River; and (b) the total acreage involved; and (c) the total number of Crown land hay permits issued by the Department, East of the Red River; and (d) the acreage involved.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I finally wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (a) the number of settlements made between the Department of Mines and Natural Resources and the Pine Ridge property owners, in each of the months since that such transactions have been made -- commenced; (b) the ratio of settlements to the total number of properties expropriated -- to be expropriated. Madam Speaker, I would ask indulgence to insert the words "to be" before the word "expropriated" -- (i) in Springfield municipality, (ii) in St. Clements municipality.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, I think we should clarify the wording of the question. I don't think there's any matter of substance here. My honourable friend did make a correction, as I understand it, in Item (b) by inserting the words "to be", and that's certainly agreed to. I take it that the last line of Section (a) is at least unusual where the words appear "of the months since that such transactions have been made."

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister for pointing out the typographical error. The word "that" in the last line of (a) should be deleted, simply deleted, and as the Honourable Minister pointed out, in (b) the words "to be" should be inserted before the word "expropriated". I believe that clears it up.

MR. EVANS: . . . . . by general consent?

MADAM SPEAKER put the question.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, before the question is put I wonder if my honourable friend -- I think I understand what he means. He means the expropriation with reference to the Birds Hill Provincial Park, but there are of course other expropriations perhaps with reference to 59 Highway and other matters going on out there, and I was wondering if he meant to confine this question to the Birds Hill Provincial Park?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Madam Speaker. I thought that reference to the Department of Mines and Resources would make that clear, but if it is not clear I certainly wish to make it clear now that I'm referring to the park.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, with leave, I wonder if I might ask a question pertaining to the previous Order. I can only do it with leave.

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the Honourable Member leave to proceed? Agreed.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I'm sorry I didn't notice this. I have it marked on another piece of paper to ask the question. The question was with reference to the total number of Crown land grazing permits issued in the area East of the Red River. I was wondering if my honourable friend could give us some idea in that Order of the time period that he is interested in. He would mean leases that are currently in effect, I would take it, for 1965?

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, yes; I mean here the number of permits in effect in the most recent calendar year or full year -- in effect.

MR. LYON: Fine.

MR. EVANS: I think -- would I be right in saying, Madam Speaker, that we must now put the question on the last of the Honourable Member's Orders?

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for St. Boniface, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. The total cost of PTH 59 from the junction of PTH 4 and 59 to the junction of PTH 59 and 12. 2. The number of contractors employed. 3. How much money was paid to each contractor.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. In my opinion this amendment is in order, and any honourable member wishing to speak may do so.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Ayes and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

MR. LYON: What's the motion? On what?

MR. GUTTORMSON: On the Speaker's ruling.

MR. LYON: You can't have ayes and nays when there's been no challenge made. My honourable friend stands up and says "ayes and nays". On what? There's been no challenge made.

MADAM SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member make the motion please?

MR. GUTTORMSON: I challenge your ruling, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House: Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs: Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Evans, Gray, Groves, Harris, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Mills, Moeller, Paulley, Roblin, Schreyer, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs: Barkman, Campbell, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak and Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 36; Nays 13.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. Any honourable member wishing to speak? Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I think maybe I should say a word on this matter. I take it that in accordance with Rule 201 of Beauchesne on an amendment of this nature, both the main motion and the amendment are subject of debate at the same time and can be considered.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the objectives of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture in his amendment, because as I read what the Minister implies in his amendment, is a method by which there may be greater protection to the livestock industry in the Province of Manitoba, and that they will not be prejudiced by the recommendations which have been made, by the recommendations -- by the Committee of Agriculture and Colonization in the House of Commons. I'm sure that all members of the House will agree that we here in Manitoba - and I would suggest also so far as Saskatchewan and Alberta are concerned - must do whatever we can to protect the livestock industry in the Prairie provinces. And also, we must protect the Canadian Wheat Board and make sure that no endeavours be made so that the powers of the Wheat Board may be diminished by actions at Ottawa or anywhere else.

I think, Madam Speaker, that is the position insofar as the amendment by the Minister of Agriculture is concerned. However, I do wish that the Minister had retained that portion of the main motion that established the principle of a two-price system for No. 1 Northern Wheat at Fort William. I'm sure he, like most of us in the House, are fully appreciative of the fact of the fluctuations in wheat prices, and now that it appears that there is going to be a greater degree of competition for - or in the wheat trade - that it is more and more necessary that our Canadian farmer, particularly those in the western plains, are protected and are assured of a reasonable price for their product. So I say that I can support the amendment of the Minister of Agriculture because of the purport of it, the intent of it, as I read into his amendment, but I regret very much, Madam Speaker, that it appears to me, on reading the amendment, that it will delete the position insofar as the grain farmer is concerned and will not give to the grain

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . . . farmer a measure of stability insofar as price is concerned based on Fort William.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I just wanted to make my position clear, too. I intend to support the amendment, as well, that is before us, because I too have a concern as to what might happen if we see this new agency come along. And since there are more votes in the east than there are in the west, we could find ourselves in a predicament where things might be done which would not be in the interests of the western farmer, and certainly I can support the amendment.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak at this time, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Madam Speaker, I'd like to ask the indulgence of this House to have this matter stand.

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

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, in taking part in this debate I promise to be very brief. After I had the opportunity to read Hansard, I have discovered there is -- an argument developed in respect to the resolution is what is the difference between a Comptroller-General and the Auditor-General? And after having the opportunity to read Hansard, I notice that the members that have taken part in this debate, some of them belong to the legal fraternity, and certainly I'm not qualified to debate the point, the legality, the difference between the Auditor-General and the Comptroller-General. However, I did not find any unanimity in their debate, so I feel somewhat better now that I can express my views on the difference, and I do recall when the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains did introduce the resolution, he tried and explicitly stated what the difference was.

The Comptroller-General, he said, is not concerned with the money - the way it was spent - but he is concerned that proper amounts are paid in accordance with appropriations. On the other hand, he did state the Auditor-General has the full right to look into complete files, records, in connection with any particular project, and to see if there's any discrepancy that he might find. For instance, he can go into any project and see for himself what is going on, and he has complete supervision of expenditures of public money. I feel the Honourable Member for St. John's has taken the same following. I think he also stated that he was sure the monies are spent in accordance with the budget, as far as the Comptroller-General was concerned, while the Auditor-General's objective is to view the method in which the monies are spent, whether that money was spent in proper and careful manner.

I'm not sure personally if the Comptroller in our province has the right to start investigating and checking to see if money is spent efficiently in most departments. I think his concern is probably more of an auditor, to see that it is recorded, and more or less of a book-keeper, so I don't know why the government is opposed to this resolution because surely -- I had the opportunity to look into the Auditor-General's report that he presents to the House of Commons, and he finds many discrepancies in many departments. Some of them are probably not through any fault of the department. It's just that he finds an irregularity and can point out, and proper measures can be taken to straighten the matter out, and that corrective measures can be taken.

Now, I had an opportunity to check through the report of the Auditor-General that's presented to the House of Commons, and it points out the functions and his duties: "The Auditor-General shall report annually" -- I'd like to quote just in brief here -- "to the House of Commons, the results of his examinations, and shall call attention to every case in which he has observed that (a) any officer or employee has wilfully or negligently omitted to collect or receive any money belonging to Canada; (b) any public money was not duly accounted for and paid into Consolidated Revenue Fund; (c) any appropriation was exceeded or was applied to a purpose or in a manner not authorized by Parliament; (d) an expenditure was not authorized or was not properly vouched or certified; (e) there has been a deficiency or loss through the fraud, default,

(MR. PATRICK cont'd). . . . . or mistake of any person; or (f) a special warrant authorized the payment of any money; and to any other case that the Auditor-General considers should be brought to the notice of the House of Commons." I understand he has to table this report every year to the Speaker of the House, which is presented to the members in the House of Commons.

I can go further, and there's many cases that he finds where money has been misappropriated, and some very good examples are listed in this report.

On Page 20, Section 49 - Defalcation of locally engaged employee in Canberra, Australia - a defalcation by a locally engaged accountant employed by the Canadian Mission in Canberra. The Chief Treasury Officer in the Department of External Affairs was dispatched to Canberra to complete the investigation and reported a total defalcation of \$13,589 as well as misappropriating payments for gasoline amounting to \$1,533.00. The employee had stolen \$9,636 received from prospective immigrants to cover cost of airmailing documents to Canada for examination; and there's many cases of a similar nature stated in this report.

No. 60: Equipment disposed of in error. In April 1963, a unit of electronic aircraft navigational equipment, originally costing more than 9,000, has been estimated at a replacement cost of 15,000, was returned for repairs to an Air Force Supply Section. Due to an error, the equipment, instead of being repaired, was declared as surplus to Crown Assets Corporation and was sold to a customer for a scrap price of \$20.00. The purchaser, in turn, sold the equipment for a nominal sum to an individual, who being aware of the actual value of the unit, refused to return it and be reasonably compensated. A Board of Enquiry concluded that faulty procedure respecting the determination as to whether material should be declared surplus to Crown Assets Disposal Corporation contributed to the improper disposal, and expressed apprehension that similar instances might have occurred. The Department has since revised its procedures.

So this is the type of things that the Auditor-General is doing. . . . . say, he might find irregularities in departments; just as easily you could find irregularities in many business enterprises which can save people money. I would say it certainly is a good resolution.

Now the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre I know just took the opposite view, and he expressed that our Comptroller-General is in fact an Auditor-General and he does the same duties as the one that's performed by the one in Ottawa. Well, according to the report I would like to disagree with him, because I don't think the Comptroller-General has at any time, to my knowledge, presented any irregularities in any departments, or pointed out any deficiencies, and this is, as far as I could see, what the Auditor-General is doing in Ottawa, so I would like to go on record and hope that some of the other members will change their opinion and support the amendment.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Logan, as amended. The Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I have found this debate a most interesting and instructive one, and I trust that the other honourable members of the House have also profited by it. I think there's an amusing turn to it that I hope to mention to the committee a bit later on, but in the meantime, may I just review briefly what happened. My honourable friend the Member for Logan introduced what to me seems to be a most timely resolution. The question of automation, I think, is one that people in all provinces and all walks of life should be paying much attention to, and certainly no body of people should be paying more attention to it than the Legislative Assembly of this province which has such a direct connection with the economic program. So I think that a most useful purpose was served by the introduction of this resolution.

Automation holds great promise, I'm sure, for benefit and advancement of the people of our province. It undoubtedly has within it the overtones also of some dislocation, and so when the proposal of the Honourable the Member for Logan was treated, what I thought, very flip-pantly, by the motion that was moved in amendment by the Honourable Member for Roblin, I thought that the government had been cast, actually, in an unfortunate position, because it just wasn't fair to the government's own interest in this matter that their concern should appear to be so light and casual as was indicated by the motion of the Honourable Member for Roblin, and

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd).....so I determined that I would try and be helpful to the government, and try and rescue them from the position into which the Honourable Member for Roblin had - unwittingly I'm sure - cast them, and so I, recognizing, Madam Speaker, that I am not an authority on the subject, had to try and seek some sources of information, and I said to myself, the place to go for information on this timely subject will be to the report of the - it has been laid on our desk - of the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board, because, I said to myself, there is one of the top economic committees that has been set up by the government, responsible to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and there is a group that undoubtedly will be paying some attention to this matter.

So I proceeded to read, with some care, what the second annual report - and it's very up-to-date because it is dated March 1965 - says about the question of automation, and I read it most carefully; more carefully than I usually read my honourable friends' reports because they are so numerous and so voluminous that at times it's hard to find the time to peruse them as closely as we would like to do, but I must compliment the authors of this report on the fact that they have been very concise in their statements with regard to the question of automation, and they have done something about it, Madam Speaker. And when the Honourable the Member for Roblin was asked during the course of my honourable friend's remarks - the Leader of the New Democratic Party - to name something that had been done by the government with regard to automation, if my honourable friend had been well advised by the people who, I guess, assisted him with his amendment, he would have referred my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party to the report of the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board, and he would have said to them: "Now here's a top level group that has been giving consideration to this question and that has done something about it." If he had read this report, he would have, I'm sure, instead of the very casual treatment that his amendment gave to a serious subject, he would have put something emanating from this report into his amendment instead.

So I said, wanting to be helpful to my honourable friends on the government side, "I shall try and rescue them from the dilemma in which they are cast and I'll, with the help of this report, I'll prepare something that will get them out of this impasse and give them an easy way out and a proper way out," and so I took the report and studied it carefully; and based on this report which I hold in my hand, I drew the sub-amendment, Madam Speaker. And I must say to you, Madam Speaker, that I had some doubts for fear that because what this report of the Manitoba Economic Consultative Committee, because what this report had said - and I wanted to quote them correctly - because of what they had said was so close to what my honourable friend's resolution had said, I had some doubts that you might be compelled to find that my sub-amendment merely reintroduced the original amendment, and that you might find it necessary to rule it out of order on those grounds, but luckily for me, Madam Speaker, and for the House, you didn't, and so we were able to give consideration to it. At least we would have been able to give consideration to it, but what happened? Nobody - literally nobody - from the other side of the House took any notice of it at all. Nobody spoke on it, in spite of the fact that we tried to tell them - and the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party laboured long and arduously to try to once again convince the government of the importance of the subject under discussion, and that they should abandon this idle amendment that they had moved and get back into this serious question, into its proper perspective. But no. Neither my encouragement nor that of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party could persuade my friends to say another word on the question, and what did they do? They voted down completely and solidly an amendment that says exactly what the report of the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board said because they have been doing something about this question. They have studied it. They have set up a committee, and Madam Speaker, I was guilty of plagiarism because I copied their exact wording. I changed it around a little bit. I left out a couple of colourful phrases, because I was afraid they would be very evident that they were copied from some governmental publication because they were too intellectual a type of language for me to use. But, with those changes, I copied my amendment directly from Page 6 of the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board, and if you will take my amendment, Madam Speaker - my sub-amendment - and look at it, you will find that it says just what this paragraph in the report says. The wording changes a little bit, but most of the words are right there together and the conclusion exactly what they concluded. I was a little afraid of the words that they used, Madam Speaker, when it says that -- when they said the "onslaught" of automation -- "preparation should be made for the possibility of major dislocations resulting from the onslaught of automation." I was a little nervous of that word because I thought it might show where I had found this descriptive language,

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) . . . . .but the fact is that if you will take Page 6 of the report and compare it with my amendment, you will find that almost the exact wording is carried into the amendment and the conclusion is the same. And the conclusion of that committee - and incorporated in this sub-amendment - is approximately what the Honourable Member for Logan had introduced in the first place. And Madam Speaker, the government turned down this sub-amendment embodying the very words of what their top-flight economic committee has recommended.

Look at the treatment that one of the newspapers of the province gave to this report. Here's practically a full page of the Winnipeg Free Press of April 1st - almost the full page devoted to a resumé of this report, including the part that deals with automation. As a matter of fact, the only other business, I think, except the Economic Consultative Board's report, that gets onto this page of the Free Press is the picture of the Chairman of the Board and one news item dealing with my honourable friend the Member for Gladstone. With the exception of that, everything on this page is a resumé of this report, including the part that deals with automation and mentions what recommendation has been made.

And look at the treatment that the propaganda section of the Department of Industry and Commerce gave to it. I just happen to have several of the pink sheets, every one of which deals with the same report, including the one that deals with automation; and I'm going to read briefly from what this propaganda sheet says: "The importance of the role" -- and I'm reading now from an issue of April 2nd, 1965; there are a dozen pages almost here dealing with that report, and I'll read only one paragraph: "The importance of the role of the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board is underlined by the fact that the eleven senior governments of Canada have recognized the need for consultative or planning action for a number of reasons. One is the growing complexity of relationships within and between government, labour and management - a sort of cleaning house or neutral ground in which participants are able to assess common futures and define the climates required for adequate growth in economy. And another is to meet the onslaught of automation which promises to be of sufficient intensity to require a consultative partnership approach involving labour, management and government." I included that sentence holus-bolus in my amendment except for the fact that I was just afraid to use such an all-pervasive phrase as "consultative partnership approach" and I just left out the "consultative" but put in "partnership approach." Outside of that it's in my sub-amendment completely.

This is the treatment that the government itself gave to the matters that were raised dealing with automation in this particular report, and when my honourable friend, the Leader of the New Democratic, spoke on this he was rather concerned over the fact that in my sub-amendment that I, in the "resolved" part, recommended the establishment of a committee representing government, labour and management to consider the probable effects of automation and plans to deal effectively with them. I did that -- I put it that way, Madam Speaker, and I left out agriculture, which he wondered about, simply because it was copied, word for word, from the report of the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board Report.

And after this Board has given such consideration to this matter, let me read something directly from the report itself, Madam Speaker, not from the articles that emanate from the Department of Industry and Commerce, or not from the full-page treatment that was recorded to it by one of the Winnipeg papers and perhaps by both - I expect likely the other paper had the same thing but I just didn't happen to lay my hands on it - but let me read directly from what the Board says. This is on Page 4: "The Board's Approach". And this Board, Madam Speaker, points out in its own report here, it points out that it is in fact, as far as the Government of Manitoba is concerned, it is comparable to the Economic Council of the Government of Canada, and it pays tribute to the work that the Economic Council has done and that it is following the same line.

But here I read from their report on page 4: "The Board's Approach. The examination of the COMEF Report referred to earlier led the Board to conclude that two factors in Manitoba's development deserved its immediate attention. The first of these was to develop manageable guide lines to manpower training programs appropriate to the emerging requirements of a maturing economy. This was seen to entail improved projections of what will be required in terms of education and skills, with particular attention to the probable effects of automation." One of the two main things that this top level economic committee decided was necessary.

And then, skipping a paragraph or two, I go on on Page 5 to the Labour-Management Committee. "This committee is required to study and investigate all those matters which, in its opinion, affect labour-management relations in the broadest sense. This will include an

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd). . . . . analysis of the measures taken by other provinces and other countries to promote closer co-operation and to alleviate problems in this field. The Board has found that much more specific information than is now available is required before recommendations for action can be made. This calls for a substantial program of research. In addition to undertaking research into approaches being made elsewhere in Canada and the United States of America, consideration is being given to relevant European experience. It is the Committee's hope that a basic formula for continuous labour-management consultation by industry groups can be devised and tested. Such consultation would, in the view of the Board, be invaluable in maximizing the effective utilization of manpower. For instance, it should enable the influence of automation on employment to be jointly assessed beforehand in many cases, thereby clarifying the need for retraining programs to help reduce the problems of displacement."

Exactly the thing that we've been talking about, Madam Speaker; and I move now to the next page where I skip a paragraph and read: "A second area" - and this is after dealing with the two things that the Board determined were essential for immediate study - "A second area of immediate concern to the Committee is the likely effects of automation on the provincial economy. It is proposed that a case study be undertaken of the impact of automation on the white collar worker in the coming year, as a first depth study into the effects of automation on manpower in the province. There is the need also to measure the probable impact of rapid technological advance on agricultural production and farm organization. The COMEF Report did not provide sufficient clarification in this area, in the view of the Committee, although it attached considerable importance to increased agricultural output. The Committee proposes a study, therefore, on the future of industrialized agriculture in Manitoba's economy in relation to reaching desired increases in output and its impact on direct and ancillary employment and skill requirements." Again, exactly the things that those of us who have taken the trouble to discuss this question at all when it's been before the House, have been pointing out as a matter of the greatest importance.

And so, Madam Speaker, I go back to Page 4, and here's the -- after outlining the two things that should be studied immediately and intensively and I don't deal here with the first -- here's the wording of the Report: "Second, the onslaught of automation promises to be of sufficient intensity to require a consultative partnership approach involving labour, management and government. While no one can predict accurately the dimensions of the displacement of workers through automation, considerable feeling exists that preparations have to be made for the possibility of major dislocations."

These are the words that I incorporated directly into the sub-amendment and then gave the same conclusion that they did, that they came to, that a committee should be set up. They had left out Agriculture, so I left it out, because here's the resolved part of my sub-amendment: "Therefore be it Resolved that this House recommends the establishment of a committee representing government, labour and management, to consider the probable effects of automation and plans to deal effectively with them." Exactly, and almost word for word, and certainly identical in conclusion, with what this top level committee of my honourable friends had recommended. And what happens? The government votes solidly to turn it down. These, I say, Madam Speaker, are -- I think, Madam, are undoubtedly Manitoba's top economic thinkers and planners. And this group has considered this important question. They didn't just treat it casually, lightly and flippantly - like my honourable friends on the other side. They gave it consideration. They said it was one of the two immediate problems to be tackled, and they tackled it. They've instituted a study, and they came up with a thought on the matter and they made a pronouncement which is contained in here. And I, to help the government to recover from the unfortunate position that it had been placed in by my honourable friend's amendment, I incorporate their language and their conclusion into a sub-amendment to allow the government to get this question back into perspective and to accept something that their own top level people have recommended; and that's put into the sub-amendment. And no one on that side says one word about it. Nobody pays any compliments to this top level committee for having dealt with this timely subject. Nobody says anything to them about the good work that they've been doing in preparing for the onslaught, as they call it, of automation. Instead of that, with not one word spoken from that side of the House, the government votes solidly against it.

Madam Speaker, are we to conclude that the government has no faith in this top level committee and their conclusions? This is the Manitoba Government Economic Council, Madam

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd).....Speaker. Is the government paying no attention to what this board is saying and doing? Because they didn't just leave it at saying, they did something about it. Or is it a fact, what some of us have suspected for some time, that the government has set up so many boards and commissions and studies and inquiries that it loses track of them, and that even the top level ones, such as this, are not listened to, or even read? But surely you'd think they would be thought of when a matter like this comes up, and surely they wouldn't leave the defence of the government's position to my honourable friend the Member for Roblin, who sloughs off this important subject with a flippant amendment that pats the government on the back, and then when a chance is given to the government to rehabilitate itself by getting back into the right perspective, by proposing the views and conclusions of their top level group of planners and thinkers, the government votes solidly against it.

Madam Speaker, our rules permit that after one sub-amendment has been disposed of, another can be introduced, and I would suggest to my honourable friends that even at this late date that they rescue themselves from the unfortunate position in which they have been cast, and that one of them move an amendment based on what this committee has recommended.

MR. ROBLIN: This is really too good an opportunity to miss. I really can't resist the opportunity of adding a word to this debate, because we've just listened to one of the most repetitious - well, as usual; my honourable friend has a reputation for being repetitious - but one of the most unusual speeches that I ever expected to hear from him. Because obviously, from what he has said, he has done at least one thing. He's given the imprimatur of his approval, at any rate, on the activities of the Manitoba Economic Council. Now what a change that is. I can recall the - well, the reservations; the lack of interest; in fact the real failure to be convinced that these measures that we had introduced respecting the COMEF Report were of any good, that were evidenced by my honourable friend when he spoke. He wouldn't have given you a plugged nickel for all the Manitoba Economic Councils that ever existed or were ever likely to exist. But he thinks he's found a nice little debating point, so he's trotted out and given us this little speech of his this afternoon. Well, if he approves of the Economic Council, if he likes what they've done, then, of course, he approves the government and the policy of the government that organized that Council and saw that it came into effect. He's paid us the nicest little compliment we've had in many a long day. There's one of our measures which he's able to give unqualified approval to.

But he has given a splendid exhibition of the famous art of beating the wind, which is so widely practised in this Legislature by members on the opposite side introducing resolutions dealing with things that the government has already dealt with itself, and here is a precise example in this case. When you come to deal with the question of automation, he wants --(Interjection)-- if you'll just keep quiet and allow me to make my speech.-- the noisy Leader of the Opposition will have a chance to get into this later on if he wants, but he should allow me to have my little fun here while I'm on my feet without too many animal noises from the other side of the House.

We established the Economic Council. We know what's in the report. We read the report. If you read the resolution that is before the House right now, there is reference to the activities of the various agencies of the government in connection with this matter. Their report was not overlooked at all. But it illustrates the fatuousness, the fatuousness of my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside, bringing in a resolution to approve something that's already being done. And that's what he did. He brought in a resolution to approve something that's already being done. Why bother with that kind of nonsense? And we've had it on more than one occasion in this particular session of the House. So I say to my honourable friend that we don't really feel at all disconcerted by the fact that he's able to quote, able to read and quote from the Manitoba Economic Council's Report. We read it too. We know what's in it. Not only that, we have provided them with the means and the staff and the funds to do the very thing that he is approving of and which is included in his resolution. And why in the name of fate you bring in a resolution to approve something that the Government has already being done, as something that is a contribution on the part of the Opposition to good government in Manitoba -- I just fail to see it, and it's like so many resolutions we're getting these days dealing with these economic matters. We're a long way ahead of you and that's where we're going to stay.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SCHREYER: I think that it was necessary for the First Minister to get into this debate if only to distract attention from the fact that this government is plainly embarrassed.

(MR. SCHREYER coat'd)..... This Government is plainly embarrassed by what one of its backbenchers did, or pulled off - I think that's the word - pulled off a few days ago. The First Minister tries to leave the impression that the Manitoba Economic Council dates with this government; tries to leave the impression that economic councils, per se, are an invention of this particular government, here in Manitoba. I think that when this government here set up the Manitoba Economic Council, it was doing something that other jurisdictions had done months before, even years before. This government was not being particularly bold, daring, or was not showing innovation. It was taking the right step, perhaps, but it was not in the vanguard at that time. There's no causal connection between the Conservative Government of Manitoba and an economic consultative commission of one kind or another. The connection is, if anything, casual, and the way this government is treating the recommendations of this commission, I suggest that it is really a casual connection.

If this government was doing all of the things necessary to plan for the advent and the growth of automation, the Economic Consultative Board's report would not have found it necessary to make a recommendation therein that a committee be set up, composed of labour, management, etcetera, to look into and plan for the continuation of the growth of automation. The fact is that when you look at Page 4 of the report, the Commission, or Committee, does recommend the establishment of such a committee. Well, if such was already being done by this Government, why would the Committee recommend the establishment of such a committee. The fact is that a committee such as is recommended here does not yet exist in this province. Isn't that the fact of the matter? And if it did exist the Committee would not find it necessary to recommend the establishment of same. However, the government asks one of its members to bring in an amendment to the original resolution, which has the effect of -- the Member for Lakeside said "sloughing off" the point of the whole resolution. Now I know that over the course of years, the past several decades, there has been mounting concern that Cabinet Government is detracting from the function and purpose of the Legislative Assembly; and this government here is certainly not doing anything to arrest that trend and the Member for Roblin certainly didn't do anything to help arrest that trend. We had a perfectly good resolution on the Order Paper. It was one which incorporated the entire gist of the report of this Economic Consultative Board. It warranted serious discussion and consideration, and a member of this Assembly - not a member of the Cabinet but a member of this Assembly - moves a resolution, an amendment which has watered it down completely, and makes the discussion here entirely meaningless. It's difficult enough for the Legislative Assembly to check and supervise the executive - which I understand is supposed to be its function - and when other members of the Assembly not even in the executive act as though they are part of the executive, it's really unfortunate. I would think that if a cabinet minister had moved such an amendment, it could be understandable - not something that I would agree with, but understandable. But for an ordinary member to do that is, I think -- in many ways, he is guilty of not keeping faith with his own responsibilities here in this Chamber. --(Interjection)-- The honourable member says "Hog wash". Those are terms -- I think those are terms with which he has some sort of natural affinity; hog wash. Madam Speaker, the honourable member --

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead has the floor and I think the members should give him the courtesy of listening to him. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Honourable Member for Roblin I would have hoped would not take such a dilettantish attitude toward this Assembly, toward the Opposition, and toward the problem of automation, but he has been -- his attitude was dilettantish in all three counts. We have now, as a result of his amendment, a resolution here which, applied in the face of facts, has no impact whatsoever. It doesn't call for anything new; it doesn't call for any exerted study of any kind. It merely thanks this government for its present policies. It thanks this government for its present policies, vis-a-vis automation, at the very same time as the high-priced Economic Consultative Board is recommending the establishment of a tangible form of committee to look into the problem of automation based along consultation between government, labour and management.

Now the government opposite, members of it opposite, they can twist and turn and squirm all they like. The fact is that they could not yet be doing sufficient work in this area of consultative planning when this Committee recommends the establishment of this committee. As I said before, if this government was already and now doing this sort of thing, then this Committee of economists would not have found it necessary to recommend the establishment of

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd)..... a committee with representation from government, labour and management.

Well Madam Speaker, before I sit down, I would like to make this one final point. I don't know on what possible grounds the government can justify voting against a motion which does nothing else but to incorporate the essence, the gist of the recommendations of this report. If we are getting to the point where we have been having so many committees and studies made that we can't keep track of them, where the government can't keep track of it, maybe it is time to cut down on the number of boards and committees; maybe it's time to set up a committee to study the studies of committees - I don't know what. But one thing has become clear and also ludicrous too, and that is that this government of the Province of Manitoba has voted against a motion which incorporates the very words of the recommendations of one of its own agencies. Madam Speaker, that is ludicrous, to use the word of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, would my honourable friend permit me to ask him a question? Is he aware that the recommendation that the Consultative Board is making is that they themselves set up a committee of their own organization to carry on this study?

MR. SCHREYER: Well yes, Madam Speaker, that's fine, but that was not in conflict with what was originally moved in the motion by the Honourable Member for Logan nor in the motion of the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from LaVerendrye, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Morris. The Honourable the Member for Hamiota.

MR. STRICKLAND: Madam Speaker, I adjourned this debate for the Honourable Member for Morris.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Morris.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Madam Speaker, with the indulgence of the House I ask that this resolution stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks, and the proposed amendment by the Honourable the Member for Wellington. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, first of all I would like to thank the members for having this matter stood over on a previous occasion. At that time I was awaiting some information and some material in connection with the Medical Plan, and while I have been so busy on other matters I haven't been able to compile it properly, but at any rate I would like to make a few comments this afternoon in connection with the resolution and the amendment before us.

In taking a look at the amendment, which reads, "that this House urges the Government of Canada to call a Dominion-Provincial conference with a view to establishing a Federal-Provincial plan of health insurance that would be comprehensive, universally available and consistent with the principle of need," Madam Speaker, it seems to me that the word "comprehensive" in a way is a stumbling block, because of, I think, the interpretation that has been placed on it from time to time. In checking the Webster dictionary on this I find that they include such words as extensive, wide, full, wide scope, inclusive and so on; so that naturally in a comprehensive plan that would take in almost -- meet all needs that are required by the people under medical insurance. While I'm not opposed to a medical plan that is voluntary, I would oppose it if it was made mandatory, and the resolution as such, or the amendment as such, doesn't specify, so that I take it for granted that when the mover concludes debate that he will inform the members of the House as to what his interpretation is in this regard.

I have not checked the 62 recommendations in connection with the Royal Commission and the recommendations that the government made to this Commission at that time. I think I read them at that time but I haven't refreshed my memory on it, so I will not comment on that part at this time. As I said, I believe in a voluntary plan such as the Province of Alberta has on their statutes and which has proven itself indeed to be a very successful plan, in operation now for some time. Already in the short time that it has been in operation 85 percent of the people subscribe to one of a number of plans, to medical insurance, and under their set-up 37 insurance companies are participating. They presently subsidize, under their plan, some

(MR. FROESE cont'd). . . . . 148,000 people and the cost to the government the last year amounted to \$2,341,000. Of the total people subscribing or the contracts in force, 670,000 of the Albertans insured through the MSI, which is their government insurance plan, so that this is a notable achievement and I feel that they have accomplished something.

I would briefly like to read a statement in connection with their plan as it is set up, and some of the principles that are involved in their particular plan: The Alberta medical plan is a method of providing a comprehensive medical care insurance program for the people of Alberta, that has been worked out by the Alberta Government in collaboration with the profession of medicine in the province along with the private enterprise insurance carriers of insurance companies and Medical Services Alberta Incorporated. It should be noted that since 1946 the Alberta Government has been a partner in an agreement with the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Alberta that has under most amicable terms provided comprehensive medical services to those citizens who are in receipt of provincial welfare payments, now upwards of 65,000 people. Children, widows, aged and blind are receiving excellent professional care. Over the years, the profession has met with the government at such times as they have requested and worked out contributions that are made to their solely operated fund for disbursements to their members for services rendered. A similar fund is operated by the Alberta Dental Association and covers dental care for these people.

In the initial discussions with the profession of medicine, a mutual agreement was reached and the principles that were put forward by the government -- and I would like to list them at this point: 1. The program should be entirely voluntary and free from any government regimentation or interference with the rights and responsibilities of individuals. 2. That it would preserve inviolate the doctor-patient relationship that we consider necessary to a high standard of medical care. 3. That it would employ the insurance principle as a means of equalizing the cost of medical services. And 4. That it would maintain the responsibility of the individual in providing for his medical requirements with the state assuming its responsibility to assist to the extent necessary to bring medical services within the financial reach of all the people.

A friendly and co-operative spirit of trust and confidence has marked the many long hours of work and thought of all parties in developing this plan. Under the plan, comprehensive medical services are available to all Albertans through the doctor of their choice and through a carrier of their own selection under a government - established maximum allowable premium. Besides providing all comprehensive types of services such as house calls, office visits, hospital care for medical, surgical or obstetrical needs, the benefits include specialists and consultant services when required, and necessary laboratory services and diagnostic aids when ordered by a medical practitioner. There have been additional benefits provided under the Alberta medical plan such as the waiver of premium if a person is disabled because of sickness or accident prior to being 65 years of age. The waiver of premium is for a period of six months, starting the third month after disability. There is also non-cancellability of policy except for the constant misuse or non-payment of premium. The government subsidy is provided to Alberta residents, people who have resided for at least 12 months out of the previous 24 in Alberta and who have had no taxable income in the preceding calendar year or whose taxable income during that period was not over \$500.00. The subsidy paid by the government towards the premium cost for those individuals with no taxable income is: a single individual, \$18.00 per year; a married couple with no dependents, \$42.00 per year; a family of three or more, \$72.00 per year. For those with taxable income up to \$500.00 this subsidy is one-half of the above.

The insurance companies, besides being able to provide the comprehensive type of medical benefits on the first dollar coverage, also have available for those who are not being subsidized by the government a type of policy with a deductible amount and a co-insurance principle in which the premium may be considerably less than that of first dollar coverage premium. Insurance companies are also able to offer endorsements to the policies that provide additional health benefits, such as special nursing services, contributions toward the cost of prescription drugs, ambulance services, optometric services, etc. The Medical Services Alberta Incorporated policies, of course, only provide for the payment of physician's services.

This is a brief outline of the plan and from all reports it is working out very well and the people are taking advantage of it.

Earlier I mentioned the number of people that are being subsidized through the plan. In addition, the outline mentions some 65,000 people, such as children, widows, aged and blind

(MR. FROESE cont'd).....who are receiving help from the government, are also brought under this plan, and the number has increased to 68,000 from the original 65,000.

The rates, when checked with out present rates of the MMS, are quite favourable, because I checked with our MMS here in Manitoba and their non-group single rate is \$16.95 on a quarterly basis, which on a yearly basis would be \$67.80, and the family rate is \$40.05 or, on a yearly basis, \$159.80. In Alberta they're subsidizing these amounts by one-half, and their contributions on a one person a year is \$18.00; on two persons, \$42.00; and on a family of three or more it is \$72.00 a year; so that -- \$72.00, if you multiply it by two it would mean that they pay \$144.00 for a similar plan. Then, as already mentioned, those that have a taxable income below the \$500.00, they still get some subsidy, and these are \$9.00 for one person, a single person; \$21.00 for two persons; and for a family of three, \$36.00. So that the government is helping those people that are in need of assistance, and I think we could well do with a similar plan.

Now the resolution before us calls on the Federal Government to call a conference, and I wonder whether we shouldn't take the initiative ourselves rather than calling on the Dominion Government, to have a committee of our own and to look into this matter as a provincial plan and follow what -- on the lines of what Alberta is offering to their citizens. I will not oppose the amendment before us, but I would at the same time also reserve my decision when the mover closes the debate, that I would only support it on the basis that it be a voluntary plan, I don't think the compulsory plans are operating as well, and I think they are more costly.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Would the member permit a question? The per capita rate in Saskatchewan is \$21.00 and comparable service in Alberta is \$41.00. Could the honourable member explain that please?

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I don't know the Saskatchewan plan that well. I'd have to check whether the same services are provided.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, may we have a recorded vote on this motion, please?

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the proposed motion in amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Wellington.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

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

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 42; Nays, 6.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

.....Continued on next page

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution as amended by the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks. Are you ready for the question?

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood. The Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam, at the outset I would like to -- (Interjection) -- quote? -- (Interjection) - No, not this time. Although I think, Madam, this resolution has been debated so often in this House that I think that all the members who have spoken have spoken on numerous other occasions and I think perhaps it would facilitate matters if we simply referred to the volume of Hansard in which our other speeches could be found when they could be read by the members at leisure. But since that procedure was not followed by the mover of the resolution and by the Honourable Member for Hamiota, who have both spoken already, I feel it incumbent upon me to say a few words.

At the outset, Madam, I would like to express to both honourable gentlemen who have spoken my congratulations on the excellence of their respective presentations. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, who happens to be my member in this House, was acting as a pinch-hitter for the Honourable Member for Elmwood and I think he did an excellent job. I think both honourable members spoke without emotion and placed their respective stands squarely before us.

Now, Madam, I think that we would be only justified in this House in adopting a form of compulsory automobile insurance if it were necessary and I don't think that such a form of insurance is necessary in this province. Because after all, I think that this House, at least the primary duty of this House in respect of highway accidents, should be to avoid them. I think too, Madam, that as far as the unfortunate victims of automobile accidents are concerned, that they are adequately protected in Manitoba at present. I don't think that any case can be made by comparing the rates chargeable in Saskatchewan to the rates chargeable in Manitoba for similar coverage. I don't think these rates can be compared because they are dealing with entirely different subject matters. I have before me Saskatchewan's Automobile Accident Insurance Act, and explanation of it, which was revised in 1960 and is issued by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office -- and if there's any doubt in any member's mind as to the futility of comparing rates, I think Page 17 of this little volume will show that even the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office openly admits that no comparison of rates can be made. It reads, Madam, "The premium rates set by the Government Insurance Office are determined by Saskatchewan's experience. Since road and traffic conditions as well as driving habits vary from province to province as between state and state, etc., it must not be assumed that even under exactly the same plan set up elsewhere premiums would be the same." Now, that's a frank acknowledgement by the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office that premium rates are fixed by the rate of accidents in the province to which they apply and they are determined by the conditions prevailing in that particular province. So I don't think anything can be gained by us in saying that under the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Plan a 1960 Ford of such-and-such a cylinder of horsepower can be insured for so much money and that in Manitoba it costs perhaps an additional sum. I don't think anything can be gained by that at all because as far as insurance rates are concerned, they vary between city and city in Manitoba, they vary between province and province in Canada, and these rates are all fixed on the basis of the premium rate ratio loss existing in that particular province.

So therefore Madam, I think that the only way that we can deal with this particular matter is to determine whether or no the Saskatchewan Government insurance policy on an automobile is as good as the ordinary automobile insurance policy issued in Manitoba. And I submit Madam, that such a policy is not. And I would like to give certain examples and raise certain points regarding the Saskatchewan Government automobile insurance. Now in Saskatchewan, an automobile policy issued by the Saskatchewan Government carries a \$200 deductible clause on property damage, collision or upset, fire theft and miscellaneous perils, consisting of lightning, wind storm, hail, flood, riot, falling aircraft, earthquake, etc., The standard automobile policy issued by a company in Manitoba, under our law contains no such deduction. As a matter of fact, it is illegal in Manitoba for an insurance company to make a deduction of any amount in respect of third party liability. It's true that they can make a deduction in respect of collision or

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd) . . . . in respect of comprehensive insurance insofar as it applies to glass but that is a deduction which is chosen by the person who is purchasing the insurance. But in Manitoba, as I say, the third party liability insurance cannot be issued by a company in Manitoba with a deductible amount. So the situation is this, that in Saskatchewan if two cars are involved in an accident and they're covered only by the Saskatchewan Government insurance policy, and the damage to each of these cars is in excess of \$200, each owner has to pay that first \$200 himself. And that is something worthy of taking into consideration when you start to compare the cost of automobile insurance in Manitoba with automobile insurance in Saskatchewan.

Now there's one thing, I think too, that I should mention, and that is this. Property damage claims make up about 92 percent of the volume of automobile liability claims paid in Canada. Now if we take the year 1959, the average auto accident claim in Manitoba was \$237 and if in Manitoba at that time the \$200 deductible did apply to policies issued by private companies in Manitoba, it would have meant an additional cost of \$200 to each individual in Manitoba whether he was insured or not. Now that is worthy of consideration. Because in Saskatchewan the driver, if his loss was \$237, he would have to pay the first \$200 himself and the government would only pay the \$37.00. Now that is the reason why in Saskatchewan they have what is known as a package policy, which is an additional coverage issued by the Government Insurance Office to make up the deficits in its original compulsory insurance.

The Honourable Member for Hamiota has dealt with the question of rates prevailing in Manitoba and in Saskatchewan for the same type of coverage, and I think he has used the cities of Regina and Winnipeg by way of comparison. But I don't intend to deal with that. But I would like to mention, Madam, that in Saskatchewan the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office does not give any consideration to a person who buys a car in the summer or in the fall. Because all Saskatchewan Government insurance runs from April 1st to March 31st and if you buy or license a car in Saskatchewan in December you have to pay the full insurance coverage, notwithstanding the fact that your policy expires March 31st. Now another thing, in Saskatchewan, in the license field, which is all part of the cost of operating a car, there's no difference prevailing between the various places in Saskatchewan as there is in Manitoba. In Manitoba, in the City of Winnipeg you have a higher rate than you have say in Arborg - where the Honourable Minister of Education is always referring to - whereas in Saskatchewan there's no difference of rates prevailing. Nor is there any difference in rates prevailing - the basic rates in Saskatchewan are all determined by wheel base; they're not determined by horsepower or anything else.

Now there's another point that I'd like to raise and that is this. In Saskatchewan the Saskatchewan Government insurance policy - that is the one issued by the Saskatchewan Government - is, to a certain extent, subsidized by private insurer, for this reason: That if I as a resident Saskatchewan, I am forced to take out my government insurance and if I take out insurance with a private company to complement or to supplement that government insurance and I am involved in an accident, and supposing I have a judgment given against me for say \$10,000 for physical injuries caused to some other party, under the law in Saskatchewan, which is unique, the private insurer in that particular case would have to exhaust his liability under that policy before the Saskatchewan Government would be called upon to pay a cent. So to that extent, Madam Speaker, the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office is subsidized by the private insurer.

I think, Madam, that as far as we're concerned, our main interest in Manitoba should be in highway safety and I believe that our law in Manitoba is about the best law in the North American continent, to ensure highway safety. It is a law which has been examined and studied by every state in United States. It has been adopted by approximately 40 states in United States. It has even been studied by France and it has also been studied by Great Britain, where automobile insurance has been compulsory since the advent of the motor car. And in each one of these jurisdictions it has been found that the Manitoba system of safety responsibility, assigned risk plan and unsatisfied judgment plan, are the best means of ensuring to the public compensation for injuries sustained. And in addition to that, they are the best means of ensuring the greatest possible degree of safety on our highways. Because under our Manitoba system, the object is to keep off the highway any driver who is prone to accident or who is considered to be a menace to the public.

If we had compulsory automobile insurance tomorrow, there is nothing which would guarantee to us any greater degree of highway safety than we have now. And as a matter of fact, our highway safety would not be of such a high degree if we deleted from our system in

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd) . . . Manitoba the financial responsibility portion of our law and the highway safety portion of our law, because if a man only had to produce a policy of insurance in order to get a licence and there was no other conditions attached to his driving as we have in Manitoba today, we would not ensure to the people of Manitoba that degree of safety which we are gradually attaining.

I think too, Madam, that there's no need for us to embark on a system of compulsory insurance by reason of the fact that even before the impost of that \$25 fee for an unlicensed driver, even before that time, I think that about 97 percent of the automobile drivers of Manitoba were insured. And that being so, why would it be necessary to bring into Manitoba a system of compulsory insurance which has been a failure in all those other jurisdiction where it has been tried. For these reasons, Madam, I do not intend to support the resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Virden. The Honourable the Member for Arthur.

MR. DONALD E. MCGREGOR (Virden): Madam Speaker, the Honourable Member from Arthur adjourned the debate on my behalf. I am now prepared to close the debate, but should anyone wish to speak . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Is there any other member wishing to speak? The Honourable Member for Carillon.

MR. BARKMAN: Madam Speaker, I have very little to add, except to get up and support this resolution. I wholeheartedly agree with the Member of Virden that it is high time that a bill or a resolution of this type is passed here in this House and I hope will be enacted in Ottawa immediately or as soon as possible. I see a great advantage, not only to the labour force but also to the farmer. I have received quite a few phone calls and I was very pleasantly surprised at the support shown in regards to this resolution. We have quite a few farmers down there with possibly 100 or 200 acres in the line of special crops or row crops such as beets, cropping such as beets, onions and the like and they have quite a time getting some help at certain times of the year and I certainly think that this resolution will help them in this respect. I also see a great advantage to the labour force, especially in rural Manitoba, or in rural areas, because of the seasonal situation that we have on the farms. Very often this season is also the lull of a rural business and I'm sure that if we can help the farmer and in return it will help also that labour can be used - some of the labour is not used in the businesses of rural Manitoba can help out part time on the farms - and some of these fellows are quite willing to do this. I'm talking possibly more of not permanent help, but some of the temporary help. I'm sure that if we can help the farm labour situation in this manner this would be advantageous to us as business people and the farmer both. So with the many points that have already been talked about from different members in this House I just thought I wanted to get up and support this resolution. I think it's important because I feel that it will help labour, help the farmer, and even help the businesses.

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

MR. MCGREGOR: Madam Speaker, it's a real pleasure in having the privilege to introduce a resolution. While I used very few words to introduce it I'll assure you I'll use less to close it. However, I would like to thank every member and every Party. I think it's something that I've never witnessed, but possibly it has happened many times before when a resolution being introduced from a backbencher and the three following speakers represented three different parties and all three expressed complete support. I don't know if this happens very often. I would sometimes like to think it should happen more often because the backbenchers I think still can play quite an important part in our government affairs.

I would like to thank every one of them. They've certainly brought points out, whether it would be the Member from Rhineland and his facts and figures; or the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye who brought another slightly different approach; or even the Honourable Member from Gladstone who was questioning me on the dollar bill. Well I'll assure him being of Scotch descent the dollar bill involved was my dollar bill but I think in the long run it'll be paid back many times over. But I think I go along with the honourable member who just spoke. I think the

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd) . . . most encouraging point was the ones that I have received from the constituents - not my constituents - but constituents throughout Manitoba and I've never received one in opposition to it. While there was some in the early stages before the resolution was introduced - and I was looking for these to find out if I was on the right ground myself - but since then I was at a meeting Tuesday of this week in the western part of Manitoba - this was not a provincial political meeting - and there was definite expression there of support all the way across.

I'm quite sure as cruising around the hallways this resolution now will get a very strong support and I do feel that if it comes out of here with a fairly unanimous decision that Ottawa will look at it. I know that they are looking at the weaknesses of The Unemployment Insurance Commission as a whole and I'm sure that they will see fit, regardless what political party is in power in Ottawa, will see fit to implement a resolution along these lines. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the honourable sponsor of the resolution a question. I'm not sure if he's in a position to answer. I would ask him what in his opinion, what seems to be the greatest single obstacle or opposition to your resolution or to the idea of unemployment insurance for farm workers.

MR. MCGREGOR: Would the honourable member repeat that? I just didn't catch his point.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Madam Speaker, I'm asking the honourable member to tell me what is, in his opinion, the greatest obstacle or the greatest single opposition to unemployment insurance for farm workers. I mean it's been years and years and it's taken so long. What's the main opposition to it? Does he have any information on that?

MR. MCGREGOR: Madam Speaker, in speaking to some of the people who officiate the Unemployment Insurance, they see quite a problem in trying to go around and see that Joe Blow is putting the right stamps in for his particular employee, is one of the ones; and I think the general farmers, some of them realize that it's going to be a nuisance for them. But I've taken the thought that the farmer who's really going ahead today has got to be a bookkeeper and he's got to have everything down, so I really don't see too much - while some express this opposition in this regard, I really don't think it's really justified if they think of it in its true sense. I'm not sure if I've got the question or not, Madam Speaker.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for LaVerendrye and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Springfield and the proposed sub-amendment by the Honourable the Member for Gladstone. The Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I adjourned the debate for the Member for LaVerendrye.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (LaVerendrye): Madam Speaker, I beg leave of the House to have this matter stand please. I was away on Wednesday and I'm not ready to speak now.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Wellington, The Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, I crave the indulgence of the House and ask that this matter be allowed to stand.

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

MR. RICHARD SEABORN (Wellington): Madam Speaker, I thought that I would like to make a contribution to this debate because I have been in the union ever since I was 15 years old and the association with whom I am associated is perhaps one of the most influential and powerful in the world. There is unfortunately a misunderstanding of what unionism represents among many people and one of the most difficult tasks that my union faces at any rate, is creating a proper image in the community; and to do this Local 190 has for many years undertaken many worthwhile projects such as providing services of musicians for charitable purposes paid out of the union treasury. But despite these most sincere efforts I'm afraid that the element of misunderstanding still exists in many areas. This is most unfortunate because the association of workers, and this must be admitted, has contributed greatly to the present working conditions under which many employees labour. It has also been demonstrated, I believe, that the full co-operation of both labour and management has done much to create our very healthy economic and social development. And while there may be those who regret the

(MR. SEABORN cont'd) . . . imposition of a government-supervised strike vote, I think I understand the reasons for it. Many unions are of such power and influence that a strike could well paralyze the whole community and the public do fear the economic repercussions that could follow an ill-advised strike action. And I think this is understandable although I must at once repeat that I personally feel that our local representatives in the labour field are upright and responsible individuals. In fact we are planning that more and more of these representatives are sitting down with management to iron out many of their difficulties and we have been particularly blessed with labour peace in this area.

We certainly have come a long way from the days when each party regarded each other as a deadly enemy and battled out each issue, quite literally, in an era of the deepest hostility, but I am afraid - and I do speak as a union man here - there are those who are not too familiar with the labour scene and still mistrust us despite our best efforts.

So we have two sides to this controversial issue and I appreciate and respect both points of view. It is comparatively easy to gain some popularity by stressing one side of the argument without considering the other and I for one would not like to do this at this time. I have perhaps expressed my views rather poorly, but I feel it would be presumptuous on my part to support this resolution which I must admit removes a part of our labour legislation which irritates the labour movement.

Maybe we should do this, I don't know, but I would much prefer to hear what the Woods Committee has to say, not only in this particular matter, but in the whole field of labour legislation. It is my understanding that the Woods Committee was not an imposed Board of Inquiry but exists and functions by the whole consent of all those concerned with it. I appreciate that I may be leaving myself open to being accused of delaying tactics and probably a lack of support for the great labour movement of which I am proud to be a member, but I am just as anxious for my own particular association to gain the full respect and understanding that it deserves as others perhaps would like to have for their organization. So I'm not without my prejudices therefore, and I would much prefer to have a neutral body render its opinions before I make a decision on this matter -- and here I might say that while I really do not champion the Minister, I'm sure he was motivated very much by the same thoughts that I have expressed here. On looking over the personnel of the Woods Committee, and particularly the chairman himself, I am persuaded that in this instance there is a sincere and honest desire to seek out the truth in the labour field and I feel there are ample reasons to withhold a final decision on this resolution in regard to the supervised strike vote until we hear the results of this investigation left in the capable hands of this committee. Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question.

The Honourable the Member from Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, we have before us a very interesting resolution as proposed by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie dealing with the question of joint study and research by representatives of labour and management.

I think it would be proper for me to say at the offset of my remarks that labour and management more and more are coming to the conclusion that they have common problems in many areas and that there could well be, particularly in the field of legislation, areas where a joint committee could consider the effects of legislation and the respective fields of both management and labour in industry and prior to any conflict taking place, might be able to remove through prior consultation and co-operation, areas of possible conflict. This I suggest, Madam Speaker, is going on more and more, not only here in Manitoba and Canada but in most of the industrialized nations of the world. So I say that it is good, and I can support in general the resolution as proposed by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

In having said that however, Madam Speaker, the resolution that is proposed by the honourable member is certainly in conflict with his remarks on introducing the resolution to this House because, Madam Speaker, if you would take a look at page 1540 of the Hansard of April 13th, at the commencement of the introduction of this resolution, the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie had this to say, on introducing the debate. "So the resolution

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . requests a Labour Management Committee be set up, that is, an official committee appointed by this House, not an ad hoc committee or a private committee set up at the whim of a Minister. We are asking for an official committee of this House to set up joint study management labour relations." The honourable member then goes on to say: "Now, although the Honourable Minister of Labour when he was requesting his members not to speak to a previous resolution dealing with labour relations, he gave us the impression, I thought, that everything was quite well in hand in the matter of labour relations, in the matter of labour-management relations, that he was as much as asking members of this House to keep their hands off and let this committee proceed at its own pace and to make a report to him whenever they have something to report, then the Minister himself, in his own good time and in his own good judgment would make recommendations to this House or otherwise, if he so desired."

I point this out, Madam Speaker, to show that there is an apparent conflict between the presentation of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie and the resolution itself, because, Madam Speaker, when the honourable member was speaking he said that a committee should be set up, an official committee of this House, which is one thing. The resolution that we are considering at the present time in the resolved portion says: "Therefore be it resolved that the Government of Manitoba give consideration to the establishment of such a joint Management-Labour Research Committee with such research assistance as may be provided by Manitoba or by the University of Manitoba for the purpose of achieving certain conditions or certain reports."

Now I want to say, and repeat, Madam Speaker, that I don't think really that a committee set up within the House itself could achieve the desired - basically I would suggest that if it were to be a committee of the House it would be rather difficult for members to give the length of time which should be given in consideration of this important matter. Secondly, that there would have to be broad delegations of functions to some research committee or the University of Manitoba or some other body.

Now we have heard a lot, Madam Speaker, about the Woods Commission which is at the present time considering matters respecting labour-management relations, matter of a survey of possible recommendations for changes in our labour legislation. The other day, Madam Speaker, in another debate I read into the record the position that labour is taking in respect to the Woods Commission. If I recall correctly, among other phrases was the phrase that labour went into that joint committee with its eye open, but certainly not with any intention, or even indeed, Madam Speaker, with any thought, that the government would use the fact of the Dean Woods Committee as an excuse for them to deter or defer legislation which is concerned insofar as industrial activity is concerned.

I might say, Madam Speaker, the Honourable Member for Wellington just this afternoon while dealing in another debate, suggested this again to the government that they should await until the Wood Commission had finalized its consideration. But, Madam Speaker, may I say to the members of this House that there is no final period of time in which the Woods Commission is obligated to make a report to the Minister. There is no directive given through any resolution of this House to the Minister that on receipt of the findings of the Woods Commission that action should be taken as a result of the deliberations or findings of the Woods Commission. Indeed, Madam Speaker, there's no suggestion at all that we members of this House, who are I am sure, all concerned with labour legislation and management legislation as well, there is no provision at all whereby we will receive any indication of the report except by sufferance of the administration or in particular the Minister of Labour.

I appreciate, Madam Speaker, that we have had an interim report from the commission, the Blake Commission that is, as a result of the Minister of Labour desiring to reveal to us what is transpiring and I say to the Minister of Labour that this is appreciated. But again I say, Madam Speaker, that there is no obligation placed upon the government to keep the House informed as to what the Blake Commission is doing. May I repeat once again - and I repeat this particularly for the Honourable Member for Wellington who just spoke respecting the secret strike vote there is no directive whatsoever, of a termination of deliberations of the Wood Commission. So I would suggest, Madam Speaker, there's really no point in any member of the government or any member of the House, no matter where he or she may sit, to just simply turn around and say well now we're not going to deal with a matter of this nature until it has been considered by the Woods Committee, because we don't know as I say - and I'm in this being repetitious - we don't know when or even if, the Woods Commission is

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . obligated to make a report to us in this House.

A little later, Madam Speaker, I intend to come back to this point. But I want to say that many of the suggestions contained in this resolution are proper. I make one or two observations in the resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. In the first "whereas" my honourable friend says that one of the objectives that we should have is to create and maintain an attitude which will be conducive to the retention of present industry. May I suggest, Madam Speaker, that while I am sure that the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie was thinking of industry that conducts itself on a fair and equitable basis insofar as its employees are concerned, that there are other present industries in the Province of Manitoba that do not, have not, and are continuing not to, conduct their present industries in an area which we in this House should think is desirable and should continue.

I'm sure I don't have to say to the Honourable the Minister of Labour that as a result of a magistrate's court hearing and a county court hearing, that the attitude and policies of one Brown Steel of Brandon would be the type of an industry that we would be desirous of retaining in Manitoba, if it continued the alleged infractions of what we in this House consider proper labour legislation. So I say to my honourable friend the Member for Portage la Prairie, I'm sure that when he is talking in his resolution of present industry, he's really talking about those industries presently in Manitoba which are conducting themselves in a fair and reasonable manner with their employees. And because of this, Madam Speaker, I suggest to the Honourable Minister of Labour that if we're going to have to await, without any termination period as concerned, recommendations first of all coming from the commission to the Minister, then through the Minister to us, the interim period gives to industries of this nature an incentive to continue. But more important, I think, or equally important with that, Madam Speaker, it gives to those other employers or some other employers, a basis on which to operate in the same matter as Brown Steel. So I say, Madam Speaker, the Minister of Labour should be fully conversant with the deficiencies in our labour legislation which caused a rejection of the appeal of the Department of Labour in the case that I'm talking of. And surely, surely Madam Speaker, the Minister of Labour or the government should not defer necessary action in order to make sure that there can be no repetition as to the situation that I have just referred to.

The resolution, Madam Speaker, also suggests that one of the purposes of a committee set up would be to achieve a sound and harmonious relationship between management and labour. I think, Madam Speaker, that the illustration that I have just used would tie in with the sentiment as expressed by the Member for Portage la Prairie. Then in his (b), on his resolved and again I've used an example of Brown Steel - "The creation and maintenance of an atmosphere conducive to the retention of present industry in Manitoba and to the encouragement of new industries to establish here."

I'm sure, Madam Speaker, that there's no question of doubt that the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, and every other member in this House, are most anxious, most anxious that we have here established in Manitoba new industries. There's no question of doubt about this. But I pose this question to the administration. Does the Government of Manitoba want any new industry to locate in Manitoba which may be the type of industry that might take the advantage of the present loopholes in our labour laws, which again led to the situation of Brown Steel. I think not, Madam Speaker. I have more confidence in the Minister of Labour than to think that he would be a party to joining in attracting new industries into Manitoba. But we won't know what type of management they might be, Madam Speaker, until after they've located; and it can conceivably be that some industries may have followed the Brandon case and endeavour to come into Manitoba on that basis. So I suggest, this is another reason why there should be no deferment in patching the loopholes in the legislation we have at the present time.

Clause (e) of the resolution of the Member for Portage la Prairie says, one of the objectives of the establishment of such a joint labour-management research committee would be to establish, maintain and perpetuate such procedures and relationship as will be conducive to free collective bargaining. I ask my honourable friend the Minister of Labour, is the present legislation in Manitoba of the type that does assure free collective bargaining? My honourable friend nods his head that he thinks that our present legislation is that type of legislation that is conducive to free collective bargaining. Then I ask my honourable friend if this is the case, why was the Brown Steel case in Brandon lost? I ask my honourable friend, the Minister of Labour, is he by the nodding in a sense, of his head, suggesting that those employees at Brown Steel who attempted to become members of an organization, covered under the legislation

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . which is conducive to free collective bargaining? Seriously, I say to my friend the Minister of Labour, look over even those portions of the Order for Return that I got that the government accepted and he will see even in them that it is not true here in Manitoba that there is free collective bargaining to the degree that we should have. And I say to my honourable friend, let's face up to it and let us not attempt to use any committee such as the Woods Committee as a lever to defer needed legislation in the Province of Manitoba.

I'm sure the Honourable Minister of Labour, Madam Speaker, has had drawn to his attention - as indeed I have and I'm sure other members of this House have as well -- many instances where employees have attempted to band themselves into a trade union organization only to find that the activities of the management were able to exercise a greater pressure on the employees, with the net result that the trade union did not become certified in some of these plants.

I would like the Honourable the Minister of Labour to assure me, and through me and this House, to every employee in the Province of Manitoba that they are guaranteed the right of free collective bargaining and agreement. I would like my honourable friend to say to me that under the present legislation in Manitoba, that no employee in industry - and by industry I mean the broad field - is or can be deprived of their rights to free bargaining. I say to my honourable friend, please tell us if this is the case. I ask my honourable friend, are we so wrong; are the individuals who have attempted to join in organizations wrong when their efforts have been thwarted in some instances by management? When I say this, Madam Speaker, I want it to be clear that I am not attacking industry in general and by and large the employers in the Province of Manitoba are good employers. But there are the odd few - possibly all too many, Madam Speaker who are not - and this is the reason, on behalf of the employees who may be in these industries where the management is not playing the game, shall I say, that it is necessary for government to step in. And coming as these few remarks of mine do on the heels of a revelation such as that of Brown Steel in Manitoba, I appeal to the Honourable the Minister of Labour, don't wait on any commission. You know the situation. You know what is required to plug at least that loophole. Why not "do it now", as the well know phrase dealing with unemployment situations we hear so much.

Another point in the resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, and this is (e), or (d) "To discourage all legislation that will be restrictive in nature, and to devise ways and means of promoting and encouraging greater industrialization in Manitoba."

Again I say on these points, Madam Speaker, we want industry, we want good employers and if we can't have industry with good employers, Madam Speaker, then I say we must have good legislation that will force, if that is the proper word, bad employers to become good employers. This is what's required in Manitoba today and I suggest deferment is not the answer particularly in those cases that the Minister is so well aware of.

I appreciate, Madam Speaker, that the government may take the viewpoint as it did in respect of the resolution on automation that because some sort of a committee is working in the field that they should reject the proposition of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, and because of the interesting debate that we had today, Madam Speaker, on automation, I ask the government please do not take the same approach to this question as you did to that. I say to the government please do not take the fact that the Woods Commission is now functioning as an excuse to reject the resolution that has been proposed by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. Because, Madam Speaker, if the Minister of Labour and the administration want the Woods Commission to continue they can accept the principle of this and that commission coupled with additional research at the University or whatever is required, can form the basis of the objectives that I'm speaking of and I'm sure in general were the objectives of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

But, Madam Speaker, I don't think really that the resolution as proposed by the Member for Portage la Prairie covers the situation to the degree that would find full satisfaction as far as I am concerned, and I want to propose a few amendments to the resolution. Among the amendments that I am about to propose, Madam Speaker, is one that a committee of joint labour-management which would be set up, would be a continuing committee. Because I don't think, Madam Speaker, that with the changing picture in industry, and the problems of industry, that we should simply set up a committee that make a report at some future date and sort of go out of existence. I think the time has come in the Province of Manitoba, and in the development of our province, where it's necessary or advisable to have a continuing committee, more or less experts in the field of labour management relations or jointly with them, surveying from time to time the problems that arise.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) .....

I appreciate very much, Madam Speaker, that the Honourable the Minister of Labour can say to me, well I have experts within my department; we can call on the University to give us some suggestions; but the type of committee envisioned in this resolution would be one of labour and management primarily, or initially divorced from government.

Another suggestion I wish to lay before the House for its consideration in addition to the committee being a continuing one, is that the government pending receipts of reports from such a committee make such amendments to present legislation or introduce such new legislation as from time to time may be desirable by parties concerned. In other words, I'm recommending to the government that they do not hide behind a committee of this type and say we await their report. And a third principle in the amendment which I am about to propose, Madam Speaker, would be one whereby in a committee set up like this, would make from time to time reports as to its findings and deliberations to the Minister or to the government and following that, that a report on the findings and the deliberations of a committee set up would be forwarded or laid on the table in this Legislature at it's next session.

I think it's important, Madam Speaker, that we do have a continuing committee which will from time to time report to government; that the government itself do not use the establishment of such a committee as an avenue to prevent it from introducing desirable legislation of parties concerned. I do think, Madam Speaker, that it is necessary that such a committee or the government make available to all members of this House, what is going on in the committee such as we have in the other agencies, such as the Manitoba Consultative Committee. So therefore, Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie be amended as follows: (a) by inserting after the word "a" in the second paragraph the word "continuing", and (b) by inserting after the word "a" in the third paragraph the word "continuing", and (c) by adding the following at the end of the resolution: Be it further resolved, that the government, pending the receipt of reports from such committee, make such amendments to present legislation, or introduce such new legislation as from time to time may be desirable by parties concerned; and Be it further resolved that the above mentioned committee, report from time to time to the government, as to its deliberations and findings and that a report of the deliberations and findings be laid before the Legislature within 15 days from the commencement of each annual session.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, would you care to call it 5:30?

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