



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable Thelma Forbes



Vol. XII

*P<sup>s</sup> 1157-2364*

1966

5th Session, 27th Legislature.

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. D. Watt	Reston, Manitoba
ASSINIBOIA	Steve Patrick	10 Red Robin Place, Winnipeg 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Hon. Robert G. Smellie, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	Vacant	
BURROWS	Mark G. Smerchanski	102 Handsart Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARILLON	Leonard A. Barkman	Steinbach, Man.
CHURCHILL	Gordon W. Beard	Thompson, Man.
CYPRESS	Hon. Thelma Forbes	Rathwell, Man.
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	William Homer Hamilton	Sperling, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Kimberly St., Winnipeg 15
EMERSON	John P. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT-PLAINS	M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q. C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	Emil Moeller	Teulon, Man.
FLIN FLON	Hon. Charles H. Witney	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	Nelson Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	Vacant	
KILDONAN	James T. Mills	142 Larchdale Crescent, Winnipeg 15
LAC DU BONNET	Oscar F. Bjornson	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
LA VERENDRYE	Albert Vielfaure	La Broquerie, Man.
LOGAN	Lemuel Harris	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEDOSA	Hon. Walter Weir	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MORRIS	Harry P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Hon. Obie Baizley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
PEMBINA	Mrs. Carolyn Morrison	Manitou, Man.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	Gordon E. Johnston	7 Massey Drive, Portage la Prairie
RADISSON	Russell Paulley	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
RHINELAND	J. M. Froese	Winkler, Man.
RIVER HEIGHTS	Hon. Maitland B. Steinkopf, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROBLIN	Keith Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	Hon. Abram W. Harrison	Holmfield, Man.
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	Hon. George Hutton	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	J. E. Jeannotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent Desjardins	357 Des Meurons St., St. Boniface 6, Man.
ST. GEORGE	Elman Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guildford St., St. James, Winnipeg 12
ST. JOHN'S	Saul Cherniack, Q. C.	333 St. John's Ave., Winnipeg 4
ST. MATTHEWS	W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Fred Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	Room 250, Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q. C.	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	Arthur E. Wright	168 Burrin Ave., Winnipeg 17
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	Fred T. Klym	Beausejour, Man.
SWAN RIVER	James H. Bilton	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	P. J. McDonald	Killarney, Man.
VIRDEN	Donald Morris McGregor	Kenton, Man.
WELLINGTON	Richard Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	James Cowan, Q. C.	219 Kennedy St., Winnipeg 1
WOLSELEY	Hon. Duff Roblin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, March 22, 1966

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions  
Reading and Receiving Petitions  
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

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

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments begs me to present the following as their first report: Your Committee met for organization and appointed Honourable Mr. McLean as Chairman. Your Committee agreed that, for the remainder of the Session, the Quorum of this Committee shall be ten members.

Your Committee has considered Bills: No. 11 - An Act to amend The Health Services Act; No. 12 - An Act to amend The Jury Act; No. 13 - An Act to amend The Interpretation Act; No. 20 - An Act to amend The Public Libraries Act; No. 29 - An Act to amend The School Attendance Act; No. 30 - An Act to amend The Manitoba Evidence Act; No. 35 - An Act to amend The Elderly and Infirm Persons' Housing Act; No. 48 - An Act respecting the Boundary between the Provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan; No. 49 - An Act respecting the Boundary between the Province of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories; and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee also considered Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act, and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments. All of which is respectfully submitted.

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion  
Introduction of Bills

Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery on my right where there are some 16 students from Grades 4 to 6 from Thames School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Friesen. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Rhineland. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you.

I would like to announce to the House that we now have the new rules printed for the benefit of the members and you will note that these rules are bound in a paper cover and that there is no index at this time. I think you will appreciate that if the rules in this copy prove to be satisfactory, that during recess an index will be prepared and a permanent copy with a durable cover will be printed. We have only a very limited number of this trial copy printed at this time and therefore I would request that each member safeguard the copy which will be distributed to him by the pages in a few minutes.

Orders of the Day.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Education. Some time ago I attempted to adjourn the House on a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the situation with regards to the announcement of increased grants for teachers' salaries and the position that the school boards were in because of their budget dates. Now last night, the newspapers carried an item indicating that the School Board of Winnipeg had approached the Minister in order to have the permission to reopen their budget so as to reflect the increased grants, presumably in teachers' salaries. The news report is that the Minister has refused the city school board the right to reopen its 1966 budget. Now it seems to me that if that is the government's position, I would like to know from the Minister whether -- well, first of all, is this definitely the government position? Secondly, why is this so, if it has a request from the school board, in view of the fact that the announcement was made to permit the other boards that had not yet submitted budgets to make a correction?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education)(Gimli): Madam Speaker, February 22 when I did mention those grants, I did make the statement that usually final mill rates weren't struck until April 15 and boards and divisions usually -- the benefit of grants was usually made available in plenty of time for divisions to make alterations. I found that this is the case all over the province except in the City of Winnipeg, where the city charter calls for a submission of the budget by the division who make known their needs by February 15. In connection with that, the middle of last week I received a request from the -- a letter from the solicitor to the Winnipeg School Division, whose legal interpretation was that following February 15 the board could not make any alterations to their budget, and that a special amendment would be necessary.

When I met yesterday morning with the solicitor, who I had made an appointment with him, and our Legislative Counsel and members of the department, to discuss his letter, members of the school division were present with the solicitor and they were advised as we discussed this, that in my opinion I did not think the government would be bringing in an amendment, and further to that particular meeting I have had a legal opinion from the advisors to the department and have contacted the Chairman of the Winnipeg School Board and am forwarding to him today the letter which contains that statement. I have it before me; perhaps I could inform the honourable member: "Dear Mr. Paschak: Your solicitor" - this is not yet in Mr. Paschak's hands; it is on the way - "wrote to me recently saying in effect that in his opinion additional grants announced for 1966 could not be used in '66 but would have to be applied in a reduction of 1967 expenditures. Yesterday, you and other representatives of your board visited me in my office and the respective positions were further explained and discussed. I have since consulted with my colleagues and our legal advisor. I am advised by our solicitor that in his opinion no bill is necessary to permit your board to use grant monies for the proper purposes of the division, nor is a bill necessary to permit an over-expenditure when the board considers it necessary in the interests of the division or to permit an application of additional revenues to the reduction of taxes. The over-expenditure, if there is one, may be covered in whole or in part by any surplus revenues including additional grants. Since, in our opinion, no amendment is necessary to allow the application of the new grants for the purposes of the district, we do not propose to bring in the requested legislation." I think that gives a legal opinion on the interpretation of this matter.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a further question on this. I understand from the letter that the Minister has sent, that he says in the first part that they do not need legislative approval; they do not need legislative approval, in order to either have an over-expenditure or to proceed and use the money as they wish. That's not the statement?

MR. JOHNSON: . . . . . opinion of the board.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, let me simplify the question. Can the Winnipeg School Board take the money, the extra grants that they are going to get for teachers' salaries, and use them to increase teachers' salaries now?

MR. JOHNSON: If the board so considers this is necessary for the proper conduct of the affairs of their board, they may, according to the legal advice I have been given.

MR. MOLGAT: So, the report in the newspaper last night then is not correct, because this indicated that the government had said that they could not use it for teachers' salaries. The Minister now tells me that they can, if they so desire.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, I want to make it clear that the statement I made was to the effect that -- my opinion, offhand, was that an amendment wasn't necessary, but I would have to consult with my colleagues and legal advisors in this matter. I believe the interpretation of those present was that I did not wish to consider an amendment. If that is the -- this was not intended in any way. I made it clear that I would have to seek consultation on the point raised by their solicitor, which I have.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. When will he be tabling the report on the Denturist Committee?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health)(Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, I was in touch with the Queen's Printer just before I came into the House. They tell me that the report is in the hands of the printer and that it's not done as yet.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. There has been much discussion on the proposed new smelter that's coming into the province and I am wondering, are these negotiations still underway or have they been terminated?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Fort Garry): I'll take notice of that question, Madam Speaker.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the House Leader. Can we expect the budget this week?

MR. McLEAN: I am unable to say, Madam Speaker, I believe the Honourable the First Minister is not well and I think it would be better to wait until his return before making any comment in that regard.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to make a correction in Hansard - Hansard No. 47, Friday afternoon last. On Page 1098, at the bottom, on the fifth line, I said: "I think it would be completely irresponsible to pretend that no displacement has taken place or no displacement will occur in the future. I think this would be completely irresponsible and I would say, as far as this government is concerned, they are irresponsible as far as automation is concerned." That's what I said. In Hansard, on the fifth line, it says: "They are responsible." So I would like to make that correction. Big difference.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, may I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Health. Has he received the long-awaited report or recommendation from the Manitoba Hospital Commission relative to the doctors' clinics?

MR. WITNEY: No, not yet, Madam Speaker.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Madam Speaker, will the Honourable Minister urge the Commission to hasten their report?

MR. WITNEY: That has been done following the debate on the estimates just the other day.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like once again this year to invite the members of the Legislature and yourself, Madam, and the staff, to the Manitoba Winter Fair to be held in Brandon, March 28 to April 2. I don't think I need to eulogize all the various attractions of the Manitoba Winter Fair. I think all members who have been there before have enjoyed themselves each time and I can assure you that they will once again see a topnotch show and some of the finest displays - animal and agricultural displays - in the country. And so it is with great pleasure I accede to the request of the Board of Directors of the Manitoba Winter Fair and the management to forward this invitation to the members.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, could I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Education? I understand that a meeting was held last night in the Swan Valley District where some 60 school boards practically unanimously supported the idea of "one district division" for that area. I am not aware of any legislation that makes this possible. I assume it's a desirable thing and possibly the Minister and his department deserve credit for it. I'd like to know whether he feels they're due, whether there is legislation to permit what they've indicated they want, and if not, whether there is any indication that a bill will be presented to make it possible.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, legislative measures dealing with this matter will be brought forward in the Public School Act amendments.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Honourable the Minister of Education. Is this his final decision that the School Board of Winnipeg will not be able to re-open the question of budget, or will he wait until he gets an official legal advice on their present position.

MR. JOHNSON: My official legal position will be transmitted to the board today which states that the board can -- in meeting its necessary expenditures may use monies which are made available to them for this purpose.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'd like this clarified. This is official, then? I thought the Minister replied to the Leader of the Opposition that this was not official.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, the other day I asked the Honourable Minister of Health about a report of the Hospital Commission with regard to ambulance service and I understood he would be tabling it the other day. I wonder, can we expect it soon?

MR. WITNEY: Yes, Madam Speaker. I seem to be having a great deal of difficulty with printers these days, but I trust it will be on the tables of the members before the end of this week.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. At the meeting held last week, the Minister urged the farmers to open roads to their bins by snow plow. Now I am getting 'phone calls - I've had several - they are wondering who will pay the cost for opening roads to the farmers' bins in the flood-prone areas. Would it be the government, the municipality or the farmer?

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): Frankly that matter hasn't been settled or dealt with. Some portion of the work is being done on municipal roads with the assistance of the Department of Public Works, but in the case where they are not on roads and in the fields, I frankly can't answer your question that the government will pay the entire cost.

MR. TANCHAK: Who can supply us with the answer? The premier when he comes back?

MR. HUTTON: If I may say so, Madam Speaker, I think the question is beside the point right now. The grain is out there -- if it's out in the field in the flood-prone area, there is only one thing to do and that's to get it out of there, and we'll talk about who pays for it afterwards.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Madam Speaker, I'd like to direct a supplementary question to the Honourable Minister. Has, or is any government equipment being used to open these roads to the granaries?

MR. HUTTON: Will you direct your question to the Minister of Highways please.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Does the Honourable Minister want me to repeat the question?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works)(Minnedosa): Madam Speaker, I'm really not sure. The Department have been asked to co-operate in any way that they can in getting grain out, with the reservation that we've asked that the request be made through the Department of Agriculture which is the only means that we have of knowing really whether the request is in the flood area or whether it's not in the flood area, and where it's in the flood area and the location and everything is approved by the Department of Agriculture, we're assisting in any way we can to get the grain out.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: A supplementary question now, Madam Speaker, to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Has the Honourable Minister made any recommendations to the Department of Public Works to have some of these roads opened?

MR. HUTTON: The Minister hasn't made any recommendations. We have a co-ordinator at Morris and we have another co-ordinator at Emerson, and any request of this kind is channelled through these people, and the municipal machinery and whatever Public Works machinery is required is handled at that level.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Has the Honourable Minister any knowledge of the co-ordinators having asked for this type of service?

MR. HUTTON: It is understood that the co-ordinators have at their disposal whatever Public Works equipment is available in the area and there is some Public Works equipment available in the area; more precisely - rotary snowblowers.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Would it be in order for me, Madam Speaker, to ask one more question?

MADAM SPEAKER: . . . all that are allowed under our rules.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Well this is directed to a different matter altogether - not altogether, but not quite the same.

MADAM SPEAKER: To whom are you addressing your question?

MR. HRYHORCZUK: My question is this: if part of the valley is going to have the use of government equipment, then isn't it fair and just that where other equipment is used that the government pay for the use of it?

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I have another question of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. In Franklin municipality last year many farmers were not able to harvest their crops due to excessive rain. These farmers were covered by crop insurance and they were promised partial payment for their losses last fall. To date they have not received any payment whatsoever. When can they expect partial payment? They need it for seed purposes now.

MR. HUTTON: I can only take this statement as Notice.

MR. McLEAN: . . . . if I may, just before I recognized that we are not in Committee of Supply, but the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs is in his place and the Provincial Secretary, and subject to the approval of the House perhaps when we do reach Committee the members would like to revert more or less to the order that had been agreed to the other day, and after Labour go into Municipal Affairs, Provincial Secretary, and Welfare. With the exception of the items in which the First Minister is concerned, that is the order that was I believe agreed to the other day.

MR. GUTTORMSON: This would meet with our approval.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to say that the Government of Manitoba has agreed to close the House for the day so that all the members can attend the Brandon Winter Fair. The day that the House will be closed will be the 1st of April. Now that is a Friday and I would just like to make this request on behalf of the Brandon Winter Fair, that since the House is being closed specifically so that the members can attend the Brandon Winter Fair and lend their support to that worthy organization, I would make a special request that members use that day to attend the Brandon Winter Fair.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, in the absence of my Leader, may we have this stand?

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

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Madam, I would ask the leave of the House to have this matter stand.

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

MR. HILLHOUSE: May I make a similar request, Madam, in respect to this resolution?

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

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, may I ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains. The Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I would like the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand. If anyone else wishes to speak I would have no objection.

MADAM SPEAKER: Any other Member wishing to speak? Agreed to stand? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for LaVerendrye; and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne; and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Member for Gladstone. With respect to this amendment of the Honourable the Member for Gladstone, I believe that the honourable member intended that his sub-amendment would read "THAT the amendment be amended by striking out all the words after the word "that" in the last line in the operative portion of the amendment of the honourable member for Souris-Lansdowne, and substituting the following" as he has suggested. Now should this be your intent . . . .

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, it would be in the first line and it would read thus: "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that" and then -- in the first line of the operative section.

MADAM SPEAKER: In the first line of the operative, not the last line. The first line of the operative part. If that is your intent I shall instruct the Clerk to make the necessary corrections and any member wishing to speak may do so. Any member wishing to speak? Are you ready for the question?

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

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

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

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

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

MR. WITNEY: I thank the honourable members for their encouragement but I ask leave of the House to have this matter stand.

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

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Madam Speaker, I guess we'd better break the monotony and give you a rest to sit down for a few minutes. Speaking to the amendment to this resolution, we realize the resolution, first of all, is very lengthy and also the amendment seems to be quite lengthy. Well if it is an importance of words that counts, this must be a very important amendment, and I believe it is. Having been an implement dealer and also spending quite a few years of my life on the farm, I should possibly be torn between the two sides, but I am not. I think that their problems are quite neutral.

I was wondering when the Honourable Member for La Verendrye - yes, I think he said this - was speaking, and reading up some of the data concerning the numbers of dollars spent by the farmers for their total capital investment on farm machinery, I think he mentioned a figure of around \$272 million. I thought it was quite a coincidence that the wheat acreage bonuses for the year 1963-64 came also to a figure very close to that. I think it was \$271 million in that year. Of course we know that oats and barley bonuses in the 1964-65 year were considerably lower. Well Madam Speaker, I feel very much could be said on this amendment. Maybe, as I said before, I feel over-sympathetic towards any rural problem but I think we are all aware in regard to agriculture that while the population on the farms has gone down tremendously, and I imagine this figure could vary anywhere from 10 to 12 percent, I think we are still aware that our economic position in agriculture has actually not been lowered by that percentage at all. I think the figure stands around 40% of the total economy. Therefore, we realize that agriculture is very important from this viewpoint and possibly even more important from the viewpoint of supplying all of us here in Manitoba and I think we can say, for that matter, all of Canada. In fact, the way our wheats and some of these other things are being sent out, we can say all of the world; and the Western regions are of course supplying one of the greatest necessities of life or importance, namely food.

Madam Speaker, I have tried to stress in a few words the importance of agriculture, or the agricultural position, but of course as the Honourable Member for Arthur and La Verendrye - both for that matter - have suggested, we are now directly concerned with the welfare of the farmer who is caught in this cost-price squeeze concerning the machinery he requires or must have. I have also tried to find out what really has been done in respect to finding out why the costs of machinery have risen to such great heights, and especially in comparison to the prices of grain, for that matter, grains including three or four of the more important grains. Yes, I guess somebody could also say that because a very high percentage of farmers have left their farms and the total population is down so much, but I don't think that this holds true because the total figures of machinery being bought today are still rising instead of going down, so I don't think that this plays very much of a role.

Madam Speaker, I would agree with the Honourable Member of Arthur that the Federal Government, through the Agriculture and Colonization Committee in the House of Commons, I believe it was in the years 1960 and '61, conducted very lengthy hearings but very little seems to have come out of this report. I'm sure the Honourable Member of Arthur read some of these hearings and there was a good presentation by this Committee and I don't intend at this time to go into that, and I also don't intend to disagree with the Member for Arthur concerning, or I should say in regard to who shall represent this committee. As long as some action or some progress is taken, I don't think we are too concerned if it is the Federal Government or the Provincial Government who investigate these matters as long as something is being done,



(MR. BARKMAN cont'd). . . . . and I hope that this government will do their part in this matter. I hope also these committees will have a good and a deep knowledge and concern for both the farmer and, I'd like to add, the small implement dealer.

Possibly right here we may have to consider some of the things that are happening today in regard to implement agencies being discouraged and not having as many in the area as we used to have. In fact, I think a lot of these dealers themselves realize that the number of farmers that they have to satisfy or supply have decreased and they could be serving larger areas, and I don't see anything so terribly wrong with a farmer going 10 to 15 miles to a town for whatever dealership or part he requires; or if he's going for an emergency part, I don't see anything too terribly wrong with him going 10 or 15 miles, as long as when he arrives there he is sure that this dealer has that part, and of course this committee is supposed to look into this. I know that quite a few dealers today stock \$15,000, 20,000, 25,000 worth of parts leave alone \$75,000 to 125,000 worth of machinery, and still the choice doesn't seem to be big enough, and I'm not trying to encourage the dealers being away further from the place of necessity, but I think we will have to take these points along the line of what the committee might hope to suggest.

I hope also that the committees will investigate why we have - and this is a few years ago when I took this synopsis or these details - but I counted, in a certain implement company book I counted 89 different models of tractors, 36 models of combines, 18 models of manure spreaders. I know a lot of us in this House can hardly imagine that we need that many, but 18 models of those, and 67 models of seed drills, and 104 - unbelievable - types of ploughs. These of course were U.S. and Canadian figures and I realize that the Manitoba figure is a lot less than that. I understand as far as -- and I'm talking only of one company, not of all the companies combined, or all the models of different companies combined. I understand the Manitoba figure in the line of tractors, there are only 21 models and these are basically, based from I think it is 14 to 150 hp ratings, and only 8 types of combines including 3 types of pull . . . . , and 6 drills and 4 manure spreaders. But if these large numbers of models are required, and I doubt very much that they are, but then you can see why the implement companies have to realize extra earnings from the regular popular items of machinery and parts that they sell. Here again I think that the dealer bears a large brunt of the load that he's required to stock, some of these very slow-moving, practically obsolete parts and possibly even quite a few of the machineries.

If these committees are going to be successful, I think they may as well try to consider some of the points of the former Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization of 1961, and I'd like to read a few of those. I'm going to read from the report of 1960-61, and I quote: "Your committee has investigated the following aspects of farm machinery prices: No. 1, the cost of manufacturing farm machinery, including labour, wages and salaries, materials, overhead and profits. No. 2, cost of distributing farm machinery including the margins earned by dealers and transportation costs. No. 3, other costs of ownerships of farm machinery such as charges for credit. No. 4, the organization of the farm machinery industry and market in North America," and he goes on and I'd like to read a few more paragraphs.

He goes on, "Your committee reports that it met 32 times and feels, due to the wide scope of questions considered, further study is necessary to determine the effect on the price of farm machinery and repairs befalling these." He mentions a few: "(a) If farmers are receiving the full advantage of a free market in farm machinery. (b) The cost of distribution of farm machinery. (c) The cost and standardization of parts. (d) The standardization of farm machinery. (e) The credit arrangements. (f) The reluctance of machine manufacturers to provide details of their costs which are regarded as being of a competitive nature. (g) The different opinions of the witnesses as to the productivity of labour as compared to increases in wages. And a further study is also required because of the following: (1) the necessity of recalling some witnesses, and (2) other witnesses yet to be heard."

I think the Honourable Member for Arthur also went to some length in saying that and still, unfortunately, this work, with all the work they went through, has not been completed. In fact, I doubt if anything more has been done since that time, and I believe that the sooner we get at this, for all concerned -- and again I say, including the implement companies for that matter, or the implement dealers, and of course, the most important party concerned is the farmer himself. We know that farmers have a right to expect prices to be paid on the most efficient and economical method of manufacturing and redistribution. We also know that the Commission should choose or should check. If the machinery industry is as competitive in prices as it is in sales, much could be said about this, unless - also, maybe I should say,

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd). . . . . Madam Speaker, the cost of distribution of farm machines and repairs at certain levels are high. We all know this. I seem to be convinced that this is not necessarily so on the dealer's level so much, but maybe on other levels.

Yes, Madam Speaker, maybe the major companies must try to reduce their distribution costs and slow down their larger number of models available or else we realize that farmers will have to go to some lengths. I have never been a great advocator of co-ops or what have you, but this is one place where possibly they could play a very important role.

So we see that there have been reports that a lot of the farm machinery companies also have their problems. I do not at this time -- I was going to before, but I think it will be too lengthy to read some of the problems involved in some of the co-operative movement reports, but they are numerous and anybody wishing to read some of them, I think you'll find them quite interesting.

So Madam Speaker, we are possibly more confused about the whole matter than ever, but on one thing I think we all agree. We need a further study by committees that are interested and anxious to study this matter, and I certainly believe that our provincial government, this government, should be anxious to take a lead in this field. Are they really? I hope so. The farmer needs up-to-date labour-saving machines; there is no argument there. The poorer his returns the more economical must be his operation. We know he must pay for his . . . . He must pay a good price for his machines, determined by the cost of their production and distribution.

I believe these are some of the facts that will confront these committees. We all know there are very many other factors involved to any kind of a solution. One thing I feel certain, and that is the fact that we have 15 companies building farm machinery or farm machinery products in Manitoba compared to only 6 companies in Saskatchewan, 7 in Alberta and 2 in B. C. While this is a very, very small solution to the problem for Manitoba, nevertheless I think it is encouraging to note that we could be at least a little bit more self-existing if we really had to. I hope we won't have to, and that the over-all situation will be cleared speedily.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Speaker, in rising to speak on this subject of automation, I am reminded that the word "automation" itself has changed somewhat in the evolution of things - I can recall as a boy looking at the Goldberg cartoons of various devices of wheels and levers and gears and belts, all made to do certain far-fetched jobs - to what we see it today.

The Honourable Member for Springfield in his speech on automation said: "Who's afraid of the big bad wolf?" I don't think we have ever said that we were afraid of automation. What we have said, we've pointed out and we have warned that if we don't do something about it, then we certainly will need to be afraid of it. The honourable member in his speech referred time and time again to the need - and I quote, Madam Speaker, from Page 592: "It's always a government responsibility, along with the employers and employees and different organizations, to help out a situation somehow in order to keep people going, to keep training; and in our economy, find means and ways of making the challenge of constantly changing economy."

Well last year, Madam Speaker, my colleague, the Honourable Member for Logan had a resolution on the Order Paper saying just about that. And again on Page 593, the Honourable Member for Springfield says, and I quote: "The government should place much more emphasis on further training of both employees and unemployed workers." And this again was said last year by the Honourable Member for Logan and other speakers. Again on Page 594 the honourable member says, and I quote: "If we understand the social difficulties, surely with the help of management, labour, government and community institutions who have common sense, we can find solutions." Madam Speaker, it seems to me that whenever we get a resolution, a very common sense type of resolution on the Order Paper, we are subjected to this kind of an amendment, and in speaking to their amendments they say practically the very same things that we are proposing.

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd).....

Now in the first Industrial Revolution we had much violence, Madam Speaker, and this is different today. In the second Industrial Revolution we are not anticipating this sort of thing. In the second Industrial Revolution, we have come to look upon our society as one in which automation has become a governing concept of production and distribution, and it, of necessity, of course, an educated society. We can't visualize automation without an educated society. But education alone is not enough. We have to make up our mind as to our objectives. Just as we tell people when we are speaking to them that they must have objectives in life, we too must have objectives when we are talking about this business of automation.

In the August 61st booklet, or the journal, issued by the Imperial Bank of Commerce, there is an article on automation and I would like to quote briefly, Madam Speaker, from this. It says: "An unfortunate anomaly in the field of production has existed in recent years, and while manufacturers have strained after greater productivity, practically every major industry on this continent has been operating well below its full capacity. However, as the historian, Arnold Toynbee, pointed out recently, every economy has two sides. It has its technological means of production and its social system for distributing the product. Technological advance has yet to be matched by social progress which has failed to find an acceptable means of supplying two-thirds of the world's population with the bare necessities, while productive capacity in the other third lies idle. The solution of this problem is likely to engage our attention, voluntarily or otherwise, for many years to come."

Madam Speaker, I think we are going to see a society in which the educated will work harder and longer as a result of the technological revolution. And while automation does create new jobs, jobs that require more skill -- and just the other night I was reading where a noted educator says that we are concerned at times with the term, the "I. Q." He says we are going to be concerned in the future with the "S. Q.", the "Skill Quotient", which will be almost as important.

I would like to quote too, Madam Speaker, from a paper given by Professor Robert Theobald, entitled New Technologies in Institutional Change, and I quote. Professor Theobald says, "In the relatively near future, those who need to expand their plant to meet created demand will choose to buy machines rather than to hire men. The machines they buy will be produced predominantly by other machines, and the new machines purchased will be so much more efficient than earlier machines that large numbers of existing firms using older machinery, and thus employing many men, will be forced to close down. They will be too inefficient to compete. Thus in the next few years a policy of forcing rapid increases in demand in order to raise employment opportunities will actually lead to the opposite result. It will raise unemployment rather than lower it." It goes on to say, "In my opinion, therefore, we cannot maintain full employment. Attempts to keep demand growing as fast as supply and thus create enough conventional jobs will inevitably fail. The effects of cybernation in developing abundance and eliminating jobs will inevitably exceed our capacity to create jobs. And even while we continue our efforts to maintain the present socio-economic system, the situation will deteriorate. Unfortunately the nature of this deterioration is still not fully understood. There is not today, and there does not need to be in the future, any shortage of jobs for those who have the qualifications to compete with machine systems. It is inevitable, however, that the number of people capable of competing with machines will decline and that the number of unemployables, people unattractive to any employer, will increase. Many of the unemployables will not be drawn back into jobs, whatever the level of economic activity, for their labour is not competitive. This analysis assumes, of course, no major long-run build up of arms, production or increase in the armed forces."

He goes on to say that we face, in effect, a reverse leisure society. "This means that those with most education, imagination and creativity will work excessively long hours and will have little time for non-work activities. On the other hand, those with little education and training will have large amounts of time on their hands, and unless society makes massive efforts, little capacity of using this time for their own benefit or that of society in general."

Madam Speaker, I think that that would certainly give one time for thought. This question of leisure time, Madam Speaker, is getting to be important too, because in our new educated society, as we like to call it, we have agreed that we are our brother's keeper. We no longer subscribe to the idea that we can let people starve in one part of the world while we have bulging elevators in the other. We now have to consider, therefore, a guaranteed annual income for people. It's true, today we talk about taking care of the needs of certain of our

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd).....people who are unfortunately indigent by the Social Allowances Act, but it seems that we will evolve to something far better than this in the very near future. Therefore the concept of a guaranteed annual income isn't so far-fetched, if people are to live in some kind of dignity.

But people will have to be trained also, Madam Speaker, to enjoy leisure, because we see today -- trade unions, by the way, have fought for years to better the working conditions of their people, only to find them out moonlighting, taking other jobs. With all the attractiveness of the material things that are produced and being dangled before the eyes of people today, in this life of competition where one is trying to keep up with the Joneses, we find a lot of our causes for tension. I think too we will have to adopt a new attitude toward work, because while we are talking about shortening the work week and benefitting the conditions, we must train ourselves to accept that work is a necessary thing. Dr. Levinson of the Menninger Institute says that work is a kind of a psychological glue that holds a man together. Motivating people to want to work is quite a challenge today. Motivating them to want to work, or to contribute to the cultural and physical well-being of their fellow man.

I would like to read a little further from Mr. Theobald. I wish I could, Madam Speaker, read the whole of the article, but it's too long. And I quote: "The computer and the new technology make possible the abolition of toil, those things which people have to do because they have to gain an income. This does not mean the abolition of work, those things which people find useful, important and challenging in themselves, because they make possible their own development or that of society." And he says, "These main areas of work in the future may well be: first, politics, not in its narrow sense but in a broader sense, the Greek idea of the development of the good community. Human beings will be more, not less individualistic in the coming year, and the need to mesh their desires and their needs to create a community in which they can live successfully will require much effort, much skill, and much time. Secondly, people will "work" at human relationships, human concern, and the humane care of human beings. Third, man will work at his own self development, both physical and mental." So I suggest that there will still be lots of work left to do.

Job satisfaction, Madam Speaker, is possibly the thing that most people are striving for, and yet today, how many people do we see suffering from the diseases of tension. We see it in industry; we see it in business; it is noticeable everywhere, in an age when we should be able to start thinking about relaxing a little if we are to get the benefits of automation and the technological revolution. How many people do we know that dread going to work every day, just hate to get up in the morning with the thought of going to work? And how many are wanting to retire because of the pressures and they can't because of these gratuitous types of pension schemes that say that you must stay until 65 if you are to get the benefit of a pension. I suggest there are far too many, Madam Speaker.

Now, historically, occupations were basically hereditary, from the caste system in India where a boy had if his father was a weaver then he inevitably had to be a weaver, or his father was a goldsmith or a merchant, the son most likely was the same. And up until 1930, we had very little freedom until then. And even then, in 1930, I can recall a son of a very affluent family in England wanting to become a mathematician and the family were quite horrified at that because they couldn't understand how anybody could possibly make a living, around the 1930's, by becoming a mathematician. And I suggest that to be a mathematician today is certainly to be desirable and one cannot visualize a person versed in mathematics without work. So you see, we have the gradual change of thought about such matters as education.

I think though, what we have to teach, Madam Speaker, is the ability to learn new things and to learn new things after one has left school. I think this is the important thing. Anyone graduating today with an M. D. soon realizes that if he is to keep up with things he must keep on learning. And I think this is much of the satisfaction in life; much of the job satisfaction we can attribute to this yen to keep on learning. It seems very clear that we need people today with systematic and pinpointed knowledge especially in the various disciplines. I was reading where one imaginative writer could foresee the day when even medical schools would become a thing of the past because of the need for specialized knowledge.

Madam Speaker, I think that we could go along with the Honourable Member for Assiniboia's amendment, but I would like him to clarify for me one point in it. I'll read it: "(a) the maximum of gain and the minimum of dislocation from automation requires the whole-hearted cooperation of government, organized labour and management." This we can go along with because, as I said, the resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan last year was

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd) . . . . much along these lines and it's very sensible. "(b) where a plant work force is to be reduced because of automation, the employees affected to be given notice of intent immediately, and at least six months, of the impending changes."

Well, Madam Speaker, in psychology we are taught to let people know well in advance of changes that are going to affect them. If you want to get along with people this is one of the things you have to do. This too we can go along with. We've been saying this for a long time. But (c) is the one that worries me. "(c) there be some flexibility in the interpretation of seniority and union jurisdiction." Now we hear much in this House about interfering in the internal management of trade unions. I'm not clear as to what my honourable friend has in mind when he talks about the "flexibility in the interpretation of seniority and union jurisdiction." And "(d) government to take the lead in making re-training programs available with the advice and co-operation of labour and management." This, too, we have been saying for a long time.

Madam Speaker, it seems so unnecessary for me to have to rise today to say the same things over and over again. Surely we have come to the point in this matter of automation where we realize that the government must be the catalyst in bringing labour and management together to discuss in a simple and honest way the future of people who are to be affected by automation; the need for re-training. I hoped that just because the resolution happened to come from this side of the House, I'd hoped to see the end of this when the government will rise and suggest such amendments which to my mind mean nothing and just delay the progress so much needed along the way of studying this important matter of automation. And with my qualifications I would support the amendment to the amendment, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

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

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, in the absence of my Leader, may we have this stand?

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

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, may I have the indulgence of the House to allow this motion to stand?

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

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I think one of the most important reasons why the people are leaving the Province of Manitoba is because of our low wages. If you look at our present minimum wage in Manitoba, which is 85 cents an hour, which at the Dominion Bureau of Statistics equals to 40.6 hours a week, gives us a weekly wage of \$34.51, and it's beyond me why anyone in this House would want to perpetuate a wage which is \$34.51 a week. This corresponds to a figure which was presented by the YMCA to the Minimum Wage Board in 1964, I believe, and I would like to just quote from that submission of the YMCA to the Minimum Wage Board in a summarized form with estimates as follows: "Room and Board, \$65.00 a month; health care, \$8.64; personal needs ranging from laundry, soap to cosmetics, \$6.59; clothing including dry-cleaning and repairs, \$24.37; recreation, including coffee breaks, cigarettes, \$15.57; miscellaneous including bus fares, charitable donations, gifts and vacations, \$18.33; income tax \$7.58; and unemployment insurance, \$2.36; makes it \$148.44 a month."

Madam Speaker, I don't think anyone can get by on a wage which I have just quoted from the submission which was presented by the YMCA to the Minimum Wage Board, which amounts to \$34.51 a week. I think it's time we have taken a good look at the minimum wage and not tried to perpetuate a wage that is not decent or proper income for anyone, and if I look at Hansard on Page 942, and just read what the Honourable Member for St. James had to say, he says: "The minimum wage is designed in order to help that worker who through no fault of his own, has not the skill and the ability to demand a higher wage. In other words, his fair wage is so low that we feel a man is entitled, by being employed, to get so much an

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . . hour. This is a minimum wage - a rock bottom wage."

Madam Speaker, I say why do we have to perpetuate this low minimum wage? Isn't it time that we re-trained the worker and increased his productivity so that he can receive a higher wage? I think this is what we have to do because the problem today is people are leaving Manitoba and we are short of labour in this province. I had a call the other day where a man in a large cotton firm cannot get people to unload freight and I think this is a serious situation, and the only reason he can't get people is because they can get higher wages somewhere else. The situation is what's taking place right across Canada today. It's a good indication that the wage scale is going to go up right across the country. For instance, in British Columbia where fair wages are much higher than ours, just the other week there was an agent from Seattle that came to the Coast and hired some 500 people, very highly skilled people, at much higher wages than they were getting in Vancouver and they have a pretty high wage scale. So as it can be seen, Madam Speaker, the present wage which we have at the moment, the minimum present wage, is very meagre. It's not even -- as I explained and used the hypothetical single girl who is supposed to exist on these wages. There's no provision for any savings; the health estimate is dangerously low; and the other figures are at best unreasonable. Yet what would be the lot of most married men if they had to live or exist on this type of wage? So I would say the answer is not "let's keep the minimum wage because we might displace some employees -- or employers." If the minimum wage is such an important thing, I don't think it is; I think it's management in some instances, and we cannot say that we should keep the minimum wage at \$34.00.

I'd say the present minimum wage is an insult to those who receive it and it could be clearly shown, and this has been -- and I would like to quote where it has been shown where the budget for the Winnipeg Public Welfare is listed, and their minimum or their welfare recipients get more than the people receiving on a minimum wage today. For instance, a family of three on the Winnipeg Welfare would receive 86 cents an hour, and a family of four, two small children, would receive 91.4 cents per hour; a family of four with two children under 15 would receive \$1.03 per hour, which goes up to two adults and five children would be somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$1.32 per hour. So this can be seen it's much more profitable for people to be on welfare than to receive the present minimum wage. This in itself is a good indication why the present minimum wage should be raised.

Now from the reports and the press clippings I have here, even people in the Senate have made a study of this and recommended to the government a minimum guaranteed wage for the retired people, and the wage that they suggested in here is, I believe, \$105.00 a month. This would also indicate that this is much higher than our minimum wage. For instance, if you take \$105.00 for two adults, which for 12 months is \$2,520.00, which amounts to \$1.27 per week. I mean the state today recognizes that this is the rock bottom the minimum should be, and here we're still trying to perpetuate and say the present wage should remain at 85 cents at the present level.

The Federal Government in its Labour Code established a minimum wage for industries under federal jurisdiction of \$1.25 an hour. In my opinion this is a realistic amount from the point of view of both employee and employer, and one which can promise the worker a certain measure of dignity and security in a country as rich as ours. A minimum wage of \$1.25 again using 40.6 hours work per week as a base, yields only \$50.75 income per week, and this surely doesn't sound like a fortune in today's wage scale.

Madam Speaker, a rise in the wage level will force structural readjustments in Manitoba economy, but the effects of these changes will be greatest upon the firms which probably are now most economical. Some may object that such an increase will be inflationary, but apart from economic . . . marginal firms the greatest effect of the wage increases will be in the area of commercial food services, especially the restaurants and similar service industries, so this would destroy much of these arguments because these industries typically are either exporters themselves for other services -- cost factors to the other firms in the Province of Manitoba. Any inflation is local and I am sure that a choice between lower prices in restaurants and a decent income for employees, Manitobans I'm sure would opt for a higher minimum wage.

I'd say our minimum wage is probably the lowest or one of the lowest of any province in Canada. It's 20 cents below that of Saskatchewan, or below Quebec; 30 cents below that of Ontario; and 68 cents below that of B. C. And I can't see how people can be encouraged to stay in Manitoba when the differential is so great between the provinces.

(MR. PATRICK cont'd).....

I don't believe that we can attract industry on this low minimum wage that we have in Manitoba because for the last ten years or so we have not attracted much industry here, and I believe quite recently one of the great woollen factories has made a study of locating in Manitoba - I believe it was Stanfield's - and have decided against coming to Winnipeg, so this is an indication as well that the low wages that are paid here in Manitoba is not attracting industry to our province.

Madam Speaker, I do not think that at the present time we would be ready to accept the \$1.50 which was proposed by the Honourable Member for Elmwood at this time, because I believe such level today would probably be unobtainable and it would also mean a very massive structural readjustment of Manitoba's industry, involving the majority of workers in the province, and it would also disrupt many of the present negotiated apprentices which are in force at the present time. I think this would be the most important reason, as there are many negotiated agreements presently in force, for instance with Hydro and Telephones, and with a change that great it would disrupt these industries. I also feel it's not justifiable to . . . one class to benefit another, especially in this area.

Madam Speaker, I understand the Honourable Member for St. James has also . . . with only in fact a very few people, but I think there's quite a number because at the present time I believe at 92 1/2¢ the present wage it would affect some 20,000 people according to the Departments of Labour, and as of December 1966 I believe it will affect about 55% of that amount which is somewhere in the neighborhood of 11,000 people.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Less than 5% at the present time.

MR. PATRICK: 5%; well it's still a considerable number, so I would say that it does affect a great number of people and we should not wait to increase the present minimum wage, because if you look, the City of Winnipeg has 3,950 employees directly on its payrolls today. There are 2,677 on the staff of Winnipeg School Division No. 1, or a total of 6,627 on city payrolls. The city's estimated payroll cost including that of its schools will reach somewhere between \$27 and \$29 million in 1966. To that sum must be added up something over \$2 million representing that portion of Metro's labour bill to be paid by the Winnipeg taxpayers. The total payroll bill for the City will therefore be in the neighborhood of \$30 million. It is important to note that the Winnipeg taxpayers on April 1st, or ten days hence, will be supporting a wage structure somewhere in the neighborhood of \$2.00 an hour, so I think that it's time that we have taken some action and increased our present minimum wage. This will not only I feel improve our labour situation, because if they can't get employed they'll have to get re-trained and increase their capabilities and productivity.

So Madam Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, that the resolution be amended as follows: (1) by striking out "the figure \$1.50" in the second line thereof and substituting therefor the "figure \$1.25." (2) by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph, "And be it further resolved that the minimum wage be reviewed at least every two years."

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Madam Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this minimum wage if I may. I have listened to my fellow member across the way from St. James, and I listened with great interest, but with growing concern, as the Member from St. James spoke on this resolution. It seemed the honourable member does not get the message that the Honourable Member from Elmwood has given.

We have given statistics through the years on prices and the various goods you could buy on the minimum wage. Now I listened to the Member from Assiniboia and he talked of \$1.25. I'm grateful to him for saying that, and I welcome what he has said on that thing, because it shows that we have people that are concerned with the various people that haven't got the wages that a lot of people have. I heard the Member from Assiniboia speak about the Winnipeg School Board and about the wages they had, but that doesn't go for all people like that. There are over maybe -- I would go easy by saying 75% of the people in Winnipeg that are earning, I'd say, around about \$1.65 to \$1.75 an hour. Now to live decently you would have to go up, Madam Speaker, in our estimation to \$1.50.

Now I want to say a few words about what was said by the Honourable Member from St. James on this matter, if I may. One thing he said was very true and bears repeating, that the correct direction for us to move in is to reduce the number of people we are trying to

(MR. HARRIS cont'd)... safeguard with a minimum wage, and I hope we can live long enough to see no need for a minimum wage. I agree with him wholeheartedly. In my estimation there should be no minimum wage board. This thing should be dealt with by this government, and have we no backbone that we can deal with these articles as they come up like this? We have to thrust them back to committee, we have to ask for a committee, we have to do this, we go down on our knees. My pants are getting holes in the knees already by going down, and it's not from praying.

He is right. The real answer is upgrading the entire working force, but that would take an awfully long time to do even if we had a government that was making a whole-hearted effort to do it, but we don't have that type of government, and I say it's time we got up on our hindlegs and showed the people of Manitoba that we are here to do something for them. But what do we do in the meantime? The Member for St. James said: "We should leave the poorly skilled worker in the state where he would either work horribly long hours to get enough money to live decently or he must live below the poverty level." Work it out for yourselves. If the poverty level for a family is \$3,000, and that's what ARDA says, then a man must work more than 44 hours a week, even at \$1.00 an hour, to make enough money to put himself above the poverty level; \$44.00 a week times 50 weeks equals \$2,200 a year.

The Member for St. James wonders why my friend from Elmwood fixed his figure at \$1.50 per hour. If you work that one over the same way, you will reach the figure of \$3,300 a year, just over the poverty level. That sounds a lot better from \$2,200 to \$3,300. I'm sure any man here would say, "By golly, which one would I grab?" I think it is fair to ask anyone who is thinking of running a business to pay his people enough that they don't have to live in poverty. What's wrong with that? People can get more from welfare than they can get under the minimum wage. My friend from Assiniboia just showed you that. He would give you a classic example all the way through and we have preached on this thing. We have gone and we have said this and we have said that; we even said we've gone down and bought hats for the wives and bought coats for the wives from these second-hand stores, just to try to live on a minimum wage. That has been brought up here through the years. That is a fine thing to be brought up I would think.

The Member for St. James said there were opportunities for a person to improve himself if he wanted to. Well, there are some but only enough that I can't call the honourable member a liar. He should look at the courses available in the technical schools he was talking about. I compare their entrance requirements to the amount of education the average person working on the minimum wage. Most people working on the minimum wage haven't got enough education to get inside the doors of the schools that the honourable member says they won't use, and that is true. You go along today - we have come today into the sixties. We can go back into the thirties and find out where were these people at that time that today are up in their fifties or so. They were out grubbing for a living. They had no time for education; they were trying to make that little penny; and you can remember, gentlemen, when you went out in those days and you bought a dozen eggs. What did you pay for a dozen eggs in those days? Yeah, thank you sir - five cents, yes, and when you went out on the labour market you got wages to correspond with that, and the poor farmer had to exist on the small amount of money he got for his eggs. The city man paid five cents for his eggs but what did the farmer get for them? Not very much.

Then the honourable member calls a person working on a minimum wage - and I'm quoting him, Page 943 of Hansard - he calls such a man "a marginal man." Now in my estimation that is a horrible expression. Robbie Burns said, "A man's a man for a' that," and do you know, I listen to these explanations here but I say to myself, we just mouth these phrases, that's all. We don't actually know the meaning behind them. We don't care for the meaning behind them. We are just like someone going down on their knees and saying a prayer. They are repeating something that they have known from childhood and it just runs through their mind and that's all. But I say, let's sit back and as I say, Robbie Burns was the people's poet of Scotland and he spoke for the people of Scotland, that's . . . . But I say he spoke the truth and he mentioned about the poor people in Scotland at that time, and by gosh we should take a lesson from his poetry, but are we doing that? He is right. Poor education and poor wages don't mean that one man is less deserving of consideration than another. The Honourable Member suggests in his speech that these marginal men should be grateful for what they are getting, take what their generous bosses give them and be grateful that someone as useless as they are are getting anything at all. The member didn't say that, but that is what his words seem to imply.

The Member for St. James also said the minimum wage doesn't become the maximum wage. I wish he'd tell me how a business man who pays decent wages can hope to compete with



(MR HARRIS cont'd)... a man in the same business who only pays the minimum. Last year I spoke on the Vacations with Pay Act and I talked with one of the members here and he told me about his business and how he tried to be fair and how these other people in the same kind of business were getting underneath the wire so that left him high and dry and he had to be as big a crook as they were.

So I would say Madam Speaker, and I emphasize again that it is up to this government; we don't need a Minimum Wage Board. If this is the way they're going to do things we want to go out and this government should say what the minimum wage should be like they are doing in Ottawa.

So I say let's put the minimum wage up to a level where all the workers in this province can live a decent life while they are waiting for the government to provide them with means for improving their skills. Thank you.

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, I would say a few words on the amendment brought in by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. I would like to say at the offset, Madam Speaker, that when I brought in this resolution I made it a \$1.50 an hour hoping that the people across the way there would have amended it themselves because they're always amending it and I didn't leave them a bunch of whereases and everything else to -- as I said before, emasculate around -- and to me getting my friends on my right here to come up to \$1.25 after just a few short years ago all of them voting against us when we brought in our minimum wages, or our resolutions on minimum wage. I'm quite happy to welcome them to the flock. Now if we can only goad these guys across the way - if they'll only move.

The Premier accused us on this side of having to be dragged, kicking and screeching and screaming into the 20th century. What have we got to do with you to goad you into, drag you kicking and screaming into the 20th century as far as the minimum wage is concerned? I told you in my opening remarks that the minimum becomes the maximum and the Honourable Minister of Labour knows this better than anyone else because he's had enough cases that his department has been dealing with. He knows it. Just let him review them. If he doesn't know it he sure should, because if he doesn't then he doesn't know what's going on in his department, because I've brought quite a few to the attention of his department. Madam Speaker, as I said, I'm glad that these fellows have at least wakened up. Now for goodness sakes let's hear something from that side or is all we're going to hear is what the Honourable Member for St. James said that we're just dealing with marginal people and that the minimum doesn't become the maximum? Come on, let's hear something from you.

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that I have other business that may engage the attention of the House I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Welfare, 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. The Honourable Minister of Welfare.

HON. J. B. CARROLL: Madam Chairman, I propose to make a very short contribution to this debate. First of all I would like to commend the Member for Logan for a very thoughtful presentation on his resolution asking the government to establish public day nurseries in communities in Manitoba where this service is warranted.

I would like to say first of all that certainly the need for this service in the metropolitan area has been well and ably demonstrated. I rather think though that the service is primarily needed in urban centres because this, generally speaking, is an urban problem. I think in most rural communities there's a much smaller problem with respect to getting people to look after children in this particular age category because of the fact that people are certainly much better known, their problems are better known, they can always call people in to sit during the day either in their own home or place the children out with friends during the period of time in which they have to be away to be at work.

So I think generally speaking we are looking at this as an urban problem, a problem in the rather large industrialized areas in our province - I think generally speaking it's pretty well limited to this area at the present time. As I said I think there is ample evidence that the need has been demonstrated here by virtue of the fact that there are several private agencies operating in this field. As I understand it there are four, there's the Day Nursery Centre operating at Stella and Broadway; the Joan of Arc Day Nursery on Jarvis Street and the St. Joseph's Day Nursery on Portage Avenue West near the Polo Park Shopping Centre. These are operated by

(MR. CARROLL cont'd). . . both private and religious agencies both of which - or at least all of which are supported by the United Way. The manner in which the service is given I understand is related to the need of those that apply for the service. They give priority to those cases where the mother is the sole support member of the family and requires employment to maintain her family. There's also the case of the other single parent family where the father is the sole support and of course cases where there is sickness or where there is demonstrated need by virtue of extremely low income. I understand that their contribution towards this service is based on the income that they receive from the work that is done during the time in which the children are left with the agency. It's safe to say that for some that this is an alternative to the seeking of public relief or assistance. The cost of day centre care can be paid by municipalities, and is indeed being paid by some municipalities today as a preventive service and to this extent they are reimbursed by the Province of Manitoba.

Unfortunately these payments are not shareable with the Government of Canada under the Unemployment Assistance Agreement. We have requested Ottawa to take this into account in the proposed changes in the Canada Assistance Plan as we understand that these changes will be made.

This as I say, can be a very important both rehabilitative or preventive program and to this extent our department is interested and to this extent we do support those who are taking advantage of the program and who make application through their municipalities and get this kind of assistance.

As far as expanding the service by government, I think we're not at all sure at this stage whether this is the role that we feel the government should play. After all, the private initiative operating in this field has already been well demonstrated and I believe they're performing a very high calibre and high standard of service for the people that they look after in these institutions.

As the House knows, we announced last year the support by the Government of Manitoba together with United Way and the Winnipeg Foundation of a study of the needs and resources of the community in the fields of health services, social welfare and in recreation. This study is proceeding at the present time; it's proceeding under the name of the Social Service Audit; it's examining the services provided both by public agencies and by private agencies, assessing the needs and the extent to which these are being met at the present time; the extent to which there may be duplication or overlapping or encroachment by one agency into the area of another. We would hope that before long they will be recommending with respect to how these services might best be strengthened and improved to the benefit of all people in this area and I think it would be entirely premature for us to embark upon a program of establishing day nurseries or even encouraging others to get into this field until the need has been established as the result of the present study that is underway.

And with that in mind, Madam Chairman, I would move, seconded by the Minister of Health, that the resolution be amended by striking out the word "therefore" in the 12th line thereof and adding the words - no, and all the words thereafter, and substituting the following: "WHEREAS the Manitoba Government is already providing financial support on the basis of need to mothers who find it necessary to place their children in day nurseries; AND WHEREAS a community survey of social welfare, health and recreational needs and resources recently established as a Social Service Audit will among other studies, consider the need for, the role and the responsibility for financing day nurseries and will be reporting on these and other matters; THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government at this time continue its present form of support for children in day nurseries.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

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

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

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, may this resolution stand?

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

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Speaker, I rise to speak on this question of allowing 18 year olds to vote in provincial elections and it's interesting that I went to the library the other day and I found a Votes and Proceedings of 1953 and I find out that this is nothing really new. What does surprise me is to see such a change of heart on the part of some of the members. Now I know that I said a few moments ago the need for adult education and the need to keep an open mind and to learn new things and I want to congratulate the Honourable Member for Lakeside and the Honourable Member for Selkirk for having changed their mind and going along with this because in 1953 they voted against it. But what does disturb me is that the Honourable the First Minister who voted for the resolution in 1953, when he was then a member of the Opposition, and since that time he has been expounding his theory of this youthful jet-age government, I'm a little disappointed to see that he has failed to keep up with his education.

It was all very well to show a pamphlet at the last election of a group of students - the picture was taken at the commencement exercises in the Seven Oaks School Division and it was interpreted as meaning that this government was a government of the young people. And here we see now a government that is opposing the giving of the vote to 18 year olds. And Madam Speaker, a committee of the Federal House even went on record as recommending it. What happened to it down there. I don't know, but it was recommended that 18 year olds be allowed to vote. So that the trend is today to certainly give more recognition to our young people.

The Honourable Member for Roblin, when he started off on his address, he said that if he seemed a little frivolous - I think he used the word - I quote; "Madam Speaker, if at times my speech seems to be a little frivolous, I want to assure you that it's not the subject matter itself that is causing this but possibly some of the arguments and the debate that's been used when this subject matter has been discussed." Then he went on to talk about the Honourable Member for Burrows and his family, and all this sort of thing. And he said that - "and I'd like to say first of all that a voting age is an arbitrary line that has to be drawn, and when we do this, we always have someone on the wrong side of the line." Well that's true. Where do you draw the line? Where do you draw the line sometimes between sanity and insanity? It's a pretty fine line. So I agree with him there.

But a little later on, Madam Speaker, he goes on to say: "I still can't draw the analogy here because quite often the requirements" -- and this is in regard to talking about the argument of fighting for ones country and this sort of thing -- he said: "I still can't draw the analogy here because quite often the requirements of the military service, particularly at the lower age level, is that physical development and maturity to be able to stand the rigours of the life, and enough maturity to be able to accept the discipline of the life. And I don't really see where these two matters are qualification to vote, as such." Well if he talks about having enough maturity to be able to stand the discipline of the life, I submit that he is arguing on our side. I think he is arguing with us.

However, I think that to use the argument that 18 year olds can drive cars today and they can do this and that, is not the real thing. I wonder sometimes though, if this government because the First Minister has certainly changed his opinion of giving young people the right to vote, whether this government is really afraid of youth. I know we hear today and we see on television a lot of unrest in the world, where we have demonstrations caused by university students here, there and all over the world. Perhaps this government isn't so youthful. Perhaps they are beginning to take the view of the old man who can only see young people as being mischievous. Perhaps they are afraid of some of the radical ideas of our young people today. Why don't they try it out? Why doesn't the First Minister back up the last battle cry of the last election, that this was a youthful government and to have his picture taken among all the young people and say, "We're on your side." I challenge him to do this.

I said a little while ago in another debate that the educated will work harder and that the uneducated will have more leisure, and surely today our young people are going to have more education, therefore they are going to have to work harder. And speaking about demonstrations by young people, perhaps it's because of the discontent, Madam Speaker. Even here in our classes, in Manitoba, we have had - well recently we had an election at the university and one of the members ran on the ticket that he would try to get one of the members on the Board of Governors - something that hasn't been done before. You had to be a graduate to become a member. Perhaps if we give them a vote, let them have a say, perhaps this will do much to

(MR. WRIGHT, cont'd) . . . subdue their boisterous spirits.

I can well remember something that sticks in my mind of pretty good psychology, I can remember in 1950 when I was a member of the West Kildonan Council I had some rather definite ideas about the flood of 1950 and I made them known to the government of that day; and the then Premier of the Province of Manitoba was very quick to subdue me because he said to me -- right then and there I was appointed as chairman of the Flood News Release Committee. And I have to admit that when I got on that committee and I started to see the problem from all sides, I wasn't altogether right either. But I think this is maybe the right approach. I think, Madam Speaker, that the ideals of youth are high. I am one that, I am not willing to admit that I have been a failure as a parent and I am willing to trust young people. I think if you keep telling them how inefficient they are and of all the things they can't do you are only inviting trouble. I don't think it's a matter of boasting of the accomplishments of youth, or anything like this; I think it's a matter of our confidence in them. I have worked with apprentices in industry and quite successfully. I have found out that while you can disagree with many of the things they do, you must never dislike the people that do those things. And I think that when we turn down the right to vote by our young people we are doing just that. We are showing a lack of confidence in them. It has been argued that many young people don't want a vote. That's fine. We have many mature people that don't want a vote. You only have to take a look at some of our school referendums to find that out. But at least they have the right. And I am arguing for the right of young people to do it. Whether they want to use it or not is up to them.

Last week, I think there were 180 students from the Seven Oaks School Division here and I appreciate the courtesy of the guides in assembling them in a large room and allowing me to speak briefly to them. I was amazed at some of the mature questions that they put to me, because I wanted to ask them questions to see what -- they are looking out on a very complex world, Madam Speaker, and to be a teen-ager today is not -- I don't think it's the joyous time we had when we were teen-agers. It's certainly a tough time for them. I think that the education that they are getting today is preparing them for it. I think that we owe it to them to trust them, to let them see -- I think it means more to them, Madam Speaker, for us to tell them we trust you and there it is; if you want to use it, it's there available for you. And I am afraid that they will show a lot of the mature voters of this province that they are -- through the study of physics and through their interest, and as I interpret it today, I think we are making a big mistake in not allowing them this right; and I think the government is too, because we are not going to forget that this government called itself a youthful government, made a great pitch to the young people of this province and the First Minister who voted for it in 1953 when he was a member of the opposition, now stands up and argues against it. Madam Speaker, I appeal to the House to support the resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

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

WHEREAS the greatest possible understanding, co-operation, goodwill and prosperity in and between the nations of the world is highly desirable; and

WHEREAS world trade and world travel are conducive to such understanding, co-operation and goodwill and at the same time add to the prosperity and standard of living of the people concerned; and

WHEREAS world trade and world travel are facilitated by as great uniformity as possible in matters affecting trade and travel; and

WHEREAS the United Kingdom, United States and Canada are great trading nations, whose citizens travel extensively; and

WHEREAS France, Germany, Italy, Russia, India, China, Japan, the Benelux and Scandinavian countries, and many others, are also great trading areas with large travelling publics; all of which countries have adopted the metric system of weights and measures; and

WHEREAS the United Kingdom has recently officially adopted the metric system and announced its intention of converting to it over the period of a few years; and

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) . . . .

WHEREAS all Canadians recognize the advantage of the United Kingdom, United States and Canada working closely together in economic and social matters; and

WHEREAS the United States and Canada already legalize and to some extent use the metric system and have both recently conducted inquiries into the advisability of officially adopting this system; and

WHEREAS official adoption of the metric system by the United States and Canada would facilitate trade and travel among these nations, areas and peoples who already officially use that system;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House recommend to the Government of Canada that it endorse the principle of the metric system of weights and measurement and seek an early opportunity of discussing with the Government of the United States the advisability of both countries officially adopting that system, with the intention of converting to it over a period of time to be agreed upon.

MADAM SPEAKER moved by the honourable Member for Lakeside . . . . .

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): . . . . . would wish to dispense with the second reading?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I will assure the House that my remarks on this resolution are not going to be exactly proportionate to the length of the resolution. Some of the members will remember that I introduced a similar motion two years ago. That motion, after being very briefly debated, was negated by this House. I was sorry to see both the lack of interest in the motion and the decision of the House as well. I don't know why it should have been negated at that time, because I think this is a very important resolution. But of course it's up to the House to do what they think is right with any of these resolutions. Some people would say that this is not our business. I think it is our business to quite an extent. I think we are vitally interested here in each one of the prairie provinces, I think we are vitally interested in trade matters in general. We are mighty interested in the recent year's wheat sales to China and to Russia and to other countries. My guess is, that although there are not by any means a major factor, that if we were talking in the same terms of weights and measures that it would have had a little effect in the negotiations that were carried on with regard even to those particular deals.

To the members who would say that this is a similar resolution to the one of two years ago, I point out that there is one difference, and it's a difference that I think is especially significant, because the United Kingdom has been moved from one side of the equation here to the other. Before the United Kingdom was one of the countries that I was suggesting should be taken into consultation along with United States and Canada; but now the United Kingdom has already made its decision to officially adopt the metric system. And for my honourable friends, and only one of them, I think is in the House at the moment, who objected to the cost and the difficulty of adopting the metric system two years ago, I would suggest to them that the United Kingdom has certainly had to face that problem too; and the fact that they are well aware of it, is pointed up by the fact that they are taking a period of years to convert to the system.

I am sure that I don't need to document the fact that that change has been officially decided upon by the United Kingdom. I have a report here from the Tribune of May 25, 1965 which mentions the fact, and I quote from it: "Concluding that such countries as Canada and the United States are out of step in the basic field of weights and measures, Britain has decided to go along with Continental Europe and most other countries, in switching gradually to the metric system." And I skip a few paragraphs to read this: "Britain also has been toying from time to time with the idea of switching its currency from pounds, shilling and pence to the decimal system, but there is no indication that the switch to metres will speed a coinage change. Vending machine operators maintain there is too much cost involved." Well, that is what was said about industry with regard to the metric system - that the cost involved was too great. The fact is that the different countries that have adopted this system have had to face that problem and have decided that notwithstanding the admitted difficulty and huge expense that the change is worthwhile. And it is interesting in that connection, Madam Speaker, to notice that the United Kingdom is still looking very closely, if it has not indeed decided, to change to the decimal system of coinage. I haven't been able to find out for sure whether the decision has been taken but definitely they have been looking at it very carefully

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) . . . and I would think the fact that New Zealand and Australia have both definitely decided to do so will be a point very much in favour of the United Kingdom adopting that system as well.

Now once again, I am not going to inflict upon the House a discussion of the merits of the metric system. I think it is generally admitted that it is just as much better than the present system that we use, as the decimal system of coinage is better than the pounds, shilling and pence and some other currency and coinages that prevail around the world.

Certainly there's difficulties; certainly there's expense in making these changes, but those difficulties and expenses do not diminish as time goes on and to agree with the statement that the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks made a little time ago, we are Madam Speaker, becoming more and more cognizant of the position of the other people around the world. We are becoming, in spite of the difficulties that exist, we are moving toward being one world; if not in ideology and if not in some other vital respects, at least with regard to trade and travel and many things that are exerting a profound influence toward making people better acquainted. And I think this is one of the great needs of these times. So these other countries have decided that it's the right thing to do.

The ones of use who would wish to argue that Russia and China are in a lot of respects a way behind what Canada is, must pay some attention to what the United Kingdom spokesmen have suggested that Canada is behind the rest of the world so far as this program is concerned. All this resolution is asking is simply that this Legislative Assembly of Manitoba take cognizance of what is happening in the rest of the world; what has recently happened in the United Kingdom and say to the Government of Canada that we would think it was a good idea for them to step up their negotiations with United States in this regard. Both United States and Canada have been conducting investigations; both on their own have paid a lot of attention to this question. They're certainly familiar with it; there's no lack of information; they certainly are aware of the difficulties that it entails and they will be aware of the expense and there's no question that those are immense problems. But they will get worse as time goes on, not better.

I quoted two years ago several examples of what failing to do these at the beginning or at an earlier time have cost some areas. The only one I will reiterate today is the experience of the Ontario Hydro. When they decided eventually, and it was a tough decision for them to take, to change from the 25 cycle electrical system that they had in that province to the 60 cycle, the estimate is that it cost Ontario Hydro itself \$350 million in addition to what it cost industry throughout that province. And this is a cost that does not get less as time goes on.

The Honourable Member for Brandon was the only one of the government forces that paid this resolution two years ago, the compliment of speaking on it and I appreciated the remarks that he made because he's a man who has a good deal of technical ability as well as practical experience and he certainly raised some valid objections or rather some valid points for consideration as to difficulty, and cost and dislocation in many cases. Anyone who wants to read the arguments against this resolution would be well advised to check on what the Honourable Member for Brandon said two years ago. But I still maintain that the fact is that in the end this will be done, and the end won't be too far away, so I would think it's good policy for us to be paying some attention to it now.

Not all of the people of my honourable friend from Brandon's political philosophy take the same position as he has taken, because I hold in my hand a clipping from the Free Press of November 5, 1964 that relates how "a Conservative M. P. for Kindersley said in the Commons Wednesday that Canada will have to switch to the metric system of weights and measures sooner or later and preparations should start now." I want to agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Reg. Cantelon who made that statement. Mr. Cantelon, to read again from this newspaper clipping, "Mr. Cantelon, a 62 year old former school principal from Unity, Saskatchewan, said the foot-pound system is old hat and a handicap to scientists, students and consumers." Now I know that our friends in this province are not constrained to go along with their federal counterparts but I just want to give them that encouragement that at least they will have some people of like mind who are agreeing with this.

I agree with Mr. Cantelon that the scientific people are ahead of the rest of us in this regard. Members who have been sitting on the Public Utilities Committee will be noticing that when the discussions are taking place now about capacities of the various power plants and the distribution system, that you haven't often, if at all, in those protracted discussions that we've had, heard the expression "horsepower". It's only a few years ago, only a few years

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd) . . . ago that the discussion about the power ratings of these various hydro plants were spoken of here in this Chamber and generally in horsepower. Not any more. They're talking about kilowatts and megawatts; and as the Honourable Member for Burrows pointed out two years ago the scientific people, the electrical industry, the newer industries generally, are adopting this system, one hundred percent. And isn't that a good argument by itself, Madam Speaker, that inasmuch as the newer industries the scientific industries, the technical industries are the ones that are adopting it as the world language, that some of the others of us should follow their lead?

Well, as I promised, Madam Speaker, I do not intend to take as much time as I have on the other occasion to discuss this resolution. I would hope that some others will see fit to pay some attention to it. I think it's worthwhile. I don't suppose that the present government will pay too great attention to the fact that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba makes a recommendation to them as to what they should do in this regard, but they're looking at it anyway; they have had capable committees studying it and I would think that just the mere fact that one of the Legislative Assembly shows enough interest in it to recommend their concerted attention to it, might be helpful. I'm certain that the United States doesn't need either Manitoba or Canada to tell them what they should be doing, but I'm equally certain that they wouldn't mind being reminded from this country who is their respected neighbour, that we're looking at it too and have a feeling that we should continue to keep in step with what the United Kingdom is doing to whom we are so closely allied in so many ways, and yet want to see that we don't get too far out of step with our other Anglo-Saxon neighbours.

Now it's possible that the present government of Manitoba will be more willing to give good advice to the present government at Ottawa than they were inclined to do to the government that preceded them. They might have thought that a few years ago that the government didn't need very much advice down there. I'm sure they would agree that the present government could benefit by advice and I'd be inclined to go along with that suggestion myself. But whatever the feelings of individuals or parties on this particular question, I suggest to the Members of this House, Madam Speaker, that the ones of us who support it now are the ones who will be getting into step with and keeping up with the times rather than holding back. So I urge an active consideration of this question by Members of the House and I trust that having had two years to think the question over -- my honourable friends perhaps require quite a bit of time to think over such a weighty question as this -- and having the example of the United Kingdom before them and the fact that one of their colleagues in Ottawa is already urging this system, that likely they will be inclined to give it more favourable consideration than they did two years ago.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Madam Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, in his absence may we have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand, unless somebody else wishes to speak.

MADAM SPEAKER: Any other member wishing to speak? Agreed to stand. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, when I adjourned this debate the other day the Minister of Public Works had not at that time given us the statement that he has since then stating that maps will be supplied to us indicating the, not exactly the traffic counts but give us an indication of what the traffic is on most of these roads. Therefore at this time I would be ready to let this motion go to a vote unless somebody else wants to speak on it.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Ste. Rose, that WHEREAS there has been recent dissemination in Manitoba and Canada of propaganda which incites contempt and hatred against racial and religious groups; AND WHEREAS such poisonous material can be harmful to the continued good relations amongst Canadian of all cultural, racial and religious backgrounds; AND WHEREAS there are no legislative provisions to prevent this; BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House advise the Minister of Justice at Ottawa and all Manitoba Members of Parliament of our deep concern in this regard and strongly urges that appropriate Federal legislation may be enacted to make such dissemination criminally punishable subject to the provision of safeguards for comments made in good faith on controversial issues which are in the public interest, consonant with the time-honoured principle of free speech.

MADAM SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for St. John's, seconded by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition . . . . --(Interjection) -- The Honourable the Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, you will note that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition has indicated that he would second the resolution. I might say for the information of the House that before I gave notice of it, I also discussed the resolution with the Honourable the First Minister. I'm sorry he's not here, as indeed I imagine he too is sorry not to be here for this occasion. He indicated to me his complete support and authorized me to make this statement in the House for the information of members. I hope that we can deal with this resolution today and I hope that we can pass it unanimously. It deals with material which is of a nature which invites contempt and hatred. I am sure that as public representatives, we have all received material of this type or at least, have seen it. I have samples of the type of material used but I have decided that I would not dirty the record of this house by reading it to the house and I will assume that people know the type of material about which I am speaking. It is material which attempts to set one citizen against another, based on prejudice and bigotry, based on ignorance. It appeals to the ignorant and not only that, but the nature of it is such that causes mental anguish to those who have suffered and who are reminded both of what they have gone through and also what they fear may yet happen. We have had examples in our own lifetime of the development of hate literature and the use to which it has been put and that too, I think need not be dwelt on.

I think we are all aware of peoples' prejudices against which we cannot legislate and yet in the educational process that must go on in our form of democracy we must realize that there is fuel given to many when they get information of this type presented in a form which is readable and acceptable to those who are not educated sufficiently or sophisticated sufficiently to see it for what it really is. I point out that there is legislation in the criminal code against blasphemous liable. There is in the criminal code provision for dealing with defamatory liable against persons; crime comics are dealt with in the criminal code; obscene matter, which deals with the undue exploitation of sex, crime, horror, cruelty and violence; they are dealt with, but there is no legislation on the books dealing with the dissemination of hate literature.

This matter was recently considered in the Ontario legislature and aroused quite a bit of debate and resulted in an unanimous vote in support of a resolution, or two resolutions actually, similar in intent to the one before us today. Its purpose is to express to the Parliament of Canada our point of view as citizens of Manitoba and of Canada and it indicates that we leave the responsibility where it belongs which is in the hands of the Federal Parliament as a matter of criminal nature.

Now I said earlier, and I will say again now that you cannot legislate understanding between peoples, but you can and should in law, express a point of view; and you can punish an overt act, an attempt to break down the feelings as between citizens; but the important thing that I am sure that the Parliament of Canada will have to consider is that any legislation brought forth must not infringe on the principle of fair comment and of free speech. That is paramount; that is of the utmost importance. I would point out that this resolution does not suggest censorship. It suggest only a reference to the Courts to assess the nature of the material and decide as to whether or not it infringes with what the people of Canada would consider abhorrent to them and infringes against the principles which the people of Canada hold dear. I point out that there is a difference between freedom and license and when the right of freedom of speech is abused, then there should be sanctions imposed by society.

I don't want to deal with this further, Madam Speaker. I would however, quote a sentence from the final address in the Legislature of Ontario, dealing with hate literature. The



(MR. CHERNIACK, con't) . . . concluding remarks were of the Prime Minister of Ontario, the Hon. J. P. Robarts, who said "I think we are trying to indicate a basic attitude that we have and I think what we are trying to do is to go on record as being unalterably opposed to this type of activity". I invite members of this House to agree with this statement.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wish to thank the Honourable the Member for St. John's for having associated me as the seconder of this resolution. We had been preparing a resolution somewhat along the same lines. It came to the attention of the Honourable Member for St. John's and in view of what had happened in the Province of Ontario where two resolutions appeared on the Order Paper - he had a resolution ready and suggested to me that possibly we could associate ourselves with the same resolution which seemed to me to be a very sound thing to do and I appreciate his courtesy in asking me to second this resolution.

I think that probably all legislators would much prefer that there were no need for laws on these subjects and would prefer to see questions of human rights so deeply ingrained in everyone that it would not be necessary to put them down in writing. It is unfortunate however, that there are people who apparently do not share with the rest, and certainly the majority of people, the majority of Canadians, that understanding that is so desirable. I think it is therefore something that we have to look very directly at and where it is found that there are in fact some people who are prepared to do harmful things to our society, who are prepared to attack unfairly certain groups in our society, who are prepared to take action which is detrimental to the understanding between the various groups in Canada, that we do take the action to protect those who could be adversely affected. This is the final analysis will be to the advantage of all Canadians.

I think that we here in Manitoba are in a particularly good position to speak to the rest of Canada. Of all the provinces in Canada we are the one that has the most diversity in our population. People have come here from every land. In the early days, I think it is fair to say that our population ended up in isolated pockets. We had little groups from various lands in different corners of our province. When my own people came here for example, they spoke no English. They landed here as immigrants. They asked the colonization people where should we go? They were told, well there are French groups over in that corner of the province why don't you go there. And so they ended up there in a little pocket of French population. Others coming from other lands were faced I'm sure with the same situation, they were told, well there's a grouping of Icelandic people there, in such and such a corner, why don't you go there; and the Ukrainian people ended up the same way. And undoubtedly during that period when we lived in isolated pockets there was a tendency on the part of some people to maybe look askance at some of the other racial groups who lived 20 or 30 miles down the road to maybe not understand completely the attitudes of people, the fact that they looked upon things differently, they had different points of view, they had different customs, and maybe we weren't always ready to accept these differences. But I have found that as time has gone on and as we have moved around and as the various groups have had a chance to rub shoulders with one another, as our children have gone on to schools, where we have mixed from the standpoint of socially and in business, politically, that there's really very little difference between the various people - that in the final analysis whether we pronounce the language in one way or have a slight accent in another, whether we celebrate different feasts, different occasions, whether our background is different, that really our intentions, our hopes, our desires for ourselves, for Manitoba, and for Canada, are not very different.

I think that this is particularly true here in the Province of Manitoba. Being still a fairly young province, having benefitted much more from the new immigration than have the older provinces in Canada, I think we are in an ideal position to speak to the rest of Canada. I think we have an example to provide to Canada as a whole. I'm proud to be a Manitoban, proud to be of a different basic root and yet a part of the whole structure of this country; proud to be able to contribute whatever I can to making it a better province and a better country; and it hurts when you see some of the literature that has been disseminated in this country, for surely the only purpose but to hurt. It cannot in any way help the understanding between groups. It cannot in any way help improving our country. It cannot do any earthly good, yet it's done. On the other hand, none of us want to get into the position where by law we are doing anything that will prevent free speech. But what can we do when we are faced with that sort of a situation where some people take advantage of that free speech to harm the Canadian fabric. It is for this reason that, with all the reluctance and the desire of having this done as we have done here in Manitoba by understanding and by meeting and by rubbing

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd) . . . shoulders together; preferring that course and yet realizing that apparently some are not prepared to follow that course, that I think we have to take the steps necessary to protect our people, those who could be hurt, by unfair tax of this nature.

So Madam Speaker, I second this resolution. I hope that we will never have to invoke the legislative sanction which it proposes. I hope that we can instead by understanding, proceed to eradicate any of these improper practices; I hope that in this way all of us will be able to continue to live as good Canadians together and improve, wherever we can, the understanding between people here in this country and across the face of this earth.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, perhaps I may be allowed to add a word, however inadequately, to indicate support of this motion. I am sure to take a theme so great as this and so important in today's world, not only in other countries as we so often think but I am sure in this country as well, would take deep thought and powers beyond my own. So I think it would be right at this time to indicate in the strongest possible terms the support that all right-thinking people have for this motion.

It would be my wish to thank the Honourable Member for St. John's for introducing the motion and bringing up the question. I am sure it's right for a Legislative Assembly to stop and consider the matters of highest concern to men, whether they be of immediate practical importance or not; whether they be a measure for immediate action or not; but to stop and turn our minds then to the higher values for which we are responsible for which we are the highest authority in each of our jurisdictions and are responsible in that way. So I think it is a right thing indeed that he has brought it up. And it gives us an opportunity, as I listen to the debate, to consider how much we have in common. We have one of the Jewish faith and race proposing a motion; it is supported in the strongest possible terms by my honourable friend representing French-Canada; and I have permitted myself the honour of trying to say on behalf of those of my racial background how deeply we feel a motion of this kind; and surely that is symbolic, that all of us leap at once in support of a motion of this kind showing the general the support that it has, I think, among all Canadians.

It should serve as an inspiration for us as we move forward to realize that the Canadian people at heart have these ideals and that they hold them strongly and at times in the past, and I'm sure in the future, if it became necessary, would take whatever measures were necessary to defend them; and to defend them strongly.

We mustn't think - I think the importance of this motion today may well turn on this point - that we mustn't think, and must never allow ourselves to think that things which have happened in other parts of the world can't happen here, because they can. I am sure the power of the mass media of communication in these days and the arts of communication and of propaganda and of advertising, are of such strength that used by evil men they can achieve astonishing results if they are allowed to go by default. I believe that bringing forward the motion today will refresh in our minds the importance of being everlastingly alert to the appearance of any of these evil tendencies in our own country and to take action at once when we do see them arise.

And so, in such a few words and so inadequately, I would like to express our thanks to the Honourable Members who have introduced this motion, to both of them, for having done so, and to lend our strongest possible support to the motion.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE Q.C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, about two years ago now at the Dominion Convention of the Royal Canadian Legion held in Winnipeg, I had the honour to introduce a resolution, almost word for word with this one, because that was at the time when hate literature first became evident in this country, and because I felt that this was a problem which deserved the attention of the Royal Canadian Legion, and that resolution passed by that body which is known as the Parliament of the Veterans of Canada, almost unanimously. And at that time I can remember one of the members of that convention who spoke who indicated that the worst thing about hate literature was the fact that it encouraged prejudice in the minds of people who accepted what was written as being true. And when you look at the question of prejudice, I'm sure we all agree that this is something we acquire, it's not something which is hereditary, but is something that we acquire as we gain our experience here in this life.

In his book, *The Source*, James A. Michener, told an interesting story, right in the first chapter of it, of an archaeologist on a ship approaching the shores of Israel. The steward approached the passenger and suggested that if he wanted to see Israel in its best light he should

(MR. SMELLIE, cont'd) . . . come on deck in the early morning just before the ship docked and see the sunrise come up over the land of Israel as the ship approached the docks. And he did this, and as he stood on the deck and they were approaching the shore, one of the things that stood out to him were the homes, the churches or the mosques, the homes of three different religions. And this gentleman who was an American of Irish descent thought to himself, isn't this remarkable, that the Jews who were denied freedom by all are the people that would grant freedom to everyone.

I too had the opportunity to visit that country last year and I was impressed by the spirit of freedom that one can find in that country and the tolerance of people, particularly of other beliefs. And yet, even in that country, one can find evidence of prejudice. I remember visiting a small museum near the place where the person in the story of Micherner's approached the shores of Israel and this small museum was dedicated solely to relics and pictures of the concentration camps where the Jewish people had suffered in Europe during the Second World War. I visited that museum in the company of a mixed group of people, some were Christians, some were Jews, at least one was of Arabic origin, and I heard several people say as we came out of there, "That was a depressing place." What is really the point of such a museum, because it only encourages prejudice in people who never had to suffer that sort of thing. The people who were there will remember; they don't need anything to remind them. And surely, this country would be better off without that sort of a museum which only encourages in others who didn't have to suffer the prejudice against those of another race, for acts long past.

I believe, Madam Speaker, that the hate literature that we have seen in this country is the same sort of thing; it's the kind of thing we can well do without in this country; that prejudice against people because of race or creed or religion is something we don't need any part of.

I too, would like to say a word of appreciation to the mover and the seconder of this resolution, it will give us the opportunity to, as a body, express our opinion so that perhaps action can be accomplished on this matter and so that Canada can in fact be a better place for all Canadians, regardless of race or creed or religion, and so that we can do what we can, to limit the prejudice that may be found among Canadians everywhere.

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

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James) presented Bill No. 43 - an Act for the Relief of Helen Radclyffe and Edward Frank Radclyffe, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. STANES: Madam Speaker, you will recall that a similar bill was before this House two years ago and at that time it was defeated in committee at third reading. I have felt ever since that time that the blame largely for that defeat should go to myself because apparently I did not explain the bill and make myself completely clear.

It is unfortunate, I think that this particular bill and the subject matter contained in the bill, should have been subject to so much pressure both inside and outside this House, to individuals and groups, because I feel that by that pressure it has tended to bring more heat than light. Madam Speaker, I am sure that every member of this House has the deepest sympathy for the plaintiffs, Mr. and Mrs. Radclyffe, in this matter. I think this goes without any more ado. Therefore I would try in the few minutes available to me, Madam Speaker, to state the facts as they are, clearly, precisely, so that there may be no misunderstanding in this matter. Before doing so, Madam Speaker, I would like to make it completely clear that I bring this matter, similar to the one two years ago, before this House because I believe in the principle contained, I believe in the method suggested in the bill, not only for this case but other cases. I am under no pressure whatsoever in bringing this bill here; I do so of my own free will because I believe in it. I'd also like to state, Madam Speaker, that if there are any members who are not quite certain of the history of it, I have a few copies of a brief history here, which is available for those.

Madam Speaker, it's often been said - was said in reading over the speeches two years ago that we cannot take this step -- oh by the way, I should perhaps go over the subject of the bill, Madam Speaker, before I go into that detail. The bill states that, if it is passed, this matter may go to a judge who will decide whether it shall go before a court for adjudication. I think when the matter was being discussed two years ago, Madam Speaker, there was a feeling among some members that we were judging this case. I am probably as familiar as any of the case and I'm in no position to judge it. We are merely saying that this case is unusual, it is a hard case, that by this bill we permit it to go to a judge who will decide, and I think he's

(MR. STANES, cont'd) . . . better equipped than anyone to decide if this matter be allowed to go before the Court. I hope I have made myself adequately clear in that matter.

Now there are several who said two years ago that we cannot do this. I'd like to say, Madam Speaker, that there are a number of precedents which we can look to. Firstly, there are other jurisdictions that permit this - several; a recent one in England where it becomes automatic and does not go before a political body. Secondly, we have had a number of bills of this kind. I think I have had three in the few years I have been in this House which have been passed by this House just after a brief explanation, the explanation being making sure that those people had no chance to take action prior to the date they did take action. One cannot take action on a matter until firstly you know of it. Having been certain of that case, and this is the point I think in this bill, we have passed many bills in the past. I believe we have, Madam Speaker, one already before us this Session.

Also, I find it very interesting, Madam Speaker, because in The Workmen's Compensation Act on Page 42 it reads, section 80 (a) "Where in the opinion of the Board an injustice would result unless an enlargement of the time prescribed by any section of this Act or by any regulation for the making of any application, the taking of any proceedings or the doing of any other act is granted, the Board may enlarge the time so prescribed and the enlargement may be granted either before or after the expiration of the time prescribed in this Act or any regulation." Precisely and exactly what this Bill is asking for, Madam Speaker.

I don't wish to take up the time of the House, Madam Speaker, in going over the history which I think is familiar to all of us, but just to remind ourselves I'd just like to say that in November, '59, the first surgery was performed which was a stone in the kidney. I beg your pardon, Madam Speaker, in 1944 there was an operation on Mrs. Radclyffe for removal of a stone in the kidney - 1944. I knew them after that date. Surgery was performed in 1959 for a minor operation affecting that same kidney. After that operation the wound did not heal. There was exploratory operations in April 1960 and November 1960, trying to discover the reason why the wound of the operation 1959 did not heal. After major surgery in May 1961, which the doctor decided to do, the gauze was discovered. After that date the wound healed. A Statement of Claim was filed in January 15, 1962, within the limitations of actions, immediately the plaintiff was able - had the information to take action. So I think that proves positive that the plaintiff in this case could not have taken action beforehand.

So, Madam Speaker, to put the whole bill in a nutshell, all we are saying in this particular case, could the person have taken action through the courts prior to that time, and the answer surely is no. The next question is "When was that swab left?" I don't know. Apparently it's not possible to prove. The plaintiff has to prove that it was left in the more recent operation. This apparently is not possible to do. This does not indicate, necessarily, that it was left in the earlier operation but it just means that it is not absolutely possible to prove either way.

We have heard, Madam Speaker, that by passing such an Act as this, it would set a precedent which we would regret in the future. I submit, Madam Speaker, we have already set that precedent, and quite rightly. If a person feels they have been wronged, the right thing to do is to put it with those who are qualified, trained to look into this matter. If the judge looking into this matter feels that circumstances which may or may not occur to us, because of the circumstances, it should not be allowed to go to court, this is his decision. Then the plaintiff feels satisfied they have had their opportunity.

It's also been suggested that because of the medical profession and the difficulty of their art, that we should perhaps protect them. I'd like to, I won't read the speech, Madam Speaker, but the Honourable Minister of Education stated quite clearly during the debate two years ago, and I think quite rightly, that the medical profession do not require and do not ask for any special protection. All they ask is that there may be laws which may be applied equally to all concerned. I agree. This is what I'm trying to get.

It's also been stated that to pass such a bill would be dangerous and a shattering precedent and would be damaging to the doctors involved. Madam Speaker, I submit that what has happened is most damaging to the doctors and whereas I have the greatest sympathy for the Radclyffes in this case, I also, have the greatest sympathy for the doctors, that if a procedure I submit that if a procedure had been available along the lines that I suggest, which have been indicated on several occasions by the Honourable the Attorney-General, and he's indicated he's in favour of that type of procedure - at least he gives me that impression - if such a thing had been in being at that time I'm absolutely certain that this matter would have been settled

(MR. STANES, cont'd) . . . soon after it came to light without any more damage to the Radclyffe family and without any damage to the doctors.

Madam Speaker, I am not influenced in bringing this matter before this Assembly for any friendships. I would do the same for someone I didn't know or I didn't like. It's a principle here and I think a very important principle. I also believe that the change included as part of this bill should be adopted as a regular matter and should not come - these things should not come before a political body. I see no dangers. I trust the courts. I feel the court's the right place to put this. All we have to decide: Is this a hard case? Could they have taken the decision earlier? If not, treat it the same way as they treated others and be fair to both parties, the medical profession and the plaintiffs and other plaintiffs that might come along.

Madam Speaker, I'd like to mention that the plaintiff, Mr. Radclyffe himself will be presenting the case in Committee at Law Amendments. He is very anxious to state his case as he knows it, as only he can state it, so I would earnestly recommend the passing of the bill for second reading in order that we may have the advantage and pay the respect to Mr. Radclyffe to hear his case. I do earnestly request your support for this bill.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 51, An Act to Incorporate the Rabbi Kravetz Foundation for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, this is a Bill to incorporate an educational and charitable foundation and it is similar to other foundations that have been incorporated by this House in the past. It is dedicated to a man who was instrumental in helping with education in this community for many years. He was instrumental in the founding of the Joseph Wolinski Collegiate in Winnipeg and the Winnipeg Hebrew School System. The Foundation is set up to perpetuate the memory of Rabbi Kravetz and it would help needy children in the future as Rabbi Kravetz helped others in the past.

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

MR. STANES presented Bill No. 65, An Act to amend An Act to incorporate the Trafalgar Savings Corporation for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. STANES: Madam Speaker, members will recall that The Trafalgar Savings Corporation was incorporated by an Act of the Legislature, 1961. Since that date they have had a number of financing problems and they've had a number of extensions. When I was asked to bring in a bill this time for an additional extension I must admit that I was somewhat reluctant. However, I did get an explanation which I have permission to read, and with your permission Madam Speaker, I'd like to read it and if required table the letter. It's from their lawyers and it states: "This company was incorporated under special Act of the Legislature, 1961. The company subsequently had two years in which to commence business but because of protracted negotiations for its financing, involving an underwriting company and a national bank, it was necessary to obtain an extension by Order-in-Council in 1963 to 1964 and also necessary to increase the capitalization and to change the name. It was not possible to complete these matters within the three year term and therefore an Act of the Legislature extending the time for commencement of business of the company was sought for and obtained in 1964. Heavy financial commitments of the Spivak group and the Portigal group at that time which have continued through until this year, prevented them from placing this company the minimum of \$250,000 which the company must have in order to be registered and ready to commence its business.

The Portigals have become involved in the sale of their finance and acceptance company to a international organization known as Walter E. Heller and the Spivaks were compelled therefore to find new associates and make arrangements to continue on their own. They have endeavoured to do so during '64-65 but because of a delay in the realization of funds to them from other investment projects they were not able to proceed within the time limited. When in 1965 they sought to proceed with the matter the financial upheaval which is a consequence of The Atlantic Acceptance Bankruptcy made it impossible to obtain the participation of other financial institutions and banks in this project at that time. The provisional directors were

(MR. STANES, cont'd) . . . . therefore left with the necessity of providing the money from their own resources to proceed with this company and have now been successful in making those arrangements but it will not be possible for them to have them completed and the registration of the company effective within the time limited by the present Act. We are therefore asking that the Act be extended for one further year only during which time they will be able to show to the Provincial Secretary's office a fully paid in capital of not less than \$200,000 and subscriptions which will, on call, yield not less than \$250,000 in accordance with the requirements of The Companies Act. "

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

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