

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Friday, February 10, 1967

MR. SPEAKER: If I may take a moment and direct the attention of the members to the gallery today. On my right we have 26 students of Grade 8 standing from the Hugh John MacDonald School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Fleming. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Logan. Also on my right, 12 students of Grade 11 standing from the Eden Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Small. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Member from Gladstone. Also on my left, 46 students of Grade 8 standing from the Lord Kitchener School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Pauls and Miss Lenzmann. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Russell and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. CAMPBELL: . . . . have some Private Members' Bills preceding these resolutions?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. I apologize to the Honourable Member for Virden. The adjourned debate on the second reading of Public Bill No. 21. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, may I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 30. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface) presented Bill No. 30, an Act to amend The St. Boniface Charter, 1963, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Where is St. Boniface?

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . . A little closer in than Selkirk. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the members would be kind enough to let this go to committee, and I think that the City of St. Boniface will make representation, and after a conversation that I had with the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I think that there might be some suggestions made to the City of St. Boniface providing for certain increases. It might be that this increase will be a little too high to conform with the proposed increase in The Municipal Act, but I wonder if we could have this moved through second reading and the members and the officials of St. Boniface be notified, then they could make the proper representation at the time.

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

MR. LYON: I wonder if it would suit the convenience of the House and the . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: If I may interrupt the Attorney-General for a moment, I still have one Bill here. Second reading of Bill No. 34. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan) presented Bill No. 34, an Act to amend The East Kildonan Charter, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, this is a straightforward Bill requested by the City of East Kildonan which I think can be explained in committee when it comes forward -- all the details. It's just to bring the rates of business taxes in line with all the other municipalities which have done that in the past.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I was just about to suggest that we would have no objection, Sir, if it suited your convenience and the convenience of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, if you wished to call the second reading of Bill No. 23 on the back page of the Order Paper in order to permit the member to advance it.

MR. DESJARDINS: If I may, Mr. Speaker? It's on the last page. Mr. Desjardins presented Bill No. 23, An Act to amend an Act to incorporate Les Révérends Pères Oblats in the Province of Manitoba, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, that Bill No 23, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate -- I wonder if I might have the Clerk read the balance. I apologize but my -- would you mind reading this Mr. Clerk?

MR. DESJARDINS: The Oblate Fathers will do.

MR. CLERK: An Act to amend an Act to incorporate Les Révérends Pères Oblats in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: That's much better than I could do it, I'm sure.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Clerk — I mean Mr. Speaker, I think that this Act is self-explanatory. This corporation of Les Pères Oblats, or the Oblate Fathers are asking a clause to cover the powers of investment. I can't explain any better than the people could read it. There's only the one class, and of course there's a retroactive clause and apparently this has been done in the past to correct probably some oversight.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Russell and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member from Souris-Lansdowne in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Virден.

MR. D. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virден): Mr. Speaker, not having heard a word of dissent in this House on the resolution of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell relative to urging the Federal Government to raise the initial payment for the 1966-67 crop year by 25 cents a bushel on wheat, 14 on barley and 10 cents on oats, I am sure all the honourable members are in agreement that higher initial payments are needed for the Canadian farmers.

I certainly agree with the Honourable Member when he said a large percentage of farmers have to resort to borrowing at varying rates of interest to carry on farm operations while their own money, generating no interest, is tied up with the Wheat Board. We should be concerned when it is shown a farmer today receives only one and a half cents more in the initial payment than he received 20 years ago.

While we are apparently in agreement with the Honourable Member from Russell on the question of higher initial payments, the resolution does not go far enough. It's the end price that really counts.

I feel Mr. Speaker, that while we must press - and in fact insist - on increased initial payments, the emphasis should be placed on the far more serious situation of current maximum and minimum wheat prices under the International Wheat Agreement. My colleague, the Honourable Member from Souris-Lansdowne, in his motion to amend the proposed resolution has reiterated solid fact when he states problems of farming in the main stem from rising costs of production. These rising costs are in continual conflict with the unchanged price the farmer receives for his product. It is in this sphere of commerce where action is needed and this House has a rightful role to play.

The International Wheat Council, as the honourable members know, has postponed a decision on the future of the International Wheat Agreement which expires at the end of July. It appears there will be no bending by Canada under U. S. pressure for an extension of the present agreement. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I need not remind the honourable members in this House that prices have been held in check for five years by the United States and other countries.

Predictions are already being widely circulated that world wheat trade will decline this year. We are already being conditioned to the thought that the only likely source of substantial future growth lies in the aid-assisted purchases by the poorer countries. We are being warned the trend of the last five years, where surplus wheat stocks have been depleted by strong demand, will be reversed.

And we will hear more about this scarcity, I predict, before the Wheat Council again meets early in April to decide the trading arrangements. In spite of the prophets of doom, this House should firmly stand in opposition to any future extension of the existing agreement. It was initiated in 1962 for a three-year period and has already had two extensions since. Another extension under the present pricing arrangements will have the effect of asking Canadian farmers to adapt themselves, not to a continuation of a cost-price-squeeze economy, but to a final strangulation from which the agricultural industry is unlikely to recover.

The Honourable Member from Souris-Lansdowne has made it clear in his amendment that the support of this House for an increase in the maximum price under the International Wheat Agreement is mandatory if the Canadian position in negotiations is to be maintained. Raising the maximum price for wheat by 34 cents to not less than \$2.50 a bushel and the minimum not less than \$2.10 a bushel in wheat is already two years overdue.

Mr. Speaker, we heard the Honourable Member from Brokenhead make it plain in this House about two weeks ago when he happily concurred with the view that the initial payments be increased. The honourable member also concurred with the motion that a higher price for

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd)..... wheat was needed on the international markets. And while in this concurring mood, he also expressed agreement with my colleague the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne that the price of farm machinery was sky-rocketing, and being a farmer I am quite aware of this. But he then implies that my colleague would solve this problem by, as the Honourable Member from Brokenhead put it, bargaining better with implement dealers.

It is not my intent, Mr. Speaker, to appear as an apologist for my colleague from Souris-Lansdowne. He is quite capable of setting the Honourable Member from Brokenhead straight, as he so ably demonstrated when he proposed the amendment to the resolution, but I feel there was some unfairness to our implement dealers. The Honourable Member from Brokenhead knows very well that bargaining, whether it be in the trade union movement or on the farm front, is a part of our way of life, and I believe possibly they have been proven better bargaining in recent years. I am disturbed that the Honourable Member from Brokenhead, perhaps unintentionally, left the impression that the implement dealers are charging too high a price for the goods they handle, and reaping too fat a profit in the deals they close. I am sure this is not the message the Honourable Member from Brokenhead intended to convey.

The Honourable Member from Brokenhead proposes in his motion for a further amendment to the main resolution, that this House urge the Federal Government to institute a two-price system for wheat. Then he suggests that the Federal government negotiate with the farm organizations to arrive at a price.

As a farmer, Mr. Speaker, I'd feel honour bound to support such a motion if it were not for a number of unsettled questions. The two-price system has long been talked about. In fact, the government now in Ottawa sneaked into office waving a two-price system flag all over the nation as it attempted to buy the farmers with a little of their own money, and I think the results in western Canada proves this point, that they were unable to buy the western farmer in this regard. Yes, this was an election promise, but now where is the reaction?

Well, we all know the favorite argument against the two-price system. The introduction of a higher price for wheat in the domestic market will reflect immediately in an increase in the price of bread to the consumer. I am a farmer and my view is that this argument is a lot of nonsense. The University of Nebraska had an economic research department that has shown if a producer receives a price of \$2.00 per bushel for wheat and if the millers and bakers were satisfied with a profit margin of 10 percent after all costs of production, the price of an ordinary loaf of bread would be only 14 cents as opposed to the 28 cents being paid at the time this research was carried out. This was in the United States.

Carrying this reasoning into Canada and into Manitoba at that same time, showed a Canadian loaf weighing 16 ounces costing nine and one-third cents as opposed to the 22 cents being charged in the stores.

The Honourable Member for Brokenhead is justified in asking if this be my view, then why not support his motion for a two-price system for wheat? The sad fact is that there are too many "ifs" attached to the workability of a two-price system, and until these are resolved I would be reluctant - I would be more than just reluctant - to plunge into a pricing system that has its strongest support based in some university that I know little about.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind the Honourable Member from Brokenhead that a government slipped into office in Ottawa under the two-star or the two price, but have not seen fit to make good on its pledge to the farmers. Why not? I think I know the reason. The powers that be are as confused about the two-price system as my honourable friend from Brokenhead, and to be perfectly frank, Mr. Speaker, I also am confused in this particular area. Unless my honourable friend has the system computed, or perhaps is in possession of some facts that have been hidden from the public, then I would say his motion is weak indeed. There may be merit in the two-price system, but I am from the constituency of Virden, Mr. Speaker, and all I ask is that I be shown.

There are many more points that I would like to cover in this debate on this particular motion, the amendment to the amendment of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, but I can't help feel, when going over the arguments, they have been heard here in this House many times.

With all due respect to my honourable friend from Brokenhead, I cannot blame him for bringing before this House an issue that he himself feels should be handled with caution. Reference on Page 615 of the Hansard, the honourable member is quoted as saying, "Probably if we had a two-price system of wheat it wouldn't add more than 10 or 15 cents or at the most 20 cents a bushel." In looking into this, I think the proper price would be approximately - and

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd). . . . I'm not quoting from Hansard at the moment - would be nearer eight cents which is a huge amount of money and it would put many farmers from the red ink into the blue figures. But even taking this into regard, it still is a weak resolution.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it just might add a few more cents to the price a farmer receives for wheat sold for domestic purposes, but it also might take a few more dollars from the budget that is now heavily strained. I must agree here with the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, we both don't know what the result of a two-price system may be. Until such time as we take a hard look at its implications, I would suggest we allow this matter to rest.

There have been repeated requests for a two-price system for Wheat. Presumably what is involved in such a proposal is this: A Fixed or prescribed support price on the domestically consumed portion of the Canadian Wheat crop and a free-market or a world price for the remainder of the crop. The difference between the support price and the free-market or world price on the domestically consumed portion of the wheat crop would be paid directly to farmers from the federal treasury. Another approach would be to have the price on the domestically consumed wheat pegged or fixed, which would mean that the Canadian food consumer would pay the cost of the support price.

The main argument which has been advanced in support of the two-price system for the domestically consumed portion of the Canadian wheat crop is that wheat producers need some relief from, or compensation for, the cost-price squeeze in agriculture. When one examines the rise in the cost of goods and services which the wheat producer has to pay, there is a convincing argument for the two-price proposal. In other words, farmers do appear to have a case for the two-price proposal. Furthermore, the two-price proposal has much greater appeal to both farmers and taxpayers than the one dollar an acre payment made to Western grain growers four or five years ago.

However, the two-price proposal is in conflict with international trade policies. Canadian farmers were extremely angry during the latter part of the 1950's when the United States did have a two-price system for their wheat. Canadian farmers of that day accused the United States of dumping policies, unfair competition, etc. It does not appear to be wise at this time for Canada to adopt a policy which was a source of serious concern to Canadian Farmers. Furthermore, it is likely that a two-price system for Canadian Wheat at this time could have significant repercussions for the present International Wheat Agreement negotiations which are being carried out in Geneva.

The government should acknowledge the cost-price squeeze. At the same time, however, it is important to recognize that this government has been calling for a full examination of the whole farm income problem and for the development of an over-all national policy in contrast to the piece-meal approach of the past. Calling for a two-price system for wheat at this time would be quite inconsistent. In addition, the two-price system for wheat would probably create problems relating to our international trade.

It would appear that the most reasonable and acceptable policy to adopt at the present time would be to support the idea of a higher minimum and maximum price bracket under the new International Wheat Agreement arrangements which are presently being negotiated by the grain men in Geneva. In other words, attempt to obtain higher price from the wheat-importing countries and continue to press for an over-all approach to solving the farm income problem, because I believe, Mr. Speaker, that agriculture is the one and only industry on this continent that does undoubtedly pay the freight both ways. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): On a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes?

MR. USKIW: The Honourable Member from Virden referred to remarks which I allegedly made in this House regarding implement companies being unfair. I was merely quoting the remarks of this honourable colleague, the Member for Souris-Lansdowne. Those weren't my ideas at all. I feel that he erred in his judgment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise and speak on the amendment proposed by my colleague from Brokenhead. However, before I go on and make my comments with respect to the last amendment I would like to refer to the statement made by the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell, I believe, when he said I have every confidence with the present Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa that he will be doing everything in his power, and perhaps it might be just appropriate at this time to pause and read three or four sentences, what the editor of The Country Guide has to say in the January '67 issue: "Although many farmers are making startling gains in developing their own farm enterprises

(MR. KAWCHUK cont'd) . . . . and farm efficiency continues to improve rapidly in Canada, this country's agriculture still tends to grope along with little sense of direction and lacking a clearly thought out and defined national farm policy. Economists have shown that our agriculture is lagging; that too many farmers aren't sharing in the wealth of this country and in fact are leaving our farms at a rapid rate. It becomes more apparent, hour by hour, that this country's agriculture must soon get some clear leadership."

And also there was a remark made by my honourable friend from Souris-Lansdowne when he was speaking about farmers being free-enterprisers and so forth and so on. May I just bring to the attention of my honourable friend that in the country of New Zealand the land became public ownership while a capitalistic government was governing that country, far before the labour government took power in that country.

He was also concerned with the fact that eventually there might be a strong threat of the small family farm being taken over by the large corporates, and in that respect I fully agree with him, Mr. Speaker, because the farmers today who have taken out these large loans are unable or find themselves in a situation very difficult to repay the payments that they promised to do so when taking out these loans. It is only a few weeks ago that I had a young farmer in my own area come to me and express great concern over his payments back to the Manitoba Credit Corporation. And I must say in this particular case that the farm unit was one that was run quite efficiently and I imagine by all comparison purposes would be considered a large efficient unit. There is about 10 or 11 quarter sections that's operated in this particular farm unit.

Perhaps it might be interesting before we go any further to just refer to the high cost of production with respect to machinery and so forth - and I have here a little chart that I have made out and I'm basing it on the fact of 3,000 bushels of wheat. There's no particular reason why I chose why I chose that figure except for the fact there are approximately 200,000 permit holders and I just took the figure of 600 million bushels of wheat and divided that and got the figure of 3,000 bushels of wheat. And if I may bring to the attention of this House like the Honourable Member did from Virden, that the farmer's price for wheat is no better today than it was at that time and if we look at this chart, in 1944, 3,000 bushels of wheat would have brought approximately \$3,750.00 to the farmer. Apparently the price of wheat at that time was in the neighbourhood of \$1.25. In 1965 - and we'll pick the Honourable Member's figure from Souris-Lansdowne of \$1.60 - the farmer would have realized \$4,800 for the equivalent 3,000 bushels of wheat. And now let's just go down and see how much machinery he could have bought for this 3,000 bushels of wheat. In 1944 a tractor was selling in the neighbourhood of \$1,300; in 1965 it was some place in the neighbourhood of \$7,200.00. Granted there are probably a few more gadgets on this more modern machine but like was pointed out by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell that this tractor will only pull four or five . . . plough and the extra gadgets are really of no marked significance.

A seed drill in '44 was \$300.00; in '65, approximately \$1,400, a drill of equivalent make. A cultivator in '44 was \$200.00; in '65, \$1,000. A car in '44 was \$1,200.00; in '65 in the neighbourhood of \$4,200.00. A plough, \$185.00 in '44; in '66, \$600.00. A mower in 1944 was \$110.00; in '65, \$580.00. A rake would have been \$140.00 in '44 and 1965 would have been \$650.00. A manure spreader in '44 would have been \$200.00 and in 1965 it was \$800.00. And if you add that all together you will find that the farmer in 1944 would have had an expenditure of \$3630.00 for these eight pieces of equipment and he would have received \$3,750.00 for the 3,000 bushels of wheat, which would have left him in the neighbourhood of \$120.00 to buy other goods and services. In 1967 the same equipment would have cost him \$16,430, and if you subtract the \$4,800 that he got for the wheat, it would have left him a debt of \$11,630 of debt, so I hope I have demonstrated that although the price of grain has remained relatively the same, the additional costs of operation have more than quadrupled.

And perhaps the price of land is also something to consider in the price -- or in the wheat production. And as we note here from the Department of Trade and Commerce survey with respect to farm land prices: in 1950 an acre of land was worth in the neighbourhood of \$39.00; in 1965 it was \$75.00, almost twice the price; and just for information purposes, perhaps, in Saskatchewan in 1950 it was \$26.00; in 1965, \$66.00; and in Ontario in 1950 it was \$75.00 and in 1965 it was \$175.00.

Although during this period between 1944 and 1965 the farmers have been able to maintain their existence perhaps by increasing their efficiency, specializing in various enterprises and living off the depreciation, however, I think the time has now come when the farmer has

(MR. KAWCHUK cont'd).... exhausted that privilege of living off his depreciation and is finding himself in the position where he must leave the land.

I have perhaps an interesting note here, and I took it out of the Diploma Grads Report, and it's a little report submitted by Ken Eadie who was a Neufeld Foundation winner to a trip to the United Kingdom who studied agriculture in that country, and there was one paragraph that I would like to read to this House: "One area in which British farmers are ahead of us is farm organization. Their national Farmers' Union is a well-financed and rational entity which gives the farmer a good voice in government policy. This is important because those directly employed in agriculture total less than four percent of the population. It's interesting to compare agriculture earnings in Canada and the United Kingdom. In Canada the average income of people in agriculture is 70 percent of those engaged in other occupations. In the United Kingdom it is 88 percent, which suggests to me that the United Kingdom farmer is getting a better share of the national income than is his Canadian counterpart."

And I perhaps could just add at this time it is my understanding that in the United Kingdom the farm organizations get together with the government and decide what is a reasonable price for farm products, the same perhaps as takes place in Canada with the large business establishments.

If we take another look and look at it from a different point of view: between 1949 and 1965 farmers produced two-thirds more produce with no significant increase in that income - less than one percent, as was submitted by the Manitoba Farm Union brief. And if you measured in 1949 cost in dollars, incomes in agriculture had increased by 13 percent while incomes in non-agricultural occupations increased by 46 percent. And despite the fact, like I mentioned earlier, the farmer has increased his production, despite the fact that he has increased his efficiency, despite the fact that he has intensified in certain enterprises, and despite the fact that farm productivity increased three and one-half times as much as the non-farm productivity, the farmer's financial position continues to deteriorate. And if this trend continues it won't be long before most farmers will be forced to enter bankruptcy.

May I submit, the farmer, like anyone else, must have a satisfactory net income in order to survive. An increase in the price of wheat, of course, would not make all farmers rich but it would be admitting the principle of parity. If every other concern in Canada receives a reasonable price for the product or service it sells, for example doctors, lawyers, dentists, soft drink people, chewing gum folks, surely then - and I put this in capital letters - AGRICULTURALISTS who produce the nation's food are entitled to at least similar returns on their investment as is enjoyed by the above mentioned. And may I suggest at this time that perhaps there are a few problems insofar as the two-price system is concerned. However, I must also take a look at this issue from another point of view and ask my honourable friends; who is being subsidized when a farmer tries to import a farm machine from the European country and is required to pay an evaluation on it - on this particular machine, he pays on a machine of its class or kind similar to that manufactured in Canada? Who is being subsidized when our tariff laws prevent the entry into Canada of Japanese or Chinese textiles for the one-third price we must pay? Who is being subsidized...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I hesitate to interrupt the honourable member. I feel he's well on his theme but I do think that he is wandering away from the matter of grain and the price of grain .....

MR. KAWCHUK: Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the two-price system and on a two-price system the only alternative is subsidization. That's what I'm trying to get at.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, but you did bring China and textiles and so on into ....

MR. KAWCHUK: Well I'm just trying to create a metaphor here for comparison purposes.

MR. SPEAKER: Well I'm sure the honourable member will attempt to keep within the boundaries.

MR. KAWCHUK: Yes, I will, Sir. Thank you. And may I submit that there is justification for using public funds to assist all those who fall in the above mentioned classes, then I submit there is equal justification in using public funds to help the farmers who are caught in technological change and who are providing the most essential of all commodities, that of food. Agriculture was man's first industry and now still is the basic industry, and until that's replaced by something better then it must remain the most needed industry. And at this time, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the only solution to our depressed farm economy is a two-price system whereby the government would subsidize the farmer to a certain extent, because the

(MR. KAWCHUK cont'd). . . . farmer of Canada is no longer able to compete with federal treasuries of other countries insofar as the export market is concerned. I appreciate the fact that we need higher initial grain prices; I appreciate the fact that we need higher prices under the International Wheat Agreement. However, I think that there is no doubt left in any of these farmer friends of mine that the only solution to our problem is a two-price system which would put the farmer of this country on a comparable basis to his counterpart in industry or whatever it may be.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I just quote Abraham Lincoln: "To sin by silence when man knows he should protest makes cowards of men." And I might submit that I for one will not be labelled a coward.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I have delayed speaking on this resolution before us because normally and from a debate I can only speak once except when you have resolutions that are amended, and therefore I try and get into the debate later on so that I'll first hear the views of other members expressed. Now in this case we have two amendments so that I can speak on this amendment and then take part in the debate later on again. So I am very interested in this amendment coming forward advocating the two-price system. After all, we, as Social Creditors, have for years already advocated the two-price system for wheat in this country, and there is sound logic for this. As already has been pointed out by the Member for Ethelbert a few minutes ago, a two-price system probably means different things to different people. Some probably reason that only certain bushels of wheat should be sold at the higher price because the Canadian consumer in Canada is getting cheap bread through a variable price for wheat the sale of which is governed by export sales, and the price is determined on that basis. I'm sure that members of this House would go along with me that the consumer in Canada should pay the price - a price that would have some relationship with the cost of other commodities that the farmer has to buy, so that a two-price system, in my opinion, is warranted.

The prices of wheat are far too low in this province, and as already mentioned too by the previous speaker, in my opinion - and this is what we have advocated - we should have an export-import board which would deal with all the commodities that are being exported and also those imported into Canada. We have dealings of this type to the goods that are coming in; we're placing high tariffs on those items that are coming in such as textiles, and the Federal Government is reaping large returns on these commodities. Certainly it wouldn't be wrong to distribute some of those funds to the wheat farmers of this country. We also find that we're doing certain trades with the Americans across the line. All these higher-priced cars and special imports, we're paying a lot of tariff on those items and what is being done with that? That money is being paid back to the manufacturer. Why cannot we have the same thing taking place as far as wheat so that the items that come in and tariffs are placed on, the imports from other countries - why cannot some of this money go to the grain farmers of western Canada? Certainly this would be quite in order. I have mentioned this on previous occasions during the wartime years when we had a special price for Class 2 wheat. I personally did sell some durum wheat at that time under the Class 2 proposition, and I hauled a load of wheat in to the elevator that fall. I got \$1.29 I think a bushel. I sold most of it, that same wheat, the following winter as Class 2 wheat and I got \$4.55 a bushel. Had I waited two weeks longer I could have received \$4.75.

This was what happened during those years. We sold our wheat cheap to these countries; they in turn turned around and sold it for enormous prices to other countries and this was the loss that the farmer took in western Canada. At that time we were told, well later on when things were changed we would be rewarded; we would be getting better prices at that time. What has happened? Nothing has happened. We're not getting any more than what we got at that time. The prices are still the same that were in effect twenty years ago. Certainly a better deal should be afforded the farmer of western Canada and I'm sure that the two-price system can be put into effect and is a proper thing that should be placed on the statutes of this country.

Now I really wasn't prepared to go into this in detail at this present time. I would certainly expect to speak on the first amendment and on the main motion when it comes up for further consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member

(MR. EINARSON cont'd)..... from Dufferin, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the House would permit me to make an observation at this time. What I have to say I am not directing at any one particularly, but I have noticed over the last few days and weeks, that speeches are being made, and I do know, and fully realize that notes are very very important and must be referred to at all times, but I would ask you to comply with the rule we have in this direction and please refrain from reading speeches for obvious reasons. So would you kindly co-operate with me in this direction. I don't want to have to bring the matter up again during this session.

The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, for the same reasons as previously stated, I would beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBLIN: As the honourable gentleman isn't here, I presume that the matter could stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for St. George and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Highways in amendment thereto. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GUTTORMSON: ..... have this matter stand. But if any one else wishes to speak, we would have no objection.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Burrows in amendment thereto. The Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I have taken part I think on every occasion when this resolution was brought before the House. It is not a new resolution. I think that it has appeared on the Order Paper nearly every year since I was first elected to the House some eight years ago and we on this side of the House have always been consistent in this regard. The Liberal Party of Manitoba is well known for its progressive move in election reform and I don't intend to go over all that, because someone the other day in going over the history of election reform referred in particular to the franchise of women in Manitoba and everything that has transpired since in that regard, so I don't intend to go into that. It was the Liberals that brought in the franchise for women and over the years, we have continued to put forward our progressive steps in this measure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to concur with you in your feeling towards the reading of speeches and as I have said in this House on many occasions anybody that would read Hansard, I'm not one of the ones that do, but anybody that reads Hansard full well knows that I don't read my speeches. They look terrible in Hansard, because I don't often read anything and I don't often use any notes of any kind. I'm not making speeches in this House for the benefit of the readers of Hansard; I don't mind going on record as saying that. I don't speak for the benefit of the Hansards. But there is nothing wrong with reading your own speeches; there is nothing wrong with reading a statement so long as you say who the author is. There is nothing wrong with reading your own speeches as I said, and I just want to read a little bit of what I said last year, what I said last year, to prove that we are consistent in this - nothing wrong at all with reading your own speeches - and here is what I said briefly on this subject. And if you want to know where to find it, it's on page 580 of last year, pardon me, going back to 1964. I thought it was last year I made this famous speech. It was three years ago. But anyway the points that I put forward then are still valid today and I said "Madam Speaker" - because Madam Speaker of course was in the Chair at that time; "What is there about this magical number of 21, which when attained makes one eligible to vote? What's so magical about age 21? I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that the answer to this question will not be found by relating the voting age with that at which one is entitled to consume alcoholic beverages legally or to hold property. These age conventions are themselves arbitrary and may be in revision. No, Madam Speaker, the only real factor which can be used to determine whether an individual is qualified to vote is the general level of education of that individual and his day-to-day knowledge."

Now I argue that that still holds true and I argue that even in the three years since I made that speech, that the 18 year old group are more knowledgeable today than they were even three years ago. --(Interjection)--

On all scores, on all scores, and my honourable friend who made that comment is a



(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd), . . . school teacher, and if they are not further advanced in his particular school, perhaps they would blame it on the teacher, I don't know but --(Interjection)-- They wouldn't want me to explain, he can make the explanations himself.

However, I have explained the Liberals point of view on this particular resolution and it was indeed refreshing the other day to hear the First Minister get up and suggest that they, the government, intended to support and endorse our resolution this year. That was refreshing indeed and it certainly is an about face for the government because . . .

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Don't count on it.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Don't count on it? Well, he indicated or inferred that we could count on some support. And I understood him to say that he was going to make a public statement - I believe that was the words - in this regard.

MR. ROBLIN: If you ever give me a chance I'd be glad to.

MR. SHOEMAKER: My honourable friend the First Minister says, if we ever give him a chance. He's had all the chances in the world to adjourn the debate and he can adjourn the debate after --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, can I have a chance to finish my speech on it?

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable gentleman could proceed without any further interruptions I am sure he would wish that.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Thank you. I am nearly finished anyway. But I was about to say how heartening and encouraging it was to rest assured that we would have the support of the members opposite, because this is an about face. Some of the members who so vigorously opposed the resolution two or three years ago are not with us today. In fact, three of them - three of them, former members who vigorously opposed it, one was sitting right over here, the Honourable Mr. Hutton. He gave us a real lecture one day and there was a nice article came out in the paper "Tories Oppose Younger Voters," and there's their pictures to prove it. And the other one was the Honourable Member for Roblin. In fact, he thought that we were going hog wild, that up in his area in particular, he knew dashed well that the young people were not fit to vote and couldn't be trusted to vote. And then the Honourable Member for Hamiota, he thought this was terrible to hold a gun at the head of the young people and say you had to vote.

We don't conduct elections in this country the way they do in Russia or the other places where there is only one name on the ballot. We don't force them to line up and vote. I know that some politicians wish they could do that sometimes, and when we are speaking about the apathy of the electors -- and I don't suppose that there is a politician on earth that doesn't at some time or another express real concern about the apathy of the electors -- and I don't suppose there are many members of the House that have taken the time to even figure out what percentage voted for them. Now I haven't got the figures for the June election, for the last June election we have had a lot of June elections - but I have some figures here for June for the election of 1962. We analyzed some of those. And knowing that I shouldn't be reading this speech, Mr. Speaker, these comments were made by our Honourable Leader the Member for Ste. Rose, and here is what he said, in this respect: "I think few people would realize, Madam Speaker, that there are nine members in this House who have been elected by less than half the people who were allowed to vote in their constituency. Less than half the total number of people allowed to vote, turned out to vote. Not just for the candidate who is here, but for all of the candidates put together." That's a shocking report isn't it?

In the constituency of Logan only 38 percent of the people turned out to vote. In the constituency of my honourable friend the Leader of the House, the Premier of this Province, only 47 percent of the people turned out to vote. Not just for him, but for every candidate in that constituency. It goes on like that: Burrows, Elmwood, St. Matthews, St. John's, Winnipeg Centre, Rupertsland and Seven Oaks. All of those less than 50 percent turned out to vote, all of them. --(Interjection)-- Well I don't know, they had some good candidates there no doubt. But why didn't the people turn out to vote? Less than half of them turned out to vote. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that apathy to that degree would not exist if we would lower the voting age. My experience, following eight elections, has been the opposite. I try to encourage the younger people even before voting age to work with me during the elections and they become a lot more enthusiastic than a lot of the older people do and I think that this is a good thing and augers well for democracy.

As respects some of the figures, that is the numbers of young people, I have some startling figures in this regard too, and I don't suppose that my honourable friends opposite are particularly familiar with the figures that I am going to give you now, and I'll tell you why, because they were put out by the Liberal Party of Canada, and unless they subscribe to some

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd).... of these documents they wouldn't have heard these figures. But it says, "By 1970, and that's not too far away, 50 percent of the population will be under 25. By 1970, 30 percent of the population will be between the ages of 14 and 25; and in 1967, that's this year, the 14 to 25 age group, will top \$1 1/2 million in their spending - billion, 1 1/2 billion they will spend. That's a sizeable amount; a major part of the Canadian economy. In 1966 the average number of years of schooling has risen to 11 years and the total is climbing. Twice as many people in our universities in 1960. I don't need to remind my honourable friends of that, because they're always bragging about these figures themselves and taking credit for all of the elementary school children, the increase and so on. And so they are much more knowledgeable today than they were even four or five years ago, and becoming more knowledgeable every day and taking a greater interest in our political life and social life and economic life of the community.

And, Mr. Speaker, appreciating, after the comments made by the Honourable the First Minister that we can expect his support, I don't suppose there's much point in putting any more arguments forward -- except one, perhaps, and if I haven't made a case at all for the under-age voter yet, I think some case can be made for the sake of having uniformity in Canada. I think it's kind of nice in Canada, particularly in this Centennial year and the Manitobans that will come forward in two or three years, to have some agreement, some uniformity in some of our thinking, and I went into the library two or three days ago -- and I must confess that they are most helpful to me in the library -- I asked them if they could let me have the age qualifications for electors for the ten provinces, and they sent this note right into the House to me, and they say it's taken from the Canadian Almanac and Directory for 1967, so it's pretty well up to date. And they say that, of course as everyone knows, the voting age for Canada at the Federal level is 21. Alberta is 19; British Columbia, 19; Manitoba 21; New Brunswick 21; Newfoundland 19; Nova Scotia 21; Ontario 21; Prince Edward Island 21; Quebec 18; Saskatchewan 18; North West Territories 21 and the Yukon Territory 21. And so you have three or four different ages at which they are allowed to vote in the other provinces. Well, for heaven's sakes, let's get it uniform and let's be able to say in our Centennial year that in Canada everyone was given the vote at 18.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I am in full support of this resolution for 18-years-olds to vote. I would say that at 18 year old, if he isn't a man by that time, he's never going to be a man. The majority of us elderly people have had to go out to work at a very early age, and we've had to accept all the responsibilities that came along, and it is our fault in a sense that there is such a low percentage of people voting in the various constituencies and in federal elections and so on and so forth, because we are not getting across to the people what should be done.

Now it was said in my constituency there, there was a very low percentage of people that didn't go out to vote. Yes, we know that, and we've had it for quite a while, and do you know in the last election there was quite a drive put on in my constituency there. I had gone through that constituency since '59, and I had worked like a Trojan. Well, I say, and I still say, you can take the horse to the water, but you can't make him drink. And the same applies. Now today, I had a very -- how will I describe it? -- a very unique experience in my way of thinking. There was a class come from one of the schools in my constituency, and I went up there to talk to these kiddies. What am I going to talk to these kiddies? Well, you know, I had enough material in this, the Orders of the Day, and various things that went on, and them kids they took that thing and they wanted more -- we didn't have sufficient time. I could have stayed there for two hours with them kids. And they wanted more. They were so grateful to come through this Legislature of ours. To me, I say this is the people's building and to keep them out is wrong. What we are doing today, when we get these kiddies in here and we show them -- when I say "kiddies", I don't mean it in any disrespect to them, because I know they have better advantages today than ever I had, and I'm grateful for that. But I say that I am in accord with this resolution and I don't think I will say anything further on that, but just I support the resolution. Thank you.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member from LaVerendrye, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to have this matter stand, if I may.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, may we have leave to have this matter stand, please.

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

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (LaVerendrye): Could I have this matter stand please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour)(Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I believe it's about time that I should put my legal reputation on the line like the Honourable Member from Lakeside, and talk about this very complex and interesting resolution that the honourable Member from Inkster has on the order paper. At the outset I should warn you that you will be disappointed because I am not going to deal with it in a legal sense at all. Our colleagues here in the legal profession I'm sure will debate this very fully because there are differences of opinion throughout the country on the use, misuse and abuse of injunctions and particularly ex-party injunctions.

I want to thank the Honourable Member from Selkirk for his remarks the other day clarifying I think to the satisfaction of a good many members of this House what the problem is and how ex-party injunctions have been used in this jurisdiction. It has been indicated that the principle of this resolution is before the Supreme Court, that there is a case before the Supreme Court and we are going to reserve any determinations as a government until (a) there has been a determination there, till Mr. Justice Rand with his inquiry commission looking into ex-party injunctions has had a chance to report. This very learned jurist and ex-member of the Supreme Court is highly respected and we have confidence that he is going to make a very useful contribution to the decisions that will be made on ex-party injunctions. And I must say too that we realize, we all realize that the ultimate responsibility for dealing with this problem is ours and we will in due course, whether there is consensus among, or agreement among the labour-management Committee, the Woods Committee - who by the way are looking into this matter - whether there is consensus or not, that we will assume the responsibility of making the necessary decisions for legislation. We are well aware that this is very very important problem to the trade union movement.

I think the remarks that I'm making here this afternoon follow very closely the remarks that our Premier made to a delegation of the Manitoba Federation of Labour here a couple of weeks ago. While we are concerned, while we realize that it is an important part of the problems of the trade union movement, we are also aware that there is disagreement within the trade union movement as to how ex-party injunctions in particular should be used in labour disputes. I notice in a conference held in Ottawa where members of the learned profession of law advising the Canadian labour congress delegates at that time were not in complete agreement by any means that the ex-party injunction in labour disputes should be eliminated. I believe that this resolution is possibly a little premature. I think the Honourable Member from Inkster would have us arrive at determinations . . . in a rather hasty fashion without due consideration to the studies and concentrations that are taking place across the country and here in Manitoba at the present time.

So again, Mr. Speaker, with these few remarks I wish to reiterate that we are well aware that it is our responsibility and when we have studied the matter thoroughly, we will make the decision as to the necessary legislative action on this problem.

MR. SPEAKER put the question.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, I, the Member for Logan, seconded by the Member for Wellington wish to adjourn debate.

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

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Wellington that:

WHEREAS it is contrary to the principle of the rule of law that persons be prevented by Court Order from doing acts which are not contrary to law; and

WHEREAS this House intends that all citizens of Manitoba be permitted to advance their interests provided that they employ means which are not contrary to the law; and

(MR. GREEN cont'd).....

WHEREAS this House recognizes the lawful right of all citizens to the peaceful use of the public streets and the right of all citizens to persuade others by the use of free speech in all forms;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House declare that no citizen shall be enjoined from exercising the right to the peaceful use of the public streets and from the peaceful use of free speech for the purpose of persuasion, even though such -- Mr. Speaker, the word the next word is "permission" and I beg leave to have it read persuasion, I believe that's a misprint -- even though such persuasion may result in a loss of trade to other persons or the termination of employment relationships, and provided that the said use of free speech does not constitute slander or defamation.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, at the outset I'd like to make something plain which apparently hadn't penetrated the mind of the Honourable the Minister of Labour. I have put no resolution in this House as a trade unionist nor do I put any of these resolutions for the benefit of trade unionists. Mr. Speaker, I said at the outset of my previous remarks that I consider it an infringement of my freedom, of the freedom of every person in the province of Manitoba, if a person, any person, be it a trade unionist or otherwise, is compelled by a court to work, I consider it an infringement of my freedom and the freedom of every person in the Province of Manitoba be he trade unionist or otherwise, if a person is found guilty of contempt of court for refusing to go to work.

Now with respect to waiting for the courts and commissions to decide this question and the question of the previous resolution that I put, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Minister can get an answer from Mr. Justice Rand if he sends him a letter. They will not be discussing anything ...

MR. SPEAKER: I must insist that the honourable gentleman deal with the resolution which has been presented to the House for consideration.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe you will have another opportunity to discuss the other matter with the Minister on another occasion.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I say that with respect to the resolution at hand that no one, let alone Mr. Justice Rand if he was sent a letter, would object to the contents of the resolution at hand, and I say Mr. Speaker, that there is no need to wait for commissions to reiterate these principles which apparently are agreed to by every member of the House, and I speak now to the principle of the resolution at hand.

Now Mr. Speaker, I put to you and to the members of this House a proposition that there were a group of people who believed that trade unions are bad; that they result in fact in the regression of working conditions of employees, and they feel that it would be good for the advancement of the interests of people who are employees that everybody be encouraged not to belong to trade unions, and they set up an organization which was the Anti-Trade Union League or the Anti-Association League, and they tried to get to themselves as many adherents as are possible, and one of the things that they tried to do would be to encourage employees who work for employers where bargaining rights exist, to abandon their trade unions, to quit membership, and to try to revoke the certification of those particular unions. I put to you that this organization would be perfectly legal and they would have every opportunity to avail themselves of all means of persuasion available to the rest of us to get this organization going.

Mr. Speaker, I put it to you further, that if these people walked down the street, walked down Portage Avenue and Main Street with signs saying "Don't belong to trade unions" that it's wrong to belong to trade unions, "that no court would or could enjoin them from walking down those streets with those signs. And I put it to you further, Mr. Speaker, that if one of the things that these people tried to do was to say that "wherever we had scored a victory and wherever we had encouraged people not to belong to trade unions, we want to encourage those people to have an effect on others by refusing to work with people who belong to trade unions," and that every job in which they are employed and they find that trade unionists are employed, they would say, "I exercise my democratic right not to work alongside with a trade unionist," and they walked off the job, that no court would or could enjoin them from doing this, and I put it to you further, Mr. Speaker, that if one of those people stood in front of a public place, stood in front of a building or any other place of employment, and said, "Union members are employed here," and hoped thereby to encourage people who believe the same way as they do not

(MR. GREEN cont'd).... to enter that job site, that no court would enjoin that person, and every member of this House would agree that that person had a perfect right to persuade other people in the manner in which he was behaving.

Well Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that the present controversy regarding ex parte injunctions involves just such rights. They involve them with regard to people who are in trade unions as against people who are not in trade unions, but the principle is exactly the same; and let me say, Mr. Speaker, let me repeat what I said earlier, that the trade unionists have articulated their distaste for what has been done to them by identifying the opponent as being the ex parte injunction. The opponent is not the ex parte injunction at all. An ex parte injunction could be made interlocutory in four days and the trade unionists who are affected by ex parte injunctions would be no better off if the same injunction was established four days lat. So it's not the ex parte injunction which is the substance of the problem; it's the fact that an injunction is being granted which puts the trade unionists in a position in which no other person in society finds himself, and that the trade union position in this regard is not that they be exempted from the application of ex parte injunctions. Not at all. In my submission, Mr. Speaker, the real position of the trade unionist is that he wishes injunctions which have been granted against him in a discriminatory fashion, and which have not applied to any other person or group in society, be no longer permitted to be granted against him; and this, Mr. Speaker, is a position which I say should commend itself to all parties in the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would think that most members of the Legislature would say that they can't comprehend how it came to be that courts began issuing injunctions which compelled people to refrain from walking down the street with signs bearing true information. That is the present type of injunctions which have been granted by the courts. These are the injunctions which I speak against in this House, and these are the injunctions which I believe if they were eliminated would eliminate the problem of the so-called labor injunction. It's not an injunction which we seek on this side of the House to have eliminated so as to put any group of citizens in a preferred position. We seek to eliminate this type of injunction so that all citizens would be in a position of equality, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is necessary, in order to put people in a position of equality, to pass the type of resolution which is now before you.

Now Mr. Speaker, the law with regard to legislating against the right of a man to walk down the street with a sign, peacefully, without doing harm to anybody else, is a law which had its growing pains in the British Isles, that there were numerous court orders in Britain which at first enjoined this type of injunction -- this type of conduct, and then the Legislature came in and said that the courts should not enjoin this type of conduct. In 1905 the English parliament, the Mother of Parliaments passed a law which said that this type of activity should not be held by courts to be unlawful. I am merely asking this House, to enact analogous legislation which would make the right to disseminate free information in this way a right which is recognized by the Government of Manitoba as it was recognized by the parliament of England in 1905. And Mr. Speaker, the whole law with regard to peaceful persuasion also had its growing pains in Canada, and the remarks that I am now making are not radical remarks. They are remarks that found favor not only with the parliament of Canada but with the judges of the Courts of Queens Bench in this province, in other provinces, and ultimately with the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada.

..... continued on next page

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

Now let me for a moment have the indulgence of the House to give a short history of this. At one time the Criminal Code prohibited watching and besetting, and judges interpreted that as meaning that people could not walk to and fro on the streets carrying signs hoping to persuade people to behave in a certain way. The parliament of Canada recognized that this was not what the law was intended to say and added a rider to the law with regard to watching and besetting, which said - and I'm paraphrasing; I don't remember the exact words: "Nothing in this Act shall prohibit attending at or near a place for the purpose of communicating or obtaining information." And after the enactment of that particular section of the Criminal Code it was common knowledge and was recognized all over the country that people had a right to walk down the street with a sign containing true information, and for many years the courts found that way, and I refer, Mr. Speaker-- and I don't like to talk about legal precedents in this Chamber, but I think that if we look at some of the legal precedents we will find they are not as technically legalistic as sometimes people think they are. Often they are in perfect conformity with good common sense which everybody can understand.

And the same Mr. Justice Rand that my honourable friend referred to, after a long drawn-out case which started off in British Columbia -- and it was a case involving Williams versus Aristocratic Restaurants Limited, and my honourable friend can find it in the 1951 Supreme Court Reports and I'm reading from section 784, page 784. In this particular case, Mr. Speaker, a group of trade unionists had an argument with a theatre chain and they walked up and down in front of the chain. There were two or three people with signs which indicated their dissatisfaction with the working conditions and labor relations which they were experiencing with that theatre. The theatre sought an injunction restraining the activities of these people walking up and down the streets. They gave as grounds the fact that this conduct was hurting their theatre chain, and then it went from court to court, as my honourable friend the Member from Selkirk wants this other case to go even though we all know that we agree with what should be done and we should wait until the courts decide, but nevertheless it went from court to court; it got to the Supreme Court of Canada, and the Supreme Court said the following. Mr. Justice Rand, the one that the Honourable Minister is so interested in, let's hear what he said about this type of activity. "There was clearly a trade dispute as well as a grievance in this case and the information conveyed by the placards as clearly as relevant to the patronage of the restaurants by consumers" -- I said theatres, it should be restaurants.

"The question then is whether the mode of persuasion followed was authorized. How could information be effectively communicated to a prospective customer of such a business otherwise than by such means? The appeal through newspapers or at a distance might and probably would be utterly futile. The persons to be persuaded can, with any degree of certainty, be reached only in the immediate locality and I must take the Legislature to have intended to deal with the matter in a realistic manner. What was attempted was to persuade rationally rather than to coerce by insolence. There was no nuisance of a public nature and the only annoyance would be the resentment felt almost at any act in the competitive conflict by the person whose interest is assailed." Certainly there would be annoyance that we envisage in our competitive society. (Those are my words.) "That those within the restaurant, either employees or patrons, were likely to be disturbed to the degree of apprehension this ... already mentioned, could not be seriously urged. Through long familiarity those words and actions in labour controversies have ceased to have an intimidating impact on the average individual and are now taken in the stride of ordinary experience, but the information . . . . may be effective to persuade, and it is such an appeal that the statute is designed to encourage. Since then, the conduct was not criminal either under the code or at any common law. Any common civil liability has been removed by these sections but even if they should extend to a public appeal I should hold the act innocent where it is done for such an object. The public is obviously and substantially interested in the fair settlement of such contests."

So after going all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada, it became settled that what they call "peaceful picketing," -- and thus far, Mr. Speaker, I haven't used the word "picketing"; it's not a word that I feel has any relevance; but thus far, at this stage, the concept of what is referred to by many people as peaceful picketing was recognized; that is, provided people didn't create a public nuisance, provided they didn't block access to any premises, provided they didn't engage in any violence, provided that all they were doing was trying by their presence and by their signs to encourage people to support them. Mr. Justice Rand said in the Aristocratic Restaurant vs Williams that this was perfectly legal and should

(MR. GREEN, cont'd) . . . . not be enjoined against, and I think that Mr. Justice Rand was making a statement which is an obvious statement. It's not one that requires deep legal thinking, because Mr. Speaker, if the conduct was unlawful, if they were talking about people blocking exits, or preventing access, or engaging in violence, there wouldn't be the necessity of a court injunction at all. The Honourable the Attorney-General could be phoned. He could have the appropriate law enforcement agency sent down, and without an injunction they could prohibit lawful conduct. It's not unlawful conduct that these court injunctions seek to prohibit. It's lawful conduct and it's on this basis, Mr. Speaker, that I suggest that the Court be made aware that the Legislature does not agree that this type of conduct could be enjoined against, and the principle that I'm urging has, Mr. Speaker, has gained favour with the Manitoba Courts, and I want the Members of this House to be made aware of the decision of the Peerless Laundry case decided by the courts of Manitoba - Mr. Justice Freedman. The citation is six western weekly reports, page 443.

In that case, Mr. Speaker, it was a worse situation. There was what was found by the Judge to be an unlawful strike; that is, a group of people had left their employment without ever having been certified by the Labour Relations Act. Now I question whether that's an unlawful strike but it's an irrelevance. Mr. Justice Freedman found it was an unlawful strike. And in support of this unlawful strike they walked in front of the Peerless Laundry with signs saying words to the effect 'unfair to labour'. Mr. Justice Freedman, in that case, quoted another judge who said: "It may be very true that the employees have improperly broken their agreement and it may be that it is unlawful for them to break their agreement, but I think they nevertheless have a common-law right to inform others peacefully that they are on strike, be the strike lawful or unlawful. And if they choose to exercise this right by picketing in a manner that is not otherwise unlawful, their actions cannot be restrained by, and particularly by an interlocutory injunction. It is for the Legislature and not for the Courts to make picketing not amounting to a nuisance at common law or by the publication of defamatory matter something that may be restrained by injunction."

I note, Mr. Speaker, and I didn't look at this case before I wrote the resolution, but if you look at the last phrase it's very much consistent with the whereases that we have in the Resolution. "It is for the Legislature and not for the Courts to make picketing not amounting to a nuisance at common law or the publication of defamatory matter something that may be restrained by injunction."

Now, Mr. Speaker, what Legislature has done this since 1952? What Legislature says that this type of conduct is unlawful? Well there was one. The Legislature of British Columbia did it. They said where you can walk with signs, when you can walk with signs, under what circumstances you can walk with signs, and it was referred to by many premiers and many provincial legislatures as being legislation that is contrary to the fundamental right of free speech. But the Legislature of Manitoba has never done it. The Legislature of Ontario has never done it. And yet it's places like Manitoba and Ontario where judges have now taken it upon themselves to enjoin. Mr. Speaker, a single man, a single person, one individual, from walking down the street with a sign bearing true information, and the basis upon which these injunctions have been granted is that it affects the freedom to trade, or the contractual relations of the person who happens to occupy the premises where they are walking in front of.

Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, that these injunctions have gone contrary to the basic rules which were set in cases such as *Aristocratic Restaurants vs Williams*, and *Peerless Laundry*, and in doing so they have extended the injunction to operate in a fashion against trade unionists and only trade unionists, because what other person in our society is prohibited from walking down the streets with a sign carrying true information? Would the Premier of this province have even dared to suggest -- and I give him marks for not even having such a thought enter his mind - that Joe Borowski should be prohibited from walking down the street with a sign bearing true information because it might hurt his Government or . . .

MR. ROBLIN: I didn't even object to my honourable friend walking down the street with false information on the sign.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, then I give my honourable friend more credit that I've indicated in my previous remarks because I think that he should be able to walk down the street with false information. I think it's often a very very -- it's a subject of great controversy and I know that some judges in some jurisdictions have said that a sign "Unfair to me," a sign which a trade unionist was carrying which said "Unfair to me" was false information.

(MR. GREEN, cont'd) . . . . He said that employer wasn't unfair at all. He was paying perfectly good wages. And that judge took it upon himself to say that that was false information. So I agree with the Premier of this province that a person shouldn't even be enjoined from carrying what a judge says he thinks is false information, because my learned friend the Honourable Member from Lakeside and myself had an argument yesterday. I said that something he said was untrue, that it was an incorrect opinion, and I'm sure he thought that my opinion was incorrect, but -- and maybe he still does. But the fact is that I still think his opinion is incorrect, but I don't deny him from walking down a street with a sign in front of the New Democratic Party office saying that these people don't know what they're talking about. And I say that I don't think anybody should be prevented from walking down the street with a sign saying "Don't work under these conditions," or "Don't work because the material supplies in this job come from South Africa" or for any other reason. That's their perfect right, and I don't think that the judges have a right to say that the continuance of unfettered, economic relationship is more important than the fundamental right of free speech. And that is what has happened, Mr. Speaker, because no Legislature changed the law since Aristocratic Restaurants was decided and since the Peerless Laundry case was decided. The law was changed conscientiously by the judges. And as long as we sit here and do what the Minister of Labour is doing, and do as the Honourable Member from Selkirk says we should do, and say let the Courts decide it, we are saying this is the law just as if we stood up and had our votes recorded when those decisions were made.

Now we know that this isn't the law and I say that we don't have to wait until every case in Canada -- and there will be cases in Canada if we choose to wait that long. There will be cases in Canada involving injunctions against picketing from now till Doomsday, and we will never have a chance to decide it if we wait until the Courts decide it. There will always be a case in Canada involving that principle, just as there will always be a case in Canada involving the principle of whether on a conditional sales contract you are able to use two . . . . Should that prevent the members of the Government from enacting legislation on that point? Because there were cases all over Canada before the Courts where this question was being decided? Why do we adopt this particular mode of behaviour when it comes to legislation affecting trade unions. Isn't it enough, Mr. Speaker, that 27 people in Ontario, hitherto law-abiding people, and I suggest that they were law-abiding people; they had pride in their work as my honourable friend the member for Lakeside said that the farmer has pride in his work; they were raising families; they were sending people to University or to other forms of education; had no previous record; all of a sudden 27 of those people were in jail because they purportedly broke a law. Now isn't that a circumstance which would cause members of this Assembly to wonder how is it that previously honourable citizens, hard-working people who work hard for less wages than the members of the Cabinet get, how is it that 27 of them are now in jail because they broke a Court injunction and the Court injunction said that they weren't to walk down the street with a sign. And I suggest to Members of this Chamber that's why they went to jail, because the Court said that they were to stop picketing in the vicinity of a certain place. And their wives and children came out to picket . . . .

MR. LYON: . . . . intimidation and violence.

MR. GREEN: They were told to stop picketing; they were sent to jail because they picketed. The Honourable the Attorney-General knows that if there was violence out on the corner of Portage and Main today, that it could be stopped without an injunction.

MR. LYON: And the Attorney-General would be blamed for strike breaking as soon as he did it.

MR. GREEN: Let the Attorney-General go down and stop violence and nobody will tell him that he shouldn't have done it. I have never acted for a trade union and I don't know of any trade union that has said that "we want the right to commit violence." The Attorney-General may know of it but I don't know of it. I have never seen a trade unionist take the position that a Court Order enjoining violence was a wrong order. The only order that they have spoken up against are the orders which have restrained them from doing what the Attorney-General has the right to do, and if he wants to, good luck to him. If he wants to walk down Portage and Main saying don't belong to trade unions, that's his business. I won't get an injunction against him and no trade union will get an injunction against him, and those are the type of injunctions which these people went to jail about. And Mr. Speaker, let's just look how far the Courts have gone in this particular area. If I read the papers correctly or if the papers are correct in reporting the news, these people were sentenced for contempt



(MR. GREEN, cont'd) . . . .of Court. One of them, the lawyers appeared for them - this is in British Columbia - the lawyer appeared and he said, "My clients didn't know what they were doing." He tried to mitigate the offence as much as possible. The trade unionist - one of them, not all of them - got up and said, "Milord, I've heard everything my counsel says; I wish to advise you immediately that I disagree with him. I knew what I was doing. I would do it again. And if your Lordship today ordered that there be nobody picketing in front of this courtroom, I would go out and picket."

Now, you may say that's an irresponsible attitude -- well I don't know, Mr. Speaker, how many people in this Chamber would say that if a court said you are not permitted to practice the Christian religion or the Jewish religion or anything else, how many of you would say that the law is the law is the law and not do anything about it? I know that historically we have not, we have not congratulated people for obeying the law because it was the law. Indeed in 1946, we sentenced judges to jail because they obeyed the law - not because they didn't obey the law, because they obeyed the law. Now I'm not saying in this particular case that there is a case for civil disobedience or anything like that, I am saying that it's of concern to the members of this legislature that 27 people in Ontario, that three people in British Columbia, who are hard working people, who didn't have any records, who weren't guilty of any criminal conduct, suddenly found themselves in jail. I am saying that similar orders are being granted in the Province of Manitoba and the dignity of the human being will not permit such an order to continue. And I say that if these types of orders aren't outlawed by this Legislature, then we will have somebody who will say rather than obey such an order, I'm going to go to jail. And I, Mr. Speaker, will not be able to fault that individual because perhaps he'll have more courage in the matter than I will.

We have this type of conduct that my honourable friend refers to, the Honourable the Attorney-General. This - an editorial in the Winnipeg Free Press - this is a newspaper which carries on its banner: Freedom of Trade; Liberty of Religion; Equality of Civil Rights. What hypocrisy! Then in the editorial they refer to the labour injunctions as complained of by the Canadian Labour Congress brief. "Without question, the past year has seen Canadian courts issuing injunctions to prevent illegal picketing," - and then in brackets - "but only illegal picketing." What an assinine, stupid statement. Is any court going to enjoin legal picketing? Do they expect the court to say we enjoin this legal picketing. In order to be enjoined they have to declare it illegal. What should be of concern to this newspaper is what type of activities are they declaring to be illegal? Is it the - is it compatible with this newspaper, which speaks of equality of civil rights, that a man be prohibited from walking on the street carrying a sign bearing true information. Because this is the type of injunction which the courts have declared constitute illegal picketing.

MR. HILLHOUSE: In Manitoba?

MR. GREEN: In Manitoba, in Manitoba. Look at the Royal Bank case; Abe Rubin walked in front of the Royal Bank of Canada -- and his case is finished with, it's not going to the spring court -- and he carried a sign saying - and I'm trying to recall -- "non-union people employed here." He was enjoined by the court injunction the next day from doing that, because some people didn't go to work when he did that. And by all means we must have work at all costs whether people have to be shut up or not . . . .

MR. HILLHOUSE: He wouldn't cross the picket line.

MR. GREEN: That's right. They agreed with him; they didn't want to work with non-union people. Just as I said at the outset of this debate that I defend the right of a non-union to walk down the street with a sign saying, "Union people employed here, don't go to work." And if the support of the public is to the person who believes is non-unionism as against unionism and he is able to gain support for his actions and the advance of his interest, good luck to him. But don't prevent it because unionism gets support. It's not sufficient to permit picketing if it doesn't get any support. That's useless picketing, and the trade unionists are just as unprone to engage in useless behaviour as anybody else.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that these injunctions and the type of injunctions which I'm referring to, and I'm saying that - I'm not complaining about other injunction against violence, although I don't think such an injunction is necessary. The Attorney-General can handle it and I'll support him. He says I'll call him a strike breaker; I'll support him if he goes and stops violence. I'm not talking about an injunction against a public nuisance. The Attorney-General can stop that. I'm not talking about an injunction of preventing people from walking into or out of a place of business. The Attorney-General can prevent that. I'm talking about an injunction

(MR. GREEN, cont'd) . . . . which restrains people from walking, walking down the public streets wearing a sign bearing true information.

And I'm asking, Mr. Speaker, how did this law get changed? How did the principles as enunciated by the courts get changed? It didn't get changed by the passing of this Legislature of new laws. But just as surely as if that were done, they have gotten changed by this Legislature sitting and doing nothing when those courts have passed those injunctions. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker - and I heard my honourable friend last year and I was very surprised to hear him say that the only injunctions have been the ones that have prevented unlawful activities. Well, last year there was an injunction, and this was an injunction in connection with contractors' equipment and somehow in that particular case, people went out on a strike which the Legislature thought was perfectly legal, and Mr. Justice Wilson declared the strike illegal, prohibited picketing, on an interlocutory injunction, and I say that walking down the street -- striking may be illegal but walking down the street carrying signs is not illegal. I say the same thing as Mr. Justice Freedman says. But, nevertheless, and I want to bring this particularly to the attention of my honourable friend the Member from Selkirk, that case was in its infancy; there was an interlocutory injunction; there had to be continued court proceedings. It never got to trial until this fall, this fall. Last year the members in this House passed a law changing the law with regard to strike votes, they didn't care that there was something pending in the courts - my case. And as a matter of fact, when we came to argue the case, we came to argue the case, we argued on behalf of the union involved that the law meant what it said before the passing of the legislation. The lawyer for the company argued, "Oh no," he said, "The legislation changed the law in the middle of the case, therefore it couldn't have meant that before the law was changed." Of course that's a - it's not a good argument; I'm not worried about it with regards to that particular case. But I bring it up because the Minister now says, and the member from Selkirk says, that we should wait until this case is disposed of in the courts. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we believe that nobody should be enjoined from walking down the public streets with a sign, or the contents of my previous resolution, then I say we can pass it, we've done no harm, no harm at all. The case in the Supreme Court will be decided; the rights of the parties will be determined, and we won't have done any harm but express a principle which not one person has raised objection to; which everybody seems to agree with it. And I say that we'll do the same thing if we pass this injunction.

Now Mr. Speaker, this resolution - I think I have to say a few more words, Mr. Speaker, on why I think the substance of this resolution is something which is not a concern to trade unions, as trade unions. It may be, it may be to the advantage of the trade union movement to have injunctions which prevent this type of activity. It may prevent other unions from getting in, or things of that nature. It's not they who I am concerned with when I move this resolution. And you don't see the word trade unionist mentioned in this resolution. I say that when a person is prevented from walking down the street with a sign, my freedom is infringed upon, not the trade unionist's freedom. I don't care if they want you to enjoin them. I say that my freedom is enjoined against and the freedom of every member of this House. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that all they are doing is exercising a form of free speech which has been recognized by every democratic society in the civilized world, the right to a peaceful demonstration. We recognize it; we recognize it in Viet Nam. I'm sure that many people don't agree with the views that the Viet Nam war is wrong, or that the Americans are wrong in that conflict. But we don't say that we'll prevent peaceful demonstrations of people who disagree with them.

And to bring matters a little closer to home, in 1963, the KOD Committee in Saskatchewan urged thousands of people from all across the Province of Saskatchewan to converge on the Legislature and have a demonstration against the medicare law. And the Premier of that province to his credit facilitated the demonstration, he didn't enjoin the demonstration.

And in the last election campaign, candidate for the liberal party in Logan asked people to converge on the Legislature and carry signs basically against something that the Conservative Government had done, I can't remember - it doesn't register with me. But nevertheless, nobody said that they couldn't do that. Nobody says that a man can't walk down the street with a sign saying, "Eat at Joe's." And Mike can't get an injunction against him even though it'll cause a loss of trade to his business. Would anybody ever think of getting an injunction against Eaton's because they put a big ad in the paper and therefore got business from the Bay. Well isn't this the same type of conduct? Isn't the trade unionist who walks with a sign saying, support my working conditions and not the working conditions of the fellow who's willing to work for less, or more, or whatever it is. Isn't that all he's saying and you say if he's successful, he's got to be enjoined again. We can't have that.

MR. SPEAKER: I regret I must interrupt the honourable gentleman, he has five minutes, would he . . . .

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I say that this is a question of free speech; I say that it's as fundamental as that, that when the issue of free speech is placed in the balance with the issue of freedom to trade as the sophisticated elements in favour of this injunction have now begun to call it - although I don't know what that means. We've never in this society recognized that somebody has property rights in his customers, that they can't be lured away by somebody else. But nevertheless when free speech, free speech comes up against such things as interference with contractual relationships, people stopping work, or the effect of free speech, that we in this Legislature must declare for freedom of speech. And if we don't, we don't have the trade union movement; we hurt every citizen of the Province of Manitoba and I'd like, Mr. Speaker, in this regard to read a definition of free speech which I've always regarded as being the best definition that I've ever read. This definition is given in the autobiography of Lincoln Stephens, and may I explain that Lincoln Stephens was a muckraker of the 1900's who had considerable respect in the United States. He was appointed by President Wilson to several overseas functions and was a very good friend, I believe, personal friend of Teddy Roosevelt -- if it will make my Honourable the Minister - the Attorney-General happy, he's as close as anything that I've sighted as a doctrinaire socialist. But he was asked by a police officer who was supposed to manage a radical rally in Union Square in New York. Stephens was telling the police officer that they shouldn't do anything to these people, that they should let them talk; that the best way of handling them was to let them talk. And the man said, "How far can we let them go?" The policeman said, "What can we permit them to say without it becoming dangerous?" And there had been beatings of people who had been speaking previous to this particular conversation, and Stephens said, "Well I'll tell you officer, whenever you hear someone saying something that everybody believes, you included, you may beat him up, that's not free speech. But when you hear somebody saying something like that pretty girl there, that you and everybody else thinks is wrong, then you should draw your clubs, line up in front of the orator and defend her, for that's free speech."

And, Mr. Speaker, when I was in the United States, I saw a picture on one of the leading newspapers which greatly impressed me because it was Stephens' definition. There was a man, a man with a swastika on, a member of the Nazi party with a sign calling for the, calling for something against the negroes and two negro policemen were walking beside him to make sure that he wouldn't be attacked by anybody else. Well that's the speech, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest that the courts because of the atmosphere prevailing with regard to labour relations have unconsciously - I don't think that they think they're making orders against free speech, but regardless of what they think, that's what they're doing. And I suggest that this Legislature take a stand against such type orders.

Mr. Speaker, I have indicated that the Free Press says that this is illegal picketing that is prohibited against. The best proof that it is not illegal conduct that is being enjoined against is the fact that you have got to get an injunction. If it was illegal conduct, from the point of view of what members in this House regard as illegal, then somebody, the Attorney-General, who is not afraid of being called a strike breaker, could send somebody down to stop that illegal conduct, but because there is nothing that the Attorney-General can do, because the man is walking down the street carrying a sign, not molesting anybody, not blocking anybody's entrance, not doing anything which is contrary to law, the Attorney-General would rightly tell an employer, I can't interfere in that matter. It's a matter of a person exercising his lawful rights. That's why they need an injunction, because the Attorney-General won't interfere; and that's why they have been going to the courts to get injunctions prohibiting this type of activity. And the Winnipeg Free Press, whose opinion in labour matters is just as good as its opinion in most other matters, says that only illegal picketing has been restrained. As if some judge is going to say we restrain this legal picketing! Isn't that stupid! But that's their suggestion.

Would the Free Press take the same position if suddenly the potato growers or a group of the dissident potato growers starting selling potatoes and were put in jail, wouldn't the Free Press then say, we've got to find out what it is about this law which permits peaceful potato growers to go to jail. But not so with labour unions - not so. These have been illegal picketing that have been restrained by the courts. The courts have never restrained any legal picketing.

Mr. Speaker, I say that there is another right that is involved here. It's the right of

(MR. GREEN, cont'd) . . . . these people to communicate information. It's the right of me and you and everybody in this house and everybody in this province to receive information. I might be interested, Mr. Speaker -- I'll wind up in two minutes --(Interjection)-- in one minute - I might be interested, Mr. Speaker, in knowing at which locations non-union people are employed. I as a member of the public might wish to support those people or wish not to support them and if you prevent those people from communicating that information, you prevent their right to communicate, you infringe on my right to be informed, to patronize those people that I want to and to not patronize those people that I don't want to, and any suggestion that I have to be forced into patronizing people whether I like them or not, and that I'm not permitted to be informed, is contrary to our principles of justice.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members of this Assembly to pass this resolution mostly because nobody disagrees with it -- and nobody will disagree with it, they'll get up and say well it should go to the courts or something else like that -- but pass it, because you all believe in it because it is an infringement of your rights that are involved, not an infringement of the rights of trade unions.

MR. SPEAKER: I must say in passing the Honourable Member for Inkster disappoints me, he took two minutes rather than one as he promised.

MR. GREEN: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I'll try and make it up next time.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, if nobody else wishes to speak, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington that debate be adjourned. I speak as the Member for Logan. I'm pronouncing now who I am because it will help you out.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, on reading the resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster, I cannot take exception to the first two paragraphs of the preamble, the first paragraph being, "that the underlying principle of labour relations is that every employee has the right to belong to a trade union and to join with his fellow employees for the purpose of collective bargaining." We all accept that principle.

As to the second paragraph in the resolution, which states that, "Whereas it is the intention of the said Act that employers have no effective interest in the question of whether or not their employees belong to a trade union." We also accept that and there is nothing in the Act which prohibits employees from doing that, and as a matter of fact, the Act specifically forbids an employer in taking exception to it. But I do object to the conclusion to which you have come, because in your conclusion you are dealing with an entirely different matter.

The purpose of having an employer appear before the Labour Board on a certification is not to raise an objection to his employees belonging to a trade union, and as a matter of fact he is not allowed to raise that objection, and it's not against them indulging in collective bargaining through a trade union. The main purpose of the employee appearing before the board - and as a matter of fact, he is summoned to appear before the board by a notice directed to him - the main purpose of him appearing before the board is to submit to the board a list of his employees, which is private as far as the board is concerned, and if he has any objection to any employees that are being included in the bargaining agreement, any employees who occupy a managerial position or a supervisory position, it gives the employer the right to state his objection to these individuals being included.

Now another thing which he has a right to object to is whether or no a bargaining unit is appropriate or not to his particular form of employment. These are the matters in respect of which he is called before the Board. He is not called before the Board so as to raise any objection to the men belonging to a union or to the men having a collective agreement; because as a matter of fact, the men can have a collective agreement with an employer without even appearing before the Labour Board.

Now what my honourable friend is actually suggesting in my opinion is contrary to natural justice. He wants to deny to an employer, who is a party to those proceedings, the right to appear and be heard -- and I have been listening to him today and as far as the employee is concerned, that is a right that he insists upon being observed. Now I think it is only fair that the same right should be extended to an employer. And the main purpose of the employer appearing before the board on a certification case is to furnish the board with information and to state to the board whether or no he is agreeable to certain members being

(MR. HILLHOUSE, cont'd) . . . . included, that is members that he thinks should be excluded by virtue of the fact that they occupy a managerial position and should not be included in the bargaining unit. The purpose of the Labour Relations Act is stated in the preamble to the act. It's an act to promote equitable relations between employers and employees and to facilitate the just settlement of disputes between them.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it is essential that the employer be a party before the Labour Board in those certification proceedings and in those revocation proceedings, because that is the only means by which the main principle of this Act can be adhered to: "a just and equitable settlement of the relations between an employer and an employee."

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against this resolution.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to be very long. I didn't have anything prepared on this debate on this resolution but I think that it is rather unfortunate for the Honourable Member from Inkster, who moved this resolution as well as the last one, that they should follow in so close order on the Order Paper. I think that my honourable friend appears, anyway to my eyes, as being very sincere, very dedicated. I did not doubt his sincerity when he spoke on the last resolution when he did not agree with certain people, did not agree with certain newspapers, and he seemed to be a real defender of freedom when he said that - we even go further and say that it was the right of everyone to walk around carrying a placard with false information. He wanted to go this far - this far - to defend freedom. I cannot understand, reading this last paragraph of this resolution, how he can reconcile his two different attitudes at all, unless that's labour on one side and management on the other side, because, Mr. Speaker, I feel that he could have made the last speech to oppose this resolution that he proposed and it would have been just as valid. I can't understand how, and as I say, I think that --(Interjection)-- well I wish you would - because I never doubted my friend's sincerity when he spoke just a few minutes ago. But I cannot help but doubt the sincerity of this resolution unless I receive a very good explanation and I cannot see how you can explain this. If he can, if he can explain it to my satisfaction I'll be the first one to admit it, but I cannot see where you can get up in this House and defend freedom and say you can, even -- what does it say? -- even though such permission may result in a loss of trade, even if it's false information, you're earning - nobody forces anybody to work in this place, but he wants the world to know that he thinks this person is wrong. But then what does he say? "Be it resolved that the present legislation, giving an employer the right to appear in opposition to application and so on," should be repealed. I don't understand that. I'm sorry my honourable friend, I was impressed. I don't say that I agree with everything that was said, or with too much of what was said before, but I was very impressed with his sincerity.

But as I say, it's rather unfortunate for my honourable friend I am sure, that these two resolutions should be lumped together, because he made a speech that if I think he is sincere, if I am swayed by his opinion, I am certainly going to vote against this resolution, because this is what he has been telling me to do for 45 - well 47 minutes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand. If anyone else wishes to speak, they may go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate in order to give a little more thought to this resolution. My first thoughts on this resolution were similar to some who have expressed it here; that of socialism, control, giving pictures of state creche, and all those quite unpleasant things which was my first thought.

As one looks further into this resolution and looks at the whereases, I find of course, it is correct, there is a need. Most of the need is illustrated in the whereases, Mr. Speaker, and I don't think there is any need to go any further into that. I can understand the situation though of members representing rural areas, whereby they see that there can be no need whatsoever for this facility, or the need for this facility. May I suggest to them that they are very

(MR. STANES, cont'd) . . . . fortunate that perhaps they have not joined the cities and the city way of life and that perhaps as some of the larger centers grow the need will grow. I do sympathize with their thinking and I understand why there is some perhaps differences of opinion.

Thinking back to the need for kindergartens, the first thought was perhaps that there should be some standard for a parent to know where to send the child. This I think will be corrected in the very near future. But this was a problem. There was good and very bad; there were some people who ran these kindergartens who had past experience that ran the thing along the lines of a school as preparation for school and tried to get the most out of the child's time and of their ability, rather than just wasting time and keeping the child away — occupying the child for the parent to be free. I think this is something that one has to bear in mind too, particularly if one is going to a younger group of people. The need is there, Mr. Speaker.

I was very interested in the Honourable Member for Rhineland's remarks. I am very pleased that his experience is that there is no need for women to leave. I am afraid that in modern society and cities, this is about as up-to-date as a Model T Ford and I would like to ask the honourable member, does he consider that a woman, a wife, helping her husband on a farm is correct, but it is not correct for a wife to help her husband in a city, where the husband's occupation perhaps is a manager of a company or so on? It is difficult . . . .

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): I hope I get an opportunity to answer you. Under the rules that we now have, I cannot answer you.

MR. STANES: I appreciate that. This is a problem we face, Mr. Speaker, although I can understand the honourable member's position and I sympathize with him, there is undoubtedly a considerable need for this facility. Now firstly, where is the need; how much is the need; surely we don't go from a need to state control. This is what the resolution implies, that the state will now provide — therefore be it resolved that the Government consider the advisability of establishing public day nurseries in communities where the demand for the service warrants such action. This I read as the state will provide, where it is necessary. I can't buy that part of the resolution. I think there is undoubtedly a need. The modern woman should not be, by force of circumstances, because of children probably beyond her control, be forced to stay in a home being unhappy when she could be outside using her talent. This is the present society. We should do everything we can to meet this need. But, Mr. Speaker, speaking quite briefly to the point, I cannot subscribe the whole way that the state should do it. I think the state should see that it is provided. Private enterprise can provide it. It should be provided at a reasonable price. I want to have the answers to all these questions before I can go from the beginning right to the end.

. . . . . continued of next page

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate the opportunity of making a few remarks on this resolution because I think it provides an opportunity to reflect on a matter that is considerably wider than the issue at point in our discussion on the resolution itself, but which perhaps is worthy of some consideration on the part of members of this House. I think that it is timely that the Honourable Member for Logan should have introduced this resolution and I hope he will be able to agree with me in the approach that I am going to recommend to the House, as to how we should attempt to come to grips with it.

The debate of course, so far reflects a very considerable difference of opinion as to what the issue is and how it relates to government. We have heard the various parts of the province speak in respect of this matter and as is true of a good many issues, there is a very decided difference of opinion depending on one's experience and background, and that of course is something that we have learned to expect and it always presents us with a problem as to how we reconcile these differing views, which are not particular to any political group, when we come to deal with a question such as this. In fact, so far it seems to me that the discussion has probably raised more questions than it answers; but certainly for me the whole idea really belongs in the context of a much wider discussion than the particular narrow issue that we have before us now.

I think this matter of day nurseries provides us with a very convenient means, perhaps, of saying that what we really ought to be discussing here and what really should attract some of our attention, is not this issue alone, but rather the whole concept of the status of women in our modern society today, because that's what it really bears directly on, and I would like to see the discussion expanded to take in this wider concept to which I hope I may refer as I proceed.

Now some people will think that the discussion of the status of women in modern society is a pretty academic question, and they may very well say, well the status of women, why not the status of this and the status of that, and it is true that this argument could well be advanced and we have to consider what kind of a case we can make that public opinion should be interested in a topic as wide as the one that I have disclosed. Well I think it is obvious that it isn't really very likely that the case for considering the status of women in our society is going to be made very effectively by men. That's the first thing I think about. Because most men I think are quite satisfied with the status of women in modern society. I am quite sure the Honourable Member for Rhineland is and I am sure there are others in this House who might very well subscribe to the same opinion. And I don't really criticize them for doing that because it is, we must frankly say, a masculine oriented world that we live in and this question is one that perhaps might not attract the interest of all men. But whatever the men may think, I suggest to you that the women don't feel that way; or more correctly perhaps, some women don't feel that way.

We remember that in 1961 one of the things that President Kennedy did in the United States was to establish a review of the status of women in that society, which was headed up by the late Eleanor Roosevelt, and that National Commission in United States was followed by studies in 45 of the states of the American Union, and they are today following through on the recommendations of these various studies and if the information provided to me is correct, with some considerable effect in dealing with legitimate points at issue and of interest in this matter.

And in our own nation there have been very considerable representations made by women's groups on this whole subject. I have a list in my hand here of some 32 who have submitted briefs in this respect, starting with B'Nai B'Rith Women, District No. 22 and going down the alphabet until we come to the Zonta International. Every woman's organization one could think of and a few that aren't entirely composed of ladies is contained between the B's and the Z's in this particular list. And we know that last Friday the Federal Government announced a Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada. So the problem is recognized nationally and in the States of the American Union and recognized nationally in Canada and I think it follows that as the jurisdiction in Canada is divided with respect to the application of constitutional powers in this matter, that the province should consider what role it should take with respect to the situation that is developing and the announcement of the federal study.

Now the resolution itself indicates one field in which some study is certainly justified, the day nursery, the pre-kindergarten requirements in this province. It has been said, and correctly, that the province supports indirectly in Winnipeg -- and I hasten to add modestly, some four of these institutions through the Social Allowances Act -- and it would be no bad

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) . . . . . thing to find out definitively what more is required and who should do it and how it should be paid for and what the role of government, if any, would be in this particular development.

And I must frankly say that with respect to the problem presented by the member's resolution there is no money in the 1967 estimates or in the 1967 budget for the government itself to make any substantial financial contribution to a service of this kind and it would be desirable I think that even though we cannot do anything about it at the present time, that we should have a look at the priority that is involved here and to see what place it should have in our spending program and its relation to the wider issues, educationally and socially. So it seems to me that we ought to be prepared, even if we haven't got the wherewithal at the present time to proceed, and even if we do not feel, some of us, that we are justified in proceeding without further investigation, I think we should agree to look at this thing in depth.

Now there are so many other problems in the same field. We enacted equal pay legislation here in this House and not so long ago some complaints have been reaching us that this law is not particularly well observed. Perhaps it ought to be reviewed in its operation. Women claim quite strenuously in the brief they presented to various government bodies, that the equal employment opportunity is one that is more honoured in the breach than the observance and it is interesting to note that the Glassco Commission referring to the policies of the Federal Government conferred that that was actually the case in their field of study, and we must certainly ask ourselves, what are the appropriate policies in this field.

I am also concerned with making sure that those women who wish are given suitable facilities to take a place in the economic field. In this province, in spite of what we heard this morning, it's not the fact that we have enough jobs for our people. The fact is that we haven't enough people for our jobs. We need to get some of our women into the working field perhaps if we are going to have a chance of filling the job opportunities that we have. How can we make better arrangements to help women become more proficient in taking advantage of the opportunities for employment that are available in our province today? We are willing and anxious to look into the measures we have in this field and to see how they may be improved and made more useful to those interested. And I had it put to me quite strongly that the taxation policy with respect to working wives is unfair and discriminatory and discourages working wives from taking the full part in the economic field that they might otherwise do. Reference was made to income tax allowances and deductions and matters of that sort which I am sure members have heard of before now; and while income tax is in the Federal field, it is also in the Provincial field and perhaps we should have an opinion as to what that situation ought to be like.

Then there is a whole realm of legal problems that perhaps could be looked at. For example, is anyone here satisfied with the arrangements that are made for the maintenance of deserted wives and deserted families and children? I'm not. We have tried our best with the law as we have it now; we have tried to enforce it; we have tried to track people down; we have tried to co-operate with other provinces, but have we succeeded in really doing a job here? I don't think so. And I'm sure there must be a better way and I'd like to find out what it is -- (Interjection) -- Governments are supporting them. Where the deserted wife or mother is not able to get support from the husband, we do not leave them floundering. They are then brought under the Mothers and Children's Allowance system and receive what help we can give in that way. But I don't see that we should resign ourselves to the fact that the husband perhaps is allowed to escape from his just responsibility, simply because he takes a notion to move out and I'd like to see that kind of thing looked into and improved.

What about the education of children past 16? What should the responsibility of the father in particular be. Has it come to the point when we should change our regulations there? What about property rights for women, particularly in cases of desertion and separation? Are they fair and equitable under modern circumstances? What about the marriage regulations? It's been put to us quite strongly that the marriage regulations and the age of consent, the legal age, particularly with respect to unmarried mothers who are very young are wrong under present circumstances and that they ought to be changed, and I would think that that is another subject that could well be looked into. And rather a minor field of study perhaps is the Jury Act which says that women "may" be jurors and not "will" be jurors, and whether that's considered a serious enough problem to require state legislative action is of course marginal, but it is the kind of thing that could well be looked into. And I'm certain that in the federal field, the status of women with respect to nationality and citizenship and



(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) . . . . perhaps some aspects of property rights as well will be a subject of real concern to that commission that is going to look into the whole matter.

So, I conclude that there is a case for looking into the question of the status of women, and I conclude that while some of the responsibility is federal, that some of the responsibility is also provincial. And perhaps the institution of the Federal Royal Commission gives us an ideal opportunity to join with them in trying to do something about it. And when a public need is established -- and that of course is something that has to be proved; I'm making no assumptions at the present time -- but when the public need is established, then of course the question of cost, the question of priorities and its relationship to other programs and to spending, is a problem that requires elucidation and comment. The Federal Government has reacted to this situation as I have stated by its own Royal Commission, and I think the province ought to be ready to co-operate with that, more especially in those fields where provincial responsibilities are involved. When we come to problems within our own jurisdiction, and when provincial public funds are called upon in one way or another, we've got to allocate the priorities, we have to make some determination of the costs which are important considerations when you're operating within the kind of overstrained budget that we're faced with in our administration here today.

So I say to the honourable member who introduced the resolution that I hope he will not be too disappointed if I tell him that I can't accept it as it stands for the reasons that I have mentioned to him. That it does raise problems which the government cannot deal with without considerable financial concern and which we have really not had time in the short space since we've seen this resolution to resolve. And when you consider that it's part of a considerably larger question and it should be studied in that larger context with due regard to costs and priorities, I hope that the House will think it useful to consider an amendment which I would now like to propose with respect to this resolution.

And the amendment which is seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, reads as follows: "Delete all the words after the first WHEREAS and substitute the following: The status of women in modern society is a matter of public concern, and whereas any inequities in the status of women reflect on the economic, political and social development of the Province of Manitoba;

AND WHEREAS it is expedient to review a number of measures already adopted respecting the status of women;

AND WHEREAS there are a number of specific areas relating to the status of women which might benefit from study, such as the following:

1. Fair employment legislation affecting women.
2. Government hiring and promotion practices and government pensions, insurance and retirement schemes as they relate to women.
3. Private hiring and promotion practices and private insurance, pensions and retirement schemes as they relate to women.
4. The special services needed to enable women to play an appropriate role in Manitoba's economy, such as day nurseries, emergency mother's help, latch-key programs, training programs, etc.
5. A consideration of the position of married women under our laws and common law customs, such as parental rights, domicile, taxation and property rights.
6. The economic and social position of widowed, separated and deserted mothers.
7. The way in which Manitoba lives up to the international standards established by the United Nations and special United Nations agencies through their convention on human rights.
8. The costs and priorities to be attached to government programs in this field.
9. Other related matters.

AND WHEREAS it is desirable to co-operate with the Federal Royal Commission on the status of women;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that consideration be given to the advisability of an investigation into the status of women in the Province of Manitoba by a commission of inquiry or other appropriate means.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I didn't rise soon enough.

MR. SPEAKER: I beg your pardon.

MR. MILLER: I'm sorry I didn't realize it was coming to a vote. Are we voting on the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Adopting this amendment.

MR. MILLER: I wish to speak to the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: We're voting on the amendment.

MR. MILLER: Is it in order for me to speak on the amendment then.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you want to speak on the amendment now.

MR. MILLER: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: By all means.

MR. MILLER: Fine, thank you very much. I'm sorry I wasn't clear at what point I could get up and speak on this.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the First Minister with great interest. I've often heard of his prowess in debate and I was really impressed with the way he took a very simple straightforward resolution introduced by my colleague from Logan and proceeded in creating out of a simple resolution, a massive public relations project which I don't doubt will earn the plaudits of everyone concerned in this House. But I think it has nothing to do with the resolution. The resolution is really quite clear. It asks that the government recognize something that in Greater Winnipeg certainly is a problem and has been recognized as a problem and I think the First Minister acknowledges this as a problem, asking that day nurseries shall be supported by the government, that they give consideration to the establishing of a public day nursery. And instead we get an amendment dealing with women's rights in society, the need to recognize the women in our day and age, tying in the newly appointed commission in Ottawa on the whole question of women's rights in the Twentieth Century. This is very commendable but I think what the Honourable Minister has done is simply detract from this the resolution itself, has avoided the issue, which is a real one in Manitoba, which the people who are concerned and dealing with these problems have to contend with today, not tomorrow or next year or two years from now when the commission reports. Speak to any welfare agency in Greater Winnipeg, and they will tell you the problem is here now. They will tell you, and the Member for Logan and I believe the Member for Elmwood the other day, spelled out the fact that these are immediate needs, and although I commend the First Minister for thinking in terms of a broader study -- and if he wishes to bring in a separate resolution, I'll be glad to second it, as a resolution -- but to thwart the intent of this resolution by introducing an extraneous thing entirely and to twist it as he has so beautifully done, much better than I could do I'm sure, is none the less taking a simple resolution and by very, as I say, beautiful words diverting the attention of this House, diverting the attention of the resolution itself into something which the resolution doesn't call for. I for one would feel inclined to vote against the amendment, not because the amendment in itself isn't a good one insofar as the intent the First Minister wishes to convey, but because in doing so, by introducing this amendment the government is in fact trying to get out of the confrontation which has been asked for in this House of looking at the problem of day nurseries. I know this is a problem which is perhaps applicable only in the Greater Winnipeg area, although I believe in other urban areas this too is a problem.

I remember the Member for Rock Lake being very incensed that the time of this House was being spent on this matter, where in his constituency he is sure they wouldn't give it five minutes of their time. Perhaps he's right and in his constituency they don't need it. Good luck to him, I wish him well. But as one of the newspapers commented, there are city mice and there are country mice and since I am one of the city mice my concern is the city area. So I deplore the fact the First Minister has introduced an amendment which distorts this resolution, defeats the resolution and puts off for an indefinite period, a need and a requirement within the Greater Winnipeg area which we have to face up to. It's a real need. The professionals in the field know it is. The First Minister knows it is. The Minister of Education knows it is and the Minister of Health and Welfare also know that it is a real need. But they're not prepared to act on it.

I agree that this year's estimates hold nothing in it in this regard, they have not set aside any money. There's nothing in this particular resolution which says the government has to implement it in this session, but on the other hand I'm very sorry, and I regret that the First Minister has instead of saying yes this is a problem, let us pass it, let us then look at it and for 1968 in the estimates perhaps we'll have a decent answer. Instead of which he's sweeping it under the table and despite the fact, as I say, he's done this in beautiful language

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) . . . . with six or seven clauses of a sweeping resolution which will no doubt earn him the support of all the women in this country, when he moves from here into the federal scene, none the less he's doing an injustice to the children of Manitoba because this resolution deals with the needs of children. The women are secondary; the mothers are secondary; the fathers are secondary. The problem here is the children. Are we going to sit back another year and another year and another year while hundreds of children are deprived, are allowed to continue in the pattern, in the cycle in which they're captives in welfare homes. The greatest problem today is to break that pattern, the circle of continuing from one generation to the other, the pattern of welfare psychology in which these children are growing up.

We talk about the costs of welfare; we talk about programs to combat the continuous growth of welfare costs. And I agree, you're not going to do it by handing out more money, you've got to do it by positive programs. This is a program that might go a little way in correcting the evil which we're living with and I suggest that in moving this amendment the First Minister is backing away from this responsibility and I for one would urge this House to defeat the amendment as it stands and ask the First Minister to bring in his amendment in the form of a resolution and as I said, I will gladly second it. Thank you.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member from Logan and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in amendment thereto. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . . could I have that stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I ask leave of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Burrows. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, while I am prepared to debate the resolution at this particular time, I don't think the clock would permit me to finish my remarks and I beg to have the matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington), Mr. Chairman, I think I would wish to take the remaining ten minutes. I think the time may be sufficient for me to complete what submission I have.

I have found that in sitting here that we are given a great lesson in humility and also in patience. It seems that on several occasions the Order Paper has gone right up to the particular resolution that I was going to speak on -- although in reality it is the other one that I was waiting for. I've been letting this one stand -- and then the time has reached 5:30 and we've gone home and we've had to go through the same procedure again. It isn't easy to be humble, as somebody to whom it was suggested that patience is a virtue replied "But who wants to be virtuous." So expecting that I'll be able to complete my submission in the ten minutes that remains, I will proceed.

The other day I heard the Minister of Health telling us that there is no shortage in hospital personnel and that is the subject with which the resolution deals. In referring to other reports, the Willard Report and the Holland report dealing with the subject of nurses, I find that they are saying just the exact opposite, that there is a shortage, not only of nurses but of hospital and health personnel. If I may, in the Holland Report, I would wish to refer to a page number here, page 48, in which it points this fact up. It has mentioned certain hospitals, says that there are 80 active treatment hospitals in Manitoba ranging in various sizes from four to a thousand beds, and it says it has been shown that these hospitals in the aggregate are considered to be short 472 full-time registered nurses. The larger hospitals, those with 125 beds; have vacancies in 12 percent of their nursing positions. The rural hospitals with 31 to 125 beds have 31 percent of their positions for registered nurses unfilled. And so it goes on. Those from 12 to 30 beds are short 25 percent of their registered nurse complement while the 16 hospitals with 15 beds and less have 47 percent fewer registered nurses than their establishment calls for. And there are other references. I let it be understood that I don't think that this is merely a Manitoba problem or a Manitoba hospital problem, it's a world-wide problem; as a result of the great demand that new and increased health services

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.) . . . . in all nations in the world are making upon the personnel that is available and that will be available.

I have read somewhere, I don't recall the source, that the developing nations are justified in seeking aid from the more developed societies and they are doing that and a great number of our trained personnel are going to these developing nations to give assistance, some direction, education and we are losing some of our personnel and having to step up the training program. But then we, in turn, are turning to some of the more developed of the developing nations -- and I have particular reference to the Phillipine Islands -- and are importing trained personnel from them. At one point there were as many as, if I recall correctly, 62 Phillipine nurses in the municipal hospitals carrying out work there in positions which the authorities there found it impossible to fill in any other way. They took it upon themselves, on their own initiative, to advertise in the Phillipine Islands for nurses and they received replies. The nurses were very thoroughly screened, they are of high calibre and since coming here, by additional training, they have advanced to additional status, and then they are now, some of them, leaving the municipal hospitals to fill the needs in other hospitals in Manitoba. But there are nurses also and hospital personnel that are also leaving the province.

Now with this as a situation -- and I have to admit that I know it is a very fluid condition, the turnover in different hospitals of hospital personnel from nurses right on down the list is a very very fluid one, the turnover is very great, there are always some coming in, others leaving -- or some leaving and others coming in, I should put it that way -- and it is difficult at any one time to say exactly where we stand. But the general impression, and it was the impression of the Holland Report, that there is a shortage, and they mention the figure 472. The thought that occurs to me is that if we cannot fully man the hospitals that we now have, then we are going to have increased difficulty in filling the demands or the needs of the hospitals that are being added to what we already have.

I wondered whether the Honourable the Minister for Health would be able to give me information about hospitals that were projected in 1964 for completion at some later date, but they were listed as construction projects likely to start in 1963 or 1964. There's quite a list of them. This is in a report that I have, I don't know where it originated, on a summary of hospital construction projects as at December 31st. And in schedule No. 3 in that report, it lists a number of hospitals that are likely to start in 1963 or '64. Many of these are additions. Some are new, such as the 22-bed hospital at Winnipegosis. I wonder if the Minister could keep the names of these in mind. I can read them -- they will be listed in Hansard -- and whether he would let me know how many of these are started; how many are completed; how many are still to be either started or completed. There's the addition at Ashern. I'll just mention the names of the towns: Ashern, Carberry, Emerson, Hartney, Manitou, Morden, Pine Falls, Portage la Prairie, Ste. Anne, Steinbach, Swan Lake, Swan River, Winkler, Whiteshell, Whitemouth, Winnipegosis, the Grace Hospital at St. James -- We know that the building is completed but it isn't opened as yet. St. Boniface General, St. Boniface Extended Treatment Hospital, Victoria, Winnipeg General, and the Winnipeg Municipal.

How many of these projects were started actually at the time that they were supposed to start -- it said likely in 1963 or '64. How many were started and how many were completed? How many of these are, if they are completed, are in need of hospital personnel? Then it mentions the number "15" in a schedule which isn't numbered, there were 1, 2 and 3, and then there's a fourth one, but it doesn't bear the number "4". It says, "Project approved, land to start after 1964 and it gives the number "15". If the personnel needs of these hospitals are being met, then the information would be very satisfactory to know. If they are not being met it would be interesting to know how they are going to be met. The question is, how many of these have been built and how many are fully manned. And, in addition to this, there are the 15 projects I mentioned. And so I enquire whether these have been started on, whether the staff to man them has been provided; if not, when and how will it be available.

One second -- I was going to say one other matter -- it's a matter of accreditation. How many of the hospitals in Manitoba are accredited hospitals; and where are these located? That is, what are the names of the places in which they are located, and if they are not all accredited, as I know they are not all accredited, does that mean that those who have not been given accreditation are giving an inferior service. And in what manner it is inferior -- whether it is because of lack of personnel to fill the posts that it is necessary to fill.

These are the questions I would ask of the Honourable the Minister, Mr. Speaker, and

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.) . . . . with that I would close these remarks in the hope that he will be able to give me the information.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we may -- it is 5:30 the normal time of adjournment -- just leave the matter open until next time we meet.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have leave?

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . . like to have one thing clear, Mr. Speaker. The last speaker said that he was finished. If he's finished, I think that somebody should take the adjournment. If not, if he wants to . . . . -- (Interjection) -- I certainly think he has more time if he wishes to but I think it should be clear who has the adjournment.

MR. PETURSSON: There were a couple of additional points that I was going to try to make but I was watching the clock. . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order. There seems to be a considerable number of discussions . . . . Does the Honourable Member for Wellington wish to ~~continue~~ another time? Is it agreed? Agreed.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.