

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, March 26, 1968

Opening prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery on my left where we have 65 students of Grade 9 standing from the Lac du Bonnet School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Chater and Miss Walker. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet. Also, we have 45 students of Grade 5 standing from the Buchanan School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Carney, Mr. Sokalski and Mrs. Collins. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

I should like to also take a moment to acquaint the honourable members with something that has come to my attention. I'd like to refer to the photograph that was taken in the Chamber and published in a local newspaper. I should also like to inform the honourable members that the taking of this picture was entirely unauthorized. The abridgement of this acknowledged practice is regretted and an apology has been received from the editor of that local newspaper.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer. I believe the Act says that this falls within his jurisdiction. Have the members been appointed to the Manitoba Arts Council yet?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer)(Fort Rouge): It is not my jurisdiction, Mr. Speaker. I think it's the Provincial Secretary.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I checked the Act but it wasn't too clear really and . . . . .

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, sometimes the Provincial Secretary wishes it wasn't in his jurisdiction but it is, and the members have not been appointed.

MR. HANUSCHAK: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister give any indication as to when he intends to proceed under the Act?

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and I do this deliberately although he's not presently involved in questions of water conservation. A story appeared in the Winnipeg Free Press yesterday regarding a possible \$30 billion scheme for the export of water from Manitoba and I wonder whether his department is attuned to this particular project which -- the story comes apparently from Washington -- and I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that I'm not objecting to what is said, I just wonder whether his department is involved in what is happening and whether it is formulating a policy about it.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the honourable member's question, the department is involved in the interprovincial study that is taking place with the three prairie provinces and we are also involved in the study that the university has been carrying on on the inter-disciplinary basis at the university, but in terms of actual water export there hasn't been any decision arrived at with regards to water export as far as the department is concerned. I should also mention that the interprovincial study is under the joint, supervision I guess you'd call it, of the Minister of Agriculture and Water Conservation and myself.

MR. GREEN: . . . . . to hear then the Minister is telling me that his department then is involved in the question of water resources and the future prospects of water export.

MR. CRAIK: Well just to clarify it, the Water Conservation Branch of the department is primarily involved in water control problems within the province but the interprovincial regulation of water is under the, let's say the joint observation of both departments, because of the natural resource characteristic of water.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Order of the Day

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) . . . . . are proceeded with, I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Last evening the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie asked the Minister whether or not it would be possible for the plane that is flying up to Grand Rapids and Gillam on Saturday could -- or whether arrangements could be made to have the plane come back via the Churchill Forest Products Factory so that we may spend a couple of hours there going through the factory. I thought it was a worthwhile request and I wonder if he would concede to that request. I think it would be most interest -- (Interjection) -- There's no landing strip? Well is it not -- where is the factory?

MR. CRAIK: I think if the honourable members -- if the question is whether or not the plane could fly that way, I think probably you'd have to negotiate this with the Provincial Minister of Public Utilities or the Manitoba Hydro, or whoever's jurisdiction it's under. There is certainly no objection if you want to take the time, I suppose, to fly that way. It's not the most direct route to get to Gillam though.

MR. SHOEMAKER: A subsequent question to the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities. Could he not arrange then with the Manitoba Hydro to fly us, either coming or going, via the Churchill Factory Plant wherever it is located? We landed one time at Bakers Narrows. The question is: Could my honourable friend not arrange with the Manitoba Hydro to have the members of the House visit the Churchill Forest Products Factory, wherever it is located, on Saturday next?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, the insurance coverage that we've arranged wouldn't permit it.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of N.D.P.) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. May I direct this question to the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities in the interests of my family. Can I be assured, or can my family be assured, that the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities or the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources will not gamble with my wife's husband's life?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address this question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has he anything further to report on the Vegetable Marketing Board, or Commission, and when this matter may be resolved?

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): No, Mr. Speaker, there is no further news that I can bring to that particular question at this time. The matter as to the validity of the recently held vote is one that's before the Courts at this time and I have, on the recommendations of the Manitoba Marketing Board, not taken any action pending the outcome of that Court decision.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. As you recall, yesterday my Leader asked a series of questions on the Status of Women Committee. My question is this: You mentioned that the status of women was a volunteer group. What I wanted to know is how did this volunteer group come about and how did they take the matter into their own hands? Was it because the government did not offer the leadership?

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from Hamiota being a man wouldn't understand. Nevertheless, I want to tell him that when the Federal Government decided that they were going to have this Commission meet and when our Premier suggested that we take part in this, we decided as a group of women when we met - and it was myself who got them together and co-ordinated the women in the province - we decided among ourselves that we would try to do this without expense. We took, for example, the B and B Report which came from down east and which really cost the people of this country a considerable amount of money, and for that reason it has been criticized from coast to coast, and we decided in Manitoba that regardless of what other provinces did that we would attempt in our own way to do this with the least amount of expense and the women of this province were quite agreeable.

The first meeting, for the information of the House, was in my office with some dozen women -- I don't just recall but I have all of this which I could give to you if you ask me for it. Later, we sent our invitations to every organization that we could possibly think of and it was these women together who made up their minds that they would elect a Chairman, and from there on in they have worked and they have worked on a voluntary basis. The publishing

(MRS. FORBES cont'd.) . . . of the report - as I understand, they find that they'll have their reports in by Thursday morning of this week and I am meeting with the ladies concerned at that time.

MR. DAWSON: A supplementary question. The Minister being as old as she is - I mean in the House - missed the point of my question. What I meant was: Did you offer the leadership as a Minister of the Government or did you offer the leadership as a volunteer woman?

MRS. FORBES: Being as young as you are, I guess it takes a little explanation. Nevertheless, I did not really offer leadership in that sense and I have never portrayed myself as one of the leaders. I merely organized the women, and it was not myself who did the work but it was the women of Manitoba who did the work. I merely offered the organization portion of it, which I did.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister whether she -- this was asked the other day but I'd like to clarify it. Were you ever approached by the women to provide research or financial assistance; and, on the other hand, did you ever offer any to them?

MRS. FORBES: No, Mr. Speaker, I answered that question yesterday. We did discuss often the fact that for research that we probably would have to seek outside help and we still considered it on a volunteer basis, and in the final analysis they never came to me with any cost or any suggestion that they couldn't do it themselves. They have done the research part themselves.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the young and intelligent looking Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is it the intention of the Boundaries Commission to table a report on Greater Winnipeg municipalities and amalgamation at this Session of the Legislature?

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, No.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. STERLING R. LYON Q. C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): Yesterday I was asked a question by the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The first question was: Does the application form for a beverage waiter's licence contain the question "have you ever been convicted of a criminal offence?" The answer is "yes". The second question was: Does an affirmative answer to this question automatically disqualify the applicant from receiving a beverage waiter's licence, and the answer is "no".

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I might ask a supplementary question. Why is it necessary to ask that question in the first place? How is it related to such employment?

MR. LYON: I believe that the Act has some requirement, Mr. Speaker, for the person applying for the licence being of good character; and also secondarily, of course, a person in that position handles money, sometimes in large, sometimes in small quantities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Education has any answers for me with regards to the question that I addressed to him yesterday.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I have referred to the Supervisor of Transportation to give me any instances that he can discover. Insofar as the question re what Hutterite schools have been closed, I've had to ask the Administration Branch what they know of this. As you know, it comes entirely under the jurisdiction of the Unitary Divisions where those colonies are so situated as to the organization of education within that division. We don't make special rules for any group within a division, and any other arrangements that I alluded to yesterday, I would have to get the precise details from the branch and I will attempt to do so.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'd like to thank the Minister for his information, but I think that he assured me yesterday also that the government would look into this question of the Hutterite schools. Now, has he asked his staff or anybody to look into this to report?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, by looking into it I will enquire, have my Branch enquire from the divisions to get what information I can. I have no intention of interfering with the arrangements which a division may make within its jurisdiction.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a supplementary question to the

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)... Honourable the Attorney-General. I was rather disturbed with his last answer that the Act requiring some one to be of good character and that's the reason for the question of the criminal record. I just wonder -- if our system assumes that a person can be rehabilitated in jail and if we pursue that, that people who have paid their debt to society should have an opportunity to play a meaningful role in the society, isn't the government form one which offers the wrong type of leadership in that respect?

MR. SPEAKER: . . . . question?

MR. GREEN: Yes, I just finished it, Mr. Speaker. Isn't it directing people in the wrong direction to say "don't hire somebody who has a criminal record". " It seems to me that this is a backward step.

MR. LYON: The answer to my honourable friend's question, Mr. Speaker, is "no", because of course the fact that a person has a criminal record is no disability to his being licenced.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Education. I asked him about this some time ago regarding the report of the Boundaries Commission on the education system at the Interlake and the reason for the discrepancy between the date of the report, which is the 18th of December, and the cover which is March of 1968, and the time it was handed into the House. Has he found out what happened in the interval, where that report was?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I can speak for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and I in this matter. I believe all correspondence will be directed to her office with respect to the operations of the Commission. However, I did make the enquiry because I had noted the same thing. The Chairman advised me that a preliminary draft copy which they had prepared for the members of their commission -- I don't know how many they prepared -- had that date on the unbound copy and he claims that's where the discrepancy comes from.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. The Honourable the Provincial Secretary.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, may I have the leave of the House to have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. John's. The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK Q. C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate yesterday, as I indicated to the Honourable member for St. John outside the House, because I did not realize this matter was going to be discussed yesterday; I thought it would be on the Order Paper today. But I'm happy we have an occasion to hear him and his explanation in connection with this Order, and while I've examined the sections of the Order and it would appear that we can accept this, I will accept this but subject to the limitations of The Manitoba Development Fund Act, and particularly Section 30(2), the question of confidential matters relating to a borrower.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK Q. C. (St. Johns): That's Section 30, subsection (2), is it? 30(2).

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The other day when I started to speak on this I didn't get the opportunity to get finished, so therefore I think I'd better recap a bit of what I said before I proceed.

Now, as I said, this was a simple resolution and all it stated is that we should go to the 40-hour week because apparently this is what we already have in this province. And of course I remarked on the Minister of Labour's remark that we wanted to be chivalrous to women when we were discriminating against them in this Act. And I stated that if we were going to be chivalrous we should make sure that they earned a little bit more if they were going to be, by law, prevented from working the same number of hours as men because this

(MR. FOX cont'd.) . . . was not being chivalrous, this was being discriminatory. On top of that, I pointed out that the Act not only discriminated in the number of hours women could work compared to men, it also discriminated when they worked with men in the same shop or industry where they had to work 48 hours instead of the 44 before they received overtime. I also suggested that if we're going to be chivalrous, let's get down to the 40-hour week so that the women could tend to their homes instead of having to work more hours and let's get them a little higher pay.

Now to proceed further, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that this has been one of the perennial things that has been brought forward to this Cabinet by the Manitoba Federation of Labour. For years now they've been advocating the 40 hours and this government has seen fit not to introduce anything in this respect. I know that they have said they have a labour and a management industrial committee which is advising them, but I believe, Mr. Speaker, that labour has not agreed that there be a moratorium on labour legislation just because we have this committee.

And further, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to wait for this committee to have a consensus - I believe there are 24 people on this - before they bring forward any recommendations, and apparently this is the way it functions, we'll be here till doomsday before they bring something progressive or forward-thinking in regards to labour matters, because it so happens that the two parties that are relevant to this committee have, in many instances, intrinsically opposing views as to what labour legislation should be. Therefore I say, and I would agree with the member from Inkster when he said the Woods Committee in that case becomes a petrified forest committee, and this is my opinion too.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say in this regard is that if we are going to wait for this committee to bring recommendations forward before we proceed with it, this Legislature in essence becomes a rubber stamp committee, and I do not think that this Legislature should permit something like that to happen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why am I asking for the 40-hour week as a resolution. As I said originally, it's discriminatory; secondly, in fact it's now almost all over this province people are working a 40-hour week. The government has by law said that we should work an 8-hour day and everyone accepts that the five-day week is here. So again we are discriminating.

A further reason to the 40-hour week being implemented, Mr. Speaker, is that we have unemployment, and the headline in the Tribune of March 2nd: "Manitoba Tops the Prairies in January Unemployment." I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is one way of relieving this unemployment, by making the employers who are asking people to work more than 40 hours a week come down to a 40-hour week. I believe most of the members in this Legislature practice a 40-hour week. They take the weekend off. I've come to this building on a Saturday, there isn't a Minister around -- occasionally there is, I shouldn't say there isn't any -- occasionally there is, but very few and very seldom, and that applies for civil servants as well. Most industries, too, practice a five-day week and under the present statute you can't practice a five-day week if you're going to put in the 48 hours, because eight hours is the maximum you can work in one day.

Mr. Speaker, I noticed also in the paper the other day that the railmen are going to get an enforced month's holiday. This too, I think could be alleviated if we had a 40-hour week. Now I realize the railways possibly do not come under the provincial legislation, but nevertheless it would be an indication of a forward-looking step by this province to indicate what is necessary in this kind of field. You know if we are to wait, as I suggested, for the Woods Committee to bring forward these recommendations, we may have to wait a very long time.

Mr. Chairman, I noticed the other day the Minister of Labour informed this House that he'd made an error to a question that I had asked, and he corrected the error. This gives me also cause for concern for the simple reason that here most of the time he tells us that we're going to wait on recommendations from the Woods Committee. Here we go ahead and we get the woods Committee to make a recommendation, and what happens? The government doesn't implement it. Now if this was a progressive move that the government had made in regard to this matter that they had omitted or changed, I wouldn't mind, but it happens to be a retrogressive move, and, as I say, I think that this is bad. If this government can only move backwards and not forwards, then it's really a serious matter and I think that it's time that it really decided to do something progressive about labour legislation.

Mr. Speaker, to sum up. As I said, this Act is discriminatory in the fact that it

(MR. FOX cont'd.)... legislates against working women who have families to support, and normally those women who are working usually find themselves employed at the low level of employment, the wages that they are receiving are fairly low, and they are discriminated in the fact that they cannot work as many hours as the men. On top of that, as I said, it is discriminatory in that it makes them work for 48 hours if they are working in a shop where there are men as well. Now, why can't we treat them equally at all times? If they are women and we want to treat them fairly, let's treat them fairly at all times, not just some of the time when it suits the employer because he's got all women, and the next time when it suits the employer, when he's got men and women, the regulations are changed for the women. It is unfair because as I said, we are waiting, according to the Minister of Labour, for a Woods Committee report on this matter, and I'm afraid that in this regard we may have to wait for a long long time.

The other point about the 40 hours, Mr. Speaker, is if we're going to wait until it's in practice in every nook and cranny of this province, then there's no point to having the legislation on the statute books because everyone is practicing it and it's just futile extra work to put it through the statutes.

And further, Mr. Chairman, as I said, the 40 hours would certainly create a little more work and therefore it would alleviate the problem of unemployment. Since on the prairies we already have a fair amount of unemployment and the greatest amount is here in this province, I think we should do this, and I commend this resolution to the House.

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

MR. FOX: Yeas and nays, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Cherniack, Dawson, Desjardins, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masnuik, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Witney, and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 23; Nays, 28.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Virден and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand in consideration of the fact that the mover is away, but if anyone else wishes to speak, they're quite at liberty to do so now.

MR. SPEAKER: Anyone else wish to speak on this? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, the Resolution that is before us has to do with the matter of having a full-time Minister of Agriculture, and at the outset I would like to state that I'm in accord with the request that is made and contained in the resolution because I feel that the Minister of Agriculture I think has a full-time job dealing and looking after the one department in itself. All these years previous to this last year we had a full-time Minister of Agriculture, and only a year ago the estimates of that particular department were, in my opinion, emasculated, because previous to that I think the estimates amounted to some \$20 million where it was cut down drastically last year to a total of \$8,746,000 -- Oh, I'm sorry, I'm quoting the Attorney-General's -- Agriculture is \$6,171,000, so it's slightly up this year, it's up to \$8,323,000.00.

MR. ENNS: I wonder if I may just correct the Honourable Member from Rhineland and draw his attention to the fact that the amounts quoted included the Water Conservation Branch and that was the explanation for the apparent reduction in the agricultural estimates, the Water Conservation Branch moving to the Highways Branch. There was no cut-back, in fact there was a slight increase last year as well.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I was coming to that. I was going to mention that the floodway was being cut out because it was nearing completion, or at least there was no amount

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . given for that purpose in the agricultural estimates, so that in my opinion this was the big reason for the reduction, but nevertheless this meant that there was going to be spent that much less within that department.

I feel that there are other useful functions that could be carried out by the Minister of Agriculture, and I made mention of some of these in my Throne Speech debate when I spoke on this aspect at some length, and I still feel that this government should make representation on behalf of the farmer to the federal authorities on certain aspects. This should not be left entirely to the farm organizations to look after, especially when they're in my opinion weakening, because the Farmers Union in my opinion does not commend the strength that it once held. Therefore, I feel that we as a government and representing the people of Manitoba should look after the interest of agriculture and see to it that we maintain a healthy economy within the agricultural industry.

There's also the matter of the ARDA agreements and the FRED agreement and these are matters that have to be looked after. We'll be spending double the amount on marketing boards this coming year from what we spent last year. The estimates for that matter alone are up from \$11,500 to \$23,500. At this moment I don't particularly know where this additional money will be spent on, but no doubt we will be hearing from the Minister on this.

Perhaps we would have a full-time Minister by now if it hadn't been that the former Minister of Highways became our First Minister and that he only had a short time in which to feel his way around before the session commenced, so I expect a shuffle no doubt in Cabinet once the House prorogues and that he will have more time on his hands to make this decision.

Last fall they were quite busy because they had two leadership conventions on their hands, first the Federal and then later on the Provincial. Some of the other members might have experienced the same thing that I experienced, that the Highways Minister was away quite a bit and that you could not get a hold of him when you wanted to. I'm not saying that of the Minister that we have now because I feel that he is looking after us and actually I have no complaints in that direction. However, I feel that we should have a full-time Minister of Agriculture, likewise a full-time Highways Minister, and as a result I will support the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I felt that I should take a small part in this debate that's before us. My guess is that there isn't a member in this House and there never was a member of this House since the first session was called back in 1870 that did not say at one time or another that agriculture was the backbone of the economy of Manitoba, and we're still saying it because it's still true. I think that it is a sad state of affairs indeed when we in this day and age, nearly 100 years after Manitoba became a province to be operating with a part-time Minister of Agriculture. Surely to goodness the farmers, the Farm Bureau speaking for the farmers, the Farmers Union speaking for the farmers, and all of the various groups that meet with us from time to time, have let us know in no uncertain terms that agriculture finds itself in a state of depression, and by that I mean the cost-price squeeze that it finds itself in. The former Premier of this province ten years ago and nine years ago said that he placed at the head of the list - and I read it during the Throne Speech debate - that he placed at the head of the list the situation with regards to agricultural economy, and spent some time dealing with it at that time.

My honourable friend the acting Minister of Agriculture was the one person I believe that moved the nomination of the present Premier and spoke in glowing terms about his ability and capacity for this position, and he described the new Premier as -- one of the reasons he was supporting -- well the reason he was supporting the Premier was: "Walter Weir can be tough when tough decisions have to be made." Well why then has he not made a tough decision and appointed a full-time Minister of Agriculture, if it's such a tough decision to make, because we've got the man for the job, the man that can be tough. Later on my honourable friend in moving the nomination said of Walter Weir, he says: "I believe in a no nonsense type of government and I'm an advocate and a supporter of this no nonsense approach." And then my honourable friend the Minister of Public Utilities said: "Me too." He said: "Everything that Walter can do I can do better." But it didn't work; he was too late. But here my honourable friend the acting Minister of Agriculture who said such nice things about the Premier and no doubt they were true, to a degree, but why have they waited. . . .

MR. ENNS: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I am the Minister of Agriculture, the acting Minister of Highways.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well I didn't intend to insult my honourable friend, but the farmers by and large just can't see how my honourable friend, regardless of his ability and capacity, can look after two portfolios and do them both justice. This is the whole point, just can't do it and it shouldn't be allowed to carry on.

My honourable friend - I don't know whether he had anything to do with preparing the Speech from the Throne, I suppose that he took a hand in it - but at the head of the list again, according to a propaganda sheet emanating from his department on March 8th, said: "New Government Programs Cited. A series of government programs covering nearly every phase of provincial activity were unveiled Thursday in the Throne Speech which opened the second session of Manitoba's 28th Legislature." At the top of the list - "Programs listed in the Throne Speech include measures to deal with the cost-price squeeze." That's item No. 1. Item No. 1, according to this . . .

MR. ENNS: You're kidding - read it all.

MR. SHOEMAKER: "Programs listed in the Throne Speech include:(1) Expansion of existing farm management programs as part of a move designed to help farmers facing a cost-price squeeze to obtain a fair return for their labour and management." --(Interjection)-- Well there was that, and as my honourable friend has said that and the Horned Cattle Fund, but they're going to amend the Dairy Act and do a lot of other things. But these things are not all possible unless we have a full-time Minister of Agriculture and not an acting Minister of Agriculture - or vice versa - I don't want to insult my honourable friend.

My honourable friend, like his former Minister the Honourable George Hutton - and as I said before, the House does not seem the same without my dear friend George - but like my honourable friend --(Interjection)-- alas and alack the Leader of the NDP says. Do you remember how Mr. Hutton used to graduate a lot of the farmers every year - the elite group - and he graduated them into a class by themselves and put red and blue ribbons on them to show that they were head and shoulders above the rest? My honourable friend is following that same practice and I have just recently -- by gosh, he's going to put a blue ribbon on me if I don't watch out - blue ribbon beef eh?

But my honourable friend has not supplied members of the House with the farm business summary, the last one that is available. Mr. Hutton used to do that at my request. But if there's anything in the world, if there's a publication that emanates from the government at all that points up the cost-price squeeze, it's the one put out by my honourable friend, because the farm business summary is a complete analysis of that elite group, and by golly I'll tell you there's a lot of them farmers, according to this summary, that find themselves in pretty dire straights in this day and age.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I'm saying is that we cannot allow this very important post to go unfilled or half-filled any longer, and it's high time that the man that can be tough when he's got to be tough and the man that can face all these decisions, I say it's high time that he faced up to the decision that he's faced with now and appoint a full-time Minister of Agriculture or relieve the present one of the part-time post that he has with Highways.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Roblin, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House to have this resolution stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for St. James and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would crave the leave of the House to have this matter stand, but if anybody wishes to speak it will be quite all right with me.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg the leave of the House to let this matter stand.



MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Inkster in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Emerson. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I was not intending to ask for this Order to stand but the Honourable the Minister is not in his place and I would not like to proceed in his absence, so I'm forced to ask the House to allow the item to stand.

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 St. John's in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware of the fact that there has been a substantial amount of discussion with regard to the subject of medical care services to the people in the Province of Manitoba at this Session of the Legislature, and in spite of the fact that perhaps honourable members feel that they have heard enough of this question, I feel impelled, Mr. Speaker, because of the present intention of this overnment, to make yet another speech on this subject. I would feel very self-conscious if I was one of the members who kept quiet, and I don't blame anybody who doesn't speak, but I've had a particular interest in this subject and I would certainly not wish to remain silent in view of what the stated intentions of this government are.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the arguments concerning the comprehensive provision of medical health services have taken a rather unique course since 1962. At that time, in an attempt to forestall the simple procedure whereby the people of a particular province decided that the best way of paying their medical health services is to get together a fund so that then anybody who is sick could go to a doctor and the fund would look after their medical expenses. At that time, that rather simple proposition was strongly opposed, and it was opposed, Mr. Speaker, principally by the medical profession of the Province of Manitoba. It was not at that time violently opposed or even substantially opposed by any political party. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Liberals have always supported the program and the Hall Commission Report, which substantially endorses the program, of course was commissioned by a Conservative Government. I'm not suggesting that they wanted the recommendations that they got, but they didn't appear to be substantially in contradiction of same and didn't really oppose the issue in the Saskatchewan election where it was made the issue before the people.

Now the arguments then principally that were raised against this particular, and I say rather a simple type of suggestion, would appear on the surface of it to be so eminently reasonable that no one would oppose it, that there be a fund established by the community which would take care of medical services to those who need it. At that time, Mr. Speaker, we had arguments that this would interfere with the doctor-patient relationship and we had arguments that this would make doctors civil servants; that this would result in the political control of medical services.

All of those arguments, Mr. Speaker, have rather been passed by the board because it became impossible for the medical profession to substantiate the sum effect on a doctor-patient relationship which they themselves created by their own plan unless they were to say - and for a while they did say it - that it's all right for the top 60 percent of the economic group in our population to receive their services this way, their relationship with us will not be affected; it's when you let those bottom 40 percent in that the doctor-patient relationship is affected. So they've abandoned that position. They abandoned the position that the government is going to legislate some control over the doctors, because as the doctors themselves have seen in the Province of Saskatchewan, it hasn't resulted in anyone being required to see a particular doctor nor has it required any doctor to treat a particular patient, and from what we hear from Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, the economic effect hasn't been serious and the doctors in the province have not yet taken to rolling their own cigarettes. They have managed to survive financially under the plan.

And for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, because these arguments were unsustainable and not possible to substantiate, over the years a new crop of objections to a comprehensive medical care program arose. And these, Mr. Speaker, are so far-fetched that they're no

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)... relation to what is actually happening, and when one examines the argument, one determines that that is in fact the position. What we have from this government is really two suggestions: (1) that the cost of medical care is getting so high that we must stay out of this program. This is the argument that was presented by the Honourable the First Minister. He said, "When we thought it was going to be \$35.00 per capita there was some sense in going into it. Now that we find that medical care costs are going up to \$50.00 per capita, we think that we should have some question about going into it."

Now, Mr. Speaker, shouldn't the exact reverse be true? When the cost of a particular commodity is getting way out of line, isn't that the traditional point at which the public steps in and says, "We have to do something about this?" Not that we have to back away from it but we have to do something about it. When the railroad workers who were employed by the CPR and the CNR said that they wanted a 30 percent increase, which is similar to what the longshoremen got in the seaway dispute, when they said that they wanted 30 percent did the government then say, "Now is the time for us to take our hands off this problem because the cost is getting out of line"? They did quite the contrary, and I don't agree with what they did, but they did quite the contrary. They said, "Now is the time to intervene and say that the entire economy is threatened by this particular proposition. We have to keep the costs down and we will legislate them to jail or to work," which is what they did. They jumped in with both feet.

When the issue in Saskatchewan -- when the civil servants started to bargain on their own and that province thought that their bargaining position put them out of line and the costs were going to go up beyond which the public can afford, did the government say, "Now is the time for us to back out of this position and let these people bargain for whatever they can get?" No. They did quite the contrary. They said, "We'll pass a Bill which either puts them to work or puts them in jail."

When the government of British Columbia was threatened with labour disputes which they said were going to result in demands going beyond what the people in the province could afford, did they say, "Now is the time to back out of this proposition; now is the time for the public to take no interest?" No. They passed a Bill -- or they're proceeding to move a bill through the British Columbia Legislature which in effect will say, "You're going to have compulsory arbitration and you'll either go to work or go to jail."

I'm not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that this is the action that this government should take. All I'm suggesting is that the traditional policy, both by governments in this country and by the government of the United States, is when a particular cost seems to be running away, seems to be getting out of line, that hasn't been the occasion when the government says that we're going to back out of the situation; that's been the occasion for the government to come into the situation. And while the government is backing out, and they appear to be backing out, isn't the reverse thinking true? They say, and this is the paradox, they say that the program of medical costs is going to be inflationary. Now I presume that if you use that argument against the program then you are saying that the alternative is true; if we don't go into a medical care program then it won't be inflationary. I assume that that's what they are saying if they are using that argument.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask this House to look at what is happening because the government hasn't entered into a medical care program which can be controlled by the people. Let's see whether that situation is not an inflationary situation. Mr. Speaker, since 1962 -- since 1962 the costs of medical services in the Province of Manitoba without a government program, with a program which has been administered solely by the doctor, have taken the following steps. In 1962 the services for which a doctor used to be paid roughly \$70.00 -- let us take what he calls his hundred dollar fee and which he used to get \$70.00 for -- he will, on July 1st of 1968, be receiving in accordance with the present program that they have implemented, and I'll demonstrate it to you in a moment, he will be receiving approximately \$135.00 or roughly an increase of 100 percent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he'll be receiving a hundred percent, and if the government decides that they're going to provide medical care for the paupers in our society, the indigents as they put it, and some of them -- I suggest very few -- but some of them take advantage of the service on that basis, his gross income, in addition to the fact that his fee for the same service is doubled, will go up considerably more. So that, Mr. Speaker, if a medical person had a gross income of \$18,000 in 1962, for doing exactly the same work he will receive roughly \$35,000 a year on July 1st of 1968. And this has happened, Mr. Speaker, not because

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)... we have implemented a comprehensive medical care program but I suggest to you because we haven't, because the public has not had a look at what is going on or had the right to do anything about what is going on and because the public therefore has not taken counter measures to prevent the costs from running out of hand. I'm not suggesting the kind of counter measures that have been taken by other governments with regard to labour disputes, although I'm rather surprised that this government who seems to favour that kind of proposal doesn't propose it with regard to the medical profession.

But the medical profession hasn't been sleeping. The medical profession has been looking after -- they've been playing doctors for themselves for a change insofar as their financial position is concerned. Let's look what they've done during the time that we have failed to implement this plan.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, they have indicated and have now adopted a policy that they will not accept the pro rated part of their fee from the Manitoba Medical Services because this to them was a dangerous precedent. By accepting 85 percent of their fee from the MMS they would be in a difficult position to say that when the people as a whole pay we are now charging 100 percent of our fee. So under MMS if you are treated today, Mr. Speaker, the doctor will -- let us say that the treatment is \$100.00 treatment -- the MMS will pay \$85.00 and the medical profession will send you a bill for \$15.00, and this they have done in preparation for the implementation of a medical care program by the people of the province. They've done it without the program. I happened to phone as a subscriber; I phoned today and I said, "If I went to a doctor's office today, how much of my bill would be paid for my my insurance policy?" And they said, "85 percent." And I said, "What would happen to the balance of it?" They say that the doctor would bill you directly. They have not -- and this is the words of a young lady on the phone, not somebody who was set up to speak to me -- they said that they had the right to do this since July of 1967 but they didn't do it until March 1st of 1968, so that they are starting this program today. In other words, the medical care premiums that we now pay under MMS will not cover the cost of medical care, and for a person who let us say has \$400.00 worth of doctor services a year, in addition to the premium for which he now pays roughly \$170.00 to \$180.00, he'll have an additional premium of \$60.00 making his premium or his cost of medical care \$235.00.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they've done something else, and this is a rather unusual step which I really can't figure out for the moment. The Manitoba Medical Services used to be the only shareholder of the Manitoba Health Insurance Corporation and ran that corporation which offered a supplementary service, that is services in addition to what the Manitoba Medical Service supplied. On December 11th -- between December and January of this year, that is December of 1967 and January of 1968, a new corporation was created called the United Health Foundation Incorporated which is taking over the United Health Insurance Services.

Now because of the new laws, Mr. Speaker, with regard to non-share capital corporations, this corporation has been applied for and letters patent have been given to it in the names of -- two, four, six -- eight individuals, most of whom are doctors. Because also of the new law it is not required that these people file their by-laws as to how the corporation is run, and my understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that at the present time there is no membership in this organization; there is no control over the directors. The directors have had letters patent issued to them. They are thus far, to my knowledge, not under the control of any doctors, citizens, or otherwise. They are the corporation at the present time. Now I don't know what steps they are going to take in the future, but at the present time they are the corporation.

What the government has permitted them to do is to buy from the Manitoba Medical Services the shares that the Manitoba Medical Services held in the old corporation, that is the United Health Insurance Corporation. And where did they get the money to buy these shares? They were enabled to borrow it from the United Health Insurance Corporation. In other words, they borrowed the money from the very corporation whose shares they were subsequently going to purchase, and in order to make that possible they changed from a public corporation into a private corporation.

Now what is the effect of this, Mr. Speaker, and why am I dealing at some length with this? I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is going to be a supplementary health insurance organization which is going to insure those services which are not insured by the Manitoba Medical Services, or the Manitoba Medical Services from the public point of view

(MR. GREEN cont'd)... which this government will have to enact in one form or another. As a matter of fact, in the letter from their solicitors, December 11, 1967, they say in that letter which is on file with the Provincial Secretary that the Manitoba Medical Services - that is the public organization, I don't know the full name of it but the one that we incorporated last year by the statute providing for this service - is not to undertake the provision of services provided by the United Health Insurance Corporation which will continue to operate. In other words, our plan is to stay out of the services that they provide.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that what this organization can subsequently do - and I just want you to see that the medical profession is not sleeping whether this House sleeps or not; they're awake - that what they are going to do is establish a supplementary insurance corporation which will have the power, Mr. Speaker, to insure people for the balance of the bill, and that if subsequently this province or the people as a whole, even if we do pass the program which this Party has put forth, that if that program is only able to pay 60 percent of the bill or 70 percent or 50 percent or whatever the percentage rate may be, and the doctor decides to over-bill, that you will be able to buy from this doctors' plan a premium for the additional services, and without that premium you won't have much insurance at all. This is what they have done while we have not done anything.

In other words, if we are worried about our health costs going up by entering into a program, then how does the government explain what has happened without the program? And how does it explain what I posed as the first question, that traditionally the public steps in when they see something getting out of line. In the case of medical services, when they saw something getting out of line, and that was the Premier's indication - it may go up to \$50.00 per capita - they said, "Now is the time to stay out of it." Isn't the reverse true, Mr. Speaker? By knowing - knowing that the price is going up; knowing that this will result in less and less coverage, and any economist will tell you that I am correct, if you increase the price you reduce the number of people who are participating or who are able to participate; knowing that, isn't that the time to get into the program rather than to get out of it?

But as I say to you, the arguments have changed and they've changed for a purpose, Mr. Speaker. I suggest to you they have changed for the very reason that whenever there is a substantial move being made by the people who are less powerful and who are on the lower end of the economic scale, whenever a move is made in the direction of helping those people against the more powerful and the people in the upper end of the economic scale, there is bound to be a bitter clash, and I don't know whether at that stage, Mr. Speaker, that the people who talk so loudly about democracy are prepared to let it take its normal course. Certainly the medical profession in Saskatchewan were not expounding the values of democracy in 1962 when the democratically elected government of that province said that "we're going to pool our resources to pay your bills." That's something that happens and has happened historically, Mr. Speaker.

I don't know whether any of the members of this House have ever read Jack London's book called: "The Iron Heel". In it - and Jack London is admittedly a revolutionary, and I'm not suggesting a revolution - but in it, London tells the story of this young man who had an argument with an industrialist and the young man's argument was that eventually the people, through the democratic system available to them, would be able to in some way interfere with the industrial monopoly that that particular person enjoyed, and the industrialist said: "At that point we won't agree to a democratic system. At that point we will take power unto ourselves." I suggest to you that this is what is happening with regard to this Medicare program, that the traditions of democracy are no longer acceptable to the people who see some fear in this program, and that they will use any system to avoid it in order that their own particular position be protected.

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

The other argument, Mr. Speaker, and this was dealt with very extensively by the member for St. John's, but I have a particular clipping which I think is of some interest to the House. The other argument is that somehow a medical care program which enables the people of the province generally to collect a pool of money which will pay for people's medical care bills, is a form of compulsion, is a form of dictatorship. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a clipping which appeared in last week's Winnipeg Tribune and the headline is interesting: "Residents must sign up or burn up." Sign up or burn up; and that they must do this - which indicates to me that there is some sort of compulsion suggested in the article. I want to read this article, and I want the members opposite to keep in mind their philosophy with regard to medical care. They say that those people who can afford it should pay for it, and those people who can't afford it, the medically insolvent, should come to the government on bended knees and say that "I couldn't make it and I would like you to help me pay my premium." That's their philosophy as to what the system should be. I want you to listen to this argument, keeping your philosophy in mind.

This is from High Ridge, Missouri: "The High Ridge volunteer fire department had a rush today on \$7.00 fire protection tags. More than 100 were sold. The fire department answered a call Monday at the home of Mr. and Mrs. John Akers in a subdivision near High Ridge. Then the firemen watched as the \$18,000 home burnt to the ground because the owner had not purchased the seven dollar tag. 'We made certain there were no persons in the house, said chief engineer, Ed Hill' " -- well, that was very kind of him; the fact that they didn't buy a tag didn't mean that they wouldn't see that there were no people in the house. " 'If there had been someone inside we would have saved his life.' " They are careful to say that they wouldn't have prevented the fire but they would have tried to save the life of the person that was in the house. But heaven forbid that they should put out the fire for somebody who hadn't volunteered into the program. " 'But we need those tag fees to pay for our equipment and meet other expenses', Hill said. 'It was no secret that we would let a house burn. We've done it before.' " And I think it's no secret that this government says that we will let somebody be without health care if they don't pay the premiums: and no doubt they will shout very loudly, "We've done it before," and possibly be very proud of that. "Hill said the volunteer unit has advertised frequently the policy of 'no tag, no service'. He said persons who cannot afford a tag" - and this is the most interesting part of the program; this is the one that will commend itself to the members of the government benches - "He said, 'Persons who cannot afford a tag, pensioners and those on welfare for example, are given tags. Churches are also given tags,' Hill said."

So let's paraphrase a little bit. Weir said - rather than Hill said - Weir said that the volunteer health services has advertised frequently that if you're not a member of the service, you don't get service. He said, Weir said: "Persons who cannot afford to be members of the service, pensioners and those on welfare for example, are given the opportunity to obtain the service." Isn't that your program? And if it is, do you justify it when you look at the program as it works with regard to fire protection in High Ridge, Missouri?

"The Akers family is staying with relatives in the same neighborhood." Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, relatives still recognize some communal responsibility for each other even though they didn't get paid for it, because the Akers family, although they couldn't get the protection of the High Ridge fire department, they did get apparently the assistance of their neighbors. 'High Ridge is in Jefferson County, a few miles south of St. Louis. There are 18 volunteer units in the country, all of them financed from sale of prior-protection tags. After the fee is paid, the tag is attached in a prominent place.' "

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask this government: do they suggest that they will now pass municipal laws seeing that someone has expounded their principle even better than they have? Will they now pass municipal laws making it possible, let us say, for the Winnipeg fire department to work in that way, or the Brandon fire department or other municipalities?

Mr. Speaker, the last position taken by the government, and the one which they rightly should take lastly because it makes as little sense as the other position, is that somehow this program is a compulsory program from the Federal Government which the province is somehow being blackmailed to accept. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can recall the words of Jonathan Swift in Gulliver's Travels. I'm not going to go through it. He suggested that in England - and he was writing about judges in the 1700s, and I hasten to say it has no relationship to judges in

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . .Manitoba in the Twentieth Century - but he was saying that judges were picked from those people amongst the legal profession who were most dextrous in defending the cause of injustice, that the legal profession itself was constantly engaged in pursuing injustice; that "If my neighbor had a mind to my cow, he hires a lawyer to get my cow from me and in those circumstances I am at a great disadvantage because I have justice on my side." He said that the judges were appointed from amongst the same people; and he said that the judges were very principled, he said - and this government claims to be very principled in making sure that they always did injustice - and that they were so principled that he had known some judges to refuse a large bribe from the side where justice lay rather than to go against their principles.

And this is what this government is saying: that we are so principled that even though justice lay in this program, we are going to refuse this very large bribe rather than do what is right, rather than do the right thing, because we are so determined to follow a policy of injustice. And I think that, Mr. Speaker, their own actions speak against this system. Last year they enacted - and this I agree entirely with the member for Rhineland - last year they enacted a program which said to people in certain school divisions: "Unless you adopt this kind of program you're not going to be entitled to certain grants." Now how, Mr. Speaker, does that differ from the program that has been enacted by the Federal Government? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the reasons for the failure to participate in this program as suggested since 1962, and more particularly by this government, are merely rationalizations; that the real reason, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest this very seriously, is that this is a struggle between the house of "have" and the house of "want", and the house of "have" is not going to yield to the house of "want" without a sharp struggle, and they are now struggling.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, 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 proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): May we have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? Agreed. The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Hamiota. The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. DAWSON: May I have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave?

The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave?

The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I also ask leave to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Kildonan. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, may I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand?

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

MR. USKIWI: May I ask the indulgence of this House to let the matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIWI: May I have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: No takers today. The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I just sat down but I'm prepared to go all over again. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood that

WHEREAS the effective operation of the Democratic process requires the fullest possible information being transmitted to the public to facilitate its participation;

AND WHEREAS it is desirable that all scientific advances which have been made in the area of mass communication should be used to strengthen public participation in the Democratic process;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House take such measure as would enable live television and radio broadcasting to emanate from the Legislature to the public at large.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the present system that we operate on with regard to the news media is one that can be rationalized only on the basis of inertia, not on the basis of any principle. I think that the people who were most responsible for the evolution of the system of parliamentary government envisaged that it could not operate properly without the participation of the public. I would go further, Mr. Speaker. I would think that democracy is a very inefficient and ineffective instrument of public government if it is participated in solely by the members of a legislature without the active interest and participation of the people, who are presumably the governors - that is, the public at large.

I think that no person who has participated in municipal, federal, provincial, or any type of government, whether it be school board or any elected office, can honestly say, Mr. Speaker, although sometimes they may like to say it, that they are in no way affected by what their constituents think or by what the public thinks, and if they do say that, then it's probably the case that they should be relieved from public office as soon as possible - and likely it will take place. And I think that the people who conceived a legislative form of government, believed very strongly in that proposition and that's why, Mr. Speaker - and I have travelled, not a great deal, but I've travelled, not in the world, but in North America; I've done some travelling and usually I take the politician's busman's holiday, visiting the legislature of the particular state or province that I've been in - and one thing that I find in common to all legislatures is that gallery up there and the press gallery over there, and I think that great significance must be placed on the fact of these two institutions, one the public gallery and one the press gallery, because it's recognized, Mr. Speaker, and again some of us don't like to admit that the fourth estate, that is the news media, are an essential element in the democratic process and we are guided by it and we are guided by their comments far more than some of us are prepared to admit from time to time.

Now that being the case, Mr. Speaker, and I think that what I have said in the last few minutes is not particularly profound - as a matter of fact, it's rather trite and probably doesn't deserve as much time as I've given it - but nevertheless, that being the case, let's try to go back 300 years and say that we were talking about constructing a parliament building, and let's say that we knew at that time that there were media of communications which went far and beyond the public gallery and the mere journals or newspapers or periodicals which appear from time to time. Let us say that we knew that there was a media which could carry what is going on live to the public generally. I think that we, Mr. Speaker, would immediately say that this is one of the most important aspects of the new type of system - that is, the system of legislative government - that we have at our disposal, and that we should make every use of it. Instead, Mr. Speaker, we are working in this Chamber largely with 17th century ideas with regard to the participation of the public, and I am not suggesting in this resolution a revolutionary or radical change. I am merely suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that we extend this gallery from the present 150 seats - and even those are not occupied and I would hope that they could be more occupied - that we extend that gallery from the present 150 seats to a possible 900,000 seats; that is, to the people of the Province of Manitoba. Now that doesn't mean, Mr. Speaker, that those 900,000 would make use of the gallery, nor does it mean that the press would make use of the time that was available to them. It merely means that it would be available.

There's been a peculiar argument with regard to television and sporting events. The people who sponsor sporting events black out television when the event is taking place locally because they say that it's liable to have some effect on the customers. Now, Mr. Speaker, what has happened is that the reverse has been true. When television was beamed out, let us say with regards to baseball or football or boxing, what it did was increase the public appreciation for these respective sports - and I suggest it does the same thing for theatre - and caused more people to come to the arenas and the theatres involved. So I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that public viewing of what goes on in this Chamber would result in a bigger gallery, which I have already indicated I regard as so important to the principles of democratic government.

The other questions that have been asked, Mr. Speaker, and I want to immediately say that I don't propose that it happen, nor would it happen, that everything that goes on in this House be televised or be piped through on the radio, because I assume that the press is going to be just as selective with regards to what they cover through live television or live radio as they are with regard to what they put in the newspaper. They don't put everything in the

(MR. GREEN cont'd)...newspapers; they won't be here to televise every debate that takes place. I notice that somehow we do have television coverage now, live television coverage of the Speech from the Throne, and I assume that when they hear that possibly the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is going to attack the government on a particularly sensitive program that they will take pictures of Mr. Molgat in action. I assume that they will do the same thing when they think that my Leader has something important to say, and I even am vain enough to think that on some day they may think that I have something important to say, and they may cover that as well. This is not going to result in a revolutionary procedure. It's not going to result in people being glued to their television sets and watching what goes on, because we know that this hasn't happened where they have this type of large coverage. Can anybody deny, Mr. Speaker, that the live coverage of the debates in the Security Council have been an important advance in the interest which people can have and the intelligence that people have with regard to the conduct of international affairs? And how has this been done? When a critical issue has occurred before the Security Council it's covered by radio and television. There's no special arrangement made at that time. It's just that they feel that at this time it's something to be covered, so I'm not suggesting blanket coverage, I'm suggesting that the option remain right where it is at the present time with the fourth estate, who I admit I'm not always -- I mean the members of this party in particular, and I suppose members of all other parties, are not always satisfied with the type of coverage they get but I say that that's where it lies and they're the ones who are going to judge, in the last analysis, what they will pick up and what they won't pick up. And the public, too, is going to be selective. People are not going to watch their television or listen to the radio for everything that goes on. You, Mr. Speaker, have to do that yourself, and we're often surprised that you don't die of boredom, but surely we don't have to impose that on the public generally. They're going to be selective.

The only other point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, is that it has been suggested that if there is some sort of extended coverage of that kind, that people are going to become buffoons in this Legislature. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a residual regard for the wisdom of the -- or I have a high regard for the residual wisdom of the public in this respect, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if people make buffoons of themselves in the Legislature the fact that more coverage of their buffoonery goes out to the people at large will be for the good of the democratic process rather than to the detriment of it. So, I think, Mr. Speaker, that -- just going back to where I started from, -- I think that the present system is one that results mainly from inertia; I think that if we were doing it now, if we didn't have the tradition which has bound us, that we would say that we would use every media that could help us participate in a full democratic process that is involving the people as a whole; I say that we would extend this gallery as far as it could go by the modern media of communication; and I say that this would all be to the good. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains. The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, may I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: May the honourable member have leave? The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, may I have the indulgence of this House to have the matter stand, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson,

WHEREAS this government talks about priorities in government programs and spending, and

WHEREAS the Premier has stated that the "costs of public service is increasing our cost of production and if we are to compete, we must cut these costs to the minimum" and also that "the urgent requirement is to separate our needs from our wants", (Deloraine,



(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd)...February 27, 1968), and

WHEREAS in the past year this government has vastly expanded the information branch by the addition of many staff members, and

WHEREAS the Manitoba Government Information Services is costing the taxpayers of Manitoba many thousands of dollars, and

WHEREAS this Government meanwhile pleads inability to find the money to proceed with urgent projects such as the construction of a new juvenile detention home,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba be instructed to disband the Branch.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, in placing this resolution on the Order Paper, I was partly motivated, I might say, by remarks that the Honourable the First Minister made during the by-election in the constituency of Turtle Mountain and, if you will note, I quoted some of his words. At this time I would like to quote exactly what the Premier said with respect to the cutting of public spending, and this is an excerpt from an article in the Free Press on the 28th of February; the date line or the place is Deloraine, Manitoba. In the second -- well, I'll start at the beginning:

"Public spending must be harshly curtailed if Manitoba is to move into new and wider areas of economic development, Premier Walter Weir said here Tuesday. 'The cost of public service is increasing our cost of production, and if we are to compete we must cut these costs to the minimum,' he told a political rally in this town of 900 deep in southwestern Manitoba."

Well, Mr. Speaker, at the same time that our Premier is making a statement about cutting costs, one of his Ministers is busily setting up and expanding, by I would say at least 100%, the Public Information Branch. Last year, the Public Information Branch required \$73,663.00; this year \$148,610.00. Now, I find it hard to equate the statements of the Premier on the one hand and the actions of one of his Ministers on the other hand. And I could mention further - I'm coming back to the article that is about the Premier and his meeting in Deloraine, and I'll quote again: "Although the Premier made no pretense that his call for reduced public spending might presage the Budget he will be presenting next month, he laid every emphasis on what he called 'the urgent requirement to separate our needs from our wants.'" So, Mr. Speaker, this is why I took the quotation and put it into the Resolution: of separating our needs from our wants.

Now, in past weeks there have been a number of examples brought forward - I know I used one myself - to show where the Government Information Service each year is getting a little further away from the original idea of informing the public about the functions and services that were available to the people of Manitoba, and I have another example here I would like to show the House, of what I would call a creeping, insidious propaganda march that is going across the publications coming out of my friend's ministries on the other side. And I have here in my hand a copy of a fishing bulletin; it's called "Fishing - a Bulletin for Commercial Fishing," and the date of this one is November 1959. When you open it and take a look at it, it begins immediately to discuss the problems and to give information to our fishermen of the province. I think this is a very good publication and when I'm speaking against certain informational activities of this government, I am not speaking against this type. Again, the same publication but in September of 1960, the same way, it starts out giving information that is useful to the men engaged in our fishing industry. 1961 - the next one I read - is somewhat similar although there is an opening statement in it by the Honourable C. H. Witney describing how he has engaged the services of a Professor Louis . . . . . to help with the problems in that department, and I find no fault with that sort of publication. But, as the years go on, a change starts to take place. Now I've quoted from one from each year, 1959, 1960 and 1961. Now here's one, December 1965, and if there's ever a cheap way to send out your New Year's greeting cards here it is. On the front page is a beautiful picture of the Minister. In this case it's the Honourable Sterling Lyon, and it says, "Greetings. Christmas is really a family festival and not a time for me to review the year's activity in the fishing industry..."

A MEMBER: But.

MR. JOHNSTON: . . .but -- and the "but" is not in the article. "I hope this Christmas finds you and your family in good health and that it will be a happy and joyous occasion for

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd)...you all. I hope the New Year will bring solutions to some of your problems. May we all look forward to 1966 with optimism," and so on. So, there's the first page in this publication that was primarily for the educational value for the men in our fishing industry. That started the trend. That Minister moved on - either up or down, I forget which now - to another portfolio, but the next Minister he's caught on to this deal too and it's a pretty good idea. And this is from an issue of July, 1966 "The Editor's Page" it's called, this one, and there's a picture of the Minister...

MR. LYON: ...is it correct that his resolution deals with the Government Information Services. That being the case, why is he reading from something from the Conservation Education Branch of the Department of Mines and Resources? It's an altogether different branch.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the . . . speaker would permit a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Attorney-General was asking a question, was he not?

MR. MOLGAT: Would he permit one...

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: If the Honourable Attorney-General would just be patient, I'm going to develop that part of the discussion. However, I come back to July 1966 issue of the commercial fishing bulletin and the Editor's Page has a picture of the new Minister - the Honourable Gurney Evans; and he feels that he has to give some sort of an explanation as to how he arrived at this position so I'll just quote his explanation: "The Honourable Gurney Evans was named Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, replacing the Honourable Sterling R. Lyon, Q.C. who became Provincial Attorney-General. Many fishermen will remember that Mr. Evans, who used to be Minister of Industry and Commerce, was also Minister of Mines and Natural Resources for more than a year in 1958-59, and it was during that time that the fishing bulletin was started."

Now, I come to the -- I think it's the latest publication for the fishermen, and there's been a little more progress made in talking about Ministers and their pictures and so on. In this one we have a picture of the Premier of the province on the second page, and he has a statement about how his group has tried very hard to work towards a Fish Marketing Board, and also there's a picture of the Minister and how all the work he's done towards establishing the marketing board, but then there's an insert in this and it starts out with a bald statement: "Ottawa says no help to fishermen." That's it. No help to fishermen. They're just cut off; they're finished you know; and those cruel mean people in Ottawa have taken this stand. -- (Interjection)-- If the members would like me to read it I'll be only too happy to read it all, but I was going to come to a news release which is based on this terrible bunch in Ottawa that won't help the fishermen.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt my honourable friend but needs must.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, 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 Wednesday afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: We now await the Governor-General.

(A visit from their Excellencies, the Governor General of Canada and Mrs. Michener.)

MR. SPEAKER: Your Excellencies:

It is an honour and a pleasure to welcome you to our Legislative Assembly on this your first official visit to the Province of Manitoba.

May we reaffirm through you and your office the loyalty and allegiance of the Members of this Legislature to Her Gracious Majesty and our deep affection for her as a person.

The Province of Manitoba is the first daughter of Confederation, and is to celebrate her centenary in 1970. As the first province to join the original four in the great experiment of nation-building, we as citizens of Canada pledge ourselves to be worthy of this noble country; we shall continue to strive, to seek and to find those opportunities that will help in the further progress and development of our honoured nation.

May we welcome you as worthy successors of that proud band of dedicated men and women who have held the position which you presently honour. We cannot but remember with pride the statement of His Excellency Lord Dufferin in 1877:

"Manitoba may be regarded as the keystone of that mighty arch of sister

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd)

provinces which spans the continent from Atlantic to Pacific."

We work to deserve that proud title of Keystone, the link between east and west -- the two parts that make up this great nation of ours -- just as we can consider ourselves a link between the two founding cultures of this land: a link re-enforced, strengthened and sustained by additional cultures which have given even greater breadth to our heritage.

We remember, too, the injunction of His Late Excellency General Vanier, when in 1960, in this Chamber, he said, "Continue to grow in that unity which is so essential to national greatness."

Your Excellencies, we also welcome you as friends. Each of you personally knows of the hopes, the problems and the aspirations of Manitoba and Western Canada. Her Excellency we happily acknowledge as a native Manitoban. His Excellency we remember as a friend who has delved deeply into the problems of local government in Manitoba and who, with sincerity, knowledge and acumen, provided a framework for development in this field.

Therefore as persons whom we know and deeply respect, and as the representatives of Her Majesty, symbolizing the unity and sovereignty of our nation, we are honoured and happy to welcome you.

GOVERNOR GENERAL: Mr. Speaker, Premier and Members of the Legislature of Manitoba, I am particularly grateful for the welcome which you have just extended to my wife and me.

This is the first time in which I have been honoured in this way by a Legislature since becoming Her Majesty's representative. It is quite a privilege. As I remember well from my days as a member of the Ontario Legislature in the three years I was there I think we received only two visitors on the floor of the House, Cardinal McQuiggin who had just been appointed to his high office, and Barbara Ann Scott who had just brought honour to her province and to Canada as a figure skater. Another reason for my special appreciation of this visit is that that Legislature whose Bills are presented to me for approval, at least the Commons half of it, seems unduly diffident about receiving me at all. In fact they make it quite clear that I am not wanted in the Green Chamber. Were it not for the more cordial attitude in the Senate, a reversal of their former coldness when they used to make me stand at the Bar, I should feel rather dejected about my new office. However there are many compensations. One of them is the privilege which I now exercise of bringing a double message to you of greetings and good wishes in your important public responsibilities. The first is from Her Majesty the Queen who will greatly appreciate the message you have given, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Legislature and the other from the Canadian people as a whole.

In this vast country which stretches fifteen hundred miles more or less each way, east and west, from Manitoba, it is not always easy to remember that Canadians with their diversity and dispersion are one collective family with common interests and a common purpose among the nations. If we forget that we are nothing; if we remember it as we did in our activities and the emotions of the Centennial celebrations we are capable of great things and are respected and admired by almost all of the world. The welfare and progress of Manitoba so often referred to since Lord Dufferin's visit as the keystone in the Canadian arch; I have heard that you make a further claim, that is to be the center of gravity of North America. The welfare and progress of Manitoba are critical if not essential to the Canadian unity and to our collective advance. In wishing you well on behalf of all Canadians I express not only their friendship but their direct interest in the prosperity of Manitoba and the contentment and happiness of Manitobans.

My wife and I come here with feelings of happiness which are tinged with nostalgia. As you have said, Mr. Speaker, she was born in Boissevain and her family, the Willisess, Robert and Richard and the late Honourable Errick Willis, whom we all remember with such affection and respect, have played their part in the development of the province. I, too, had the good judgment to be born in the west but farther west and so I know, as you say, Mr. Speaker, something of the feelings and aspirations of those who opened up the prairies and made of them a grainery for the whole world. More than that I had the honour in company with four knowledgeable and delightful Manitobans to form the Royal Commission on Local Government Organization and Finance and with them to study these problems in depth, to tour the province and to meet a great many Manitobans particularly those concerned with government and education. Among them, Mr. Speaker, were many of your legislative family, who I judge from their

(GOVERNOR GENERAL cont'd)...department today give you as their presiding officer very little trouble. So as you see I come back here to old acquaintances and I'm greatly encouraged in my new role to find that I am still received with such cordiality.

There have been some changes, Mr. Premier; I shall not speak so much about the changes as the things that seem to be the same. I was struck of course by those two great bison of which I was so fond that stand guard over the Grand Staircase and as usual I was greatly impressed with your Legislative Building which seems to me to be the first among its kind. I know of no building so well designed or so well built in Canada and for that matter beyond. Since those days of which I speak I have followed your deliberations and the progress of your people as best I could from distant India and more recently from Ottawa with greater facility. There is a dynamic quality to life here which makes progress inevitable. Manitoba is intimately involved in almost everything important going on in Canada from rocket manufacture and research to new types of nuclear reactors and new methods of harnessing the resources of mines, farms, forests and waterways. The province is a prime contender for major honours in the next phase of Canadian development. Once again Manitoba is taking a course full of meaning for all of Canada. It is mounting a major effort to expand its already diverse economy by planned growth based on intimate collaboration of industry, labour and government.

A key to this progress is the attention that you are giving to education, to developing latent talents and giving scope to the energy of youth. You have enlisted the participation and sought the opinion of your youth and in so doing have avoided some of the alienation which bothers relations between the generations in other parts and this is why I congratulate you who are the leaders of political thought and action in this province. You have not only been aware of the right and potential of your youth, you have made their interests your own. In so doing you have not only captured their spirit but have assured them of their own achievement and with that the future of your province.

Again, Mr. Speaker, Honourable Premier and Honourable Ministers and Members of the Legislature of Manitoba I thank you for your gracious and cordial reception.

God Save the Queen.