

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 13th, 1965.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

MR. CLERK: The petition of Francis Alexander Lavens Mathewson and others praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate the Planetarium.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 40 Grade 12 students from Lorette School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Rosset. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Springfield. There are some 100 Glenlawn Collegiate Grade 11 students under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Scott, Mr. Checkwitsch. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for St. Vital. There are some 60 Grade 8 students from Butterworth School under the direction of their teachers, Mrs. Halowka and Miss Kelly. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I should like to lay on the table of the House a return to an Order of the House No. 27, dated the 25th of March, on the motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Education. Is there any consideration being given to providing living-in accommodation at the Manitoba Technical School, that is residence accommodation?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Not at the moment, Madam Speaker.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to draw the attention of the House to Page 1475 of Hansard where I am being credited with half the speech of my honourable friend from Selkirk. Mind you I wouldn't mind getting the credit for a very fine speech. However, if I am to give credit where it is due, it was made by the Honourable Member from Selkirk.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to ask a question from the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has he received a petition signed by the members of the Grand Beach Campers Association protesting what they call inequitable taxation imposed on them by the Rural Municipality of St. Clements on their summer cottages?

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): No, Madam Speaker.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour, but in his absence I would like to direct it to the First Minister. With respect to the membership of the Woods Committee, have any members recently resigned from the Woods Labour-Management Committee?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): None that I am aware of, Madam Speaker.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, another question of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has he received any petition signed by the campers of Winnipeg Beach.

MR. SMELLIE: No, Madam Speaker.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, I wonder if I might address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. When might I obtain from the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources a return for the order I put in respecting Thompson and agreement some time ago?

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I checked on that just before I came down, anticipating the honourable member's question. I am advised that they are still working on it and I'm hopeful that we will have it here just as soon as absolutely possible. He has received the agreement in the meantime, I believe.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, that's right. I trust, Madam Speaker, if I may, a supplementary question, I trust that he will be prepared to table it before his estimates are entered into.

MR. LYON: I wouldn't want to give that undertaking but certainly we'll try to have it in my honourable friend's hand just as soon as we possibly can.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I might be permitted to make a suggestion as to the order of business. I notice that we have a number of private bills on Pages 12 and 13 of the Orders of the Day and some of them have been on the Order Paper for several days. We don't seem to reach them on private members day, and in order to facilitate their going through and their going to committee where there may be people who wish to come and make representation, I wonder if we could proceed with those ahead of resolutions. Certainly so far as our group, this would be suitable to us.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I think we'll arrive at those bills in good time.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to table a return to an Order of the House No. 8 on the motion of the Honourable Member from St. George and also a return to an Order of the House No. 38 on the motion of the Honourable Member from Emerson.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): In the absence of the Honourable Minister, could we have this matter stand?

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

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, in the absence of the member for Assiniboia, may we have this matter stand. However, if anyone else wishes to speak we would have no objection.

MADAM SPEAKER: Any other member wishing to speak? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, this motion seeks to obtain the approval of this House for the establishment of a second audit department under the control of a person known as the Auditor-General. The work of our Comptroller-General is governed by The Treasury Act which was extensively revised about 1933 with the assistance of the Manitoba Institute of Chartered Accountants. That a good job was done is shown by the fact that since that time there has been no revision of The Treasury Act and there has been no major shortage of funds in any of the government departments.

The Official Opposition had some 25 years after the passing of The Treasury Act to bring forth the appointment of an additional auditor in the person of an Auditor-General. The member who moved this motion was a member of the Cabinet of the previous government, and among the opposition we also have the Leader who was a member of that government for some five years, and we have the former Premier and Treasurer who all had an opportunity to do their best at that time to have an Auditor-General appointed, and if they thought it was a good idea then he could have been appointed when they were in power.

The resolution, Madam Speaker, starts off with this clause: Whereas the appointment of an Auditor-General in other jurisdictions has proved of great benefit in controlling waste in government and has provided savings to the taxpayer. Generally speaking, when members opposite refer to that clause they refer to the position of Auditor-General of the Government of Canada, but we have not had that experience with the work of the Auditor-General of Canada. They have not controlled waste. The Auditor-General of Canada makes spot checks months after the waste has occurred, makes spot checks after the money has been wrongfully and wastefully paid out, whereas in Manitoba we have a system of audit whereby the accounts are checked, whereby every disbursement is pre-audited so that the wrongful payments do not occur. They are checked before they are made and we do not close the barn door after the horse has gone as is the case with the Federal Government. If we really wanted to improve

(MR. COWAN cont'd). the administration of government with regard to auditing and financial administration in this country, the members opposite should be trying to convince the Federal Government that they should be setting up an audit department similar to the one we have in Manitoba where expenses are pre-audited before disbursements are made.

This clause goes on to say, "and has provided savings to the taxpayer." It would seem very doubtful if the Federal Auditor-General has provided savings to the taxpayer, for year after year we have the Federal Auditor-General bringing in lists longer than ever of wasteful expenditures by the Federal Government.

The second clause in the resolution reads: Therefore be it resolved that there be appointed an officer known as the Auditor-General, and that he be empowered to make independent spot inspections and running audits of all government departments, boards, commissions, and utilities, and to report to the Legislature. This is in the large part work that is already being done by our Comptroller-General and there is not the necessity of appointing another man known as the Auditor-General to do the same work. The Comptroller-General conducts independent spot inspections; he conducts running audits of all government departments, boards, commissions and utilities excepting with respect to the Manitoba Telephone System, the Workmen's Compensation Board and the Manitoba Hydro; and the Auditor-General reports to this Legislature through the certificates contained in the Public Accounts.

The third clause goes on to state: And be it further resolved that the Auditor-General should be appointed by the Legislature, be responsible only to the Legislature, be removed from office only by a two-thirds majority of votes in the Legislature. Our Comptroller-General, Madam Speaker, was appointed many years ago; carries on his work very well; and he is responsible to this Legislature and can be removed from office only by a two-thirds majority of votes in the Legislature as provided by Subsection (2) of Section 9 of The Treasury Act. So we have pretty well all of the duties being asked for in this resolution being carried through by our present staff.

The audit system we have in Manitoba is one of the best, and when visitors from other countries come to Canada to learn of our system of audits and financial administration in our governments in this country, officials at Ottawa generally refer the visitors to Manitoba so that they can best learn how an efficient audit system is carried out, and in recent years there have been visits to our Auditor-General's Department from Indonesia, Ceylon, Pakistan and British Guiana.

Our Comptroller-General's Department has been recognized as a first-rate department by one of the largest, and perhaps the leading organization dealing with government finance on this continent, called the Municipal Finance Officers Association. In the 1950's this Association gave their principal award, known as the Louisville Award, one year to the Comptroller-General's Department of the Province of Manitoba in respect of a study of gasoline measurement and shrinkage, and only two years ago the Executive Director of that large organization stated that he couldn't recall when the Louisville Award had evoked as much interest as had the study prepared by our Comptroller-General.

In addition, Madam Speaker, we have the protection provided by the Public Accounts Committee, and each year the Comptroller-General and other members of his staff have appeared before the Public Accounts Committee to which all members of the Legislature can come and ask questions of him concerning the Public Account of this province.

With respect to the comments of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead on Page 639 of Hansard of this year, on March 16th we have this quotation: "There is yet another reason why there should be an establishment of the post of Auditor-General, and that is so that we might have an officer of this Legislature who would be responsible not just for conducting an audit, post audit; but also for conducting an investigation into basic administrative practices and procedures. You could refer to this as an efficiency audit. This is in fact what is being done now by the Auditor-General in the Federal Government." Now, Madam Speaker, Manitoba's auditors do review the effectiveness of departmental administrative practices and procedures with particular attention to the effectiveness of the internal control of revenue and expenditures. Furthermore, there is a close liaison between the Comptroller-General, department administrators and the Organization and Methods Division maintained by the Treasury Department. The fact is that the Auditor-General of Canada cannot possibly have conducted a full-scale efficiency audit otherwise the Glassco Commission would not recently have found such a fertile field for observation and comment.

(MR. COWAN cont'd).....

Then, Madam Speaker, on the next page the Honourable Member for Brokenhead goes on to say, and I quote, "The original conception was that Parliament or the Legislature was to pass laws. I think the day has long gone when we have exercised that function in its full and complete sense. Today, legislation is for the most part determined by the Administration and by the Treasury Branches, and it is admitted that Parliament and the Legislature are there but to analyze the legislation, to comment on it; that the real function of the Legislature today is no longer to legislate in the full sense" -- and he goes on. This, Madam Chairman, is a fantastic proposition to state that the real function of the Legislature today is no longer to legislate in the full sense, that we are here only to make comments. Surely the members of this Legislature do not pass laws which they do not approve of. Surely if they do not like the legislation that is proposed, they bring forth amendments and ask that changes be made and the members of the House do that. We are the Legislature for this province and we do make the laws, and the members of this House do carry out their duties in that respect.

The Comptroller-General has a staff of 70: 10 chartered accountants, 13 articulated accountancy students, 21 audit clerks, 12 comptometer operators and stenographers, and 14 bookkeeping machine operators. If we were to add an additional audit staff under the direction of the Auditor-General, we would be adding an additional expensive department which is certainly unnecessary in this province.

So, Madam Speaker, I submit that we do not need the appointment of an Auditor-General to control waste and provide savings in this province for the taxpayers. We have the Auditor-General conducting a pre-audit before disbursements are made, and in that way he controls the waste and provides savings for the taxpayers. We do not need an Auditor-General to provide spot inspections and running audits. Our Comptroller-General is already doing that. Nor do we need an Auditor-General to be responsible to the Legislature and to be removed from office only by a two-thirds majority of votes in the Legislature, as our Comptroller-General is already in that position. We have an excellent staff; we have an excellent Comptroller-General in this province. There is no need for a second auditor, and I ask the House to defeat the proposal to establish an unnecessary second audit department in this province.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member from St. Boniface, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, even though I am sure that I would have to consider myself as one of the least qualified of the members of the House to speak in any technical terms on the subject of automation and its likely impact on the economy and the society, I still have found this debate a most interesting one, because I think it's a most interesting subject to begin with, Madam Speaker, and one that the House and the public should be well aware of.

I'm afraid that I can contribute little that is new after the contributions that have already been made to the debate, but I would like to follow the example of those who have preceded me and read briefly from some of the things that have been said by people who are knowledgeable in this field. I think it is a field, Madam Speaker, that we simply must become knowledgeable in because both the mover of the motion and the others who have spoken on it since must have convinced us, if we needed any convincing, that the day of automation is here and that we must be prepared for its effect both on the economy and on society.

I was interested in the fact that the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks, whom I would be only truthful I think if I characterized as one of the most gentlemanly members of the House and one who always speaks in gentlemanly terms, became quite annoyed with the fact that the amendment was moved in the terms and in the spirit in which it was moved. I was quite interested -- as one who does not pretend to be as gentlemanly as my honourable friend -- I was quite interested in the fact that he used such terms against the government as saying, and I'm quoting now from Page 1174, "I think if there ever was an innocuous and straightforward resolution, this is it. This amendment, in my way of thinking, is a good

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd). example of the smug and conceited way in which the government regards a good suggestion to this House, because the amendment just oozes with self-righteousness and it suggests we should applaud what is being done and the government should be encouraged" -- and there is more in the same vein. I would think that in this case the government deserves the strictures my honourable friend from Seven Oaks laid upon them, because it seems to me that their spokesman did take advantage of what was intended to be a sensible, logical discussion of a most timely subject in this House in order to strain their arms by reaching around to tap themselves on the back and thereby detract from the seriousness of the subject matter that is before us. So I don't blame my honourable friend at all for being a bit annoyed.

I want to tell him though that in this matter of objecting to the amendments that are placed before the House at times, that he's in good company because I want to read a quote that was made away back in those days of 1958, and apparently the same thing, the same complaint existed then because here's where a certain member says, "As is usual, in the cases when some constructive suggestion is offered by the Opposition, we find the government feeling the compulsion of introducing an amendment to take some of the sting out of it" -- and the gentleman who was speaking at that time was the Honourable the First Minister of this province. That is he's the First Minister now, but he was speaking from a seat along here at that time. And this is the way it has been.

But I went to this trouble, Madam Speaker -- because I am interested in the frequent references to comparisons between 1958 and now -- I went to the trouble of looking up the Journals to see what amendment had been proposed at that time, and I'm glad to report that the amendment of that day, although it drew some moderately critical language from my honourable friend the present First Minister, the amendment to which he was referring was not one that praised the government at all, not at all. I join with the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks in suggesting that the praise to the government for its programs in the amendment that we had before us is gratuitous, unnecessary, irrelevant, and detracts from the serious attention that I think should be given to this most pressing subject.

Now being far, as I have admitted, from an expert on this subject -- and I have not even made any great study of it -- but like the honourable members who preceded me I too had been attracted by some of the articles that have appeared in periodicals from time to time and I want to read a couple of paragraphs from an issue of "Time" of April 2nd, 1965. Now I would be the first to admit that "Time" in its treatment of many important subjects is in my opinion far from profound, but on the other hand in some cases it certainly does seem to go to a lot of trouble to gather up information that already exists.

I'm reading only a very small part of an article that appears in that issue under the heading of "Technology," with a sub-heading, "The Cybernated Generation," and here I'm quoting from Page 68 of that issue. "'The electronic computer,' says Dr. Louis T. Rader, a Vice-President of General Electric, 'may have a more beneficial potential for the human race than any other invention in history.' As viewed by Sir Leon Bagrit" -- and I interpolate here, Madam Speaker, to say that he was quoted I believe by my honourable friend from Seven Oaks as well. I resume the reading. "As viewed by Sir Leon Bagrit, the thoughtful head of Britain's Elliot-Automation, the computer and automation will bring the greatest change in the whole history of mankind. The public too has begun to sense the power of the computer for good and evil" -- and he goes on talking about the cartoonists and even best sellers of books. Then on the next page, "'When these new machines realize their potential,' says Dr. John Diebold, Chairman of the Diebold Group, Inc., consultants in the computer field, 'there will be a social effect of unbelievable proportion. This impact on society is still to come.' " That's the end of the quotation on Page 69.

Madam Speaker, if we accept these statements by people who are supposed to be trained in this field as being even just a little bit exaggerated, I think we must realize that this is a subject of tremendous importance to all of us and something that we should be paying attention to and not be satisfied with the rather casual treatment that is suggested by the amendment that is before us.

I read again from Page 73 of this same issue. This heading of this paragraph is "Staggering Capacity." "The most impressive fact about the age of the computer is how young it still is and how little society has yet felt the full impact of the computer's potential." This article, Madam Speaker, while it mentions that it has potentials for great good, does not miss the other point that has been mainly presented by the honourable member who proposed

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd). this resolution, that it also can have potential, great potential for likely or possible unemployment.

So, Madam Speaker, my whole point in taking part in this debate is to simply redirect the thinking of the members of this House to the fact that here is a force that while it is new, still very new, while it is as yet little understood by the average person, and whose ramifications and potentials both for good and for dislocations are not realized I think by the most of us, that that subject should be intelligently considered by this House and arrangements made so far as possible to assess this probable impact.

So considering that the original resolution was along the right lines; believing that the amendment, apart from the uncomplimentary things that my honourable friend the Member for Seven Oaks said about it and with which I agree, does not meet the situation as it should when we consider the seriousness of this whole problem; I propose an amendment to the amendment, Madam Speaker, to try and get the discussion back into what I believe to be the proper perspective and to make arrangements for that type of an intent study, by people qualified to do so, that I believe should be undertaken at this time.

So, Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk, that the amendment be amended by striking out all the words after "whereas" in the sixth line thereof and substituting the following: "Preparations should be made for the possibility of major dislocations resulting from the onslaught of automation; And whereas such preparations require a partnership approach involving labour, management and government to make a prediction of the displacement of workers through automation; Therefore be it resolved that this House recommend the establishment of a committee representing government, labour and management to consider the probable effects of automation and plans to deal effectively with them."

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

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

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

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): I adjourned the debate on behalf of my colleague from St. John's.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Thank you, Madam Speaker. This issue, Madam Speaker, is one which does not directly involve this government but is rather a matter directed to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and of course involves budgeting of the Government of Canada, and as such I suppose it's comparatively easy to deal with this problem because money of the Provincial Government is not involved.

Now I note some of the sentences, some of the words used by previous speakers, the Honourable Member from Churchill in presenting this resolution spoke of the fact that he doesn't have any axe to grind for the system which is in Thompson now, as is being presented, through the fact that there is nothing else that private enterprise can do about it. He accepts the fact that private enterprise has no role to play at the present time for television service in Thompson.

The Honourable Member for Swan River seemed to agree with that, endorsed the resolution and said, and I quote, "I know the wheels of government sometimes move slowly, but we in Northern Manitoba become incensed with the constant boasting of the CBC and its so-called national coverage." A few sentences further he states, "Those things" -- that's bringing up services to a par -- "those things are essential if we are to keep at home the oncoming generations, and more important, attract people of the professional occupations and the trades who are so sorely needed," -- and speaks further about the importance of the development of the north. The page number in the Hansard is 419 for the words of the Honourable Member for Swan River and 418 for that of the Honourable Member for Churchill.

Now there's a very good case made out by these two honourable gentlemen on the need for the providing of television service in the north and in Churchill. I see that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition agrees with that, and I quote now from Page 1286 of Hansard where he states that he agrees with the Honourable Member for Churchill that this would be a desirable development in Northern Manitoba and indicated that he intends to support the

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd). resolution. He says further, and I quote, "I think that it would be very desirable for the Federal Government in co-operation with the province to proceed and serve as many of these areas as is possible. Naturally," he says, "there will be the question of cost. Some of the areas because of their great isolation, the distance involved and the small population, the argument will no doubt be put up that it isn't reasonable to proceed with the service."

Madam Speaker, I have a handy marking pencil where I mark those lines which I think are worthy of review, and I notice on the next page I also marked some lines which I would like to read into the record, not because they are so germane to what was said but rather because I thought that in marking it that these were words of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, but they turned out to be words of the Honourable the Member for Carillon who sits behind him. He said, and I thought this was in the same speech so that it's interesting how the words of a member of that Party seem to point themselves up in this debate, and he said, "Madam Speaker, our system of free enterprise has produced the highest level of well-being to the majority of people, I think, ever known throughout the world, and at no time in our history, I believe, has the system faced -- our system of free enterprise faced the serious threats and grave perils it does today. World-wide economic dislocation, communism and communist teachings, commercial trickery, defeat and fraud, are pointing up to the necessity of action on the part of business and on the part of the individual to help counteract the enemies of this free enterprise system and those who would change our way of life." These are words -- I end the quote, Madam Speaker, from a speech of the Honourable Member for Carillon on the question of, I think it was Consumer Protection, but it was just the juxtaposition of these words with the words of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition dealing with the provision of services to the north that seemed to me to be an interesting point of view and actually contradictory to my way of thinking, because, Madam Speaker, the costs of providing television services to our community are shared by two systems. One is the private enterprise system which is concerned with a profit, and the other is the provision of a service for the public with public monies, as in this case, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

So, Madam Speaker, I asked for certain information which I could get about the CBC, and I think it's of interest to read into the record some of the information which I have received. In the 12 years of operation of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in the television field, coverage has been extended to 94 percent of the population, this on a more or less -- well on an orderly pattern of development, and with a due regard to the cost per unit or the cost per capita of the operating cost, not the capital cost, and I think it is an obvious fact that the cost per capita rises tremendously as the population served decreases.

In Toronto there is one transmitter which serves over a million people. In Winnipeg there is one transmitter which serves half a million people. In Brandon there is a transmitter which serves 50,000 people. In Thompson there would have to be a transmitter which would serve some 5,000 people, and the cost rises much steeper than in a proportionate increase. I am informed that the two stations which are unconnected with microwaves, that is in Flin Flon and The Pas, have all their film flown in by air transport to these two centres. The cost of service there would obviously be a great deal higher than the cost of service in Winnipeg.

As I understand it, because of this cost, and the gradual extension to the service, that it was only this year that Fort Frances, Ontario, received television coverage. In doing that there was a complex of small transmitters ranging from Dryden to Fort Frances servicing 150,000 people. Obviously, the provision of this service for these 150,000 people was much more expensive than the cost of servicing the area of Metropolitan Winnipeg. Obviously too, by the same token, when you compare 150,000 to 5,000, the cost of providing the service to that area is considerably less than the cost of providing the service to Thompson.

I understand that factors regarding cost and speed with which service would be provided are not only that of population to be served but also the geography -- that is the ease or the difficulty with which it is to construct microwave towers -- the existing communication facilities -- and I'm told that up in the Yukon area, there being a microwave network previously installed for defence installations, it was possible to hook up a TV service into that area to serve some 100,000 people in the Peace River. But I am also told that the existing microwave network now run by Manitoba Telephones would have to be considerably modified to accommodate the transmission of television programs up to Thompson.

There was a guess made by my informant, Madam Speaker, that the cost of providing

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd).....television coverage for the balance of the six percent of Canada now unserved would equal the cost of providing television coverage to 94 percent of the nation already provided. I just find it difficult to believe that statement, Madam Speaker, and yet it was made by a person who is much more knowledgeable than I in this field. But even assuming that there's a tremendous exaggeration there, I think we must all recognize that the cost would be tremendous, and the cost of this type, Madam Speaker, is obviously the monies which must be provided out of the operating revenue of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and thus subsidized through the annual budget voted through the Parliament of Canada.

Now, Madam Speaker, I agree with the speakers who have already spoken that the real purpose, the *raison d'être* of the CBC is to be of public service and to provide coverage for all the people of Canada as soon as possible. I believe that they are moving to that point and will do so just as quickly as their budget will allow them to do, and we the people do have something to say about the budgets of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

So, Madam Speaker, I think that in voting for this resolution we should bear in mind that we are giving a very very hearty vote of confidence to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. We are recognizing its prime purpose and that is the service of a communication media to all the people. We are recognizing that the people in far-flung Canada in the small areas, the small sparsely populated areas as well as the heavily populated areas, are entitled to this service, but we must do so with our eyes wide open, recognizing the tremendous costs involved, and we must therefore remember to support that service on which we call now to extend its contribution to the cultural and intellectual well-being of further corners of this country.

We know that if there was money to be made in this deal the private enterprise stations and private enterprise networks would not have hesitated to have been in Churchill. We know very well that they would have been there without waiting for motions and resolutions to be passed in Houses such as these. So we must not in the future think in terms of demanding a service be provided and at the same time support private enterprise in this field to the detriment of the public service of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. And when I say that, I say so because of the fact, Madam Speaker, that there are many occasions in the House of Commons and elsewhere where there are attacks made on the monies spent by the CBC, on the deficits which accumulate in the CBC, on the vast costs which are in CBC and which do not relate to the profits or losses as the case may be of private enterprise.

Every time, Madam Speaker, we hear about Air Canada, about its desire to be economical, of its need to tighten its belt, and when it exercises what it thinks is right we all rise to protest and say, this is a publicly-owned service which owes a duty to the public and to all of Canada to service all of Canada and to provide a substantial bolster to the economy of Canada.

So, Madam Speaker, we must bear in mind that when we make these demands on a publicly-owned service and do so at the cost of the people and forcing it to show a detrimental financial picture as compared to private enterprise, that we are not doing a service to the people, especially the people in areas like Thompson, when we attack at the same time as we demand the service. I believe, Madam Speaker, that this indicates the importance that there is for us to strengthen the CBC and other publicly-owned enterprises, to encourage it in its work and not to jump to its criticism as often as some people are inclined to do. I think that through the years, both in radio and TV, the CBC has shown its outstanding contribution, which is without equal I believe anywhere in the world and certainly on this continent, in the standard of service it provides, in the intellectual achievement and the cultural recognition which it has and which it contributes to the people, and I would say that it would be a very very sorry day if the CBC were not encouraged as we are doing in this resolution to spread its contribution to all areas of Canada.

So let us remember, Madam Speaker, that when we support this resolution, as obviously now I think almost all of us have indicated we will do, we must do so in such a spirit as not later to seek to -- not to seek to, but to possibly inadvertently undermine its progress and its program by criticism of the costs which we ourselves insist that it undertakes.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker.....

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I have no prepared speech to make in connection with this resolution before us, but I feel that I should make some comments after hearing the last speaker. The

(MR. FROESE cont'd). resolution calls for services for the northern part of this province, and I for one would certainly support the resolution in this connection. After all, we as taxpayers of Canada are paying the shot, and our Federal Government is subsidizing this CBC every year I think by some 80-odd millions, and therefore I think we as Manitobans should support a request like this. We should try and get the best services for Manitoba if we're going to pay the cost anyway. I think this works the same way as our school system. Now that the government is paying a greater cost of the cost of education, the more requests you will have from the people that it serves, and likewise if we as Manitobans and citizens of Canada are paying taxes towards this service, we should be requesting better service then and at least include all our people. So it's quite logical to have a resolution like this come forward.

If I understood the honourable member who just preceded me speaking that we should probably not be as outspoken in our criticisms because of the fact that this is a government agency providing the service, I for one feel that we should retain that right and express our criticisms just as freely whether it's a private enterprise concerned or whether it's government business. I don't think, as far as I'm concerned, that that makes any difference to me. If I misunderstood him, let him correct me later.

Certainly I would like to see competition in this respect in this province even for the northern part of the province, and in the future probably we will see that private enterprise might go into this area. For the present, however, this apparently is not feasible and therefore we should do everything in our power to have the Federal Government come in and provide this service to our people of Manitoba.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, I think possibly I should speak to this resolution, particularly as prior to getting into the field of politics I was one who managed a radio station up in the north country, a radio station that was considered a small radio station because it had only 1,000 watts at a time when 5,000 watts of power was considered to be quite large and then 10,000 watts was considered to be rather magnificent and 50,000 watts was out of this world--(Interjection)--Thank you. Am I speaking too loud, because if I am I'll just calm it down a wee bit.

I wish that we had had a resolution such as this when I was operating the radio station with respect to the radio operation in the north country, because in the north country we wanted to use the CBC not only for some of the cultural broadcasts but also for the broadcasts such as the NHL and the World Series, the football games, particularly the Grey Cups and the championship fights, which the people in the north country, being very sports-minded, wanted to hear, but for a long time we were never provided with a line service that connected us to the facilities of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

For many years, and as a matter of fact even up to the time that I left the radio station, we were still required to use two receivers, one of them located in what we termed the barn area and the other located up on North Avenue, in order to pick up the signals from CBK Watrous and to then pass it through our equipment and broadcast it to the people in the north country. Well there were many times, because of the lack of facilities, that there was a considerable amount of noise. During a thunderstorm or during periods of northern lights, and during periods of thunderstorms far removed from us, when we were trying to listen to a cultural broadcast from the CBC or when we were trying to listen to a hockey game from the CBC we found ourselves having to listen to the culture or the hockey mixed up with a considerable amount of noise and there was not much that could be done about it.

I do vividly remember that at one time the International Agreement on Frequencies and Powers had been more or less bent, and when we were broadcasting hockey or when we were broadcasting culture we used to have riding in on top of our signals the bells and gongs and bingo games from stations as far south as Mexico, and it was rather disturbing when there was a very exciting period in the NHL or a very exciting period in the World Series to have somebody playing bingo in the background or come in so loud on the skyway as they came in that the hockey game or the football game or the baseball game or the culture was wiped out.

Now I draw this to your attention because for years we wanted to have a line network and for years it was said that it was too costly, and for years the figures, if I recall correctly, came down that it would cost us so much per thousand people in order to put this service in. It's only been since about 1960 that the radio station in Flin Flon was physically joined with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and could broadcast all of these events that I have mentioned with as much clarity as they can be received here in the settled parts of the province

(MR. WITNEY cont'd). or in the metropolitan area or in Regina or Moose Jaw or from east to west across the country.

Now at the present time with respect to television, some of the areas haven't got it and in the Flin Flon and The Pas areas we have a delayed form of television. And just reverting back to radio, up in Lynn Lake they still do not have adequate radio coverage even though radio has been with us for so many years and there have been so many improvements made in the communication media. Lynn Lake is still without radio service. As a private broadcaster we were investigating the ways and means of increasing power at that time in order to provide a signal for Lynn Lake but the costs were beyond us. We were a private radio station operating with a limited audience and competing with two daily newspapers and several other advertising media at that time, and our revenues were not such that as private enterprise we could expand into the area of Lynn Lake.

I always felt that if good and adequate provision could be provided through transmitters such as CBW and CBK for a large area down south that was heavily populated, that it wouldn't have taken that much more to provide either line facilities or to provide transmitters, and one was considered in the Churchill area at one time to provide the people of the north country with Canadian communication. When I was in the north country in the latter part of the '50s there were still places there that were receiving better signals from some of the short-wave emanations from Russia than they were from any Canadian broadcasting station that was operating at that time.

Now we are asking in this resolution that consideration be given to extend national television and radio service to areas in northern Manitoba. I do not think that it is highly expensive or too far out of the road to ask to provide radio service at any rate, particularly in an area such as Lynn Lake, and I do not think that now that the costs are going to be such that it will be that far out of the way to provide the national television coverage for the north country. In 1959 and 1960 this matter was being debated quite heavily at that time and as a result of that the Kinescope method came to Flin Flon and The Pas. There were figures then that were given, and if I recall correctly they were something like \$14.00 per radio home, and I believe the national average at that time was about \$7.00 per radio home.

We had the CBC send a team of engineers into the north country to investigate all the problems and I've often wondered whether the CBC would not have been well advised to put up a major installation on Baldy Mountain, and from Baldy Mountain not only have been able to have got closer to the north country for future dissemination of their broadcasts in that area but also to provide a stronger coverage for the areas in the Interlake and the areas that surround the constituencies of some of the members, the Honourable Member for Ethelbert and the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, and over into the country in between Lake Winnipegosis and Lake Winnipeg. Then of course once that was established it would have been easier to move up into the north country, but unfortunately they couldn't come to that decision and so up in Baldy Mountain, in order to give some television coverage, the private television station from Yorkton was established.

But even since that time, if one takes a look at what is happening up in the north country, back in 1960 there were not the numbers of people that there are in Thompson today. Back in 1960 there was not the spreading out of the north country as we see Flin Flon now joining up and becoming more or less of a complex of Snow Lake and Flin Flon; there was not the -- slow, but they're coming up and the future development will show more in Lynn Lake; and there was not the development of communications at that time that there has been five years later, nor was there the numbers of people. The numbers of people are coming; the communications are improving; and I suggest that the CBC could well afford now to take another good look at extending the national television service into the north country.

I would not want the CBC to consider that they are going into a pioneer area because the area of pioneering in the north country in my opinion has passed. We are now a modern community peopled by people who are laborers, people who are chemists, people who have had education from Grade 8 and people who have had doctorate degrees from our universities. We have people who now can pick up telephones and phone direct to Winnipeg and Winnipeg can phone direct to them. We have people in modern homes; we have people with modern facilities; people who think in modern terms; and people who want to have the modern conveniences that others have. I am sure too that they are people who recognize, as the Honourable Member for St. John's mentioned, that these things do cost money. I think they are people who recognize that they cannot be unreasonable about their demands, but I think they are people who recognize

(MR. WITNEY cont'd). that perhaps they had better start now to let others know that they are not only there but they are going to be there for a long time and they are going to grow, and that to take national television into the north country will be not just a move to service a few people in a widely dispersed area but a move to help in the growth of a whole brand new part of this province and a brand new part of Canada, one that the north country has always said is going to grow and grow and grow, and over the past 15 years have proven it.

If I might just deviate for a moment, in the 15 years when I first went to Flin Flon in 1949 there was no road then. There is now a road to Flin Flon; there's a road to Snow Lake; there's a road to Thompson. There is now a town at Thompson where there wasn't one there before. There's now a town at Lynn Lake where there wasn't one there before. There are now more mines at Chisel Lake, at Stall Lake, at Osborne Lake and at Snow Lake, and while for instance Sherridon you might say closed down, Sherridon simply moved. But the point I'm making is that 15 years ago when we were seeking to get some better radio communication the people at that time said the country is going to grow. I was saying the country is going to grow and they should have the same opportunities as they are having in the south country. The same situation applies now with respect to television, and I hope that they do not have to wait quite as long as we had to wait in order to have a physical connection with the Canadian system of the CBC.

I was reading the terms of the CBC the other day, and I believe as a private broadcaster that the CBC have done a fine job in this country. I never had any quarrel with the CBC. At any time when I was a private broadcaster they did their best within what they could to facilitate this radio station up in Flin Flon and we used their programs to a great deal. But I think also that they must get away too in their thinking from this East-West line of Canada and start to expand. They can do that here in Manitoba because the Province of Manitoba is expanding quite rapidly, I contend, when one considers 1949 to 1965 and when one considers what can happen now in the next 15-year period up to say 1980.

So, Madam Speaker, I've just stood up on my feet to more or less argue in favour of this resolution. It's been a disjointed speech, but I agree with it and naturally I'm going to vote for it.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Member for St. Vital.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): Madam Speaker, before making my contribution on this debate I would like to thank the House for having allowed this matter to stand for as long as it has and to apologize to the Honourable Leader of the NDP for having taken so long to give this subject matter the attention which it deserves.

The government's concern, Madam Speaker, over the plight of consumers has been directed lately towards preventing abuses in the field of consumer credit. We had at the last session The Unconscionable Transactions Act; we have had the meetings of the Tallin Commission on mortgages; the Premier's Committee with its sub-committees dealing with consumer credit, the report of which was tabled in the House the other day; and also we have before us at this session Bill No. 86 dealing with Consumer Credit. All of these matters that I have mentioned, or reports, deal with the matter of consumer credit, that is where the consumer is buying a service or merchandise on time.

The honourable member who introduced this resolution, however, is quite right in the contention that he made when he introduced this resolution that there are abuses just as bad in other fields of consumer affairs, and more and more these are becoming matters or abuses of public interest and matters in which the government is going to have to take a stand as it has done with respect to consumer credit.

It's interesting to note, Madam Speaker, that just the other day in the newspaper, in a report from Regina that the Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan are dealing with this matter at this session and a bill is being introduced in that Chamber for the licensing and bonding of door-to-door salesmen, and companies employing these salesmen, providing for a waiting period on sales that are made at the door by these men and also requiring these salesmen to sell only goods that are specified in the licenses. Another provision that is being considered by the Saskatchewan Legislature is the posting of a penal bond instead of the present surety bond if salesmen violate the provincial Act or leave the province.

So, Madam Speaker, this is a matter which is of interest not only to us but in many other jurisdictions, not only in Canada but I'm sure in the North American continent, and we

(MR. GROVES cont'd). should study very carefully the results of the debates that are taking place in the Legislature of Saskatchewan at the moment dealing with this matter of consumer protection. Door-to-door salesmen of books, pots and pans, cemetery plots, etc., have been and are a real problem and these people that are selling these products in the way that they are, are to a large degree men of no substance who are primarily interested in taking the consumer and forcing him to part with his money without any effort on their part to render a legitimate service to them.

In connection with the matter of bonding which the honourable member mentions in his resolution, he mentions specifically a used car dealer and radio and TV repair people. These are fields, Madam Speaker, in which the public generally have to rely on the good faith and on statements that are made by experts in these fields and made by what the public consider to be reputable persons. Many of these people have let the public down very badly and there is good reason to believe that licensing and bonding is going to be necessary in order to give the public the protection which it needs from persons or salesmen of this type.

I mentioned last year about misleading advertising, exorbitant charging and unfair sales practices by one particular organization in the TV repair business, and there are others, Madam Speaker, I am sure, in the province that are just as bad as the one that I mentioned. These organizations are mostly victimizing persons with small degrees of education and older people who are not in a position to know what they are actually getting into.

With respect to "lure advertising" and untrue and misleading advertising which the honourable member deals with in his resolution, this is getting now to be common practice in most of our advertising media. One was mentioned last year in our debate by the Honourable Member from St. John's and that was the matter of the advertisements that we see, particularly in our week-end newspaper, advising people that if they join a record club that they are going to get a Hi - Fi set free -- an expensive Hi - Fi set. Well we know, Madam Speaker, that these sets are not being given away free and many of the people that are entering into contracts of this type I am sure would not do so if they knew what they were getting into in the first place. The people that are placing these advertisements and sending salesmen to sell such schemes throughout the province are persons that are going to have to have some sort of degree of control by the government authorities.

I find, Madam Speaker, that I must disagree heartily with what the Honourable Member from Carillon had to say on this debate. On Page 1287 of Hansard, and it just so happens it's the same quotation that was read by the Honourable Member from St. John's. He says, "Commercial trickery, deceit and fraud are pointing up to the necessity of action on the part of business and on the part of the individual to help counteract the enemies of this free enterprise system and those who would change our way of life." Madam Speaker, the fact that business, or the free enterprise system if you like, is not doing this, is why it's necessary not only in this field but in others for the government to take a hand.

He also talked about built-in safeguards to protect the consumer from exploitation. Now, Madam Speaker, these safeguards of the free enterprise system and of industry and commerce I think are the words he uses, if there are any in these particular fields, they just aren't working so it's going to be necessary for the government again to enter this field and make sure that the consumers of the province are being protected.

The Honourable Member from Carillon says the consumer has a choice as to price and quality and places to buy and that competition keeps industry and commerce honest. These statements, Madam Speaker, are true when we apply them to the type of person and to the type of business establishment that the honourable member was referring to in his address, but this resolution as I understand it is not directed at this type of businessman nor at this type of commercial establishment. It's directed at fly-by-night operators, con men and people that generally are preying on the gullibility of the public for the purpose of making their living, and these type of persons are not working for the honest and reliable establishments which the Honourable Member from Carillon referred to in his speech.

Madam Speaker, the unfortunate part of this is that this type of person that is causing the trouble is operating entirely within the law, and these are the people, it's my understanding of this resolution -- my understanding of this resolution is that these are the type of persons that we want to bring under control. Surely the free enterprise system can flourish without this type of person and can flourish in an atmosphere of control that's directed at those who are preying on the consumer rather than those who are trying to render a legitimate and honest service.

(MR. GROVES cont'd).....

On the other hand, the Honourable Member from Carillon pointed out some pitfalls and some danger areas when we start entering this field which indicate that although action is needed we must be careful to move so that undesirable consequences do not result. He mentions the fact of somebody buying a television set on Friday night, watching the Grey Cup over the week-end and then returning it on Monday morning. He also refers later on on the same page of his address to salesmen selling homes where it's common practice for a real estate salesman to solicit, contact at their home and in many instances to sign up the agreement. There have not been to my knowledge a great many complaints in the field of real estate sales, so I think, Madam Speaker, that we should in this respect heed the warnings that were made by the Honourable Member from Carillon and not get into this field to the point where we may have consequences that are undesirable and which we do not anticipate at the moment.

I would point out, Madam Speaker, in concluding my portion of this debate that the final report of the Premier's Committee on Consumer Credit that was tabled in the House just the other day does recommend that there be a waiting period on off-premises sales whether or not a time sale agreement was involved, so they are recommending a waiting period not only for time sale agreements but also for direct sales that are made at the householder's door for cash. This committee is pretty definite I think in this recommendation. It's one of the few where they make a definite recommendation. The licensing and bonding of off-premises salesmen are also recommended by the Premier's Committee and they also make some recommendation with respect to registration of conditional sales contracts. Advertising practices are considered only in a general way by this committee.

Madam Speaker, my only disagreement with the Honourable Leader of the NDP on this subject are the words which he uses "enact immediate legislation." It would seem to me that where a committee of the House is being set up to consider the report of the Premier's Committee on Consumer Credit and where the subject matter of his resolution tie in so closely with the subject matter contained in the Premier's Committee recommendations, that perhaps both of these subjects affecting consumers might be studied by the same committee.

So I would like to move, Madam Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member from Pembina, that we delete the words "necessary to relieve" in the first line thereof and substitute the words "deemed desirable to consider the matter of relieving"; that we delete the word "can" in the third line thereof and substitute the word "should"; that we delete the words "indeed restored" in the fourth and fifth lines thereof and substitute the words "should restore"; delete the word "such" in line six thereof and add the words "to accomplish these purposes" after the word "legislation" in line six thereof; delete all of the words after the word "government" in line nine thereof and substitute the following: "request the Committee of the Legislature proposed to study and review the law and business practice in the field of consumer credit to also study and review the law and business practice as it relates to consumers in other fields besides consumer credit, and without restricting the generality of the foregoing, to consider: (a) licensing and bonding of dealers in some trades; (b) registration of conditional sales contracts; and (c) means of eliminating misleading advertising and sales contracts."

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

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

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I would beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand, but if anyone else wishes to speak, they may do so.

MADAM SPEAKER: Any member wishing to speak? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Wellington. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could get the approval to have this matter stand.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Could we have the matter stand, Madam Speaker.

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

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I was rather surprised at the stand taken by the Member for St. James in speaking against this resolution introduced by his colleague. The farming community has been desirous of this type of legislation for a number of years. One of the biggest problems the farmer has today is to obtain farm labour, and many of the people who would work on the farm seek employment in other industries for the simple reason that they are unable to obtain unemployment insurance while working on a farm.

The present legislation as it stands today is virtually putting the farmer into a position where he has to make a false statement, and there are great inconsistencies in the legislation as it stands today. For example a farmer, or a man working for a farmer as a general farm labourer doesn't qualify for unemployment insurance. On the other hand, if he registers as a specialist as a truck driver or in some other field in the farming industry, he is able to obtain unemployment insurance, yet the fact remains that they are all doing the same type of work. There is great discrimination in this situation. For example if a man registers as a poultry specialist, as I understand the legislation he is able to obtain unemployment insurance, or as a truck driver on a farm, yet if he is hired just as a farm labourer he is disqualified.

I think that it's time that this situation was rectified and that all the members of the House get behind the sponsor of this resolution and give it his support. I would hope that the other members of the House — the other colleagues of the Member for St. James will not take his stand and vote with the sponsor of the resolution.

HON. ABRAHAM W. HARRISON (Minister without Portfolio) (Rock Lake): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hamiota, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Springfield. The Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. STRICKLAND: Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member, could we have this matter stand?

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I was rather agreeably surprised to hear the Honourable Member for St. James the other day when he spoke on the resolution that had been introduced by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, and apparently his main objection to giving wholehearted support to the resolution, although he was in considerable agreement I thought, his main objections were to the fact that some of the responsibility that is talked about in the operative part of the resolution now rests with Metro, and if I may refresh the members with that part. In No. 2 (a) the honourable member is requesting the government "to install traffic lights at the intersection of Westwood Drive and Portage Avenue; and (b) to install traffic lights at the intersection of Cavalier Drive and Portage Avenue."

Now when the Honourable Member from St. James spoke, he did have a great deal to say in agreement with the fact that there was a problem existing and he says, and I quote, "We are all and should be most gravely concerned with the toll of traffic accidents on our roads today which I am afraid will incline to get worse. It is very easy to say that. It is very difficult to find a solution, but I do want to say how much I commend the Honourable Member for bringing this forward." A little further down he said that "safety is becoming an increasing problem." On the next page in one very short sentence he restates it again, and he says, "It is a problem" -- and he's talking now about accidents and the need for traffic lights in the area. On Page 1315 in the third paragraph he says, "However, the problem is now with Metro, and I am sure that Metro will continue its studies on this matter." In the latter part of the same paragraph he says, "Incidentally, I might add that the jury verdict was that lights be put up at these two points," and he's talking about the points where there had been bad accidents.

However, the only part that he had any disagreement, he says, "I cannot support this resolution because in the resolution it includes of course the lights on Portage Avenue" -- and I presume he's referring to the fact that this is now Metro's responsibility. At the end he concludes his remarks by saying that he hopes the Honourable Member from Assiniboia will

(MR. JOHNSTON contd') keep bringing back this resolution because sometime it will coincide with the building of an overpass out at the perimeter. I think it's a well know fact that out at the perimeter, Highway 100 and No. 1, there have been a number of severe accidents in the past year by the information that I have. There have been over 20 accidents; there have been nineteen people injured and one fatal accident in the past year, so I believe every member in this House agrees that there is a problem there. So to facilitate the Honourable Member from Assiniboia -- or from St. James so that he can support our resolution, I have drawn up an amendment and would like to present the amendment at this time.

I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that the motion be amended by the word "and" being inserted after the word "Assiniboia" on the 16th line, and that the words "request Metro to" be inserted before the word "install" on the 17th line, and that the words "request Metro to" be inserted before the word "install" on the 19th line.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: the main motion?

MR. JOHNSTON: Could we have the yeas and nays, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: The members who support the amendment? Call in the members. The question before the House is the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Beard, Bilton, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Harrison, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 21; nays 29.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The main motion. The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. Are you ready for the question?

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

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

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

MR. RICHARD SEABORN (Wellington): Madam Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand.

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, although we know on this side that when we are speaking to resolutions such as this we may be incurring the wrath of the Honourable Minister of Labour, who has requested his own members not to speak on labour matters, however -- (Interjection) -- it was moved -- Madam Speaker, am I not correct that it was moved previously, the resolution?

MADAM SPEAKER: I believe the honourable member moved, and he has not had an opportunity to speak on it yet. (Interjection).

MR. JOHNSTON: No, I'm introducing the debate. So the resolution requests that a Labour Management Committee be set up, that is, an official committee appointed by this House, not an ad hoc committee or not a private committee set up at the whim of a Minister. We're asking for an official committee of this House to be set up to study joint management-labour relations. Now, although the Honourable Minister of Labour when he was requesting his members not to speak to a previous resolution dealing with labour relations, he gave us the impression, I thought, that everything was quite well in hand in the matter of labour relations, in the matter of labour-management relations, that he was as much as asking members of this House to keep their hands off and to let this committee proceed at its own pace and to make a report to him whenever they had something to report, and then the Minister himself, in his own good time and in his own good judgment, would make recommendations to this House or otherwise, if he so desired. As I say again, we on this side disagree with that stand. However, I feel that I must say something to refute the idea that the Honourable Minister of Labour has put forward, that everything is going fine and not for any of the members to rock the boat, talk about things that he doesn't want talked about.

I have here the submission of the Manitoba Federation of Labour that was presented in March of 1965, and on Page 3, one of the paragraphs has this to say about what these people in Labour feel about the situation, and I quote: "As we look in retrospect over the past year, we see little in the way of progress in which to feel proud. We find the same forces represented by people with whom we have been consorting all year, exerting the same pressures upon our movement. We face constant frustration in carrying out our legitimate role of organizing the unorganized, obtaining recognition by certification, bargaining collectively, and even the right to conduct our own affairs by strike action."

Now on Page 9 of the same submission, and I quote again: "We may agree there is some merit in making a detailed study and an analysis of certain sections of the Act. However, we can assure you that our membership is no longer willing to patiently stand by until something is done about certification, unfair labour practices, and Section 21, but conditions as they now exist, continued promotion of labour-management conferences, is considered by many of our members to be merely an exercise in futility." Yet, a few nights or a few days ago, we had the Honourable Minister of Labour stand up here and infer that everything was going great guns in the Woods Committee, that everything that was going to come out of this committee would be in his time brought before the House, that is, if he decided it that way. But we find from the submission -- which is not recent news at all -- we find from this submission that this isn't quite so; that Labour were in fact willing to give this a try, the Woods Committee, but they had their reservations about it.

But the Minister didn't tell us about that, and if I may quote further: "Present restrictions and interpretations of the Act not only make the operation of our unions more difficult, they strike squarely at the very heart of our existence. It has been our hope that your government was desirous of achieving in Manitoba the kind of constructive relationship between labour and management which has proven so beneficial in developing the economics in western Europe and the Scandinavian countries. If your government is desirous of developing such a relationship, it must immediately recognize that the prerequisite to such achievement is the maintenance and restoration of traditional trade union rights, the recognition and the acceptance of trade unions in our society, and the elimination of legislation in employer behaviour that is designed to defeat these traditional rights. We respectfully suggest that the responsibility for establishing this climate at labour-management co-operation should not be delegated to any representative review body, no matter how competent, but should be the sole responsibility of government."

Now here again, I think we have ample proof that the labour people were only co-operating in a spirit of co-operation, but they were co-operating with some reservations when

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd) they agreed to go on the Woods Committee, and we had the Minister stand up here and tell us that the use he will be making of the Woods Committee is going to solve all Labour's problems.

If any final proof is needed of the statements I've just made, surely they can be found in the newspapers in the last day or two. the heading in the Free Press in a news item, April the 12th: "Baizley Shocks Labour Federation. A. A. Franklin, president of the Manitoba Federation of Labour, has expressed in a press release his shock at Labour Minister Obie Baizley's call to Conservative MLAs not to debate amendments to The Labour Relations Act. Mr. Franklin said that the Minister knew the MFL had only agreed to participate on the Woods Committee, now reviewing Manitoba labour law, on the basis that there would be no moratorium on the MFL making legislative demands during the period of such review. It appears now that the Minister is imposing such a moratorium, whether the Federation likes it or not, he said. The Minister's act at this time gives all the more reason for concern, coming as it does within a few short weeks of a news report in which he had indicated that pressure from union membership for immediate action on unfair labour practices and government-conducted strike votes made it difficult to say how long Federation officers would be able to continue to serve on the Woods Committee. The MFL is arranging for early meetings to make its position clear."

Another news item in the Tribune of the same date, and I'll just read the headline here. It said: "Baizley Muzzling Labour Debate." At the very bottom it says: "We are surprised the Minister has adopted this restrictive approach to our problems," said Mr. Franklin."

Well Madam Speaker, when we are speaking of labour management relations, surely this is not the way to go about it, in my considered opinion. When dissension between management and union often relates to means rather than objectives, sometimes management forgets that there are different ways to reach the objective, so if the objective is what counts dissension may be avoided by working with the union on the means. Labour management discussions must be based on a clear understanding of the respective functions of each. Top management defines the over-all objectives in goals, and plant management must take the steps necessary to reach them. The union's function is to see that employees' interests and well-being receive all the proper consideration. All too often plant management, in their desire to achieve goals and quotas, pay stockholders profits and so on, are inclined to ride roughshod over anything that may stand in their way. If, on the part of some management, there has been a degree of failure in achieving their objectives, they are severely condemned from top management and this increases the pressure on these people, so that they may make decisions that are unfair to union people or considered in a very narrow light and not the over-all picture. This can occur anywhere. It is all too often that a plant foreman may, in his desire to do his job, may ride roughshod over the rights of some of the people who work for him.

I have here a few notes that have been made in a study of the Nova Scotia attempt to look into the labour-management problem, and if I may quote from them, Madam Speaker:

What they are doing in Nova Scotia is significant for two reasons, because it is an attempt to reduce the amount of government interference in affairs of the community by encouraging the parties -- that is, labour and management -- to arrange their own affairs between them, because their program takes a path which fosters and indeed requires better labour-management understanding. I have referred to this as an experiment but this is only true in Canada. This concept has been developed over the years and has outstanding success and acceptance in the Scandinavian countries and other parts of Europe. Nova Scotia started their studies in 1960 where at that time and up until that time the province of Nova Scotia were facing the problems that we are facing here in Manitoba at the present day.

There was some agitation for the Labour Board to be given jurisdiction to deal, among other things, to deal with unfair labour practices. In order to determine the best form that the legislative changes should take, various studies were undertaken, various systems were considered, and the opinions of many were heard. The people considering these matters came more and more to the conclusion that labour-management relations worked best in a spirit of good will, mutual knowledge and understanding. They came more and more to realize that the more that labour and management's relations are regulated by government, the less the parties had dealing one with the other, and the more the relations become strained and mutually distrustful. Thus the European and in particular the Swedish system was so attractive to them. In brief, the Swedish system is that labour as a bloc and management as a bloc work out their own private laws, that is a sort of a master agreement governing their relationships.

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd) Within that agreement various contracts are entered into on a plant or industry basis. The only times the government enters into the picture, generally speaking, is upon a request for conciliation and upon referrals to the labour court of disputes on interpretations of contracts. There is no such thing as certification or of government-supervised strike votes, nor of minimum wage legislation. Obviously, therefore, most of the matters which arise are settled by the parties. This kind of arrangement requires a high degree of discipline within the ranks of labour as well as among the employers. It means that the main labour organization must be able to speak for and to bind their member unions. It means that the management must have an organization which will speak for them and by whose decisions they will be bound. In Sweden, the parties have so grouped themselves with great success and benefit to all.

Presently in Nova Scotia, organizations exist but they do not have the required power. At present they can advise and recommend but they cannot enforce. That was of course 1960. However, under the auspices of the Dalhousie University in November 1962 Labour and Management came to a six-point agreement as follows: 1. Requesting their respective groups and organizations to declare a moratorium on further appeals to the Legislature for amendments to The Trade Union Act; 2. Both management and labour recognizing the right of all workers to organize for collective bargaining. 3. Condemning unfair labour practices when employees seek to organize. 4. Recognizing that management is entitled to a fair return on its investments. 5. Undertaking to continue the joint labour-management study committee. 6. The committee to attempt to arrive at a basic agreement to outline the scope within which future relationships will be contained.

In November of 1963 there was a second joint labour study conference at Dalhousie. It adopted a second six-point agreement which differs somewhat from the first in that it recommended amendments to The Trade Union Act giving the Labour Relations Board power to direct its chief executive officer to make an investigation of unfair labour practices and to attempt to resolve the issue. Upon its failure to do so the Board may enquire further into the matter and issue whatever orders it deems necessary, such orders to be enforceable as an order of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia. When the Nova Scotia experiment can carry itself further to the next step, that is, the strengthening of the employer and employee organizations to the point where they can make master agreements within the framework, then their component units are prepared to be bound. This has yet to be proven or yet to be seen.

The important thing is that -- what they are doing in Nova Scotia, however, is that management and labour is defining the things on which they agree and on which they do not agree, the things on which they had to work together and the things on which they must contend. The emphasis is that the parties must be required to bargain collectively and they must be permitted to come as infrequently as possible to the government to make their bargains for them.

Now if the government would set up a permanent House-appointed labour and management committee, I feel this would be in the best interests of labour of Manitoba. Referring briefly to the Woods Committee -- I'm talking now about published information -- there has been very little progress come forward despite what the Minister of Labour tells us, and it is my wholehearted hope that this House will support the setting up of a permanent Labour-Management Relations Committee.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Before we vote on that would I be correct in saying on a point of order that the honourable gentleman that just spoke closed the debate?

MADAM SPEAKER: No, the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie introduced the resolution but did not speak on it before. He was speaking to the resolution this afternoon.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains, that

Whereas the Government of the Province of Manitoba is responsible through the

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd)..... Manitoba Hydro for the development and distribution of almost all electrical energy outside of the City of Winnipeg;

And Whereas the principle of rate equalization was fundamental to the carrying out of this responsibility;

And Whereas there are areas in Northern Manitoba such as The Pas, Cranberry Portage, Churchill, Bakers Narrows, etc., where this principle is not being applied;

Therefore Be It Resolved that this House request the government to equalize rates in all areas served by the Manitoba Hydro to provide these northern areas with the same rates as in the remainder of the province.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, when the government of this province many years ago decided to expand the hydro electric service through the Manitoba Power Commission to service all of Manitoba, one of the fundamental propositions behind that decision was that there would be equal rates in virtually all of the province of Manitoba. This was largely a post-war development, that is, the rural electrification program. The Province of Manitoba was amongst the first to launch as an extensive a program as was done, and we certainly are the western province --I should say the province in Canada that developed the highest degree of electrification through the province. This was done by proceeding to set up a block in the province of Manitoba, and saying that anyone living within that block would have free service, that is electrical energy brought free to their door; that outside of that area other arrangements would be made, but within that area it would be delivered to them free to their door and that the rate would be the same regardless where they lived. At that time most of our power came from the Winnipeg River system. As time went on and we had needs for additional power, the next steps were the steam plants at Brandon, then the steam plants at Selkirk, and now of course the new power generation at Grand Rapids.

During that same course of time, in the northern part of the province certain developments went on; for example, the development at Kelsey to service in particular the township of Thompson. Subsequently, arrangements were made in other areas to take over some of the existing federal institutions as, I think, in the case of Churchill, in the case of Cranberry Portage, and the case of The Pas, the province took over a local municipal corporation that was operating there giving the service. But in the remainder of the province, whether the power came from the Winnipeg River system or whether it came from the Selkirk steam plant or the Brandon steam plant, and whether you lived at say Beausejour within 30 miles of the Winnipeg River and got power, or whether you lived in Swan River or Ethelbert, you paid the same amount for your power. It was equalized through that area. There remained this area in northern Manitoba serviced by other means, it is true, serviced largely by local diesel units. These areas remained on a different basis.

Last year I introduced a resolution, the wording of which I think is almost identical to the one that I have introduced this year, and I indicated then that there had been a number of delegations from northern Manitoba to see the government about this, and to explain to them the wide variation in the costs that were involved. Those delegations gave some figures which indicate quite clearly the need for an equalization. The figures are given, for example, for a dairy farm in The Pas area.

Now this is an area that has been developed largely as a result of federal-provincial operation in the Pasqua Valley. The dairy farmer there had taken his figures, and for the consumption of 2,746 kilowatts his bill was \$61.77. Comparing that same consumption to a Winnipeg suburban area, the price for the same consumption would have been \$25.97 --in other words, substantially less than half. Or if you take the southern Manitoba rural, that is, a dairy farmer for example in the Winnipeg milk shed area, using the same amount of power, his cost for the same number of kilowatts would have been \$28.76. The dairy farmer at The Pas paid \$61.77, a variation of more than 50 percent. Similarly, taking a private home, and this is an average house; this was taken over a period of time -- wasn't just a one-month's bill. It was averaged I think over 21 months so as to arrive at a proper equalization, taking in winter months and summer months. That average home consuming 857 kilowatt hours, in Winnipeg would have paid \$8.97, in rural southern Manitoba would have paid \$11.76, in The Pas \$19.03, in Churchill \$23.10. Again a very wide variation, more than double in the case of The Pas and Churchill over what would be paid in Winnipeg, and almost double what would be paid regularly in southern Manitoba. Those figures are the ones that I used a year ago. They were presented to the government I think by The Pas Chamber of Commerce in February or January of 1964.

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd).....

Now since that time, Madam Speaker, or I should say at the time I introduced the resolution last year, the government moved an amendment to it indicating that they should continue their policy of reducing the differentials, and I have not been able to ascertain definitely what reductions have come into effect since then. Possibly the Minister will indicate that some differentials have been reduced. I know that there was a delegation here from The Pas, I think in the month of January or February, and they made their presentation to the government, or to the Hydro, and I understand that there may be some slight adjustment made on the top end --(Interjection)-- in the middle, is it? I'm not exactly sure what the amount is. I was hopeful that when we reached Public Utilities estimates that we could get the figures, but as it stands now I think some adjustment has been made, but I do believe that there is still a substantial differential between the northern areas and the remainder of the province.

So Madam Speaker, I believe that the need is there. I think if the principle was established very early in the distribution of power, that provided it was power from the what we call the line distribution system, the regular distribution system in the south, it was equalized, and the farmer in Swan River or Birch River even if he's only some hundred miles or so from The Pas and some 300 miles from the source of the power pays the same price as the farmer in the rest of the province, but not so for the people in the north. Now I know the Ministers are going to say, well but they are serviced from higher cost units. So I come back, Madam Speaker, to the point that we now have a one system operation. This is all under Hydro. It is true there are the odd other locations up there serviced other ways, for example Flin Flon is serviced directly by the company that has the mine there, and I understand that they have reduced their rates to meet the Winnipeg rates. I think Lynn Lake has its own power as well, produced by the mine. But the other areas are serviced by Manitoba Hydro. They are paying more money than the rest of the province.

Madam Speaker, we speak a great deal about the development of the north and about the future of our province lying in that area, about the need for new mines, new pulp and paper mills, the need for people to go up in those areas, but I think we have to consider that they have much higher costs than we do. This year in particular we have added on to them additional costs. I'm not going to go over the heat tax debate, but the facts are that in this particular field of power where we are already charging them more in the past, we have added on this year another five percent tax. True, that the remainder of the province are paying it, but these people are going to pay all the more because they were already having a higher bill, and five percent on their higher bill means that much more dollars and cents that they have to pay out.

I submit, Madam Speaker, that if we are going to encourage northern development then we should show this in a tangible manner, and it can be done in this particular field at not very much cost. When we consider the total consumption of power in the Province of Manitoba and the part of it that is consumed in the north, I think that we could make the adjustment and have them all on the same basis without having to make any major changes in the rates. If they represented a very large percentage of the power consumption, then I think the Minister would be in a proper place to say, well if you're going to do that obviously it means that the rates in the balance of the province have to go up, but the figures don't show that this is the case. And this is a fairly constant situation, because if you take the figures given by the government itself in their report on the Manitoba Hydro Electric Board, and I'm quoting first of all here from the 12th Annual Report for the year ended March 31st, 1963, we see on Page 9 that in 1961-62 the total amount of power that was generated and purchased by the Board here in Manitoba was some 4,221 million kilowatt hours. The heading is millions and it's 4,221. Out of that, only 17.86 were consumed in the northern system. That is, in The Pas, 11; in Churchill 3; in Cranberry Portage .68; in Grand Rapids .270; and in Bakers Narrows, that particular year nothing -- '61-'62. So the total generation in those centres was 17.86 compared to the total for the province of 4,221. The percentage share, therefore, was .0042, less than one half of one percent.

The following year the situation stayed relatively the same. The total generation and purchase for the system across Manitoba was 4,631. The northern area accounted for 23 --23 as against 4,631. In that particular year Grand Rapids accounted for a substantial amount of the increase, it had gone up from 2.7 to 6, so the percentage consumption in the north as compared to the total system came up to approximately one half of one percent, .005 according to my calculations.

Then we go on to the next year and this is in the following book for the report ended March 31st, '64, Page 6, and it shows another substantial increase in the total generation and purchase

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) from 4,631 to 5,032. The northern system moved from 23 up to 27, total generation. So 27 million kilowatt hours as against 5,032 for the whole system. Again the percentage is approximately the same, .005, still less than one half of one percent. And I'd like to point out that in the increase in this particular year Grand Rapids again accounted for a fair amount of the diesel production up to 8.26, and I assume that with the Grand Rapids production now coming in, that the diesel production will cease, so in the next year this will not be a factor; it will be serviced by diesel. So if we remove that 8 points we would be back down to approximately 18 million kilowatt hours used in the north as against 5,000 million kilowatt hours used in the south. So the percentage, Madam Speaker, is very slight. It's a fairly constant one half of one percent of the total, so I cannot see that there is sound economic grounds for not doing this when you compare those figures with the total production of the system.

Now last year the Minister indicated that there was a survey being undertaken. The Minister of Public Utilities stated on the 7th of April, speaking on my resolution, that "the matter" --and I'm quoting from Hansard, Page 1641: "The matter of the equalization of rates is something, of course, that everyone is very sympathetic towards, and the matter is receiving a lot of consideration from the Manitoba Hydro, and at the moment they have a team up in the north making a survey of these particular areas, and also the possibility of putting diesel equipment in some of the more remote areas, being equipment that they recently purchased from the Federal Government." Well, I don't know what report the team brought back, Madam Speaker, insofar as the equalization. Possibly the Minister will have something to say about that, but I would hope, Madam Speaker, that the government will not take the same course this year as they took last year on my resolution. At that time, the Minister of Welfare, representing the area of The Pas, got up and gave us a speech about "Why didn't you do it when?"

The whole gist of his approach was that this is a problem that has existed for some time, that it hadn't been taken care of, and why hadn't it been taken care of before. But, Madam Speaker, I don't accept any responsibilities for what was not done before. My responsibility is today here in Manitoba, and I submit that on the basis of the figures that I have shown, on the basis of the need, on the basis of wanting to develop northern Manitoba, that this is a sound resolution as it stands, and I appeal to the government not to take a negative position on this matter. They have had plenty of requests from northern Manitoba. They're fully familiar with the whole thing. I appeal to them not to bring in another amendment suggesting that this should have been done before, or that it should be done three years from now, or that they'll have a study to do it. Let us move on now. The problem is not a great one. When you look at these figures, the need is important for these people. Let us pass the resolution and get on with the job.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, if no-one else wishes to speak to it, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Madam Speaker, may I have the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Emerson. The Honourable the Member for Springfield.

MR. FRED T. KLYM (Springfield): Madam Speaker, may I have the indulgence of this House to have the matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I would ask permission from the honourable member to speak on this resolution if I may?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, it was with interest that I observed the introduction of this resolution by the Honourable Member for Emerson. In the preamble paragraphs to the resolution he states the case why, the Ukrainian language should be allowed as a language, as an accredited language in our high schools. Now, I think that most members realize that as of a few years ago the Ukrainian language has been introduced into our high schools and is presently being offered in three grades at least, Grades 9, 10 and 11; and someone made mention

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd).....the other day that it is also offered on a very restrictive basis in certain Grade 12 courses, Grade 12 General Course. Apparently some students enrolled in that course do take Ukrainian as a language.

However, there is one problem certainly, as has been pointed out, and that is that while it has been introduced as a language, as a subject language in our high schools, the enrollment is very low. I have here before me some statistical data to show that the total enrollment of students taking Ukrainian or studying Ukrainian in our public schools, stands at the following: In Grade 9, 283 students in 16 different schools; in Grade 10, 76 students enrolling for Ukrainian in eight schools in the province; in Grade 11, 43 students enrolled for Ukrainian in six schools throughout the province; and the enrollment is obviously diminishing as you go from Grade 9 to Grade 11. The reason for that is plain and simple. It is because the Ukrainian language, while introduced in the high schools, it has not been given a matriculation standing.

For example, a student in Grade 11 who wishes to qualify for university entrance must have a foreign language. There are certain minor exceptions, and the foreign language thus far has been either of French, German or Latin, and consequently the enrollment in our schools of those students taking French is running at about 10,000 in each of the high school grades throughout about three to four hundred schools in the province. Those taking --I'm sorry, I'm sorry, Madam Speaker. Yes, that's correct. The number taking German is also quite high, in that there are close to a thousand taking German in Grade 9, close to 800 taking German in Grade 10, almost 700 taking German in Grade 11, and 400 taking German in Grade 12. Now this is rather small in proportion to the number taking French, but nevertheless it is high when compared to the number taking Ukrainian. In Grade 11, for example, there are almost 700 students studying German and only 43 studying Ukrainian. The reason for that is that Ukrainian does not count as a matriculation course. It does not satisfy by itself the foreign language requirement. Only French, German and Latin satisfy that requirement. And I think that since Canada is, and particularly since western Canada is a plural society, and since we almost all here subscribe to the theory of mosaic in Canadian society, I can see no good reason why Ukrainian and any other major language for that matter, could not be given parity of status, that is to say, why it could not be given matriculation status, so that it itself would suffice as a foreign language.

However, while speaking thus positively in support of the resolution, I must say that I don't like the idea of we in this Legislature telling the University what it should or should not accept, and I would much have preferred if the Honourable Member for Emerson had, in the second last line of his resolution, if he had used the word "consider" rather than "recognize". This may not be a big point, but the point however big or small is simply this, that if couched in terms here as to give the connotation that we are telling the University Board of Governors or Senate, as the case may be, what languages or what subject matters should be in their calendar, what status the various subjects should have, and so on, I don't consider this to be compatible with the highly vaunted principle of academic freedom.

Now you might say that you're really stretching the argument to construe or to impute into this last paragraph something that seems to clash with the principle of academic freedom, but I insist that there is, even if it be indirect, there is nevertheless a clash here with the principle of academic freedom and higher institutions determining themselves what shall or shall not be taught. I think, however, we are perfectly justified here in asking the University to consider this request favourably, for the reasons which I've already outlined. I think that the Member for Emerson is entirely correct when he points out that in Canadian society which is long accepted as a plural society, a mosaic society, one which acknowledges the right of all sorts of cultural and ethnic groups to contend and to survive and to flourish, we should be giving some tangible encouragement to the maintenance and development of these cultures; and it's pretty difficult for a culture to survive or to sustain itself over a period of time unless the language is maintained along with it. If you don't maintain the language, after a few decades and two or three generations you have perhaps the culture without a language, and that sort of culture is an artificial one, or certainly soon becomes so.

It has been argued by some people that the Ukrainian language does not lend itself as a substitute or as an alternative to French or German or Latin because it lacks sufficient literature and depth, but --I'm certainly not an expert in this field but it seems to me that there are some authors in Ukrainian who have set a standard of literature that is comparable with any. Some members here may have had the opportunity to read the life and works of Taras Shevchenko and certainly he has written a whole collection of poetry which is collected in his

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd).....Kobzar, and I had the privilege, if you like, or the opportunity to study Ukrainian grammar and literature at the University three years ago under a professor who has now been called to the Senate, and I found it most interesting and enjoyable, and I think I uncovered sufficient evidence to indicate that there is a substantive body of literature to go with that language.

It may well be, however, that there is some sort of practical problem which the University might face, which might explain its unwillingness to date to accept the Ukrainian as a matriculation foreign language, but I believe that we must do something really positive to stimulate the learning of the Ukrainian language, particularly of course among the students who come from Ukrainian-speaking homes or from homes where the parents are of Ukrainian ethnic stock; that if we don't do it now, in a few short years the language drain will have taken place.

The French in Manitoba are experiencing this problem right now. They have a term for it called "le drainage," and the Germans of course, and all the ethnic groups are facing this problem. Well we can do some things about it. What about conversational Ukrainian? What about Ukrainian being taught conversationally in our high schools? I know there is the problem of teachers, etcetera, but unless we attack the problem, start in on it now, we will find that it is too late to make any kind of --to arrest the trend, the trend being that with each passing generation fewer and fewer and far fewer of the young people of an ethnic group are able to speak and to converse in the language of their forefathers.

Before I sit down I must take the opportunity to really commend the Honourable Member for Emerson for the very first paragraph of his speech when he introduced this resolution, and I think it is worth quoting once again. He said; "In 1867 the keystone of Confederation was the principle of unity in diversity for Canada. One way to recognize this principle would be to encourage officially the diverse strains of our great heritage. Now to preserve this heritage of many Canadian citizens, Canada is in need of citizens with knowledge of different languages. The founding people of our country, the British and the French, are senior partners, partners whose special rights includes the recognition of English and French as official languages of Canada, but in addition to these two major races, a great segment of Canada's population is made up of people who came from many lands across the ocean bringing to Canada priceless treasures of cultural heritage which is rich in variety and rich in expression."

I consider this to set the whole matter on the right basis, that while Canada is and ought to be recognized as a state wherein two founding ethnic groups live, both of which have languages that are acknowledged official status under the Constitution, this does not rule out the possibility of other ethnic groups being allowed the use and the development and the sustenance of their language within Canadian society, if not within the Canadian state, and since Canadian society is perfectly willing to allow them to have and use their languages, it only follows that we should be prepared to allow for the kind of curriculum, etc. that would really enable them to preserve their language and thus avoid the language falling into disuse and limbo.

Madam Speaker, I could speak much longer on this resolution but I feel that having said these few words I have stated clearly the support we intend to give to it with that one slight reservation, namely, that I'm not happy with the idea of us really in a sense telling the University what it should or should not do. It's a case of substituting the word "consider" for the word "recognize," but I suppose that that is not really a major point. For all I know the member for Emerson may really have meant this in the first place.

MADAM SPEAKER:.....agreed to stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Springfield? The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Madam Speaker, in speaking to this resolution --(Interjection)-- Oh, pardon me, I'm away off here somewhere. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

Whereas The Manitoba Vacations With Pay Act is inflexible to the extent that employers may and often do arrange their schedules of work and lay-offs so that employees may not qualify for vacation benefits under the terms of the Act;

And Whereas employers generally use the Act to their advantage and to the disadvantage of the workers;

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Government give consideration to the advisability of amending the Act to provide for rate of vacations with pay to be computed at a minimum of four percent gross earnings for all employees with up to five years of service, and at a minimum of six per cent of gross earnings for all employees with five or more years of service.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: Madam Speaker, in speaking to this resolution I am speaking for the unorganized mass that is in Manitoba here, that is affected by this Act. When I say that, I say that from my experiences through the years. When I first came to this country we worked and there was no consideration of any kind for vacations with pay. We worked 65 hours a week and some times more than that. Then a period of time came, we had lots of vacation. We had three and four months through the winter. Lots of vacation but no pay with it, so when the first week of pay came in, that was really great; but as time went on I came into this House and in a Law Amendments Committee of 1960 our First Minister brought in something that I thought was really great. I said to myself, "Sure and begorra he's a broth of a boy." For one reason, he brought in two weeks vacation with pay, but I had to go over this thing and through experiences through the years I find out there's a big loophole in there, and we now have to go along and try to plug this loophole up, because we find out that the people in the unions, they are protected by the collective bargaining, but what about the vast mass that is not protected? Sure, you say, all employers should go along with this thing, but you have a lot of people. When you have so many people working for you if you can do this man out of about \$80.00, that's \$80.00 in your pocket and you're going to keep that man working. He's not going to have no vacation --you're going to keep him working. Well, in this way I would say that we should do just what this resolution of mine says.

Now Madam Speaker, the Vacations with Pay Act recognizes the need for a person who is gainfully employed to have a rest period at some time during the year so that his mind can become refreshed and so that he can devote some time to his family if he has one. There are, though, a number of shortcomings in The Vacations With Pay Act. For example, the present Act is so worded that an employee must work 95 percent of the available working days to become entitled to the vacation benefits. This effectively denies a vacation to many people. For example, some employers so arrange their schedule of work and lay-offs that almost none of their employees can qualify for vacation with pay under the terms of the Act. Moreover, an employer is not obliged to extend the benefits of the Vacation with Pay Act to an employee qualified under the Act until 10 months after he has qualified, so a person can in Manitoba work for 22 solid months without receiving a vacation or vacation pay. In addition, a person who terminates his service with the company after working for a period less than one year following a vacation, loses all rights to the vacation benefits he has accumulated in that time.

What this resolution attempts to do is to relate --the relation pay and days directly to the number of days a person works, thereby ensuring that every person who works receives a vacation, or in lieu of a vacation, vacation pay, and that the vacation and the pay he receives are proportional to the amount of work that he has done. I am not introducing this resolution to benefit unions, because the unions through collective bargaining can do much to protect their members and to see that the rights of their membership are observed, but out of the total labour force in this province of 327,000 people there are a maximum of 50,000 who are union members, and I would suspect that 50,000 is a high figure. It is the other, almost 300,000 people, that this legislation is designed to protect although its benefits would automatically be extended to trade union members. This resolution does not attempt to change the principle of The Vacation with Pay Act. It simply attempts to remove any loopholes in the Act and to ensure the people who are being gainfully employed receive a vacation or some just compensation in lieu of vacation. This is a principle we can all accept.

Now I can say, Madam Speaker, as I said before, I remember in 1960 when I come in here and our First Minister brought this thing up. I felt very proud, and I can remember the representative of the Chamber of Commerce at that time calling it a bad bill and calling it this and that and everything else, and I wondered to myself, how can a man stand up on his feet and say such a thing like that? Here are people, they work all the year round and by gosh they can't even take their family out. And what happens? Here is our First Minister come up, and he's got the gall to get up on his feet and tell him that this is a bad bill, and here it is his bill. What kind of a guy is he? You know I felt like going up and throwing that guy out through the window. That's how I felt, and I told the First Minister that. Maybe he doesn't remember that. I told him. The First Minister says, "Maybe I spoke a little bit too harsh. I says, "Not harsh enough for me." So all I can say, Madam Speaker, I'm not speaking for myself. I've gone through the years and where I come from --I've been told lots of times, "Oh, you speak too much on the Old Country." Well maybe I do, but I don't think so, because there's certain things there that I have in my heart that I feel that I can bring here and maybe help out. All right. Where I come from there, we do all these various things that go along and we don't try to think,

(MR. HARRIS cont'd)....."Oh well, I'm sitting all right." We try to say, "Well there's a little fellow over there. Is there something that I can do to help him out?"

So I feel, Madam Speaker, if we go along and do the thing that is in this resolution we will be helping the people that can't help themselves because they've got nobody to look after their interests. The union members they are well looked after, but as I say this vast group has no one whatsoever to look after them, and I try to do that. Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LISSAMAN: If no one else wishes to speak, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews) presented Bill No. 58, an Act to incorporate Strathcona Curling Club, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MARTIN: Madam Speaker, this is a simple bill, just a change of name. The Strathcona Curling Company Limited, an organization which has had a distinguished record in the sporting world for many many years, is being reorganized and is seeking a new corporate set-up to be known as the Strathcona Curling Club.

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

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia) presented Bill No. 87, an Act to incorporate the United Fund of Greater Winnipeg, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, the reason this bill is before us is because of the studies that have been by the Citizens Committee, the Chamber of Commerces and the Labour Council who enquired into the multiplicity of campaign funds for various charitable organizations, and as a result, the committee brought in a report and recommended that united community action should be taken to create a non-profit corporation to eliminate as far as possible separate fund-raising campaigns.

If I can just explain a little further, for instance at the present time we have the Community Chest which embraces somewhere around 40 different agencies and this organization has to draw executive staff from various different businesses to conduct and try and raise the necessary funds. On the other hand, at the same time there is the other agencies, for instance organizations like the Red Cross, the Salvation Army, the Heart Fund, the Cancer Fund, Multiple Sclerosis, and these at the same time have to raise separate campaign funds and at the same time they have to organize, set up various committees, set up chairmen, each one individually, so what we have is a multiplicity of organizations raising campaign funds for the charitable organizations.

I think this bill would be a good one which would eliminate as much as possible separate fund-raising campaigns and duplication of organization, and efforts to provide financing for such non-profitable organizations would be done much more adequately in a manner that could be done by one organization.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, there's just a few comments I'd like to make on this bill. Firstly, I'd like to endorse what was said by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. There is no doubt that this is an indication of growth and maturity in our province in recognition of need and in recognition of the importance of distributing the ability of the community amongst those who are in need in proportion to such needs.

The elimination of competition for the charity dollar is very important because competition often brings additional expense, and not only additional expense, it may also create a distortion in the requirements of the various institutions based on their campaign ability, on their publicity value, on the emotional tug which may be disproportionate to the service it gives to a community, so that I say that this bill is desirable because of the principle behind it and that is the unification of fund-raising for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

So having said that and having indicated my wholehearted support for it, there are two matters which I'd like to draw to the attention of the House and hope that when we deal with this in detail in committee we could possibly have some reference to these two items.

One is the portion of the bill which gives this fund the right to sue for and recover and compel payments of sums of money which may become due and payable to the fund. I'm wondering whether this is intended to include pledges which are made; because I am not at all sure that the present law provides the right to sue on a pledge made and unpaid, and if it is intended

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)..... that the right be acquired by this bill then we should know that this is the case and we should then consider the advisability of changing the law to that extent.

The other point, Madam Speaker, is the portion of the bill which provides for the membership in the fund which of course will determine who shall make up the Board of Directors and who shall have power. Now the most desirable organizational approach to this is to provide for representation from donors and from recipients, from agencies, and it is important that the community be represented. Now this fund will be the major fund-raising arm of the community and as such I think it is important that there be some attempt made to take care of the democratic right of full representation on the board from time to time.

Therefore, I'm not saying that this is wrong in itself as it is worded here, but I am suggesting that some consideration be given to a review by let us say the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council or let us say by the Provincial Secretary to review the by-laws when first established and when amended from time to time, to ensure that the public is protected in terms of participation at all times in the management of the affairs of this fund and thus make it not only such an important fund-raising arm of the community but also an important arm of the community in terms of the distribution of the funds in the most effective manner possible.

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

MR. PAULLEY presented Bill No. 75, an Act to incorporate Transcona Curling Club, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to incorporate a curling club called the Transcona Curling Club. At the present time, Madam Speaker, the incorporated club is called the Transcona Curling Club Limited, and the objective of the bill is to place the ownership of memberships within the playing members of the club. There are other provisions in the act but may I have your permission, Madam Speaker, to make an exception to directing the attention of the House to a particular clause of the bill, Madam Speaker, and I do so not to attempt to violate your ruling, Madam Speaker, but to point out an error in the bill itself. In Clause No. 15, reference is made to the Transcona Golf Club Limited and it's obvious the reference should be Transcona Curling Club Limited.

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

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk) presented Bill No. 78, an Act to incorporate The Manitoba Law School Foundation, for second reading.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Is it the wish of the House to go on?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, if you wish to call it 5:00 o'clock I think that would be in order --or 5:30 o'clock rather-- and we can proceed with these bills when we return at 8:00 o'clock.

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