



Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable Peter Fox



Vol. XIX No. 147 8:00 p.m., Wednesday, July 5th, 1972. Fourth Session, 29th Legislature.

Printed by R. S. Evans — Queen's Printer for Province of Manitoba

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Wednesday, July 5, 1972

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notice of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the House Leader. I wonder if he can inform us at this time how many new bills he intends to introduce during this Session?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I believe that there are about three Government Bills. I cannot answer insofar as Private Members' Bills are concerned, because of course as my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside will be well aware I have no control over that. And also that it is the disposition of this government to proceed with Private Members' Bills as expeditiously as possible. So I can only say to him that there may be three or four Government Bills, and again as far as Private Members' Bills are concerned I haven't the answer. But I would appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that if any honourable member is desirous of introducing a private bill he would let me know in order that we may expedite the business of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I want to direct my question to the House Leader as well. A week ago I asked a similar question and he told me that there were three bills. Since then there have been six. Are we now to believe that this is the correct answer, that we are now getting three more, instead of another six or a dozen more?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend is wont to question my integrity in this House and I can understand it because of the character make-up of my honourable friend from Morris. I don't fault him for it. --(Interjection)-- Yes, I am answering the question. I don't fault my honourable friend for Morris because he has this inclination. And I give him the liberty to question my integrity. But I did say at that particular time, as far as I was aware at that particular time, with the exception of Government Bills that were necessary, such as Capital Bills, in my opinion there were three. I don't think that even the Member for Morris can question the position I took at that time. I know the warped mind of my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and ask him if he would now reply to a question that I asked him a week ago about the current state of negotiations with a computer that seems to have gone errant doing work for the Autopac industry?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): I suspect that we will be on the verge of giving the computer one week's notice tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if there are no more barbs from my honourable friend the Member from Morris, may I suggest that we call Third Readings on the Amended Bills 12, 29, 39 and 51.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. Bill No. 12. The Honourable Minister.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Highways that Bill No. 12 an Act to amend the Pharmaceutical Act be now read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, I missed my opportunity to speak on

(MR. GONICK cont'd.) this Bill on second reading and in a way I feel glad that I did because I much prefer to talk to it at this stage when it has been substantially amended.

Before, Mr. Speaker, directing myself to the specifics of the legislation as amended I want to talk briefly about the problems which this legislation is directed to solve, namely the high price of prescription drugs. The question, Mr. Speaker, we must all ask ourselves is why prescription drugs, the price of prescription drugs are so high. And they are high, Mr. Speaker, particularly for the elderly and the chronically ill who are often made destitute because their savings are not high enough to afford the drugs prescribed by their doctors.

I have a man in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, who earns \$105.00 a week which is not a bad income, but he has to spend \$40.00 every two or three weeks in drugs. And there is also an elderly couple in my constituency who receive \$258.00 a month, which also is not as low an income as many elderly couples receive, but they have to pay out \$100.00 a month on drugs. And these examples are not isolated. For people in these situations, and I suspect that there are thousands of them in the Province of Manitoba, the price of drugs is probably the most important single problem in their lives. And at any one time, Mr. Speaker, most families in the Province of Manitoba have at least one person who is required to take a large amount of drugs. And certainly all members would probably agree with this, that drugs rank with housing and food as the three most essential conditions for human well-being which still remain in the domain of the profit system.

In 1949 the average price of prescription drugs in Canada was \$1.38. In 1965 it was \$3.32. Now it is roughly \$4.00. The price of drugs has been rising, Mr. Speaker, three times as fast as the over-all cost of living. There is something unique about this product which we have to address ourselves to and which this legislation indeed does address itself to. The law of supply and demand has absolutely no application to this product. The reason for that, Mr. Speaker, is that the industry does not sell its product to the ultimate consumer nor even to the middle man, the druggist; instead the industry sells its product to the doctor who after all does not pay for the drug himself but simply prescribes it. And since the doctor is for this reason not concerned about the price since he doesn't have to pay for it and the patient has no say in choosing the drug, the drug companies have absolutely no incentive to keep prices low particularly in view of the structure of this industry where many drug products are produced by only a single company. If doctors were readily interested in the prices that their patients pay they could prescribe by generic name. And there are very large potential savings should that be the case. For example: the generic drug called "Dimenhydrat" sells for \$6.12 a 1,000 tablets. The brand name "Gravol" sells for \$69.55 a 1,000. Roughly ten times the price for the same drug in terms of its chemical components.

Another example - and there are many of them listed in the Klass Report, these are just two and they're not outstanding examples. There are many in the same category. Tolbutamide, the generic drug sells for \$6.90 per 1,000 tablets, Mr. Speaker; Orinase the brand drug of the same chemical component sells for \$64.00 per 1,000 tablets. Again roughly ten times the cost. And if members turn to the Klass Report they will find dozens of examples of this kind.

But, Mr. Speaker, doctors rarely prescribe by generic name, though they could. The Alberta Pharmaceutical Association examined 3,491 prescriptions. These were analyzed quite recently in the last 18 months. Only 243 of these - 243 of the 3,491 were written using generic names by the doctor. So, Mr. Speaker, the doctors do not ordinarily prescribe by generic name though they could and thus save the consumer millions of dollars in all throughout the country. But even if they did, Mr. Speaker, there is the question of the pharmacist, because the pharmacists rarely use generic names.

Mr. Speaker, at present a prescription calling for generic drugs can be filled of either a brand name or a generic drug. The pharmacist would have the choice of choosing which. There was a survey also investigating this question as to the extent to which pharmacists when they have the choice, that is when doctors prescribe by generic, the extent to which pharmacists fill drugs by generic names, this survey discovered that in 62 percent of the instances the druggists prescribed not the generic drug which the doctors prescribed, but a higher priced brand drug. So even if doctors write prescriptions for generic drugs, which happens rarely, they could still be filled by the brand names by pharmacists and tend to be filled by brand names by pharmacists at far higher costs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we will examine why this occurs but certainly this legislation which I will get into in a moment directs itself to this problem. Now, Mr. Speaker, why are the drugs

(MR. GONICK cont'd) . . . that we purchase so expensive? And why don't doctors and pharmacists do what they can to use generic drugs to help their patients and costumers get around the high price of drugs? Mr. Speaker, the most important single reason for the high price of drugs in Canada is the enormous profits that are earned by the drug companies. The average rate of return on investment over the 12-year period 1953 to 1965 which is the last average I've seen was 20 percent. Mr. Speaker, 20 percent return on investment. Which is double the rate earned in the manufacturing industries taken together. Or if we examine profit on sales, the average rate on drugs was 9.55 percent, again two-thirds higher than in all manufacturing. So it's a very unusual rate of return that the drug manufacturers receive and I suggest that it accounts to a very substantial degree for the high price of drugs which consumers must pay.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some people have tried to justify these high profits earned in the drug industry by the unusual risks that are involved in this industry; risks over and above those which prevail in other industries. But here again, because this industry has been examined so many times by so many Royal Commissions, in all jurisdictions, a study was made of the risks in the pharmaceutical industry to check out this explanation offered by the drug companies. A special committee on drug costs was established by the Federal Government and one of the questions it examined in depth was this matter of risk. Mr. Speaker, the special committee on drug costs disagree with the industry; it finds that if anything the pharmaceutical industry judged from its past record has been less risky - less risky compared with manufacturing industries in general.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is no economic justification for the unusual excessive profits that are earned in this industry. I could say, Mr. Speaker, that it is very rare that there could ever be justification for these kinds of excessive profits. As in other instances it is a question of excessive greed and monopoly on the part of this industry.

Mr. Speaker, a second reason which we cannot ignore as to why the price of drugs is so high in this country is the large expenditures that goes for sales promotion. Twenty-five cents on every sales dollar is accounted for by sales promotion. Some drug companies spend 50 cents on the sales dollar on sales promotion. Not research, not production - on advertising and give-aways of one kind or another. Another method that we will briefly examine. This is probably the highest cost, the highest proportion of revenue used in sales promotion of any industry in the country. The drug companies spend an average of \$3,000 a year on each physician to convince him to prescribe their drug, because the drug companies understand that their consumer is in effect the physician who they have to persuade to prescribe their brand for their patients. So they spend an average of \$3,000 a year in various ways on each doctor in the country, each doctor in the Province of Manitoba as well, to persuade them of the merits of their particular drug. More than half of this sales promotion is taken up by the so-called detail men who visit doctors.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read for members a bulletin which has been prepared for the detail men of a particular drug company selling a drug called Indocin which would give members the flavour by which the drug companies tend to promote their product. This is the way this bulletin goes: "Tell them again, and again, and again" - this is addressed to detail men in promoting to doctors - "tell them until they are sold and stay sold. You've told this story now probably 30 times. The physician however has heard it only once so go back and tell it again, and again until it's indelibly impressed in his mind and he starts and continues to prescribe Indocin. Let's go. Every bottle of Indocin that you sell is worth an extra \$3.80. Go get it. Pile it in." That, Mr. Speaker, for an essential product which the health of millions of Canadians depends upon, the drug industry, that kind of promotion for the sale of drugs.

Mr. Speaker, another factor which we must be aware of and which doctors would readily admit; and have admitted again in one of these other surveys - and there has been literally dozens of them in the past ten years of the drug industry - and the doctors are willing to admit, in fact 70 percent of the doctors have now admitted that they first hear of a new drug, not from some research bulletin, not from some objective source, but from the detail men; 65 percent of them say that their main source of information of new drugs - and many of them say their only source of information of new drugs, because they don't have time to read the literature - is a detail man, who, Mr. Speaker, needless to say, is not the most objective person in being able to review and summarize and analyze the merits of his particular drug as compared to others.

Mr. Speaker, besides the continuous visits from detail men, a Doctor Gemmell who

(MR. GONICK cont'd.) teaches at the University of Manitoba in the Department of Medicine has estimated that each doctor receives 4,500 pieces of literature a year from the drug companies. I mean all of us know that doctors are busy, and for all my criticism of doctors with respect to their greed in terms of the income that they expect, I would be the last one to say that they are not busy, but on top of the time they must spend with their patients legitimately, they receive 4,500 pieces of literature, which most of them again on survey say that they throw in the garbage because they don't have time to examine this literature.

Now interestingly 200 pieces of mail were analyzed in depth by fourth year medical students at the University of Manitoba under the direction of Dr. Gemmell, in terms of the contents of this literature, and they found that 21.5 percent of this literature does not state the generic names of the drugs, 48 percent gave no mention of the toxicity or side effects, 95 percent did not mention the cost of the drug. So here we have an industry, Mr. Speaker, where 25 cents on every dollar is spent on drugs, which is a total waste, completely unnecessary. It adds nothing to the drug, it certainly adds nothing to the health of the consumer, and provides no information for the benefit of the doctor that is useful. And here we have a system whereby the major source of information of new drugs is not a doctor's own research, is not his reading of scientific articles, is not his testing or his re-education through various courses, because he has no time for this; it is, instead, the representatives of the industry themselves who, Mr. Speaker, all would admit are not the most objective evaluators of their own product.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another part of the sales promotion campaign on the part of the drug companies which adds to the cost of the ultimate consumer are the free samples that are given out to the doctors; four cents of the sales dollar of prescription drugs is spent on free samples to the doctors. The average doctor in Canada, presumably in Manitoba as well, receives 500 to 2,500 dollars' worth of free samples a year. Naturally the company that leaves the most free samples are most likely to get, certainly we have every reason to expect that they could get, the doctors to prescribe their brands. Studies have shown this to be the case. Members should also know that drug companies keep the medical-professional associations alive by funding their journals through advertising in them. The C.M.A. turned a profit of \$100,000 on the C.M.A. Journal - \$100,000 profit on their journal per year, primarily because the only source of funds aside from the subscriptions from doctors is advertising, primarily from the advertising from the drug companies. And if we can take an example: Pfizer Drugs inserted an ad in the journal at one point and paid them \$5,000 a page, as it costs for the advertisement. Can we seriously believe that the C.M.A. could afford to offend this drug company by running an article that critically examined one of its drugs when it was contributing to the amount of \$5,000 per page in a single ad to this journal?

Mr. Speaker, all this together in this country amounts to \$15 million of waste, of junk, of junk mail, a wasted effort of misinformation of no use to anyone. Mr. Speaker, the excess profits and the advertising costs taken together add up to something like 35 percent of the sales cost of the average prescription drug. Totally unnecessary, add nothing to the product, add nothing to the consumer, add nothing to the information of the doctor. The drug industry has become less of an aid to the sick than a leech on the sick, Mr. Speaker. Monopoly that costs a drug consumer millions of dollars because of its own waste and greed are hardly therapeutic. The thousands of duplicate, confusing and useless drugs marketed over the years represent not medical progress but extended patents and increased profit. None of us is healthier for misleading promotion and advertising that costs millions, and causes immeasurable damage and confused doctors and adverse drug reaction.

In 1962, Mr. Speaker, The Food and Drug Administration of the United States had a test done on the effectiveness of the drugs that were then on the market and they examined all of them because in the United States too this industry has been examined countless times. Of the 2,000 drugs then reviewed, 16,000 therapeutic claims were evaluated. I want members to remember that number. Sixteen thousand therapeutic claims of these drugs were evaluated, and 10,000 of these 16,000, or 60 percent of the claims, were found to be false.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many instances of giveaways, excessive costs, and waste, free trips which drug companies finance for doctors to visit their parent plants in the U.S. and all the joy-rides and entertainment that goes with it. One doctor, different perhaps, perhaps wiser than many of the others - certainly wiser than apparently members opposite - whose name is Dale Counsell, Canadian doctor, in his brief to the Senate Sub-committee on Monopoly - which again reviewed this industry in this country not long ago - warned of the effect of these

(MR. GONICK cont'd.) generic gifts, warned of the effect they have on the medical profession. And I'd like - it's a very short quote, Mr. Speaker, and I think members would be interested in what he had to say, in effect about his colleagues in the medical profession. He says that "It seems impossible to convince my medical brethren that drug company executives are either shrewd salesmen or shrewd businessmen, never philanthropists. They make investments, not gifts. Unfortunately there are far too many physicians who must still be taught the difference between a golf ball, the magnetic personality of a detail man, and the scientific fact as criteria for the evaluation of a drug".

Mr. Speaker, I'm not here launching a critique of the medical profession, rather we are examining the drug industry and its relationship to the medical profession, and to the consumers of drugs. Now, Mr. Speaker, these are the facts of the situation and if members opposite wish to refute these facts I invite them to. I have examined the various studies performed in this industry. If the Member for Morris has as well I don't think he could come to any other conclusions other than the ones I have come to with respect to the performance of this industry.

Mr. Speaker, this is the real situation which the Government of Manitoba faces, as all governments do across this country, and now we must examine the method that the government has adopted to deal with the situation. In the amended version of the legislation after a therapeutic drug committee has been established, and we expect that to be done in the not too distant future, it would then set forth drug equivalencies, and pharmacists would then be required by law to substitute the lowest price equivalent drug unless doctors instruct them not to substitute in their own writing. Now, what savings will accrue to prospective drug users of Manitoba by virtue of this legislation?

Well, Mr. Speaker, this too, has been studied in Ontario where the government has considered many alternatives. A study was done to examine the overall effect of a program such as we are now about to legislate in the Province of Manitoba, and they have discovered what the maximum benefit would be under such a program; that is for core drugs, for the most commonly used drugs, if the pharmacist obeyed the letter of the law completely, a 100 percent, and if the doctor did not instruct them not to substitute; in other words if there was a 100 percent performance with respect to this legislation, and they discovered that if this were the case, if this law worked perfectly with no obstructions from pharmacists, no obstructions from the medical profession, that the total savings to the ultimate consumer would be 7.7 percent off the prevailing market price. In Manitoba, looking at our gross figures, this would come to a savings of about \$750,000 maximum, unless my figures are wrong and the Minister could correct me if they are. Allowing for a reasonable no-substitution instruction from doctors, we could expect that the savings in Manitoba next year, if it's instituted next year, would be in the order of \$600,000 let's say, or about six percent off the existing prevailing market price.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I expect that the government will be watching for possible abuse on the part of the medical profession; certainly the pharmacists will be monitored in some way, but there is a possibility that doctors would want to instruct this legislation - and they have the ability to do so - by instructing the pharmacist on every occasion that they cannot substitute. This would be, Mr. Speaker, an abuse, and I think that the government will honestly have to watch for that. And that could be monitored too, as the Minister reminds me.

Mr. Speaker, that's not a bad first step in the struggle to bring down the cost of drugs, a seven percent - a six percent reduction is not a bad first step in the long road to the ultimate solution to the drug problem. There must be a second step: this I imagine must be only a first phase. The second phase I think can be found in the Klass Report. That is the establishment of a central drug purchasing agency. And that should add on top of these savings substantial savings in addition; at least 10 percent, possibly 15 percent on top of the initial six percent that we would provide this year. And I hope that a central drug purchasing agency is not that far distant for the people of Manitoba, because taken together, these steps could reduce the price of drugs for the people of Manitoba at least 15 percent, possibly 20 percent, possibly somewhat slightly more; and that is a savings of over a million dollars, possibly as high as \$2 million or slightly more. That, Mr. Speaker, is a substantial saving for the people of Manitoba and particularly would be a very sorely needed saving on the part of elderly citizens who are such heavy users of drugs and those who are chronically ill and who are particularly heavy users of drugs.

There are other steps that could be taken: they have been alluded to in the past, not only by myself, by members in the front bench: they have not been discussed recently, but certainly we could - I could say for myself that I'm satisfied that this is a good first step, that I expect

(MR. GONICK cont'd.) that a second step is not too far away for the people of Manitoba, and therefore I commend this legislation to the members of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Minnedosa the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Would you call the third reading of Bill 29, Mr. Speaker.

BILLS No. 29, 39, 51 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I --(Interjection)-- carry on . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I guess it's too late, I was looking up the rules in respect of the adjournment of debate on third reading . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I presume it's a little late now, maybe I should have been on my toes in respect of Bill 12. The third reading on a bill, as to whether or not it was proper for an adjournment of a bill. However, it's past now, I'm not going to raise the question at this particular time, so therefore maybe we can go on to the third reading of bills without amendment.

BILLS No. 13, 28, 32, 34, 42, 48, 61, 62, 65 were each read a third time and passed.

. . . . continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 70.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I hope that applause doesn't come out of my 40 minutes. Mr. Speaker, like most of the members I've listened with a good deal of interest to the remarks made on this particular bill and I do feel that the debate has been out of all proportion to the importance of the bill and I put this down to the influence of the first speaker on the bill the Member for Thompson who in his usual manner gave a most newsworthy and hard-hitting speech on the subject. The Member for Thompson is well-known for his phrases and his very pithy comments, he can be called a journalist's delight, Mr. Speaker, and on this particular speech he really went to town on the subject of pornography.

However, a good deal of what he had to say concerned pornography and obscenity in general and not too much of it was dealing with the actual bill, and the very fact that he used this particular bill as a vehicle to defect to the opposite side leads us to wonder whether he was in fact justified in doing so and perhaps an analysis of the situation and his remarks would be in order at this time. I won't quote from the speech of what he said, but a number of his remarks were directed at media other than the films, which is what concerns this particular bill.

I wonder if he realizes, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing in the present censorship bill, and nothing in the new classification bill, that would affect books in any way. That there is nothing in that censorship bill nor in the new classification bill which would affect magazines at all. That there's nothing in either the present act or the new bill that's coming in that would affect radio or television and there's nothing there which would affect newspapers. It seems that we've discriminated then against films, Mr. Speaker; it seems to be a situation really without very much logic. And in making this change from a censor board to a classification board it does make a step at least in the direction of removing this discrimination, although if there is no sense in having a censorship board for films only there seems little reason for having a classification board for films only.

The report last year of the censorship board -- or perhaps it was the Review Board. I'm not sure which -- recognized the fact that the board had done very little actual censoring of films. That it was in fact, if not in law, a classification board, and this is freely admitted by members of the Censor Board who I have spoken to. For they do in fact classify films, restricted, adult or general. And it would seem rather strange if anyone would go to any film not knowing what he was going to see, or at least having a pretty good idea of what he was likely to see. Did anyone for instance go along to see "Midnight Cowboy" thinking it was a Western or go to see "The Stewardesses" thinking it was a travelogue? I would make the same comment for the Member for Lakeside that he made to the Member for Ste. Rose that maybe it was over his head.

One other point that I wanted to bring up to the Member for Thompson was that the bill that is before us really extends one freedom while restricting another. It extends the freedom of an adult to see an uncensored film but it restricts the freedom of an adult to take a juvenile or anyone under 18 to see a restricted film, which freedom they presently have. So what in fact the bill does is to exchange one freedom for another, and adding these things together it hardly seems that the reason given by the Member for Thompson for his move across the Chamber seem really valid. I get the impression from his remarks and from subsequent remarks that this was just a vehicle for it, and if this one hadn't come along then maybe another would have done.

I will make one quote from the Member for Thompson's words, Mr. Speaker, and this I found really shocking. The Member for Thompson said, "If we allow censorship to be removed then I'll guarantee you it won't be very long when they'll be showing anti-semitic movies that will depict them as the most sub-human animals in the world." I wonder if the Member for Thompson thinks that censorship is any protection against anti-semitism; or if he thinks that censorship is a protection against any form of prejudice. And if he does, then I tell him that censorship will no more get rid of prejudice than legislation will get rid of prejudice. And just to refresh his memory about anti-semitism and censorship. I will read to him a few little comments from a book that I brought along. It's called "The Rise

(MR. WALDING cont'd). . . and Fall of the Third Reich." It's written by William Shirer. And I just have a few quotes to make from this. The beginning of one chapter starts out: "On the evening of May 10th, 1933, some four and a half months after Hitler became Chancellor, there occurred in Berlin a scene which had not been witnessed in the Western world since the late Middle Ages. At about midnight a torchlight parade of thousands of students ended at a square on Unter den Linden opposite the University of Berlin. Torches were put to a huge pile of books that had been gathered there, and as the flames enveloped them more books were thrown on to the fire until some 20 thousand had been consumed. Similar scenes took place in several other cities. The book burning had begun." Later on he goes on to say, "The new Nazi era of German culture was illuminated not only by the bonfires of books and the more effective if less symbolic, measures of prescribing the sale or library circulation of hundreds of volumes and the publishing of many new ones, but by the regimentation of culture on a scale which no modern Western nation had experienced. As early as September 1933 the Reich Chamber of Culture had been set up by law under the direction of Dr. Goebbels." He goes on to explain that this chamber of culture was divided into seven sub-cultures which controlled every sphere of the Arts including fine arts, music, the theatre, literature, the press, radio and films. Everyone engaged in any of these particular pursuits was required to be licenced and controlled by the particular subchamber, and of course he could lose his position and his livelihood if he failed to follow the party line. He goes on to say that music fared the best of these particular arts, although Jews were quickly weeded out of the orchestras and operas and no Jewish compositions were ever played.

I go on to Art in the 1930s, and in the summer of 1937 Hitler formally opened the House of German Art, and part of his speech on that occasion went as follows: "Works of Art that cannot be understood but need a swollen set of instructions to prove their right to exist and find their way to neurotics who are receptive to such stupid or insolent nonsense will no longer openly reach the German nation. Let no one have illusions! National Socialism has set out to purge the German Reich and our people of all those influences threatening its existence and character. With the opening of this exhibition has come the end of artistic lunacy and with it the artistic pollution of our people."

Concerning other media, Mr. Speaker, he goes along to say, "Every morning the editors of the Berlin Daily newspapers and the correspondents of those published elsewhere in the Reich gathered at the Propaganda Ministry to be told by Dr. Goebbels or by one of his aides what news to print and suppress, how to write the news and headline it, what campaigns to call off or institute and what editorials were desired for the day. That is the daily press." He goes on to say a little bit later on: "The radio and motion pictures were also harnessed to serve the propaganda of the Nazi State." He said the films remained in the hands of private firms, that the Propaganda Ministry and the Chamber of films controlled every aspect of the industry, their task being in the words of an official commentary, "To lift the film industry out of the sphere of liberal economic thoughts and thus enable it to receive those tasks which it has to fulfill in the National Socialist State. The result in both cases, that is radio and films, was to afflict the German people with radio programs and motion pictures as inane and boring as were the contents of their daily newspapers and periodicals."

Mr. Speaker, that is an account of a regime which was not only probably the most anti-semitic but also the most censor-minded probably in this century. Mr. Speaker, book burning is censorship taken to its most terrible end. And this by a regime which took anti-semitism to its most terrible end.

Mr. Speaker, on a slightly different note, I notice yesterday that the Member for, I believe it was Rock Lake, speaking on this subject brought into the House three magazines which he alluded to when he was speaking of a news stand in his own constituency. He dropped a number of hints about them although he really didn't tell us what was in these magazines. He did hold one up and wave it a little bit but he didn't quote us anything from them, nor did he show us any pictures and he really didn't make any point as to - to the point that he was getting at. --(Interjection)-- Well possibly he was but I think anyone who brings in something to make a point about pornography should be willing to quote from it or at least tell us what it was about.

The Member for Ste. Rose this afternoon also told us about one book that he had read. I'm taking the liberty of bringing a book into the Chamber this evening, Mr. Speaker. --(Interjection)-- Yes, it comes in a plain brown wrapper and it also happens to be a

(MR. WALDING cont'd). . . hard cover.

Mr. Speaker, thinking of the Member for Rock Lake and the matter of obscenity and pornography raised a rather intriguing thought. You know we pride ourselves in this Chamber on our freedom of speech and in fact we have it written right into the legislative act governing our affairs that members can speak up freely without threat of legal action for what they say. And we also have a list of prescribed parliamentary expressions, what is unparliamentary should not be used. It has occurred to me to wonder, Mr. Speaker, what would happen as far as pornography is concerned in this Chamber whether it would in fact be censored or not. And whether you, Mr. Speaker, would be placed in the position of censoring any pornography or obscenity in this Chamber, or whether it would in fact be done at the level of Hansard, whether we would see those little dots instead of certain words. Or whether members who oppose this measure would care to be placed in the position of instant census of pornography in this Chamber. But I will spare them and you the embarrassment of being placed in such a position, Mr. Speaker, and I will not quote from the book but I would like to refer to it. --(Interjection)-- I think that this might interest the Member for Thompson, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's the tale of a transient, a young girl --(Interjection)-- I mean to make a comment of the book and I'll try to keep it clean as the Member for Lakeside requests.

In the very first chapter of this book, Mr. Speaker, this girl makes contact with a rather strange character who introduces her to the underworld of drug culture and in fact supplies her with two different drugs. A character by the name of Rabbit, incidently. She finally steals drugs from him and makes her escape, and we next find her involved, Mr. Speaker, in a communal bathing scene where she is the only female with a group of males. At least one of whom happens to be a politician, I'm sad to say. Following this bathing session there is a most unusual race, Mr. Speaker, a race where there are no losers except the girl, only winners, and the girl is called on to supply the prizes to the winners. And it's rather explicit but I won't go on from there. The next scene finds her in a garden where she comes across a character who is smoking a water pipe and after a rather brief interlude with this character who supplies her with yet more drugs, this time in the form of a mushroom, she passes on to another chapter. This chapter finds her taken into a house presided over by a woman called the "Duchess". The first job she is given in this establishment is to take care of a baby. Still under the influence of drugs she escapes from this house and later abandons the baby. --(Interjection)--

Mr. Speaker, if I can be excused the interruptions I would like to go on to a party that this girl soon finds herself at; a rather weird party, Mr. Speaker, which includes a most original and a most extraordinary use of a teapot. She finds herself later at a rather weird outdoor ceremony where under riotous, somewhat riotous circumstances ends with the decapitation of a cat.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I realize I must allow a lot of latitude in respect to the Amusement Act Bill but I would ask the honourable member -- order, please. I would ask the honourable member to try to get himself involved in the Bill No. 70 which is The Amusement Act. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was attempting to make a point with regard to both censorship and pornography and I was coming to almost the last chapter in the book which finds there our heroine involved or dragged into a mock trial at which she is sentenced to death and then violently attacked by the participants in there. And I wondered if this was the sort of book that those members on the other side who had spoken in favour of censorship would be willing to have their children read. And I would ask the Member of Thompson if this is the sort of book that he would want to have censored. --(Interjection)-- He says that he wouldn't censor the book. But the point that I was trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is that this book is called "Alice in Wonderful".

MR. BOROWSKI: I wonder if I could ask a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a question before . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: The member referred to some book burning that took place in Germany in a particular year. I don't recall which, and then the subsequent licensing that took place of all book dealers which we had the impression was a terrible thing. Is he aware of the fact that his government, the government that he is part of, not only licenses people but they have

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd). . . sent people to jail for selling certain books in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Again I must indicate to the Honourable Member for Thompson, questions to be asked must be relevant and on points of clarification on the speech that took place. Not new ones that will open up debate. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask, Sir, your indulgence at the outset as you have shown to so many other speakers on this interesting bill that's before us, some degree of latitude. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that my remarks will be reserved solely for the principle contained in the bill, namely that of censorship. I rather suspect that to some extent the comments made at the outset by the Honourable Member for St. Vital when he said that the bill and the discussion on the bill to date has been somewhat out of context or ballooned up into a situation far greater and beyond than what is actually before us, is correct. But however, Mr. Speaker, that has happened by successive speakers, particularly on the government side, and it's incumbent upon us at least to make some response to that.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that I reserve for myself the right to be as inconsistent in my voting on this bill as the members of the government are, so that I indicate that I will not support the bill and vote against the bill. I say inconsistent because the only consistent people on this matter will be those Conservatives who vote for it. Those will be the only consistent people in the Chamber -- and I by my declaration just a moment ago, you know, obviously count myself outside of that consistent group. But as you, as you, the proponents of compulsion of regulation or censorship of one form or another to now berate us and tell us stories about freedoms of this and freedoms of that, then it is, you know, entirely my privilege to be as - at least as inconsistent as you are in supporting this measure. Mr. Speaker, I always have time for the First Minister of this office to ask me a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Member for Lakeside is prompted by his reference to this party as being the sort of the principal advocates of regulation and compulsion. He didn't indicate whether he was referring to the economic sphere or the social sphere, but I would ask him the following question. Is he aware that the most renowned advocate of liberalism, John Stewart Mill, who once stated that the ultimate and logical successor to liberalism in terms of civil liberties was democratic socialism?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, you know I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, because again my innate courtesy towards the First Minister compels me at all times to yield my seat to the First Minister, but I would ask you, Sir, to use your good office to remind him from time to time that if a member interrupts another member who has the floor to ask a question, that that question should be for further clarification of what the member has just said who has the floor.

I am always prepared to listen to the Honourable the First Minister to tell me what honourable gentlemen of the past have said or have not said. But Mr. Speaker, I happen to be living in the present, I happen to be living under this socialist regime and I am subject to the kind of regulations and controls that they are about to impose on me. So what somebody has said theoretically, you know, is water off my back - is water off my back. I, Mr. Speaker, have to live with the fact that I no longer have freedom of choice as to where I can purchase my automobile insurance. Mr. Speaker, I suggest if this government stays in a little longer that I will not have freedom of choice as to who will administer me medically, if I want to continue under the auspices of my own tax supported Medicare plan, because I would suspect that pretty soon we will be into a community health clinic setup; we will be directed and we will be told where to receive our medical services. And for very good--the reasons will be rationalized, they will be justified. Mr. Speaker, I see you about to rise to admonish me so let me get back to the question at hand.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, there are two sides to the question before us and they have been raised by speakers before me. I regret, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Inkster is not in his chair nor the Minister of Finance who spoke rather eloquently this afternoon, because certainly certain aspects of my remarks I would have preferred to direct to them.

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, this particular bill raises a question that has heretofore not been raised in this Chamber. However, it's a basic one. It calls for a basic division between us. You can put it in many ways. The Member for Inkster for instance expressed a view; his innate belief that man is good, and left alone uncluttered, uncensored, he will ultimately arrive at the satisfactory conclusion. That is his belief. Mr. Speaker, it is not my belief. I believe that I am born in corruption, that I will die corrupt. and that I need the salvation of one Jesus Christ to save me from that corruption. Mr. Speaker, I demand, I demand at least the courtesy of this House, demand the courtesy of this House to be able to say that without being laughed at. Because, Mr. Speaker, members opposite and particularly spokesmen opposite have brushed aside this consideration completely out of this issue and it is particular issue that is particularly involved in this particular bill. We are dealing with pornography. Other members have suggested that we're not talking about the censorship of drugs, we're not talking about the other things that we may wish to censor. It is the film industry that's before us to some extent, the film industry in which excessive exploitation of sex is before us that concerns some of us.

Mr. Speaker, the absence of consideration in my judgment for the majority of Manitobans in the debate thus far was expressed perhaps best by the Minister of Finance this afternoon when he said that it's not what you think that is wrong, it's what you do that is wrong. He of course is expressing the old Judaic law which said to commit adultery is an offence. The New Testament, the Christian concept says to think it is to commit an offence. Do you wish to argue with that particular position? --(Interjection)-- do you wish to argue with that position? I believe that - I believe that position is sound. And I don't put myself forward, I don't put myself forward as a theological student of any kind. I only put that forward, that I rise with some indignation at the categorization that is being put for anybody who put forward that kind of a position as being somehow, you know, intellectually unworthy, square and really not in keeping with the time.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I also object at how the members opposite have chosen in the course of this debate to choose those forms, those kinds of censorship that is, you know, suitable to them. The Member for Inkster admitted during the course of his speech that he is quite prepared to support the concept of regulation, excessive regulation, censorship in the area of economics, but leave the mind uncluttered and leave the mind uncensored. Well that's fine if it's just a question of how, you know, who does the deciding as to when you censor what and what you cannot censor. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that a society or a group that comes particularly from that side who, you know, by coincidence put forward the concept of philosophy that massive economic regulations, massive interference in the private life with respect to the economic activity of people can somehow be completely separated from what I believe to be the consequential censorship that is brought about by this kind of an approach to our life style; this kind of approach to society, the eventual censorship on thought, the eventual thought control that is exercised by the government that espoused this particular kind of a program.

Mr. Speaker I suggest --(Interjection)-- well nonsense. Mr. Speaker. You know, June 26th, I read in my daily paper: "Moscow warns party members". "The Soviet Communist partisanship has warned unworthy members that they have one year to prove their value or be expelled in next year's party card exchange." You know the exchange, a screening procedure last June, 18 years ago - has been interpreted as a move by the Kremlin to weed out opposition and tighten membership for better reorganization of party policies. Well that same day, Mr. Speaker, in Ontario, Ontario NDP votes in Waffle Whigs you know, Censorship, thought control within your party, within your party, Mr. Speaker - not here, but nationally. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if you accept and you adopt that, and it is really a supreme degree of arrogance that sets up - you know, we say, Mr. Speaker, and we listen with some conviction with some belief to the honourable members that have spoken - how can one group of people, a two or three or five or six-man board set up and say what I should see and what I can't see. And yet, Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to sit in this Legislature and have a group of 28 or 30 people say that this is the only way of running the government. And this is the only way that an enterprise can be undertaken, namely monopolistic, state controlled and socialism.

Mr. Speaker, where can you have it - how can you have it both ways. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Inkster chooses to assume for himself the right to censor or to reject any form of censorship that he feels is uncalled for in terms of any inhibitions with

(MR. ENNS cont'd) respect to what he says matters of the mind, matters of the individual. But he is quite ready to assume, he's quite ready to assume total control and total censorship and regulation of my economic well-being. Mr. Speaker, the member who just spoke on the previous - a little while earlier this evening - with respect to the Pharmaceutical Bill that we are dealing with, you know, indicated that he recognized the bill that was under discussion at that time dealing with the question of substituting drugs, that this was the first step. He says, and he closed his speech I believe with you know, what I think have rather come down in history as being kind of onimous words when he talks about the ultimate solution or the final solution with respect to drugs, and that is massive central purchasing, state-controlled central purchasing.

I wish that these people that are in that government, these people that are in that government, Mr. Speaker, there are people in this government that want to control me from the day I wake up to the day I - the moment I wake up to the moment I go to bed. And I wish they would quite hiding behind the screens or picking on a few scapegoats that are politically vulnerable, like doctors, like independent insurance agents like pharmacists; I wish they would start talking about people like the necessity of such things as bread. Now surely, Mr. Speaker, you know even drugs - fortunately only a minority of people require them - but everybody needs bread. So if we want to do away with the advertising if we want to do away with the competition let's start with something fundamental like bread. You know, --(Interjection)-- no, Mr. Speaker, I'm just suggesting that is what you are advocating, and that's not what you're telling us. That's not what you're telling us, Mr. Speaker. They choose the political expedient route of bit by bit nailing those sectors those portions of our society that are you know, in all honesty, in all fairness open to some examination and to some criticism and to some modification of their practices and their means of business. But, Mr. Speaker, that is not - that is not the aim and that is not the goal of certain members of this House and certain members of that government.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that to some extent that we have a - and certainly I have tonight done precisely what the Member for St. Vital has indicated, blown out of some proportion the bill and the measure before us. I think that the question before us is a question that involves a degree of a moral position or a moral ethics that the society of the day either accepts or rejects. I'm not so sure that the position that the Honourable Minister is putting forward is the position that the society here in Manitoba quite frankly, accepts. I appeal, Mr. Speaker, to some extent that we are being subject to tyranny by the minority. We are closing our eyes, we are closing our eyes to the technical ability to peddle smut and dirty movies. I think that it should be said that up to now there has not been a dirty movie shown in Manitoba yet, you know, despite what my friend the Member from Thompson has said. There has not been any pornography shown or distributed in Manitoba yet, and I say this simply to underline as to what is available. And this is why I say that we have not really experienced what the capacity, the technical capacity for the production of filth, pornography and smut is available. Now, Mr. Speaker, do we really, or does Manitoba really wish to facilitate this, you know, go out of its way to facilitate this particular situation. I don't really think so.

Mr. Speaker, you know, I agree as a Conservative; this is why I say, those Conservatives who vote for this measure will be the most consistent people in this House. I believe in minimum government, I believe in parental responsibility and I believe in individual responsibility. You know, what I see and what I allow my children to see and what I do is my business. And I don't really, I don't really put forward the position that the government or that government agencies should be telling people what they can and what they cannot do. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't close my eyes to the fact that the position that I often have a great deal of difficulty with as an individual member also bears some importance with respect to my decision on this bill. There's always an argument with every individual member as to what particular role should he allow himself to be, to portray in this Chamber, to be paramount, have priority in his decision making process here in the Chamber. Should he be a representative of the people who elected him, should he represent the views of the people that put him into this Chamber or should he feel compelled to bring his own guide leader - certain questions? Should he impose his own moral you know, restrictions or inhibitions or what have you on judgments that we face? Should he follow the party line? Mr. Speaker, for this reason, and I wish to make it known very clearly and very publicly, I believe that as a representative of the Constituency of Lakeside, that a vast majority of the people of the constituency that I represent would not wish, would not ask me to support this measure - would indeed ask me to support a

(MR. ENNS cont'd) measure that would if anything, put more teeth into the Censor Board rather than extract it, which is what we're doing by merely putting it into the Classification Board.

So, Mr. Speaker, I make no apologies. Call me a political opportunist, call me anything you want. I always will defend my position and my right to reflect the wishes and the true desires of the people that I represent, and be not in any way stampeded by anyone in this Chamber much less the members of the media to be tabled square, to be tabled what - Christian? Or to be tabled in any other manner for the position that I take on this bill. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the bill dealing largely with the subject matter of pornography in films - it is a subject matter that is of concern to the Christian church, it is a subject matter that is explicitly spelled out by the Christian church and by the Christian faith and I have no difficulty in allowing my faith to be some guidance in this particular vote as well. Thank you.

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

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I listened with great interest to the honourable member opposite and I can certainly respect some of his sentiments. I nevertheless don't agree with them. He has once again stated that this is the party of compulsion, implied that this is the party of regimentation - and I think that the vote on this measure, when we stand up and be counted on this measure will tell to some extent who stands for freedom of opinion and who stands for compulsion.

The bill before us is one of rather limited nature and this is being brought up by many speakers. It merely deals with the question of whether there should be a board of censorship for movies or simply a classification board. And even though it is limited, I think it is very important in that it touches upon fundamental principles, and of course many of the speakers have dealt with these fundamental principles. And I think it is important that once in a while the Legislature debate these fundamental principles because it is this constant revival of debate on fundamental principles that gives them some meaning, some life.

The Honourable Member for Thompson started the debate following the Minister, and I regret the fact that he launched personal attacks on the people who support this bill. This is unfortunate because it is unfair and it's an illogical way to deal with arguments, to attack the personality of the person making the argument. I personally intend to support the bill. I would trust no man in this House to censor the things that I want to see or that I want to hear, and I wouldn't feel competent myself and I wouldn't be arrogant enough to want to assume the responsibility to censor something that someone else wants to read, to see or to hear. I know myself to be very fallible, I am imperfect sinner just as the Honourable Member for Lakeside is, very imperfect. And I would think that even the Member for Thompson belongs in this category. We are all imperfect sinners --(Interjection)-- at least at one time he was.

I'd like to quote one quotation from John Stewart Mill who was mentioned by the First Minister a few moments ago. Mill once said that "if all mankind minus one were of one opinion and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person than if he had the power would be justified in silencing mankind". And I accept that position. And the censorship of movies certainly is one aspect of opinion. Movies are a reflection of opinions, they involve moral beliefs, and censorship of movies just as silencing of discussion is an assumption of infallibility and I don't think that any man in this society including the present members of the Censor Board are infallible. In fact the newspaper last year carried a story stating that a member of the Alberta Censor Board had been charged with a moral offence against a young girl. Now he was - this member of a censor board was --(Interjection)-- subsequently acquitted --(Interjection)-- Yes, the movies may have had an effect on him. However, this certainly calls into question the infallibility of the man.

The Honourable Member for Thompson used the argument that since we in this Chamber have the power to make laws on other matters, we also have the power to make laws regulating morals and regulating moral conduct and therefore we should have the power to censor movies. The Honourable Member for Lakeside also blurred this distinction between laws regarding matters other than those in the realm of thought and in the realm of beliefs and morals, when he stated that we had made laws involving well as he said compulsion. But there's a fundamental difference and that is, when we passed a law like Bill 56 setting up Autopac we did that, but at the same time we didn't silence opposition to it. There was a fantastic amount of argument and opposition from the members opposite and from the insurance industry, in fact I

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd) would say that the bill was probably as thoroughly debated in principle as any bill ever will be. And therefore we were justified in proceeding on the basis that every possible contrary argument had been advanced, and we did proceed to implement the bill and we are now, Autopac is now of course proving us to have been correct in proceeding with the bill. Beliefs that we can trust the most are those which have a standing invitation to the whole world to prove them unfounded, those that are constantly subject to arguments of opponents. Some members have objected to freedom in the morals area being pushed to extremes, and the problem is that unless reasons are good for an extreme case then they are not really good for any case.

Now not only are individuals infallible, and all of us I think would agree that we are fallible, but different ages are fallible. One age will believe something that a following age will find out is not only false but it's completely ridiculous, and one age will do something that a following age will condemn. And I would just like to cite a couple of examples: Socrates was of course the father of philosophy, the father of ethics in Ancient Greece. This was the man who was the teacher of Plato, the inspiration of Aristotle. This was the man who was really the fountain-head of --(Interjection)-- Yes, one of the better students of the Member for Winnipeg Centre. This is the man who was the fountainhead of western philosophy; this was the man who was probably the most virtuous man in an age and in a society which produced many many great men and yet this man was put to death, this man was put to death as a criminal after being convicted of impiety and immorality. He was impious because he denied the gods, the official gods of the State of Athens and he was immoral because the instruction of his doctrines were corrupting youth. This man was put to death by good men not by --(Interjection)-- No, he was given hemlock. This man was put to death by good men, by wise men, but we now feel that they were incorrect that they were certainly fallible and yet they tried to stop his preaching or stop his teachings, certain doctrines.

A second example is obvious - Christ. Christ was put to death as a blasphemer about 2,000 years ago. He was put to death by men of goodwill, by men who are certainly as good as the men in this Chamber, certainly probably as wise or wiser. --(Interjection)-- Well the Honourable Member for Thompson says "ridiculous". --(Interjection)-- No, the men who put Christ to death were not bad men but they were mistaken and they put him to death for blasphemy, for a variety of immorality and of course today we condemn them for having done this. So they obviously too were not infallible, in fact the present age condemns them for what they did in good faith. --(Interjection)-- I have read the Bible.

A number of members have mentioned the Christian faith, and the Member for Thompson has been one of the most vociferous. And the Christian faith involves a number of doctrines. Christ preached that blessed are the poor and the humble and those who are ill-used by the world; he preached that it's easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven; he preached that you should not judge lest ye be judged; he preached that you should love thy neighbour as thyself; if one take your cloak, then you should give him your coat also; that you should take no thought for the morrow; and that if you would be perfect, you should sell all that you have and give it to the poor.

Now some of us very easily profess our Christianity. It's very easy to do this but all we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is to listen to some of the speeches the honourable members have made on, for example welfare, and we see how much they love the poor and the humble, those that are ill-used by the world. We see how they practice the Christianity which they are so very very ready to profess. John Milton of course was also a great Christian and one of the things that Milton said which I thought made a lot of sense, "Areopagitica said that I cannot praise the fugitive in cloistered virtue". I've forgotten the rest of the quote, but the point he was making was a point he made in other of his works and that was that Christian virtue means nothing if it's an untested virtue. That virtue has to be tested by temptation and without that temptation there is no Christian virtue.

One of the difficulties with censorship - and this is of course one move away from censorship and I think it's a very promising move - is that it tends to discourage people of intellect who otherwise would provide leadership in the world of thought. But it's important not only for great thinkers, for a society to produce great thinkers, it's important that every individual in a society have the freedom to think so that he can obtain the mental stature for which he has potential. And the society that allows all great questions to be debated, to be discussed, is a society that can develop a high level of mental activity - and I would like to see in Manitoba, I'd

(MR. JOHANNSSON cont'd) like to see us develop in Manitoba the freest possible society. I would like to see a society that is friendly, that is gentle and doesn't have harsh, restrictive laws such as laws on censorship - and I think this is one small move in that direction, and therefore I'll support the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation,

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Highways) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I really wasn't intending to get into this debate on this bill, but after listening to the number of speeches that have taken place in the House on both sides - from the Opposition as well as from the government benches - I felt as one who for almost two years as Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs and who was responsible for the Censor Board at that time, I felt that I had something to do with the Censor Board as it presently exists and also something to do with the bill that is before the House at this time.

I know that there are a number of things that were said by the members of the Opposition that really were not challenged - and I'm referring to some of the comments made by one or two members last night for example that I thought were statements were made were really statements that were not correct, and this is why I feel I should say a few words on this particular bill.

Just to go back into a little bit of history of about two years ago when I was Minister responsible for the Censor Board in the Province of Manitoba, you know, there were many delegations, many phone calls and many letters I received on this question, and after reviewing all these letters and listening to the comments made on the telephone and the comments made by the various delegations being presented to me and their briefs, I found out after tabulating the whole thing that those people that were interested felt that there ought to be a classification board - most of them felt that way - rather than a Censor Board. And I believe it, because some of the other people in the Province of Manitoba that did not bother to write or to phone or to come in as a delegation really didn't care one way or the other. And it is from this type of survey, if I may call it that, that this bill is before the House at the present time.

You know last night for example, the Honourable Member for Rock Lake and also the Honourable Member for Rhineland made certain comments, and it's unfortunate they're not in their seats tonight, but I did say when I tabled the report on April 15, 1971, the Manitoba Censor Review Board - and this I can verify, it's listed on page 149 of the Debates and Procedures - will show that when I did table that report I invited comments from all members from both sides of the House. And you know, Mr. Speaker, the funny part of this whole thing was the only comments I heard was one of course -- the first one was comments from the Member from Thompson, when we did discuss this in caucus and other members on the government side. But I didn't get a single comment from any of the members on the Opposition at that time and I'm not sure whether the present Minister of Tourism and Recreation responsible for this Censor Board has received any since he took over that portfolio. But I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I did not receive a single comment although I invited the comments of the members of this Legislature.

And then the Member for Rock Lake, and as I said before last night he made a comment, and also the Honourable Member for Rhineland, they pointed out that, you know, the Censor Board didn't get the proper guidance from this government. And I want to remind, Mr. Speaker, the members of the Opposition that when this government took office, do you know how many members were there on the Censor Board? Two. that's all there were. And then during the Estimates, during the Estimate debate in this Legislature here just a couple of weeks ago when the Estimates of the Minister for Tourism and Recreation were being reviewed in the Legislature somebody said - I'm not sure who it was, but you can check it for yourselves in Hansard - that the Censor Board had been increased by quite a few people and that there is an extra cost involved. Well I want to assure the House, Mr. Speaker, that that is not the case as far as the costs are concerned. Certainly we did and I did, I accept that - that I did appoint more people to the Censor Board but with no extra costs; we operated within that budget. Because, Mr. Speaker, what actually happened when there were two or three people on the Censor Board - and as I said when we took office there were only two, and they were elderly people by the way. --(Interjection)-- Yes, right, I agree, they did a good job, but you know what happens, The Honourable Member from Swan River says they did a good job, I'm not disputing that fact. But you know what happens, we're only human, and once in awhile somebody gets sick. So you know, I found out that in a number of cases only one person viewed some of those films and I

(MR. BURTNIAK cont'd) don't think that one person ought to make decisions as far as censorship is concerned on films in the Province of Manitoba. This happens. So what I said at that time - and that is why I did appoint seven or eight people from all walks of life and different age groups, not only people who were middle-aged or people who were younger or people who were older but from various age groups so that you have a good cross-section of opinion. And they did not sit, viewed every film, they were divided into groups but never no less than two or three were viewing certain films without extra cost to the province. We were operating within the same budget that we had when the previous administration had only two or three people, and they did follow the guidelines.

But you know another interesting point in this debate is the fact that you know this is 1972 and we were operating as far as the Censor Board was concerned under the rules which were set out in legislation which was passed back in 1923 - 43 years ago, Mr. Speaker, and no changes had been made. Many things have changed in our ways of life in our society in the Province of Manitoba, in Canada and throughout the country and outside of Canada, but we're still operating under the rules and regulations that were set back in 1923. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it's high time that we did make some changes, and this is the reason that the bill is being presented before the House at this time.

Some say that censorship is the real thing. Well I'm not so sure about that. I believe and I suggested when the bill was - when we first discussed this about a year ago, and in the meantime since then, I've always believed that there should be a classification board rather than a Censor Board, and I'll tell you why. It's been said many many times in this House by the various speakers that spoke here over the last two or three days or the last week or so, that people should not be told what they ought to see or what they ought not to see or what they should read or what they ought not to read, and I believe in that. I don't think that we should be told, no government should tell a person what movie he should see or what he shouldn't because -- but I do believe that a classification board so-called ought to advertise when they classify, it should be advertised in every newspaper, every radio station, television and so on, informing the public, and I believe in that way a person as an individual will censor himself. If I want to see a real pornographic movie that is up to me to decide, but if I don't believe in those kind of things I'll censor myself, as every member of this House and every Manitoban I believe will do the same thing. Because what happened when they had a Censorship Board? They will censor certain films, they'll advertise - you know, when you pick up the paper in the evening and you look through the pages of the movie shows and so on, you want to find out just what kind of a movie they're advertising - you almost need a magnifying glass because you can hardly find out whether it's restricted or whatever, and I think this is wrong. But in the meantime under the Censorship Board, they will cut certain portions of the film but the general public doesn't know this. They only see the advertising of a certain name of a film, they don't really know what is involved, what kind of a movie it really is unless somebody tells them - but just basing it on that, they really don't know. So what happens. I know that there are a lot of people that have walked into a movie house - and some of them have told me this when I talked to them, when they wrote their letters and came in in delegation - many of them have walked out of the theatre houses because they were not aware as to what they were going to see. And sure the Censor Board went ahead and cut off 20 minutes or 15 minutes whatever, but the fact was that these people did not know when they went to the movie house just exactly what they were going to see. And I don't think -- that's why I say that I don't think that the Censor Board, the Censor Board is not the answer. I think that people ought to know what they're going to see every time they want to see a movie based as we suggest under the classification board and they will censor it themselves.

Just for example, just think about two or three years ago or four years ago no doubt that some of us in this House perhaps found ourselves in a line-up in front of a local pub, because you know what happened? Every hotel owner decided that they were going to put on a show in order to increase business. That's fine, but what did they bring in? They brought in go-go girls. Remember that? Not very long ago. They brought in go-go girls --(Interjection)-- go-go girls, that's right. Now, just a minute. Maybe you were in the line-up, I wasn't, but nevertheless they brought in go-go girls, and do you know what, there were lineups. Well how long did it last? Two or three years, that's it. Where can you find a club anywhere in Manitoba now that has go-go girls for entertainment? --(Interjection)-- All right, so what I'm trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is things come in cycles, it comes in cycles. So what happens, somebody

(MR. BURTNIAK cont'd) got the idea, says well to heck with the go-go girls, we're going to bring in good, clean entertainment, - a good band, a good singer, or a group of singers - and this is what you find today. Go to any pub in Winnipeg here, will you find a go-go girl? --(Interjection)-- Where, you tell me where? Will you find line-ups, will you --(Interjection) -- I thought the Honourable Member for Thompson didn't believe in these things but all of a sudden he knows where the go-go girls are in Winnipeg. I don't know where they are and I don't care, but I can tell you that most of the hotels, entertainment places will not lower themselves to that any more. They will go for clean entertainment, and that's what brings the crowds in. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the same thing will happen insofar as our movies. It only comes in cycles, this will fade and die away as long as people will censor themselves and know what they're going to see. They will go and see it, if they don't like to see it, they will stay at home. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I support the bill wholeheartedly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Would the Minister permit a question? In his discourse about go-go girls and the hotels and all of a sudden that phase of the entertainment died down, would he not agree that the hotel industry made an internal agreement because of the high cost to stop this sort of entertainment?

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, I don't think the cost is any higher now. I would suggest that the costs are even higher now to bring the kind of entertainment they're bringing in at the present time rather than the kind of entertainment the honourable member's talking about.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID R. BLAKE (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge that debate be adjourned.

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

..... continued on next page

MR. PAULLEY: Bill No. 81, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry, 81, Mr. House Leader?

MR. PAULLEY: That's right, Mr. Speaker, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. It deals with labour relations.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Minister of Labour, Bill No. 81, the Labour Relations Act. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can best start off my remarks on this bill by saying the government has done it again. The NDP Government has now really brought to light the sign on the back of the cars in Manitoba - Will the last person to leave please turn out the lights. Because here we have a situation that is really going to put another hand in the pocket of the working man in this province. The working man who now has high tax -- highest personal income tax' the working man who now has to live in a province where you've got your succession duty legislation; the working man who has high taxes because of Unicity; and all of this is hitting that middle man in this province on the hoax that we're doing some good for you. And now you have some legislation that basically says, Mr. Speaker, one of the things it says is that if the union is certified everybody will pay union dues in that organization. Now that isn't really brought down in any way, shape or form the management can pay and really the fellows that are going to come from other areas to manage in this particular area, will they come here? No, they won't be bothered, but here you have a situation where you're going to just be driving people out again.

I've had three letters and a lot of you have had letters. I've had one today - the Premier seems to want to get involved with religious matters of people of all different types. This man quotes the scriptures and says that according to his religion there is no way, no way that he is going to pay union dues and he'll take it to the highest court he has to. So again, you're now starting to tackle people. You're now starting to put in legislation in this province when you read this bill that you can't possibly put together. Let's discuss some of the areas, Mr. Speaker. What about the hot cargo situation - you know, where a man who says that I won't handle this particular commodity because another plant is on strike. This present time the man can punch out and go home; you don't have to pay him if you don't want to, but now you can't send him home. And if you say, if you don't want to go home, will you go and work in another area? He doesn't have to do that, and he can probably stand around and say to the other fellows that want to work, that why are you handling this? You know, you're just creating another problem.

And let's take the new Arts Centre that the government has \$7-1/2 million in. And if the quotation on the plumbing fixtures has to come from Kroehler in the United States that's been locked out for the past seven or eight years - and it all arrives and the money is paid for the fixtures and there they are sitting there, and some man who's a plumber in the union says, "I won't touch that". Well you've got 12 or 15 thousand dollars worth of capital sitting there that you probably won't touch for two or three months. The situation is just not proper. It's not commonsense legislation to really try and put that into effect.

Then you have the technological changes. We've really got a beauty here. Really, a plant says that you're talking about layoffs because of technological changes. Now what about the plant that doesn't have any technological changes but has to lay off men because somebody else starts manufacturing a product in competition to them that takes over? You know right today they're not selling many copper drainage fittings any more. The John Wood Company used to manufacture pails in great quantities, somebody opened up a plastic plant and they're selling plastic pails; they had to go out of that business. It will happen to you, it won't even happen in your own plant - and it will happen to you, and you're talking technological changes.

And then you say in the technological changes' section of it, you know, you can now reopen the agreement. This agreement can be reopened if you want to lay so many people off for technological changes. I would say that you're going to put a deterrent on the people of Manitoba, and that the manufacturer won't make any changes to his plant or upgrading to his plant until the agreement runs out. It may be two years in waiting on technological changes. And here we are in Manitoba where we have exports on continually, and we are putting in legislation that is going to be a deterrent to the manufacturers in Manitoba putting in technological changes. And, Mr. Speaker, it's so damn stupid to put it in because technological changes have been the least cause of unemployment. The biggest cause of unemployment is damn fool government legislation, bad economy created by damn fool government legislation. That's your biggest cause of unemployment in this province. It's the biggest cause of unemployment in any province, so don't blame technological changes. Men are usually placed in other areas in the

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) plant and the men who are let out or do have to go are the bottom of the ladder - summer employment people - but don't tell me that your technological changes are going to have that much effect. If you're talking about discontinuing building air-planes or something of that nature in very large quantities, I assure you that that could happen if you just dropped a project like that. But most of your major companies with their technological changes are designed to go into other products and keep working. So what are you doing? Under that section, you're now putting another deterrent onto the people of Manitoba. You know we're going to have the best labour laws according to the Minister, and they're not really the best, nobody can understand them, nobody can tell me that he can even interpret them himself. The man that wrote them has to be close to being an idiot because nobody can understand it. And you're going to have more, you're going to have more changes to this bill or amendments to this bill to make it even look as if it can be handled. It reminds me of one we had last year that had more amendments than sections to the bill. The same thing will have to apply here to even make it work.

Mr. Speaker, why this type of legislation has to come through this fast, I'll never know. First of all as I mentioned before, the technological changes section I believe - and I can't find anything to the contrary, maybe the Minister can tell me - is the only bill in North America that has that section in it. You know, we're really looking for a change of life in Manitoba; we're looking for a bill that is the longest labour legislation act probably in North America; we're looking at a bill at the present time, Mr. Speaker, that is just almost, I hope it's a white paper, Sir, I hope it's a white paper, I hope the Minister of Labour has enough common sense after his years of experience that he continually brags about in this House, to put this bill into committee to be studied and put it into common sense. Because it has been written, it has been written exactly the way the labour people want it - the big labour unions - who when they get certification they're going to have more moneys coming into their coffers because everybody's now going to be involved in paying. Did you ever feel when there's certification then you go to the appeal to certification. One person can appeal the certification and that one person can hold up when there's appeal any agreement or certification that's been made, so then the man is in limbo - they really haven't got any agreement, they really haven't got anything because there's an appeal against the certification. --(Interjection)-- Well I've read it, Mr. Speaker, I've read it and I think I've got as much common sense as the Minister of Labour, and I've always given him credit for common sense. And I assure you that this bill is not practical, and he knows it, but he wants to go wandering around saying, look at the labour legislation we've got in Manitoba. It's like giving a policeman a law he can't enforce.

Mr. Speaker, this is the type of thing that Manitoba really doesn't need at the present time. Nobody over here can be opposed to a new labour law or labour code, and this is a labour code - the other ones that were put in were just fancy, nice things that nobody could disagree with, and then we got the real shot when we got this new labour code. But this is now a new labour code in Manitoba which as I said before is a change in the way of life of Manitoba. It's basically close to being unconstitutional to some of the people of Manitoba, and they're going to push it through; they're going to push this bill through in what they feel will be a two to three-week period.

So where do we stand? How do we stand in Manitoba with manufacturers and people in business who say to themselves, you know, Manitoba and Saskatchewan are ten percent of the market in Canada; we have a plant in Toronto that is capable of producing the Canadian market; by a small expansion in Toronto or Alberta or B. C., we can supply that ten percent. We can close up in Manitoba quite easily because we can't really afford this type of labour legislation. We don't have to be there, and they won't. You know the greatest labour laws in the world, but nobody at work. This is really what you're looking to. And why, why are you pushing it through? You know, this is the basic social control type of attitude of socialists, that here we've got to control - the people have been marching up and down like zombies unhappy, and when they're unhappy then we really control them. But, Mr. Speaker, here we have, as I said, real legislation. You've got real legislation in the minds of those red-eyed socialists over there who want to walk around making this province nothing but a bunch of zombies. And they'll accomplish it, they'll accomplish it - and when we read the articles about Sweden, we'll accomplish that too, you know. I just love to look at that advertisement of the Volvo, you know: "We have to make the car good because we've got the highest prices and lowest wages in the world". You know, that's really what we're looking for in this province.

Here's a young man who writes me today, a very young man; I phoned him tonight from

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) my constituency. He really wants to know what he can do as far as the Human Rights Act is concerned. And he says, when I walk down the street and go looking for a job, and there's a certification in that shop and they tell me I have to pay union dues - I don't want to pay union dues, he says. And if I do want to pay union dues, I should have at least the right that they have in Ontario to pay it to a charitable organization. But no, no, not the greedy union mongers in this province. The heads of those unions let me tell you, those guys aren't for the working man, they're just going to put their hands in the working man's pocket again and drag the money out of them. And I don't feel sorry about telling those guys down at the union halls that can really expect this government to push through labour legislation like that that will in time hurt this province and put men out of work. They're just out of their minds. --(Interjection)-- Yeah. Gold hearted Minister of Labour, is right. I didn't ever expect it of him. We've had many discussions on labour relations, he and I. We can agree on an awful lot of things as far as labour relations is concerned and he knows that. But as far as agreeing with many of the clauses and many of the clauses in this bill that cannot even be put into effect, that are not even common sense, I just wonder, I just wonder how it ever got here. So I would ask him, Mr. Speaker, to consider this maybe a White Paper, maybe he is, maybe he's thrown this out knowing it's impossible and I'll get something back if it is. Because if he isn't doing that that way he's really being foolish and really he's now taking on all kinds of people who don't really want this type of legislation.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I call on many plants and I know many union men, and I have never heard one of them say that I really think the guy working with me should be forced to do something he doesn't want to do. You know they believe that themselves, and now you're telling them you're going to make them, force them to do something they don't want to do. The percentage of people that is there for certification is also ridiculous. --(Interjection)-- Well it is, because you know, it's you know 50 percent he may call a vote; between 35 and 50 percent he shall call a vote; 35 percent he may call a vote; for 35 percent or under he may call a vote. You know we get down to that 35 percent area. you know - and in the law of the land and in the way things usually go in this country it's usually you know, 50 percent of what has to be abided by. You know --(Interjection)-- well, let me say when we put a --(Interjection)-- in my constituency more than that. --(Interjection)-- Yeah. --(Interjection)-- I'd run against you in my constituency any time. --(Interjection)-- Any time. Move in and run against me. --(Interjection)-- Fine. Okay. --(Interjection)--

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you this, let me tell you this, here we have this labour legislation again. And I said you know, you want to have a road paved in front of your street, the city sends out the notices and you have to have 50 percent of the people or 50 percent of the assessment has to be there. You know, that's --(Interjection)-- on a dollar basis. --(Interjection)-- That's right, 50 percent. Here we go again. Not on a dollar basis - dollar basis and 50 percent of the residents on the block. --(Interjection)-- Oh well, you haven't been an alderman for a long time, and very obviously by the look of this bill you forget a hell of a lot. --(Interjection)-- Okay. So - now, Mr. Speaker, the technological changes when we are talking about - and this 50 percent business is just undemocratic. You know I think you could take it to court - if I didn't want to pay union dues and I didn't want to be in a union and I had been put in there by less than 50 percent of the employees of that organization, I think you could take it to court and win. And now because it's the board specifies it after it's certified, who will pay, and you know the management could end up paying union dues. And you're really going to have a lot of management. You're really going to have a lot of management wanting to live in Manitoba where they get the hell taxed out of them. Already - and they're going to put their hand in your pocket again.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour has gone right out of his mind if he wants to put this bill through at the present time. He could really come down to common sense if he would have hearings on it and get it into shape that it could be a new labour law; it could be a new labour law that we could be proud of in Manitoba, but we can't be proud of junk like this.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words on this bill, I couldn't have spoken a couple of weeks ago when I was on that side because I'd have been inhibited from my friendship to the Minister of Labour, and also the fact that there is such a thing as caucus position. And plus the fact that I did have something to do with what's in the bill - and I believe I've stated on a couple of occasions that the Minister is bringing in some of the most progressive legislation probably in Canada. That does not mean that it's all progressive as the Member

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) for Sturgeon Creek indicated, some of it is less than progressive and less than desirable and I will touch on it shortly. But I think by and large if you look through the bill you will find that - and I'm speaking strictly from a working man's point of view, and I don't think that I have to apologize. I was not sent here to fight the cause of Inco or the Chamber of Commerce or anyone else. I was sent here by working people and whether I sit there or I sit here I certainly intend to speak for them.

And I'd like to first of all indicate to the members in opposition who have criticized, and I say some of it was justified, that the Minister of Labour - they are right, he did not write the bill. Many of the backbenchers had a great deal to say what was in the bill; but there's quite a few experts in there, one over here from Logan; there's a few others in the back bench. As a matter of fact there's even a few experts in the front bench; not too many, but there's some that know something about labour. And they had something to contribute to that bill.

One of the other objections raised by I think the Member for Emerson is that he felt it was written by the labour leaders of this province, or else that they were in direct consultation - Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that there's any great secret about that. I believe when the Conservatives were in office they did that and I think that we applauded them for it. Labour after all are people too, and they are entitled to have their views heard. And certainly when I was Minister I consulted with labour many times, I've put labour people on boards, the three boards that were in my jurisdiction - I wasn't ashamed of that. So there's no question that labour had a great deal to say of what's in here. After all back in 1961 the labour unions in Canada and the CCF did have an official marriage in Ottawa, so there's no question that we do work together and support each other. Sometimes we have our differences, especially our Minister certainly had his differences, he's been taken behind the barn by labour and they've told him what they feel about some of the things he's done. And I think he's deserved the criticism that labour has levelled his way.

One other thing that seems to be a sore point in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, is the question of compulsory checkoff. Now this is an area that's really very sensitive, and I find myself in a - I've always found myself in a very difficult position. How do you argue? You know, there's the question of freedom of choice, and I think the government have more difficulty justifying their position in view of the open door policy they're using to the smut peddlers. You know, they have a greater difficulty. At least I'm being consistent - you know I may be wrong, but I am being consistently wrong, if I can use that word.

We were - you know, I go back to Thompson, Mr. Speaker, when we had one union, we checked that out, we didn't like it - under the laws you can do that. We brought in another union and we negotiated a compulsory checkoff and I think it's called the Rand formula. An eminent jurist I think recommended it some place or other in Canada. It's been accepted generally, I thought by all parties as a fair way for a person to pay for benefits. And we had discussions about this in 64 when we went to strike in Thompson, and there were people that objected on religious grounds and somebody suggested look, if you really feel that strongly, I mean if your religion is that important to you and your principles are that important and there are people that have such views, feelings - the agreement that we negotiated for three years is worth \$1,341 I believe it was; and we had to go on a month's strike, we spent \$130,000 of funds which we didn't have; we had to get them from Pittsburgh from the Steelworkers' headquarters, that means we're going to have to repay it - are you prepared to go to an employer and say look my religious beliefs are such that I don't want to pay dues and really I don't want to accept that \$1,341.00. Of course not a single one took us up on it.

Then that is the way it's been ever since and I really, I know the letter that was sent in here - I've had two letters asking me to protest on this basis and I can't do it for the reason I've indicated and for the reason that we would be inconsistent. We allow lawyers and doctors to have probably the worst union, absolutely no democracy. If you're a doctor you come from Europe, we had quite a few doctors come in here from Europe; they don't ask you whether you want to join, they say buddy, there's the fees, you want to be in the medical profession in this province you pay those fees. No questions asked; no votes, no democracy. We have outside of these two organizations - undoubtedly there are some others, I don't know. I'm sure somebody in this House knows of some other organization which forces people to pay dues regardless of their religious beliefs. And therefore, I, Mr. Speaker, for that reason I can't look at that section as being terrible. I realize that it creates problems for some people, but at the same time if anyone in this House wants to throw it out then I ask him to do the same thing for the medical and legal professions, and at that basis I may be persuaded to support him and no other way.

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd)

The other question that was raised about contributions to political parties. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have a local in Thompson that wouldn't support me officially. They took a vote on it. As a matter of fact, this winter they took a vote and they almost voted to give money to the Liberal Party. They have a right to do that. And for some to argue that it's really undemocratic or unfair to have a union support a political, use that money for political purposes. I don't think is a good argument because every Local has an opportunity to vote. That's their right. And if they want to give it to the Conservative Party - and it may happen - if those guys don't smarten up, I tell you it will happen. But they will vote, and they say let's give it to the Conservatives or let's give it to the Liberals and there is nothing anybody on that side or I can do about it. They will just say \$1,000 contribution for Mr. X, you know, whoever it may be. And I'm certainly not prepared to - I'm not prepared to stand in this House and say to the members in Thompson or Dominion Bridge wherever they are, that you have no right to make political contributions - because companies do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm a small shareholder of Sherritt-Gordon. As a matter of fact, I have a dividend cheque in my pocket here -- (Interjection)-- It's \$18.75. -- (Interjection)-- I'm a micro capitalist. And, Mr. Speaker, this comes to me; I know every year makes political contribution, I know the Conservatives get some money, I know the Liberals do and they have a right to do that. Whose business is it? It's their profit. But, Mr. Speaker, I object because they never consult me. Like in the labour union they consult me and I have a right to vote. I have never heard anybody come into this House and say, let's put some restrictions against the corporations. And when I say restrictions I'm not suggesting that they shouldn't be allowed to give it, rather that the shareholders should have some say in it. And on that basis, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how anybody could argue. And I ask my friends, you are my friends now, to be a little more consistent when you argue on these issues because the majority of the people out there that are paying taxes and paying our wages are working people, and they have pretty strong feelings about some of these things here. -- (Interjection)-- Well the working people obviously didn't vote for Stephen Lewis - and maybe they've got too many Waffles there, maybe he's doing the right thing checking them out. Maybe they should do it here in Manitoba. I don't know. -- (Interjection)--

One other item I'd like to bring up before I get off the subject of complusion, there's some of us, Mr. Speaker, object on religious grounds and there are doctors that object on religious grounds for paying premiums for abortions. They object on religious grounds to be forced, and nurses to be forced to perform abortions. I don't hear anybody chanting their cause here. Surely they have as good an argument as those that say I don't want to pay the \$5.00 on religious grounds. If their religious grounds are good on the issue of dues, surely they're just as valid on premiums or on being forced to perform an operation.

Now on Page 13 and 15, Mr. Speaker, there is two items that disturb me, and I'm sure that the Minister will enlighten the House when he gets up to speak on it - Section 20 Subsection 1: "Every employer and every person acting on behalf of an employer who enquires of an employee or a person seeking employment with the employer whether the employee or person is a member or has applied for membership in a union is guilty of an offence and of an offence liable of summary conviction". Well, Mr. Speaker, it was only a couple of years ago that they were allowed to ask you your religion, and in fact they insisted to know if you were married or shacked up. Now again I'm asking the Minister to look into this, into the consistency of what he is doing here. Why shouldn't an employer have a right to say to an employee, do you belong to a union? I mean, is that such a terrible crime? The employee could say it's none of your blasted business, there's no law against that. Why is it being made an offence for a foreman or a superintendent or an employer to ask him if he belongs to a union? Perhaps he has a logical explanation. I certainly don't know of one. -- (Interjection)-- Yes.

The other item is -- (Interjection)-- I see. Section 23, Subsection 1; Freedom of Speech: "Nothing in this Act deprives any person of his freedom to express his views if he does not use intimidation, coercion, threats or undue influence." Again I would like to know what it's there for. It sounds almost like -- (Interjection)-- it almost sounds like the Bill of Rights that was brought in here - and as much as I like the new Leader of the Liberal Party, I could never understand how he had the audacity, the gall to bring in a bill saying that a person has a right to leave Manitoba or to come to Manitoba. Surely that right is inherent in this democratic system. This, Mr. Speaker, this thing here is no different. Do they need your permission

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) ... for freedom of speech? Mister, when the day comes that we have to ask any government whether it's the government I support or not to exercise this freedom, I say we're in real bad trouble in this province. --(Interjection)--

But there is one piece of discrimination, Mr. Speaker, that I would ask the Minister of Labour to look into and this has been a sore point with the older people since I can remember. Age 40, that magical age when you reach it, you know the companies say, sorry buddy we can't use you. International Nickel is desperate for men, but if you are 40 years old and perhaps one day - maybe they overlook one day - they will not hire you. Now if that isn't a violation of civil rights, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what is. I'd like to know what that government that's the champion of civil rights, including the guys that smuggle money in here and push drugs and all - sell smut, what are they doing for the people that are 40 years and over in this province? Where's their civil rights? --(Interjection)-- Well there's not enough seats in this Legislature, but there's a lot of people reach that age. Are they something less than human when they reach 40? What do you do with them? Do you line them up and shoot them, or do you put them on welfare? I suggest to that government that they better smarten up and start looking after this long forgotten group.

Now I'd like to deal, Mr. Speaker, -- there's a very interesting editorial in yesterday's Tribune about who should have the right to strike. One of the members in this House suggested that certain people shouldn't be allowed to strike, and I agree. This is where I'm going to get into trouble with the Minister of Labour because he believes even a mother-in-law should be given the right to strike. Well I don't agree with him. I don't agree with him. Somebody went so far as to suggest that the news media should not be allowed to strike because they're an essential service. --(Interjection)-- Pardon? --(Interjection)-- Well, somebody did. I don't agree with it except in the rural areas. In the rural areas where people depend -- most people in rural areas unfortunately buy the Free Press -- and they depend on that paper for their toilet paper so in that respect it could be considered as essential. But outside of the rural areas I really don't believe that the news media should have any shackles put on them. and I apologize to the -- Speaking of the press, the Minister of Labour has generated so much public discussion with his legislation, there's a gentleman from Le Presse sitting in the gallery who's going to give a write-up about the terrific legislation, I think he'll say terrific legislation that he is proposing here in the House.

Mr. Speaker, there's three people in our society, three groups of people that in my humble opinion should not be given the right to strike. The first one is the doctors - and I shouldn't have difficulty getting support from that side. We know what happened in the Saskatchewan doctors' strike. There was a couple died, I believe. I don't believe that a person on whom we depend for our health and our life and death should be given the weapon to strike. Nor do I believe, Mr. Speaker, that firemen should be given the right to strike. --(Interjection)-- Yes, firemen. Somebody here suggested garbage men too. Well I know you can take the garbage and you can burn it, you can bury it, you can take it out to the farm, to La Salle or someplace and dump it. You can get rid of garbage somehow. But if your house is on fire, Mr. Speaker, you can't take your neighbour's hose and try and put it out. That house will burn if there's people in it just as surely as God makes greenapples, if I could quote the Minister, the Member for Inkster. That house will burn down. Should we as a responsible Legislature pass laws giving a group of people that have that kind of power to strike? I don't think so. Nor do I think that policemen should have the right to strike. --(Interjection)-- Yes, because I was part of the government. You're right. You knew my views. --(Interjection)-- That's perhaps, Mr. Speaker why I'm here right now, because I had no choice to express my views over there.

May I before I proceed read this editorial which I think is timely and an excellent editorial and I know that the government reads it, I don't know if it will do any good. But I'd like to read it into the record because I think it has a message for us: "For the second time in less than a year Nova Scotia has witnessed the ugly spectacle of unchecked vandalism, and hooliganism. Last August it was Sidney when police exercised their right to strike to enforce their contract demands. It was Yarmouth's turn last week and when vandals rampaged through the town until the Royal Canadian Mounted Police were sent in by the Provincial Government to take over policing service from the town who were on strike".

Mr. Speaker, last night when the Member for Inkster was speaking, he says, you know basically people are good and if you leave them alone nothing will happen. Well we heard the Member for Lakeside say that we are born in sin and we are basically not so good and unless

July 5, 1972

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) we have some controls on all of us we'll do awful stupid things. And, Mr. Speaker, the police strikes that we had down east I think indicate, even if those bad people may represent ten percent and maybe it was less, it seems to me that society has to protect itself even against the ten percent. And if we're going to have a carbon copy in Manitoba of what has happened down there, then I think that the Minister should have another look at the legislation that he has passed as a matter of fact.

"The anomaly on this deplorable situation is that the government has a responsibility to maintain all essential public services including policing, yet by its own permissive legislation it lays the groundwork for policemen's strikes. The government cannot have things both ways. Why hand out the strike weapon to policemen if it is not to be wielded? Also it has placed the RCMP in a most difficult position, in effect using the force strikebreakers against the Yarmouth municipal force."

Well, Mr. Speaker, there's another inconsistency about secondary boycotting and strike-breaking. We know where the government stands, but this is precisely what they are going to do. They're going to be involved in strikebreaking if those policemen ever exercise the right that that government has given to them. Now either they're serious or not serious. If they're not serious then they're hoaxing the people and the policemen. If they're serious let them publicly say that they're prepared to use the RCMP to strikebreak. Let the Minister say so.

MR. PAULLEY: I'll say it.

MR. BOROWSKI: Let the record show the Minister has indicated that he will do so.

"There's an object lesson in all this to Manitoba. The Schreyer Government has insisted on giving municipal policemen in this province the right to strike on grounds they should enjoy equal rights with other groups in society, but the strange thing is that Manitoba policemen have not agitated for the right to strike. It was thrust upon them." And that, Mr. Speaker, is a fact. "All policemen ask is to be given fair treatment as regard their pay, working conditions by their employers. Policemen of all people know the terrible consequences of any breakdown in law enforcement or preventative crime work. They are keenly aware of just how thin a veneer civilization wears. Still now the Manitoba policemen have the right to strike should not come as a great surprise if at sometime in the future they exercise it when confronted by niggardliness of a town or city council. And Labour Minister Russ Paulley in his new labour code proposals would be required to maintain a hands-off policy, he says, the new code would remove compulsory arbitration as a method of settling walkouts even by policemen". I don't think anybody would call that responsible government. "There is a growing body of opinion in Canada that believes strike action as a means of settling union-management dispute is a costly anachronism. In the case of police strikes however the result can be anarchy or its equally abhorrent alternative vigilante actions."

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I criticized the Attorney-General about using a double standard of letting certain people get away with murder but when a guy defends his store that's a terrible thing and he said, well we don't want people using weapons, that's what we have the police force for. But if he thinks when the policemen go on strike in this province and the banks are being knocked off left and right that the people aren't going to take guns and law into their own hands, he's crazy. And he has a responsibility, even though the bill is a labour bill, he has a responsibility as the Chief Officer in Manitoba to see to it that we never reach the situation where we have armed camps in this city, and that surely he will have.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the government has any intention of backing off on any of the items in this bill. I know by reading the paper that some labour leaders have stated if the government goes along with the suggestion of the Opposition and withholds the bill for study or whatever reason till the next session, they will march on the Legislature. Whether that will happen or not I don't know, but I ask the Minister to consider very seriously, whether they march or not -- and they have every right, and if I was out there on most of the issues I would be marching with them -- I would like the Minister to know before he puts this into legislation that if those men are going to be marching on this Legislature, it's not going to be to give the policemen the right to strike. I think he should know that. That is one of the things in society that if you take away you go back to the jungle and I hope that the Minister will take a hard look at this and see if he can have that deleted. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question? In view of the present situation with respect to labour relations and in view of his presentation, does he believe that this bill

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) should be considered by a committee in-between this session and the next session?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I had my way I'll tell you what I would do. I would take out the sections that I've mentioned and proceed with the bill. If the Minister chooses to be bullheaded, which he has a habit and he is famous for, then perhaps that may be the best alternative.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Minnedosa that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm not so bullheaded that we won't proceed with the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, and I will not listen to the tripe of the Honourable Member for Thompson. --(Interjection)-- You don't know what it means. I'm looking opposite, Mr. Speaker, and I can't find anybody over there who apparently is prepared to take over their adjournments. The Honourable Member for Inkster is not here. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether anybody would care to make a contribution to the resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside wish to contribute to . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Did your boss flag you down? --(Interjection)-- I don't have to calm down, but apparently the Honourable Member for Lakeside was prepared to speak until he got the hand of the Member for River Heights. Apparently . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Let me make it very clear that I don't have any difficulty in recognizing who my Leader is on this side of the House.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right, that's very evident, Mr. Speaker, and I alluded to that. We talk about dictatorship . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable House Leader indicate . . .

MR. PAULLEY: . . . we got an exhibition of it tonight.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder in the absence of the Honourable Member for Rhineland whether there is an inclination of any of the members of the House to speak on the adjourned debate standing in the name of the Honourable the Attorney-General?

Mr. Speaker, apparently there isn't any inclination for processing some of the resolutions, but there is another bill that may be called, and that is a bill on the report stage on Bill No. 3 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Rhineland. I wonder if there is any inclination by any member of the Assembly to proceed with the Government of Manitoba?

It doesn't seem, Mr. Speaker, that there is any inclination to deal with the legislation in Manitoba that is being hurried at this stage, so therefore --(Interjection)-- What's that? No, I won't want you to write my speeches. I usually speak intelligently when I speak.

Mr. Speaker, there doesn't seem to be any inclination to deal with the problems of Manitoba. so therefore I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that the House do now adjourn. which is not debatable.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, we will put up with a great deal of the kind of chirping that is coming from the House Leader, but bills that were presented to the Chamber today and adjourned by somebody not present, namely the Member for Rhineland, for him to continue to cast aspersions to us. the Official Opposition. as not being prepared to carry on the official business of the province is uncalled for.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Minister of Labour . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the motion before the House, . . . despite the turbulence of my honourable friend, is a motion to adjourn.

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