

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 12, 1966

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

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

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg leave to present the following as their Fourth Report. Your Committee has considered Bills No. 27, an Act to amend The Child Welfare Act; No. 31, an Act to amend The Prearranged Funeral Services Act; No. 84, an Act to amend The Consumers' Credit Act; and has agreed to report the same without amendment. All of which is respectfully submitted.

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 14 4H Club members of Woodlands under the leadership of Mrs. Van Camp. This club is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you. Orders of the Day.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health)(Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 46 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. D.M. STANES (St. James): Madam Speaker, may I have unanimous consent of the House to make a statement on Bill No. 43, an Act for the Relief of Helen Radclyffe and Edward Frank Radclyffe, before you proceed with the Order Papers?

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the honourable member permission? Agreed.

MR. STANES: Madam Speaker, I received a phone call just before lunch this morning from the solicitors representing Mr. and Mrs. Radclyffe, informing me that there has been a settlement in this case and asking me to ask the House for unanimous consent to withdraw the bill. I do so at this time, Madam Speaker, in case others were prepared to speak on this particular bill.

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the honourable member leave to withdraw the bill? Agreed? Agreed.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): . . . ask a question before the Orders of the Day.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Health. Will the Minister be calling for concurrence on the report of the Special Committee on Dental Services this Session?

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, when I plan to call for concurrence there will be adequate notice given to the members of the House.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, didn't the Minister indicate earlier that he would be bringing in legislation on this if the report was concurred in? Does he still intend to do so and will he have time to do so?

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, I did say that if the concurrence was given in this House that we would plan to bring in legislation, but as I mentioned, on concurrence adequate notice will be given when I plan to move concurrence.

MR. JOHNSTON: . . . question, Madam Speaker. This Session - will it be this Session?

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, I adjourned this debate for the benefit of my friend, the Minister of Highways.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Highways.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works)(Minnedosa): Madam Speaker, I'm prepared to support this motion.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I adjourned ~~this~~ motion for the benefit of my friend, the Minister of Highways.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Minister of Highways.

MR. WEIR: Madam Speaker, this is not the first time we've had orders of this nature before the House at this session, and there has been no change, Madam Speaker. It's still not considered in the public interest to provide the information in the form in which it's requested. Members of the department are working on maps, as I indicated earlier in the session, and I believe some of these will be presented to the House prior to us rising and if we're not able to have printed copies for everybody they'll be mailed as soon as they can be made available. I can't support the Order as it stands.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker - would the Honourable Minister permit a question? Would the Honourable Minister tell us why it is not in the public interest to answer?

MR. WEIR: Madam Speaker, I've answered that same question in the various debates that we've had in the House on two or three occasions.

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: All traffic counts taken on P. T. H. No. 4A for the years 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barman, Campbell, Froese, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 17; Nays, 32.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. Committee of the Whole House. The Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills: Nos. 40, 9, 24, 25, 33, 46, 50, 56 and 91.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, this is again Private Members Day and we're proceeding into government business. It was agreed the other day we'd go into private members' bills first and then we'd switch into government afterwards. For example, the other day we dealt with Bill No. 5 and it took the whole afternoon. I'm not suggesting these will take all afternoon but it's possible, and then we would be deprived of our Private Members afternoon.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, if I might be allowed a word on the point of procedure, I've examined the rules governing the order of business as it applies to Tuesday, and as far as the Rule Book is concerned I can't determine which of the rules has precedence. I'm not sure that it's clear from the Rule Book how the order of business should be placed on the Order Paper. That being the case, we turn to the practice of the House which has been consistently to place the order of business as it appears on the Order Paper today, and so I think it's quite proper that the Clerk, under the direction of Madam Speaker, has arranged the Order Paper in the way it appears now. I would say to you Madam Speaker however, that if you wish to entertain a request for unanimous consent to proceed with private members'

(MR. EVANS cont'd). . . . . resolutions or any other order that some other member would wish to call first, we would raise no objection on this side of the House. The matter is in Your Honour's hands, but I say that as far as this side of the House is concerned, we would have no objections to altering the order of procedure as suggested by the honourable member opposite.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, to speak on the point of order, I appreciate that when the rules do not provide that we turn to the practice of the House, but where the rules do provide, then it seems to me that there's no question as to what the House must do, and referring back again to the rules as they were read here before in the same discussion we had last week, on Page 10 of our new Rules of Order the order of business for Tuesday and Friday between 2:30 and 5:30 is clearly stated. There's no possibility, it seems to me, of confusion there. It simply says that on Tuesday and Friday between 2:30 and 5, it'll be questions, written first, and then motions other than government motions. Now this, it seems to me, is perfectly straightforward. I cannot see any possibility of confusion there. Rule 22, which has been referred to, merely says that where there is no procedure laid down, in other words, "except as otherwise provided," it is third reading of Bills, reports from Committees, and so on. But surely Rule 22, which comes after Rule 19, is merely one that provides for a case where Rule 19 does not provide, and it says so, "except as otherwise provided." So it seems to me if there is no question insofar as the Rule Book, that Rule 19 on Page 10 provides what the order is for Tuesday, and seeing that that is provided in the Rule Book, that there is no question of going into the practice of the House because the Rule Book does provide.

MR. EVANS: I'll just offer one more comment to the effect that despite what appears to be a difference of view about the rules, Madam Speaker has in fact made a ruling which I would say now governs us. But nevertheless, what are we quarrelling about? Why not get along with the way my honourable friends across the way want to conduct business this afternoon, and we'll have an opportunity to see any difficulties about the Rule Book put right before another Session comes.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Madam Speaker, I think that the suggestion of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce as House Leader is quite reasonable, and as far as I'm concerned, quite satisfactory; that is, that insofar as we in opposition are concerned. He has offered not to proceed with consideration of third readings in Committee of the Whole House, go to private members. Why worry about it? We've spent considerable hours on this question --(Interjection)--. Yes, and we will be spending some more, Madam Speaker, until such time as certain individuals or a certain group in this House realizes they had an opportunity of setting the rules during Committee considerations, and this is the rule that was set and it's up to you, Madam Speaker. But anyway, apart from this, it's not up to me to start any argument now. I would suggest --(Interjection)-- I beg your pardon? Yes, and I can conclude them too, Madam Speaker. But anyway, Madam Speaker, the Leader of the House has suggested we go to private members' resolutions. We're satisfied. Let's go to them.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, may I ask the Honourable the Leader of the House if, in the remarks that he made a moment ago, he made the suggestion that we would have a reconvening of the Rules Committee or something of that sort before next Session, to get this matter straightened out?

MR. EVANS: I would hope we take the earliest possible opportunity to do so.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is it my understanding that the House Leader has made a motion that . . . . .

MR. EVANS: No, Madam Speaker, I think it would not be within my power to do so. I simply said that we would raise no objection on this side of the House if you, Madam Speaker, wish to ask for unanimous consent to accede to the wish of the Member from St. George.

MADAM SPEAKER: If I have a motion from someone I will ask for unanimous consent, otherwise I have a ruling before me that I cannot put aside. If any individual wishes to make a motion to ask for unanimous consent, I will present it.

MR. PAULLEY: You already have a motion before you, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Quite right, the motion before us is that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills listed on the Order Paper. Are you ready for the question?

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, did the Honourable Member for St. George say they would like the resolution withdrawn? I ask, with the consent of my seconder and the Leader

(MR. COWAN cont'd).....of the House, that the resolution that I moved be withdrawn.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, may we have the permission of the House to proceed to private members' resolutions, please?

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the Honourable Member from St. George, by leave, permission of the House to proceed to Private Members Day? Agreed? I still am not of the firm belief that it is a proper motion; however, if it is the wish of the House to suspend the rules at this time then I shall call the proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

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

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

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I rise to support the resolution of the Honourable Member for Selkirk, because I do not agree with the methodology of taxation of the Government of Manitoba. However, I do want to say to my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk that his arguments the other day, while quite logical in substance due to past performance, were not consistent, because my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk pointed out to the House how wrong it was - and I agree with him - how wrong it was for utilizing public utilities as a method of taxation within a jurisdiction - utilities being public utilities.

I wonder if my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk recalls that in 1956 he joined with others - and I frankly confess, Madam Speaker, with myself - in granting this privilege to the City of Winnipeg, which he now so vigorously condemns insofar as the province is concerned, because Madam Speaker, at the present time in the City of Winnipeg the city has the authorization, and I believe are making use of that authorization, said authorization being granted by this Legislature to impose a tax on electric or gas accounts to the degree of 2-1/2 percent of the total bill within the City of Winnipeg. So Madam Speaker, I say that we have to first of all go back for this authority which was granted to the City of Winnipeg, to the Statutes of Manitoba of 1938 (1938 originally) Chapter 74, Section 1, whereby the City of Winnipeg was granted the right to impose a tax on utility bills in order to raise revenue for municipal purposes.

And then, Madam Speaker, and this is where I mention the Honourable Member for Selkirk and myself, (I believe at that time I was the Member for Kildonan-Transcona) we fell down in adhering to the principle enunciated the other day by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, in that we approved the revisions of the Statutes of 1956, said Statutes being -- I'm sorry, I haven't got the Chapter of 1956. But in the amendments to the Charter of the City of Winnipeg in 1956, we carried on the provision of granting to the City of Winnipeg the right to continue the imposition of a 2-1/2 percent tax on gas and electricity bills.

So while I say to my friends I agree most heartily with them that this is a bad tax, it's not a proper tax, and should be eliminated, I merely want to point out that back in 1956 we granted this principle to the City of Winnipeg, and I think that when we're considering the repealing of the imposition of a tax on public utilities at the provincial level, we should do likewise insofar as the municipal level is concerned. However, I want to say to my honourable friend, I support this contention that this is a bad tax for the provincial government to enact.

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

MR. T.P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Yeas and Nays, Madam.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Froese, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 16; Nays, 32.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution as amended by the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie. Are you ready for the question?

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon, that the amendment be further amended by adding after the 11th line the following: "WHEREAS Brandon has benefitted greatly and The Pas may also benefit from being located in designated areas," and by also adding at the end thereof the following words: "and that in the meantime the Government of Manitoba urge the Government of Canada to declare all of Manitoba a designated area."

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, I'm just wondering whether or not you might wish to consider this amendment - I'm speaking now on a point of order - as to whether or not, Madam, you would like to consider -- take some time to consider whether this amendment is actually in order, because at first blush it appears to me, without having had the benefit of reading it, that it purports to re-introduce into the resolution subject matter which was once there and which has been dealt with by the House, voted upon and dealt with by the House at this Session, and which then therefore is out of order.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, it seems to me that the Minister is not in a position to make a point of order after you have made a decision. If I recall correctly the situation of the House, it is that once you call the question that you have made a decision and the question is before the House as to whether or not they want to support or oppose the question.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. May I speak to the Clerk for a moment? I have before me the original motion of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie which I did not have with me at the time that I gave my ruling, and I do take into consideration what the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has brought to my attention, that in the original motion to declare all of Manitoba a designated area under the Federal Government Industrial Promotion Program. However, I have given my ruling now by asking for the question and I believe I shall have to allow it to stand. Therefore, are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. When I spoke twice before asking for the support that the amendment asked for, I had pointed out that in certain parts of the province there are communities who are gaining immeasurably by the legislation that has been enacted by Ottawa, and that is, in the matter of tax grants and outright loans, and if I may remind the members of what such grants mean for new industries -- and we can recall the one at Brandon, the Simplot Factory, are gaining in tax credits and outright grants up to \$5 million on a \$30 million investment. We've had the Premier tell us about what he has in the way of hopes for The Pas area on a combined lumber and pulp mill, and we know from the correspondence that was tabled a few days ago by the Minister of Industry and Commerce that the First Minister of this province has made doubly sure that Ottawa will be granting a similar type of loan to the Swiss firm and then on to Churchill Forest Products. So, it can be seen that this program is being made use of in the areas that it is being applied to.

In earlier speeches I have pointed out through figures where there are similarities in communities in Manitoba that are both in and out of designated areas. I believe I showed members a map and this map makes it rather clear that there is no attention paid to municipal boundaries or to provincial boundaries - that designated areas are covered on a regional and an area basis, although for administrative purposes the administration is done through the employment office areas.

I have here Community Data Sheets for over a hundred communities in Manitoba supplied by my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce, in which his department has supplied communities with all sorts of statistical information that will be used by the communities when they go out and try to attract new industry, and I have taken the liberty to mark a number of these and I would like to quote the prevailing wage rates that apply in communities and municipalities that are both in and outside of the present designated area in Manitoba. In the City of Brandon the prevailing wage rate for males is estimated to be from \$1.00 to \$1.80 an hour for skilled labour. For semi-skilled labour it is from \$1.00 to \$1.35 an hour; for unskilled female labour the rate is 75¢ to \$1.45 per hour, and we know that Brandon is one of the areas that is presently enjoying the benefits of being in a designated area.

The Town of Carberry, which is also in the same designated area. Wage rates - skilled, for male \$1.50 to \$2.00; female - skilled wage rates \$1.00 to \$1.25; semi-skilled male rates are from \$1.25 to \$1.50 per hour; then down to the bottom rates, unskilled male \$1.00 to \$1.25 per hour, unskilled female 70 cents to 75 cents per hour.

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd).....

The Town of Emerson, which is not in a designated area. Skilled male rates, there's only one rate given here; it's \$1.50 per hour. Female skilled rates \$1.10 per hour. Semi-skilled male rates 95 cents and female 90 cents.

The Village of Gilbert Plains. Skilled rate for male, up to \$2.00 per hour; skilled rate for females, up to \$1.60. Unskilled rates for male \$1.00 to \$1.25.

Village of Manitou. Skilled rates up to \$1.75 per hour for men.

City of Portage la Prairie. Skilled rates for men \$1.50 to \$2.00 per hour. I believe that's the same as Brandon. Female from \$1.00 to \$1.50 per hour, and the semi-skilled male rate \$1.25 to \$1.50 per hour, and for female 80 cents to \$1.30 per hour. Now this is a community that is not in the present designated area, and if members would like to take the time to look through this, they'll see that the pattern of wages throughout Manitoba, with some exceptions, with the exception of some of the mining communities like Thompson and Flin Flon where there are higher rates, it will be found on examination that the wage rates throughout rural Manitoba - Winnipeg excepted - there is a similarity of rates and probably not more of a variation than ten or fifteen cents per hour for the same work.

Now, in our area in Portage there has been a concerted effort by the Chamber of Commerce, by the City Council, by the Member of Parliament for Portage-Neepawa, and by myself, to try and have a change brought about in the existing designated area program in Manitoba, and I find it very difficult to believe that this government would stand in the way or impede such efforts, because what difference is there between people of Portage, Carberry, Emerson, Brandon? Their problems are all the same. It's primarily an agricultural province outside of the Winnipeg area. So therefore, every effort should be made to take advantage of the program that Ottawa is putting out, and I feel that this government is failing these people badly when they do not urge upon them the importance, the importance of expanding the program in the west and in Manitoba in particular.

Two weeks ago a delegation from Portage City Council went to Ottawa to try and have this program changed on their own, and I regret to say that their efforts did not meet with much success, but they were told one thing, that if it will be seen that an industry will move out of Portage to take advantage of a grant system 50 or 100 miles down the highway, then they will change the program. They have received this assurance. But what a terrible thing this is going to have to be when we have to wait for an industry to leave Portage, and I have here a letter from an industry that is considering such a move.

The letter is dated January 27, and it is addressed to the Honourable Roger Teillet, Minister of Veterans Affairs, Ottawa, and the letterhead is Northern Equipment Limited, Portage la Prairie, and I quote: "Dear Mr. Teillet: In the near future this company plans on arranging for a new factory building along with some additional production equipment. Our existing building is now much too small and any attempt to add further to it would result in uneconomic production due to lot size, etc. Financing of this new building and equipment is, of course, a matter of great concern to us and we have given considerable thought to relocating away from Portage la Prairie to some community in a designated area. We find it extremely hard to understand why Portage is not in a designated area and Brandon is in such an area. It seems to us that for its size Portage la Prairie sadly lacks industrial development. Any nurturing of an industry in this small city so close to Winnipeg would seem to be in the best interest of the whole province. The writer therefore petitions you to seek the inclusion of Portage la Prairie in a designated area so that this company can expand here without the necessity of having to move 20 or 30 miles down the highway to more effectively improve its production," and so on. And if I may remind the members what this proprietor is thinking of, here's what he's thinking of: the amounts of grants for new industries under this program are as follows: 33-1/3 percent on the first \$250,000. Now I ask members here, can any businessman afford not to examine this pretty closely? The incentive is so large that it pays an industry to pick up and move, and surely management and the industries in Manitoba are going to be eyeing communities not too far away as a possible place to base future expansion. On the next \$750,000 there's a straight 25 percent grant, and then when it becomes \$1 million it drops down to 20 percent grant, so I would ask this government to give consideration to this resolution, and for goodness' sakes, to help these communities, because we can see in the days and months in the year or two ahead that there is going to be some re-shuffling and moving around the province and perhaps even out of the province by some of the industries we already have.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, perhaps I should make some comment before the vote is taken. It seems quite clear that my honourable friend didn't listen to the address that I made on this subject, because I detailed to the House the steps through which the government and my department in particular, and myself in particular, had taken to get that part of Manitoba that is, in fact, included in the designated area program, included. In the program that was first announced it included no areas in Manitoba. It included only one area, if I'm right, in the prairie provinces and possibly in western Canada, and that was one depressed . . . . . area in Alberta. It was completely unsatisfactory and I made one trip East myself on it, and my Deputy Minister and other officials of my department made another, and we made a counter proposal.

We were not successful in getting adopted the entire province but we did get a very large part of it. I see no point in limiting the scope of the amended resolution as it stands on the Order Paper now. We have called on the Federal Government to use all of its tools and means to achieve a policy of balanced regional development in Canada, the Designated Area Program among them, but I went much farther than that and called for the use of whatever implements the Federal Government had at its hand, including the direction of the Armed Forces, the use of transportation as a tool of development, as it had been from the earliest days including the canals and the railways, and all other means that the Federal Government has at its disposal, and I detailed quite a number of them in the address that I made at that time.

So I cannot support this new amendment to the resolution, on the ground that it limits the scope and reduces the scope of the plan, or the use of federal policy and federal means in a policy of balanced regional development. This would tend to limit it. For that reason I see no point in adopting the present further amendment to the resolution, but I do remind my honourable friend, as he chose to repeat his speech on this occasion, I remind him of a few things I said on a former occasion, but I won't go farther now.

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

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

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

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition was called away. If anyone else wishes to speak on the resolution, we would have no objection.

MADAM SPEAKER: Any other member wishing to speak? The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition and my Leader are I imagine both at the same place, so unless anyone else wishes to speak on this, may we let it stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Any member wishing to speak? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Carillon. The Honourable the Member for La Verendrye.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Could we have this matter stand, but if anyone else wishes to speak, we have no objections.

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

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Madam Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Health didn't speak long when he brought in his amendment to this resolution. I will be just as brief in telling the House why we can't support this amendment. Paragraph 4 of the amendment states, "WHEREAS the Government of Manitoba has announced its intention to implement such a program;" Unquote. This statement is simply not true. The second of the four terms set out by the Federal Government for a Medicare Plan is this: coverage. There must be a universal coverage, and I say again, they said there must be a universal coverage. This government has no intention of implementing this section.

I quote the Honourable Minister of Health as reported on Page 1003 of Hansard: "As proposed in Manitoba's recommendations for medical services insurance to the Royal Commission

(MR. HARRIS cont'd). . . . . of Health Services, the province would prefer a plan which depends on voluntary enrollment. We believe a voluntary plan based on an individual exercising his responsibility to maintain his own health and that of his family can be formulated at a cost to the individual within the reach of the majority of all people. For those who could not meet the cost, public assistance with all or part of the cost would be available. Such a plan, which we believe could be successful in covering nearly all of our people, should be eligible for physical assistance and we are negotiating to this end."

**Madam Speaker**, I didn't go to school as long as the Honourable Minister, but I know that "universal" doesn't mean 85 percent or 90 percent or 98 percent, but it means 100 percent. And that is the figure that we want to see, 100 percent. This government, following the lead of Mr. Manning and Mr. Bennett, is attempting to avoid its responsibilities to provide adequate health care for all of the people of this province -- and I say, ALL of the people of this province. This is what we need in this province, is our people to have 100 percent protection and that is what we want. Because this is their aim, the Minister is wrong when he says the government intends to implement a plan in keeping with the Federal Government's statement of principles. The Federal Government principles for a medical scheme are the least we will accept. They should be the least the Liberal Party of Manitoba will accept. Therefore, we oppose the amendment and we fully expect that the Liberals will join with us in opposing it.

**MADAM SPEAKER**: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

**MADAM SPEAKER**: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Arthur, and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. I've had this proposed amendment of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition under consideration and in my opinion it is in order. Any member wishing to proceed may do so.

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

**MR. GUTTORMSON**: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER**: Call in the members. The question before the House, the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

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

**YEAS**: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Patrick, Peters, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak and Wright.

**NAYS**: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

**MR. CLERK**: Yeas, 13; Nays, 32.

**MADAM SPEAKER**: I declare the motion lost. The proposed amendment of the Honourable the Member for Arthur.

**MR. CAMPBELL**: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

**HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour)(Osborne)**: Madam Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I think it is fair to point out to honourable members that there is really little disagreement in this House as to the benefits that technological change have brought about to the community, but there is some disagreement as to how it should be controlled, the degree of rigidity that should be introduced upon the parties that are first bringing in technological change and the individual who has to accept the change.

I think most people agree, Madam Speaker, that the improvements in technology have



(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd).....been an important means of increasing production, of making the better life that we enjoy today. There's no doubt that the technological changes that have taken place in this competitive world have placed us on the North American Continent in a very favoured position, but several honourable members who have taken part in this debate have been concerned with the dislocation that has to occur with technological changes. There's no question about it that the benefits of such change are for the whole community, and that there should be an equitable distribution of these benefits, and the community has the responsibility in helping the individual who is dislocated or subjugated due to the changing conditions with which he is faced.

Now the aim of our government, of course, is to assist the individuals who have been adversely affected by technological change, but before we get into this part of the debate, Madam Speaker, I would like to point out to honourable members that the parties involved themselves through contractual agreements, in many instances, have and will continue to take the necessary steps to ease the impact of technological change.

I would like to cite some examples that exist in contractual agreements to ease the effect of technological change on the workers. These are clauses that exist in contractual agreements. They are clauses that deal specifically with technological change. They make provision for joint consultation and advanced planning in the event of technological change. They make provision for advance notice to the employees in the event of change. There are provisions for severance pay. There is provision for training and retraining. Some contracts have provisions for supplementary unemployment insurance benefits. There are provisions for income guarantees. There are provisions for inter-plant transfers.

It's true that change is occurring at a tremendous rate. I quote here Dr. Dwayne Orton of the I. B. M. He gives his scale of the ages of man and the rate of change. The Stone Age was 500,000 years. The Bronze Age was 50,000 years. The Iron Age was 5,000 years. The Industrial Age is 500 years. The Nuclear Age is 50 years. The Space Age is 5 years. And I suppose we could add to that the Lunar Age in, say, 6 months. So there isn't any question that we are faced with rapid technological change.

But let us look for a few moments at the situation as it exists in Manitoba. And what is the impact of technological change in this province? I suppose, Madam Speaker, that it goes without saying that the greatest impact has been on the agricultural community. The agricultural sector of the economy has noted the greatest technological change within our province of any of the industries. This has meant that there have been changing patterns of employment. People have moved from the rural areas to cities and towns in search of jobs. In the non-agricultural sectors of the economy, technological change has not so far resulted in a very widespread worker displacement; in cases where technological changes have made possible the elimination of certain jobs, that adjustments usually and generally are made without undue hardship to the individual affected. Where lay-offs have occurred, displaced workers have generally had little difficulty in finding alternative employment in the buoyant economic conditions which are existing at the present time.

However, there is no need for excessive concern. Certainly there is no room for complacency either, because the impact of technological change is going to be felt at a greater rate. The community as a whole is going to benefit from these changes, and yet the individual or groups of individuals within the community are going to bear the brunt of the technological change, so that the costs as well as the benefits of technological change must be shared, must be equitably distributed. This, I believe, is where the responsibility of government comes in. We have accepted this responsibility. We are trying, and have played our part in the expansion of job opportunities to make alternative employment available. Certainly there are a wide range of training and retraining facilities that are available to displaced persons who can qualify themselves for other jobs, take advantage of available opportunities.

Labour and management have been coming to grips with some of the problems created by this changing world. Through their co-operative efforts they have been primarily devoted to developing a variety of measures, some of which I have related to you as examples within contractual agreements where they recognize their responsibilities. There is another instrument that is used today which is known as the Manpower Consultative Services of the Federal Government, in which the provincial government shares a part and plays a role with labour and management, and these instruments are used on request in joint application of labour and management in those areas of anticipated change.

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd).....

Madam Speaker, this government for its part is anxious to assist in the early phase of labour-management's attack on the problem. We would like to do this in an atmosphere of voluntary activity. I think it's been suggested in one of the amendments that we introduce some specific rigidities, suggested that these are the way to eliminate or reduce the effect of technological change, and we on this . . . . . House can't agree with that. Our hope is that sufficient progress will be made by labour and management that only moderate forms of legislation will be necessary to cope with technological change.

It is our firm belief that legislative measures should not be introduced before the parties themselves have had reasonable time and opportunity to devise adequate measures by themselves and on their own making, and give them plenty of opportunity, as they have done in other jurisdictions, to cope with the problem. I believe at the present, the efforts of government would be best spent in encouraging both employers and employees and their organizations to continue to consult and co-operate one with another, so that each may play an effective part in developing satisfactory solutions to the problems of automation and technological change.

In this respect, Madam Speaker, it is felt that the employer should accept the responsibility for taking all reasonable measures to minimize the adverse effects of technological change on their employees, and that the costs of such measures should be accepted as a proper charge against the benefits of change. The government feels, on the other hand, that the employees should recognize the necessity for technological change, and should refrain from demanding unreasonably high rewards to excessive safeguards as the price of their acceptance of change. In short, Madam Speaker, co-operation, consultation, and joint action on the part of labour and management are to be necessary if there are going to be adequate solutions to the problems which will result from automation and technological change.

I'd say, Madam Speaker, that the government is not inactive in devising measures to facilitate adjustment to technological change. The recently published report of the Royal Commission on Railway Run-throughs rightly stresses the importance and the effect of government employment and manpower policies and programs in developing conditions which are required so that technological changes can be introduced with a minimum of adverse effects.

The importance of employment and manpower policies has also been stressed by those who have spoken in this House and by most authorities in this field. The government is in agreement with this view and has concentrated its effort in these areas. I would like, Madam Speaker, to review very briefly what the government has done and is doing.

Madam Speaker, in the field of employment, the Government of Manitoba is engaged in a continuous effort to stimulate industrial development and economic growth in the province so that there will be jobs available for those affected by change. The Nelson River development project and the new pulp and paper industrial complex planned for Northern Manitoba are two outstanding examples of recent successful government efforts to stimulate the economy of the province of Manitoba. The thousands of new jobs which will be created as a result of such economic expansion will provide employment opportunities for workers who may be displaced by technological change and for persons leaving the farm in search of jobs in industry, and for our young people coming into the work force.

In the field of manpower development, the government is engaged in continuous efforts to expand and improve educational and training facilities for both young people and adults, and we are expanding and improving the general education system. We're building and operating trade and technical schools. We're operating an apprenticeship program. We're expanding and improving provincial universities, and we have established the basic training for skilled development program and we are participating in an increased number of in-plant training programs in co-operation with industry.

Madam Speaker, we are providing financial assistance of various kinds to more people of all ages who wish to upgrade themselves through further education and training and we propose to establish a Youth and Manpower Agency with the responsibility for co-ordinating manpower policies. Of course, most of the provincial programs are supplemented by federal employment and manpower programs designed to expand again employment opportunities and create an adaptable and mobile and highly skilled work force. It's only recently established consultative service will provide both labour and management the opportunity to sit at the bargaining table, devise ways and means in techniques to lessen the impact of technological change. Yet in all these programs the help that is provided takes place with little social and economic consequence. We are confident that through the joint and co-operative efforts of

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd).....management, labour, agriculture and government, that the benefits of technological change in economic progress can be reaped without undue hardships being imposed on individuals or groups of individuals in our province.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HARRIS: Madam Speaker, if nobody else wishes to speak, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Elmwood, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. PETERS: In the absence of the honourable member, can we have this matter stand, Madam Speaker?

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I think when the Honourable Member from Elmwood proposed this resolution to raise the minimum wage from 85¢ to \$1.50 he would no doubt find much agreement with people in the province that there was a need for an upward revision in the minimum wage. Yet I think when the Member for Assiniboia proposed the amendment he was being more realistic when he suggests the figure of \$1.25 an hour as a minimum wage at this time.

I think the Honourable Member from Elmwood pretty well admits it in his own remarks when he rose to speak in the debate a few weeks ago, and just to quote him I'd like to read from Page 1165 of Hansard, and Mr. Peters says the following: "Madam Speaker, I would like to say a few words on the amendment brought in by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. I would like to say at the offset, Madam Speaker, that when I brought in this resolution I made it \$1.50 an hour hoping the people across the way there would have amended it themselves because they are always amending." So I think perhaps this is one of the rare times when the Honourable Member from Elmwood and myself are in agreement that this is a reasonable compromise, taking into consideration the times and the wage scales in Manitoba.

The Manitoba Federation of Labour brief that I have in my hand here, for the year 1966, has this to say in part on Page 15: "The considered improvement in minimum wage standards, especially the removal of zoning and sex stigmas, was most encouraging. While we note the increase to \$1.00 is the largest gain to date, we are optimistic that your government will follow the lead of federal authorities and bring the increase to \$1.25." I might say that any conversations that I have had with union people, in the main the ones that I have spoken to agree that \$1.25 at this time is fair and reasonable. If it were to be set any higher, it not only would work hardships to many businesses that are operating on a marginal profit, it might even close some of them down and consequently cause unemployment. It would also disrupt some apprentice-training programs that are presently doing well, and I understand there are some union agreements that have this figure even mentioned in them.

So I think for the present time that \$1.25 is a fair and reasonable compromise, and the fact that, as my honourable friend from Assiniboia has suggested, that this should be reviewed -- well it may be reviewed any time but he has it in his amendment that it must be reviewed at least every two years, and I support the amendment.

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

MR. PATRICK: The Yeas and Nays, please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The question before the House, the proposed motion in amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Patrick, Peters, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Froese, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon,

(NAYS cont'd).....McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 13; Nays, 32.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood. Are you ready for the question?

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that the debate be adjourned. I will be closing the debate the next time I speak.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Logan and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare. The Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. PETERS: Unless anyone else wishes to speak, Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed to stand?.....

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface as amended. The Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, could we have this matter stand? However, if anyone else wishes to speak, we have no objection.

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

MRS. CAROLYNE MORRISON (Pembina): When this resolution to lower the voting age was brought forth at this Session, Madam Speaker, I was determined I would keep an open mind on the subject. I didn't want to put myself in that category we think of when we hear the phrase, "Convince a man against his will, he's of the same opinion still."

I recall having spoken against this same resolution at a previous Session, but I was going to put that out of my mind and see if I could learn during debate some logical reason for lowering the voting age to 18 in the year 1966. But Madam Speaker, try as I did, I didn't hear one shred of evidence from any of those who spoke in support of this resolution that would make me believe there was anything to be gained by making such a change. In a democratic country like Canada, the right to vote is a priceless gift of citizenship. The right to vote is one of the most powerful and precious rights that we have. It is the very foundation on which our democracy exists.

In looking at some of the arguments put forth in favour of this resolution, Madam Speaker, I will first consider some of the statements put forth by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. In speaking to his resolution, the Honourable Member for Assiniboia felt it was a coincidence that on the same day as the resolution came on the Order Paper there was an item in the morning press stating that the students of the University of Manitoba had suggested and recommended to the Premier that the Legislature lower the voting age for the next election in Manitoba. I would remind the Honourable Member for Assiniboia that the number of students attending university represents a very small percentage of the young people in our province who belong to the age group which we are concerned with. I would remind the honourable member also, that not all of the young people in this group attending college or university are of the opinion that they should have the voting privilege at 18.

Among other statements, the honourable member for Assiniboia tells us that there are many countries where persons 18 years of age are allowed to vote, namely, many states in the United States as well as the countries of Brazil, Argentina and Israel, to name only a few. However, he doesn't put forth any evidence to show these countries have gained any outstanding advantages by this legislation.

I agree with the Honourable Member for Roblin who expressed the thought that some of the statements made by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia were somewhat extravagant, statements such as the fact that an 18-year-old is able to count down space missiles; fly jets; is considered for military service. I believe at the age of 18 there are young people beginning to train in these various fields, beginning - and I emphasize the word "beginning" - to prepare themselves for the future, be it the army, the navy or the air force. It is only after a period of rigid training during which a young man or a young woman is taught self-discipline, respect for authority, is prepared in many ways to carry out such responsibilities as flying jets, counting down missiles, defending their country, and many other responsibilities which

(MRS. MORRISON cont'd).....are attached to military service. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia named a few other qualifications which he felt should entitle one to voting at the age of 18, but I am not going to discuss them because I feel that they are quite irrelevant.

And now, Madam Speaker, I am going to consider briefly the words of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, and I must say that I was somewhat disappointed in the remarks of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, because generally I feel we get something constructive when he speaks, takes part in debates, but this time I seemed to have some difficulty in finding much or anything that was constructive. He dwelt at some lengths on the fact that he thought this government was a government that supported young people, but because we favoured retaining the voting age at 21 years, he states that perhaps this government isn't so youthful. Perhaps this government is taking the view of the old man who can only see young people as being mischievous. So said the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

I certainly feel this was an irresponsible statement, and I would ask the honourable member, since when does the age of 21 no longer signify youth? It seems to me, Madam Speaker, a person is still young many years past the age of 21. He expresses his view that the ideals of youth are high. He is willing to trust young people. Yes, Madam Speaker, we in the Roblin government have the same belief.

In speaking to this resolution, the Honourable Member for Selkirk, apparently after much thought on the subject, decided he would favour lowering the voting age to 18, but he would withhold the full rights of citizenship until later - I presume until the age of 21. The honourable member feels that this would be a probation period, or an apprenticeship period when, as I understand his thinking, the young people would have a few more years to learn more about the rights of citizenship and the privileges that go with it. It seems to me, Madam Speaker, this is, to use a hackneyed expression, "putting the cart before the horse."

I agree with the Honourable Member for Brandon who stated that voting is a serious matter. I believe the privilege of marking one's ballot is such an outstanding privilege it should come at the end of the probation or training period. A doctor gets his degree after his training the same as an engineer, a nurse or a school teacher. The grand climax comes after the training period, and I believe that to give the voting privilege to our young people before they have had time to become aware of the rights and privileges of full citizenship, would take away from the value, the prestige that the young voter experiences when he or she casts their first vote.

Now, Madam Speaker, I come to the Honourable Member for Emerson and the views he expressed. I will not take much time in considering his philosophy because to me it was very strange logic. In fact, there was no logic at all, because I believe the definition for logic in the dictionary is given as "correct or proper reasoning." In summarizing, as he does, the qualifications that in his opinion are necessary for a voter to have, he lists them as honesty, intelligence, maturity and loyalty to their country, and he states, "I do not think we have a right to point fingers to them and say that you are not honest, you are not intelligent, you are not mature enough, or you are not loyal to your country," and it is his theory that by not allowing our youth to vote at 18 years we are pointing our finger at them, and telling them, "You are not honest; you are not intelligent; you are not mature enough; or you are not loyal to your country." Madam Speaker, I never heard of such illogical reasoning, and I don't think his opinions are worth any further comment.

Now, Madam Speaker, I want to say that I have given this resolution a great deal of consideration, and in so doing I have made a point of engaging in casual conversation with many young people who have not yet cast a ballot. I cannot speak too highly of these young people. They were absolutely delightful, charming and intelligent. They were a joy to talk with. Some were training for the nursing profession. Some were working in banks. They were from many walks in life. But, strange as it may seem, there wasn't one of these young people who felt they were being discriminated against or being deprived of any rightful privilege by not having a right to vote at 18. In fact, they said at 18 years of age they had too many other things to think about without trying to decide who they should vote for. I recall asking one mother if she thought the voting age should be lowered to 18, and she replied, "My goodness, at 18 they are only a wee bit past 17. Why are they trying to push our young people so much?"

Now, in conclusion, Madam Speaker, I do realize there are young people who are ready to cast their ballots at the age of 18, but I believe they are very much in the minority. There are many young people who can gain much by that period of years between 18 and 21 when they

(MRS. MORRISON cont'd). . . . . are preparing themselves for the future, when they have time to give more thought to the political part of life. We have to have a line, and I still firmly believe that holding the line to 21 years of age is all to the good; it is a very satisfactory level. And for those people who fear for our democracy, I would say to them, Madam Speaker, I believe we have enough interested and intelligent voters in Manitoba and in Canada that our democratic form of government will be with us for a long time to come. Madam Speaker, I will oppose this resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I will close the debate.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia is closing the debate.

. . . . .continued on next page.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity now to thank all the members who have participated in this debate. I know that it doesn't matter what side they have spoken on this resolution, I have listened to all of them and I'm sure that they have all made good contributions on this resolution. But I was somewhat disappointed when I listened to the Honourable Member for Roblin. He seemed to have picked on the last three or four words that I mentioned when I spoke on it, or introduced the resolution, and that's what he based his whole debate on, because as a matter of fact he said my arguments were quite frivolous. I would like to tell the House that he did not introduce anything new in his arguments against this resolution, so I would also like to say that his contribution to this debate was somewhat frivolous too.

Madam Speaker, I was somewhat disappointed too that the honourable members that did speak on it did not mention that five provinces in Manitoba now did lower the voting age, and I also mention that in 1911, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, an 18 year old had an education equivalent to Grade 7, and today an 18 year old has an education equivalent to a little more than a Grade 11 and I think this is in itself quite a significant thing because I was trying to stress when I did introduce the resolution that the young people today have much more education than they did years ago and are much more prepared to make their decisions on a candidate or on certain government fiscal policies.

I also mention about the study that was made and carried out in eastern Canada where there has been samples taken in a voting booth I believe of younger people and of those that are over 21 and there were no significant differences in answers from these people. So it showed quite clearly that 18 year olds that were voting at that time seemed to be quite well informed on the fiscal policies of the government or on their candidates. I thought that this was worthy of mention and it's unfortunate nobody has said anything about it. Now is it not true also that the federal, I believe, Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations had unanimously supported - this committee consisting of all parties supported that the voting age be reduced and I believe the Conservative Party federally are favouring that the voting age be reduced. This is quite different from the Conservative Party here in Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, this is just a few points that I wanted to raise at this time and I do want to thank all the members that have taken part in the debate.

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

MR. PATRICK: The yeas and nays, please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Cherniack, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Patrick, Peters, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Wright.

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas 14; Nays 31.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Lakeside. The Honourable the Member for Burrows.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, I wish to add my support in the request to have the Provincial Government request the Government of Canada to adopt the metric system in Canada. This is a very important step which will effect the entire economy of Canada. We see that the British Government or the United Kingdom has seen fit to start in transforming their present system into the metric system. Why is it so important to Canada?

Madam Speaker, one of the outstanding contributions that the Canadians have made in the field of consulting and designing engineering has been in the pulp and paper plant construction. Today we see Canadians constructing pulp plants in countries such as Portugal, the northern parts of Russia, in countries like Romania and in Brazil. Now these consulting firms have to work in the metric system and it is very frustrating when you have to transpose from inches to centimeters and meters. The planning and engineering of flow sheets and the ultimate construction of processing plants in other countries are based on the metric system and we in Canada who are enjoying a high level of consulting engineering in foreign countries are at a disadvantage. At a disadvantage because when you visit these countries it is completely based on the metric system. These countries are not accustomed to our method of measurement and when you visit with them and when you discuss the possibility of a feasibility report the Canadian firms have

(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd)... lost out to Japanese and German firms simply because we were not completely conversant with the metric system.

You take the matter of water and power. Much goes into the construction of a power dam in terms of turbines, pipes and various other materials all of which are expressed in foreign countries - or foreign countries as we know them - in terms of the metric system. In the matter of design and planning you are constantly faced with having to transpose our method of measurement into the metric system. This Madam Speaker, involves a great deal of work. It involves doubly as much work to have to check the plans and make sure that no errors have been committed in the transformation of our system into the metric system. And strange as it is you'll never get to express an inch in terms of the metric system unless you extend it to the third and fourth decimal place. In other words it will never equal a unit; it will never equal a whole number. You take for instance they will speak of a vessel that might be two metres wide. Now you transpose two metres and it comes out to so many feet, so many inches to the third or fourth decimal place, and this is a very confusing way of having to carry figures up to the third and fourth decimal place in reference to construction and planning.

The possibilities of Canadian consultants and subsequent supply of plants and mechanical know-who into countries like Turkey, Africa, and Europe, are practically unlimited. More recently when the United States Government undertook the study of what was known as the Aid Program, the United States found out that for the next 20 years half the United States economy can be given over to aid in the various countries in Africa and Europe and they would still end up at the end of that 20 year period requiring still additional economic development. This gives our Canadian technical and engineering know-how an unlimited possibility of exporting the program of engineering and the construction of plants in these countries. It would mean an unprecedented type of fabrication in our plants in Canada. We have the manpower, we have the material and we have the technical know-how; but, Madam Speaker, many of these projects are lost to Canadians simply based on the metric system. And this is very strange but when you sit down with the corresponding people from these other countries and after you have engaged them in a conversation for two or three hours, their type of thinking is different to ours and it is most difficult to have a proper understanding in your initial contact with your prospective buyers when they're thinking is based on the metric system and you have to automatically in your own mind transform and think in terms of feet and inches in order to get some idea of the scope of the project that's being discussed.

Madam Speaker, we also have in the world today matters of the metric ton, the long ton and the short ton. Now I fully believe that if we were to convert to a standard metric ton this would benefit a lot of the exporters in Canada. You'll receive a letter in the mail and somebody will be asking a quotation based on metric ton or somebody might be inquiring for a product based on the metric ton, and when you give thought to the fact that most of our packages are being packaged either in 50 or 100 pound bags and in order to export in metric tons you have to package something like 112 pounds per bag in order to have the same number of bags equal a metric ton as against a 100 pound bag equalling a short ton. This is most confusing, because invariably if you're quoting on a foreign export they'll come back at you and say are you quoting in metric tons or short tons and this makes a big difference in terms of being able to sell into the foreign market.

You take the matter of replacements, Madam Speaker. You take the matter of specialty equipment in the export field. You're always working against the misunderstanding and the possibility that they have ordered the replacements for their equipment in terms of metric requirements based on centimeters and millimeters and we in Canada are working in terms of inches. This is one of the reasons why we in Canada are not able to take advantage and supply the necessary spare parts for farm equipment that is being used by countries such as Morocco or Tunisia to just mention a few. You will notice that in many instances a plant will order parts and these parts will come specified to our system in terms of inches and the importer in the country that was ordering these parts felt that he had it quite clearly understood in his mind that they were going to be in centimeters and millimeters, and you have this whole shipment that is completely worthless. Now, Madam Speaker, one such experience is enough to kill 50 or 100 such trades, possible trades, in these various countries. And this misunderstanding exists day after day, week after week; it is not as if it's something that happens once in a while. It is more so today because we are having more Canadians coming into the export market who have not had previous experience in the exporting field, and therefore it is for this reason that there is a bigger possibility of misunderstanding and leaving a rather bad image of Canadian exports to these foreign countries.



(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd) . . .

Massey Ferguson, more recently into Pakistan, this big organization makes its spare parts available from places like the United Kingdom simply because it doesn't want to run the risk of ordering the spare parts in terms of our Canadian measurement and must have them in the metric system and they know they can have them in the metric system from other countries. So this does place Canada at a disadvantage.

You take in the study and discussion of any type of commodity that you care to mention. Take for instance the matter of the World Fertilizer Review and it speaks of the consumption of fertilizer in terms of metric tons, in terms of so many kilos per bag, and yet if you're interested in the export field you have to refer to a handbook and take out your pencil or slide rule and make a calculation to figure out how many short tons equal a metric ton.

You will find the same condition exists, Madam Speaker, in terms of dies and tools that are required by some of these countries that make their own spare parts; and here again you run the same risk. You will have these countries requiring to make their own nuts and bolts if you want to give it the terminology and they require dies and tools in the metric system. Now when this order comes into Canada the supplier is faced with two decisions; (1) his production line is set up based on our system of inches. He has to modify it and change it in order to accommodate the fabrication of a die in the metric system and unless he has sufficient requests for these dies in the metric system he will turn the order away. It is the small export order that is likely to be a very large one tomorrow, because the European and Asiatic trend of thinking in terms of trading with the western world is rather unusual. They may have placed a small order in order to get to know the western exporter somewhat better and also to see the type of work and the quality of his work that he is prepared to export to the country that desires to have this export purchased, and because the initial small order has not been properly attended to subsequent orders that might materialize from the supplying of a simple order of dies will mean no additional orders to our Canadian suppliers.

Madam Speaker, I could go on and on in reference to these things. Another matter is the replacement of spare cylinders and parts in reference to the tractors, farm tractors in particular. Many a time the foreign purchaser is talking in terms of millimeters clearance in the cylinder construction wall of the engine and we in Canada interpret it to mean in terms of a thousandth of an inch, and you will find that time and time again we supply a cylinder to a foreign country which is based on our system and when delivered to the country that imports this product they find that the clearance in these systems is not proper and therefore you have a dissatisfied customer and naturally you will not have any more export business. And it is these matters that are continually cropping up.

There was a recent write-up in connection with the development of oil in one of the eastern countries where a large supply of drill rods were flown in at a high cost to a job site to only find that the thread on these drill stems were based on our inch setup, and they felt that they were based on the metric system because the initial drill stems had been manufactured and came from Germany. And all that happened, Madam Speaker, somebody ordered the drill stems but somebody forgot to find out whether it was in the metric system or whether it was in our own standard Canadian or standard American system, with the result that this meant of course creating new adaptors at a high cost, high delay and everything else, and I'm quite sure that next time they order drill stems, I think that they will order them from Germany at a higher cost but knowing full well that there will be no delay on the job site.

Madam Speaker, it is most difficult to work in terms of feet and yards. In the metric system you have the multiple of 10 or 100 and it is a lot more convenient to work in terms of engineering, planning, flow sheets and design of equipment and I think that we in Canada, a country of some 20 million people surely should give some very serious thought to converting to the metric system when we have literally hundreds of millions of people in Europe, Asia and Africa who are going to be potential buyers of the product that we will make in Canada and who are using the metric system, and who will continue to use the metric system, and I urge that this government should recommend, and that's all that's being requested, recommend, to the Government of Canada to endorse the principle of adopting the metric system in Canada and it can be phased out and carried out over a period of years. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, in previous years I've spoken against this resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, and did so on the grounds that any such change completely through the industry would be a tremendously expensive change to make, because it would entail changing of the standards of measurement which are used largely

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd)... on this continent and this can be very expensive. I think members would realize that industry's working to as close as one or two ten thousandths of an inch in changing over to a different system and actually ending up with a product of a different size expressed in the metric system, this means a very costly change.

However, since the honourable member has pointed out that whereas all Canadians recognize the advantage of United Kingdom, United States and Canada working closely together in economic and social matters, and so on, one must realize that the longer any of these types of changes take to be put into effect or supported then certainly still more the expense of the change grows. And since too, the decision really will be made at the national federal levels of government and this resolution as I take it is simply an expression of a thought that there would certainly be no resistance to such a change, then probably this House might be well advised to go on record supporting the honourable member's resolution.

If one were looking for complete standardization and replaceability of parts we could start within many of our own industries, because it's - I suppose all members realize the difficulty at times of, for instance trying to get repairs for plumbing fixtures. Manufacturers seem to take a great delight in making them a little bit different or with a different thread or a different size so that you can't replace that particular item with anything but their own manufacture.

I think there are many many ways in which, within this country itself, we could work or recommend greater standardization. However, this doesn't detract and I suppose this is the place where the politician rises and says "after due consideration of all the factors involved" - and I may say that after this consideration I think that in the light of all things and in view of the fact that costs will become progressively far greater and no doubt the change if made will be only made upon the recommendation of the manufacturers of the tool industry which probably has the greatest amount of cost at stake, and at the proper levels, then certainly this House in my opinion could record its at least non-opposition to such a change, Madam Speaker. So I will be changing my stand this year and supporting the resolution of the Honourable Member for Lake side.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Those in...

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker if no one else is wanting to speak I would simply say in closing the debate that I appreciate very greatly the fact that the Honourable Member for Brandon has taken the stand that he has. I hope that his enlightened point of view has rubbed off on some of his colleagues as well but only time will tell about that.

I certainly appreciate too the remarks the Honourable Member for Burrows because he is a man who has experience in this field and can speak from that practical experience as to just the type of difficulties that many of our manufacturers encounter. I have always looked at these questions primarily I suppose from the point of view of the farmer because that's the area in which I am best acquainted, and it seems to me that as we are wishing both from the point of view of our own economical advantage and from the practical political and humanitarian point of view to supply the needs of the ever-growing populations of other countries with basic food materials, that we simply are being unbelievably shortsighted if we do not recognize the fact that we should pay a lot of attention to the type of weights and measure system that those importers use; and now that the United Kingdom in particular - not the biggest of our wheat importers these times it's true but our steadiest importer through the years - now that it has decided that it's going to adopt the metric system I think we have an added reason for once again taking a careful look at our policy in this matter. But I still would certainly not recommend, Madam Speaker, that we should move without the closest co-operation and discussion with the great neighbour to the South, because certainly we're very closely tied up with that country's economy and policies as well and I think that we should move together rather than separately.

And I do realize as the Honourable Member for Brandon emphasized quite properly again this year, I do realize the tremendous job that industry faces in making the change-over. But the change-over will come, Madam Speaker, I'm certain that it will come. We like to think that in a lot of ways we're more advanced than some of the European and Asiatic, African countries. We don't like perhaps to admit that we're behind them on certain things, but regardless of which one of us is right the great predominance of the population of the world have already adopted the metric system. It is almost beyond the realm of possibility I would say that they would change to our system. The main reason I think is because their system is better. It just definitely is better. The only reason for us taking so long to do this is because of the costs involved and the difficulties and the inconvenience and those certainly are important. But in the end

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd)... it will be done. No question about it. And I hope that the views of my honourable friend from Brandon expresses is one that will commend itself to the other members of the House so that we can send, on this occasion, from the Province of Manitoba a recommendation to the federal government that they pursue with diligence as they have already started to do discussions with the United States so that some further progress can be made in this regard.

I appreciate the remarks of both the Honourable Member for Burrows, the Honourable Member for Brandon. I once again felt it to be worthwhile in the public interest to bring this matter before the House and I commend the adoption of the resolution to all the Honourable Members.

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

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

MR. PATRICK: In his absence may we have this matter stand, Madam Speaker?

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

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Carillon, that the resolution be amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "That construction be started in 1966".

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak on this I would like to adjourn it. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Emerson. The Honourable the Member for La Verendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, as is often said in this House, I really did not intend to speak on this subject. It is a rather self-explanatory resolution as it says: "therefore be it resolved that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of co-operating with the Government of Canada and the news media in providing detailed local and regional daily and long-range weather information primarily for the benefit of agriculture".

I thought my honourable colleagues from Emerson and Carillon had made a very good presentation. However, after I heard the four speeches consecutively after the introduction of the resolution I thought I would make my small contribution. I really don't think that our resolution was taken in its right context because as far as I am concerned it is a rather constructive resolution and I do not see the logic in the attitude that some of the members have taken on this resolution.

The Honourable Member from Brandon made I think a very good presentation as he usually does and as he sure did again this afternoon and he thinks that it should be left to private enterprise. Well the only disagreement I have there is that I don't think the resolution really . . .

MR. LISSAMAN: On a point of privilege, I don't think I intended to leave the impression that it be left to the private enterprise. I said there were various government federal departments engaged in this and the service was being well provided for.

MR. VIELFAURE: Yes, Madam Speaker, this is certainly what he said, however, what I meant to say I don't think our resolution asks for private enterprise to take it over, it's just co-operation with the federal government to provide the information to the people involved in agriculture.

The Member from Springfield seems to think that we should not - how should I say - bore the farmer anymore when the weather is not nice and tell him that it's going to last any longer. Well I certainly don't think that we can legislate the weather, however, I think it is important that the information be given to the farmer be it good or bad inasmuch as it is possible.

One very important suggestion I think was made by the Honourable Member from Rhineland when he said that the Country Guide for example is paying \$500 a week - an issue I should say - a month to publish weather forecasts in its paper and certainly people with that kind of a publication would not keep on paying \$500 if it wasn't read.

The Honourable Member from Souris-Lansdowne gave us some very good information in saying that we'd better watch the weather in June and put on our white shirt because we'd be

(MR. VIELFAURE cont'd)... campaigning. So it looks as if we might be campaigning in June and I'm sure that this will happen - if it is the intention of the government it will happen whether the weather is good or bad.

However, with a little more seriousness I really think that this is a good resolution and I'm sure the members will agree that we should do all we can to provide the information in a more detailed way and in a more regional way. I think it is important that forecasting be done in a more regional way that it's not simply for the province at once, it could be more detailed. And certainly as was mentioned for example by the Member for Brandon with the modern developments in science we are getting closer to more exact weather forecasting and the resolution only asks for the co-operation with the news media and the Government of Canada and I cannot see why we should not support this resolution. Times are changing, science is progressing, and certainly every year brings us closer to more exact forecasting. For example a few years ago I think talking about sending a man to the moon one would have been called crazy; however, right now I think it's not too far away where somebody will be going there, and developments of this kind certainly bring us closer to being able to forecast the weather.

So therefore, Madam Speaker, I say again that I think there is a lot of logic and a lot of constructive suggestion in this resolution that the Government of Manitoba co-operate with the Federal Government and the news media in providing regional, daily and long-range weather information.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, if nobody desires to speak I'll be closing the debate.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson is closing the debate.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I wish to thank all the different members of the House for participating in this debate, and whether they agree with me or disagree with me that's the members privilege and I don't hold it too strongly against them. I'm sorry that I was obliged to miss the most important part the day of the debate. I think there were four debates on that. It happened on a day I had to be out of this Legislature in our flood pestilent area. I'm very sorry that I missed that. But I have had time to read the debates in Hansard and I would like to comment on some of these debates, I know the Honourable Member for Springfield, Brandon, Souris-Lansdowne and the Honourable Member for Rhineland and just now the member who spoke.

I myself just cannot see how any member and especially a rural member could oppose a resolution such as this, but if there was any valid grounds to oppose a resolution like this, I cannot see how three of the members could simply get up and not constructively debate this resolution but ridicule it. I don't think that this resolution is a subject for ridicule. It's incredible. It's unbelievable that any of the members should try and ridicule this. I would like to mention something about what the three members, the Conservative members have said in this debate a few days ago. As I said before they were just ridiculing the resolution. Why? Probably because it didn't come from the government side. I know that deep down in their hearts they believe that the resolution is a good one, because it will help very many people in the Province of Manitoba. As the honourable member who has just spoken, maybe our weather forecasts are not absolutely correct but we are not standing still, we're improving them. In the Federal Government and all levels of government studies are being made and those are being improved, and we should get ready for the time, if it isn't the time yet when these weather forecasts will do immense good to the people of the Province of Manitoba.

Now the Honourable Member for Brandon worries about the cost, the cost that this would involve, but if the honourable member would have listened to what I said, I did not think that the cost involved would be very great, it would be very very little; because I suggested that the extension service, the existing extension service could probably forward this to our existing news media who are doing a good job now; but they're not creating these forecasts themselves, they're not writing, they just pass the information that they receive from other proper authorities, people who know more about it, and I'm not complaining to the news media. So we'll still have the existing news media, the radio, the television, they will be able to forward this information for the good of the people of Manitoba, and I'm sure that they would do it as they are doing it now without any cost to the people of the Province of Manitoba. The cost involved, if there would be any cost as far as the extension service is concerned would be very very minimum. We've got other things, we've got bills before us which provide for appointment of new board members to our utilities. I am sure that this would cost much much less the cost involved here than paying for one of the board members that the present government is trying to name now.

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd)...

Now we'll go to the Honourable the Member from Souris-Lansdowne. Reading his debate, I don't think there is anything concrete to sink one's teeth in, simply tries very very hard to ridicule the resolution. Why, I do not know, because I am sure that the people in his area, the people that he represents, whom he represents, would be very happy to get this information if it was coming to them. He seems to be concerned that probably if the present government agreed to this resolution, then the present government may be blamed for some adverse weather. We've got a very good example here where some of the members are more concerned about the welfare of the Party they represent than the welfare of the people that they represent, because in one of his speeches, in his speech, he says something like that, and I'll read some of it. He seems to be in doubt, he doesn't seem to understand the resolution, and I'll quote from Hansard. "Well, I think most of us know, and I think it's the Federal Government that do forecast the weather right now, and if I'm not mistaken I think it's the Department of Transport, isn't it? I'm just not aware. Well, I don't know. Changing it to the province I don't think that's going to help matters very much." He doesn't seem to be too sure of what he knows at this time, and I'm sure that the people that he represents would certainly like to have this little service extended to them. I don't think that it was a subject for ridicule.

Now the Member for Springfield also ridicules and he ridicules his own constituents. I'll come to that later. Quite a number of his own constituents he ridicules, the majority of them, and I'll explain that as I go on; as also did the Member from Souris-Lansdowne. He ridiculed his own constituents because they asked for it. The argument that this member is putting forth seems to be completely unrealistic on that. The member talked about some, I don't know how to call it, some mania probably throwing out, or probably would throw out the radio through the window of his home or through the window of his car, and so on. No one but a person who's not right in his mind would blame the radio for adverse weather conditions and so on; throwing out the radio through the window seems to me very very childish. He talks about the government trying to solve the weather conditions. The resolution doesn't ask for the government to try to solve weather conditions. No. It's just to help the existing facilities and give them instruction at certain hours and so on.

The Honourable Member for Springfield also mentions something about very frequent radio forecasts or television forecasts being made and he says repeats himself there, maybe every half hour, one hour and so on. I think that in my speech I suggested at least three, that three broadcasts be made, and again I will repeat this, I don't think that this was a subject for ridicule at the time. And the resolution does not ask for the solution that this government solve it. It simply asks for the findings that are being found, are being processed, to be passed on through the proper media to the people of Manitoba.

And then again he mentions me as saying that they have a system like this somewhere else in Illinois - Illinois. I wish the member would wake up because I didn't even mention Illinois. I did mention North Dakota. I did mention Saskatchewan. Both of them provide these services, but Illinois - if he reads the Hansard he'll find there is no Illinois mentioned. Where did he get that? I do not know. To me it seems he was trying very hard to ridicule. But talking about Saskatchewan and North Dakota. Since I spoke last I have also learned that Alberta is providing this service. Alberta is providing this service to the people of Alberta. I mentioned before that Saskatchewan is doing it, has been doing it, and North Dakota is doing it. So what do we have? Of all the prairie provinces in Canada, the three prairie provinces, Manitoba alone isn't doing it. The others are doing it. So again it's a very very good example of Manitoba lagging, lagging behind other provinces; and Manitoba is lagging because this is very important.

Now the three Conservative members who ridiculed this resolution I said before were ridiculing their own constituents; the majority of the people asked for this resolution. And I have a good reason for saying that, because as the members know there is a farm organization now called the Farm Bureau, and most of the members if they heard the brief that the Farm Bureau presented to the Provincial Government and also the opposition parties, they will remember that this resolution was called for by the Farm Bureau, and at that time I think one of the Ministers made this statement -- I think I was told it was the Minister of Industry and Commerce -- he made this statement when this was brought forth by the Farm Bureau, that in his opinion it would be a very worthwhile resolution. He thought that it would not only help the farm people but it would also help the tourist trade and industry immensely. So at that time the Minister agreed but the members of the same party do not agree now.

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd)...

Now who is represented in the Farm Bureau? Again I go back to ridiculing his own constituents, and here are the commodity group who are represented by the Farm Bureau. The Manitoba Seed Growers Association, they asked for this resolution unanimously through the Farm Bureau. Winnipeg District Milk Board Producers, or milk producers asked for this because they're members of the Farm Bureau. The UGG, United Grain Growers asked for it; the Manitoba Pool Elevators asked for it; Manitoba Beet Growers Association; Hog Producers Association of Manitoba; Vegetable Growers Association; Manitoba Hatchery Association; Manitoba Turkey Association; Manitoba Women's Institute and Canadian Co-op Implements - all these commodity groups are members of the Farm Bureau and they've all asked for it. And as late as April 4th, 1966 the Manitoba Farm Bureau had its annual meeting, and again even after this resolution was introduced, a similar resolution was passed unanimously by the Farm Bureau. So why ridicule the resolution. I think the resolution is a very very good one and I hope, I hope that members have a change of heart, the members of the Legislature, and support this resolution. It's not going to cost very much money, very little money. It will not be an added tax burden to the people of Manitoba, but the amount of good that this resolution if passed, or this forecast given to the farmers would do an immense, immensely much more good than the cost that would be involved.

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

MR. TANCHAK: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before the House, the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Emerson.

A standing vote was taken the result being as follows:

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

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 17; Nays 26.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Morris.

MR. LISSAMAN: Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member, I wonder if this matter could stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, WHEREAS the Government of Manitoba has established, by Order-in-Council, a judicial enquiry headed by Mr. Justice Dickson, known as the Totogan Farms Enquiry Commission, with instructions to "... investigate the circumstances surrounding the acquisition by the Crown of the property described..." in the Order-in-Council as belong to Totogan Farms Ltd., and

WHEREAS this action by the Government is taken under the provisions of subsection (1), Section 80 of the Manitoba Evidence Act, which provides in part as follows:

"80 (1) The Lieutenant-Government-in-Council, where he deems it expedient to cause inquiry to be made into and concerning any matter within the jurisdiction of the Legislature and connected with or affecting...

(f) any matter, which, in his opinion is of sufficient public importance to justify an inquiry, " and

WHEREAS other land expropriations and land purchases made by the Government of Manitoba qualify equally, if not more, as being "of sufficient public importance to justify an inquiry, " and

WHEREAS in the case of lands and chattels known as the Bain Estate purchased by the Manitoba Government from Octave Enterprises Ltd. in the vicinity of Portage la Prairie and Grosse Isle, it has been shown in this House that

1) on February 17, 1964, transfers of the land and chattels were made from the Bain Estate to Octave Enterprises Ltd., of 3 parcels of land at an option value of about \$102,500;

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd)...

2) on March 9, 1964, (about 3 weeks later) two of these parcels were sold to the Manitoba Government by Octave Enterprises Ltd. for about \$170,000, and

3) the third parcel was sold to the Manitoba Government by Octave Enterprises Ltd. on October 14, 1964 (about 8 months later) for \$75,000;

4) this shows a net gain on this transaction of the three parcels, of about \$142,500 on an original cost of \$102,500 for a percentage gain of 140% in a period of about 8 months.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba extend the jurisdiction of Mr. Justice Dickson's judicial enquiry to include an investigation into all aspects of the negotiations and purchase by the Government of Manitoba of the lands and chattels from the Octave Enterprises Ltd., and/or the Bain Estate and/or anyone acting on their behalf with a view to ascertaining all of the facts and circumstances in any way relating to the acquisition of such lands and chattels by Octave Enterprises Ltd. and their subsequent purchase by the Government of Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, on the matter of calling of inquiries, it is normal perhaps for governments to be the only ones who may ask and institute inquiries. I believe when there is sufficient interest shown by the people of the province, that the government has a moral obligation to call an inquiry. It is all very well to say that the Cabinet make the decisions, but when there are enough people and enough interest brought to bear, this action should be followed, and in the case that we are talking about, in the matter of the Totogan Farms Inquiry, I am not aware that there was that much pressure on the government, or that much action called for. This was a decision taken by the Cabinet for their own particular reasons.

Now, in dealing with my resolution where I ask that the terms of the inquiry be enlarged, I think it would be fair to say that there have been questions asked the length and breadth of Manitoba about the transaction known as the "Bain Estate Deal." I'm sure that members of the Government have received letters from taxpayers asking, shall we say, awkward questions, but asking them. I know I've had many letters and I'm sure that members of the Cabinet have had conversations and phone calls from people who have asked about this matter. I know we on this side of the House have had many enquiries, many enquiries indeed both by phone, by mail, and by conversation. The newspapers of our province at the time that the Bain Estate was being discussed last year asked many questions that never received an answer. So, Madam Speaker, I suggest that there is enough interest, enough public demand, that the terms of the resolution be complied with.

I have here a letter which is a copy to me - the original went to the First Minister of the Province - and I'd like to read it: "To the Honourable Duff Roblin, Legislative Buildings, Winnipeg 1, Manitoba. Dear Mr. Premier: The Provincial Government's announcement that a judicial enquiry into methods of expropriating land for the proposed Portage Diversion project is of interest to me as a property owner on the Portage Plains and a taxpayer of Manitoba. However, I am puzzled as to why the terms of reference are so narrow. Assuming that only four parcels of land north of No. 1 Highway have been expropriated to date, as stated in the Free Press on February 18, 1966, that no hearings have been held by the Land Value Appraisal Commission in regard thereto, and that no settlements have been reached, I fail to see what the Totogan Farms Commission can determine at this time insofar as Totogan Farms Limited and its shareholders are concerned. However, if public funds are to be spent to satisfy the taxpayers as to the fairness of all aspects of this undertaking, I would like to suggest that it be considered in the public interest to broaden the terms of reference so as to include the following:

"(1) Inquiry into the acquisition of lands purchased by Octave Enterprises Ltd., after announcement of the location of the proposed Diversion route, and resold within a short time to the Province of Manitoba. There has been controversy and dissatisfaction over this. In particular, information should be provided for the taxpayers in regard to how it was possible for a short-term investment to reap such a large profit, the amount of which could readily have been determined by a search at the Land Titles Office before the transactions were completed by the Province; and why expropriation was not employed here. Are there grounds here for proceeding under The Unconscionable Transactions Act? The Estate Tax Act? Or The Gift Tax Act?

"(2) Inquiry into the tactics and methods used by the agents of the Province in negotiating and attempting to negotiate for the land acquired for the Portage Diversion without resort

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd)... to expropriation, and the prices paid, including individual analyses of the computations used in calculating the compensation payable to each of the property owners involved.

"(3) Inquiry as to whether an alternative route could have been selected for the channel so as to involve land less valuable for agricultural purposes, and to avoid the necessity of acquiring land from a former member of the Provincial Cabinet, or from a bidder on various provincial construction contracts and several members of his family, and from Octave Enterprises Limited.

"Your comments on the above will be awaited with interest."

Madam Speaker, insofar as I know, the writer of the letter still has not had an answer from the Premier in that regard.

Not only are private citizens, taxpayers and newspapers asking questions about this transaction, but some of the heirs, as I recall, at the time were very disappointed that the Government took the action that they did, and through legal action tried to stop the proceedings, and we know that this did not prevail upon the Government. The Government pressed ahead and carried out the transaction as it stands today.

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member will note that it is now 5:30.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you Madam Speaker, if I may be able to continue at the next Private Members...

MADAM SPEAKER: I beg your pardon?

MR. JOHNSTON: Will I be able to continue at the next Private Members sitting?

MADAM SPEAKER: Not at 8:00 o'clock. Not at 8:00 o'clock. Next Private Members... It is now 5:30 and I leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.