

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, March 23rd, 1965

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

MR. CLERK: The Petition of the Reverend Jacob F. Pauls and Others, praying for the passing of An Act to incorporate The Bergthaler Mennonite Church of Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

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

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg me to present the following as their second Report. Your committee has considered Bills: No. 6, An Act to amend The Department of Industry and Commerce Act; No. 12, An Act to amend The Arbitration Act; No. 13, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act; No. 15, An Act to amend The Animal Husbandry Act; No. 17, An Act to amend The Mines and Natural Resources Department Act; No. 18, An Act to amend The Coat of Arms, Floral Emblem and Tartan Act; No. 23, An Act to amend The Education Department Act; No. 24, An Act to amend The County Courts Act; No. 25, An Act to amend The County Court Judges' Criminal Courts Act; No. 26, An Act to amend The Jury Act; No. 53, An Act to amend The Small Debts Recovery Act; No. 54, An Act to amend The Insurance Act; No. 57, An Act to amend The Public Libraries Act; No. 61, An Act to amend The Health Services Act; No. 64, An Act to amend The Civil Service Act; and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered Bill No. 43, An Act respecting the Care and Treatment of Mentally Disordered Persons and the Custody and Control of their Estates, and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I beg to 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 61 Grade 8 students from Windsor School under the direction of their teachers, Mrs. Cummer and Mrs. Novak. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for St. Vital. There are also 60 Grade 11 students from River East Collegiate under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Stinson and Miss Toews. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Kildonan. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, if I may make a correction, River East School Division spills over to that good constituency of Brokenhead which happens to be represented by one of my colleagues, Mr. Schreyer.

MADAM SPEAKER: Thank you. Orders of the Day.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I don't know who to direct the question to since the First Minister is not in his seat, but when can we expect the report of the committee that sat on the matter of the denturists?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, that will be coming forward soon.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to lay on the table of the House the Return to an Order of the House No. 14, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, before you go into Orders for Return I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the First Minister, the Provincial Treasurer. I know he's just now entering the Chamber. I regret very much that he wasn't available for me to give him notice but I would ask him -- I have observed that the regulations pertaining to the Tobacco Tax have been changed. My question to my honourable friend is: Have the regulations respecting the collection of the Tobacco Tax been changed because the First Minister is convinced that

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . . there is evasions in the collection of this tax at the present time?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, I don't think I have anything to add to the statement I made at the Estimates when we discussed this item, but I do know that the people in the department feel that it would be wise to be more specific in the regulations and that's what's being done now.

MR. PAULLEY: May I ask a supplemental question then to my honourable friend? Am I to gather then that the regulation was changed as the result of mention of the situation in the House and also that some representation was made, if not to my honourable friend, to the department respecting evasion of the tax?

MR. ROBLIN: Again, I'm not aware of any, Madam Speaker.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I notice the Minister of Agriculture is not in his seat but maybe the Minister of Public Works could answer this. I have asked on past occasions whether we could obtain maps or a list of those roads and waterways that have been taken over by the government. I know that municipalities have been getting this information and I would like to get this if at all possible.

MR. WEIR: Madam Speaker, general maps are being prepared as far as the roads are concerned and I will have them available in due course. I'm not in a position to answer for the Minister of Agriculture. I don't know how he stands as far as waterways are concerned.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Has he or the government appointed a Chairman of the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board as yet? It's a month ago that we asked -- or that the question was asked on this subject.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): The answer is still "no."

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Could I ask the Honourable the Attorney-General, Madam Speaker, when he is going to share with the members of the Legislative Assembly, and through them to another wide public, the information that he has already given on TV a few evenings ago regarding an Ombudsman?

MR. McLEAN: I wasn't aware that I gave very much information.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, the honourable gentleman is unusually modest. I thought it was most interesting and I wondered why it would be given first on TV rather than in the House? Are we to take it that some legislation dealing with that matter is imminent?

MR. ROBLIN: If my friend is asking the government's policy with respect to this matter, notice was given in the Throne Speech that the House would be asked to deal with the question. That is still our intention.

MR. CAMPBELL: Was it policy then, Madam Speaker, that the Honourable the Attorney-General was announcing on TV a few nights ago?

MR. ROBLIN: I didn't have the advantage of hearing my honourable friend but I'm sure it is consistent with what we intend to do.

MR. CAMPBELL: May we be informed as to when the matter will now be brought before the House seeing that it has already been brought before the public?

MR. ROBLIN: Soon.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, I'd like to ask a general question to anyone to whom it may concern. If and when I have a minute to spare on the television and I hear a speaker from either the Conservatives or the Liberal Party, are they speaking for themselves or the Party?

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, if I might include one other group, is my honourable friend speaking for his party?

MR. PAULLEY: May I say as the Leader of his Party, Madam Speaker, I join with my colleague in wondering sometimes whether the other gentlemen are speaking for their respective parties.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): In the absence of the honourable member, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that An Order of the House do issue for a

(MR. PETERS cont'd.) . . . . Return showing whether the Manitoba Development Fund has: (a) extended any loans to any commercial vertical integration type farm operations in the past 3 years; (b) the number of such loans; and (c) the amount of each.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to vote for this Order with respect to Items (a) and (b) as they stand on the Order Paper, and in answer to Item (c) I should be pleased to supply the total amount of the loans involved. I have had a discussion with the Honourable Member for Brokenhead and he has indicated to me in personal conversation, and I'm sorry he's not in his seat to confirm it now, but the answer in this form will be satisfactory to him.

MR. PAULLEY: May I, on behalf of the Member for Brokenhead, Madam Speaker, accept the statement of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

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

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

MR. PETERS: May we have this matter stand, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster and the proposed amendment as amended by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk. The Honourable the Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, I would like the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster and the proposed amendment thereto of the Honourable the Member for St. Matthews. The Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. PETERS: Could I have this matter stand please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable the Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (LaVerendrye): Madam Speaker, I adjourned this debate for my Leader.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I will be closing the debate, I believe, if I am to proceed at this time. If there are others who wish to speak, I just want to give that notice.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does anyone else wish to speak?

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I would like to speak but I'm not prepared on this occasion to do so.

MR. MOLGAT: Well does the honourable member wish to adjourn then, Madam Speaker?

MR. FROESE: Yes. Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, 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 St. George and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for St. Vital, and the proposed further amendment of the Honourable the Member for Gladstone. The Honourable the Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. VIELFAURE: Madam Speaker, I do not rise to speak on this motion just because as was said in here it is popular or to make "political hay," but because I really think and am convinced that this is a very unfair tax. As a matter of fact, I think I was one of the first members in this House to mention it at the last session. If you take for example the small farmers who use oil to heat the house, the chicken barn, or the hog barn, or the small shop, this creates quite a burden on them, and it is the very people that we intend to relieve by the rebate which is to be financed by this particular tax on fuel oil. Now in many cases I am convinced that the money they will receive in rebate will have been paid by themselves by the one cent on the fuel tax itself, so I think that it is absolutely not serving the purpose that it was intended to and it is just adding a burden on the people that we intend to relieve by a rebate.

Now we have been told in this House that we on this side were just sticking on some items, that we were just trying to make "political hay" out of this. I certainly don't feel this way. I think this is a very unjust tax on some people and the burden is being imposed on the wrong people because they are the ones that will be paying what they will actually get in their rebate.

(MR. VIELFAURE cont'd.)

I am sure that -- my honourable friend from Churchill says that this protest is really not from the small wage earner but rather from the small politician and that there should be a tax on hay that these politicians are trying to make out of it. Well I want to assure my honourable friend that I am not interested in making hay out of this tax and there are a lot of people in this province right now who are very concerned about this tax. They are very concerned about the excessive spending of this government and that they have to pay for it in the way of a fuel oil tax, and I think there is much more than the few members on this side that are crying "wolf" right now as far as this tax is concerned.

Also, they charge that it's not that bad because the oil companies have reduced the one cent on fuel oil. To me that just doesn't stand because certainly I think I know the oil companies and they are not around to subsidize the government. If they reduce the fuel oil by one cent, it is in order to improve their sales and certainly not to take care of the tax that was imposed by the government. Therefore, if the tax wouldn't have been there, the consumers would have been able to buy their fuel oil for one cent less, and therefore, as far as I am concerned, this argument doesn't stand.

So I will certainly repeat that I am strongly opposed to this tax, and I hope this government will see fit to remove this tax on fuel oil because it is a very charge against the people that we intend to relieve of property tax by the rebate. I'm sure that in many cases the amount that these very people in the low income group will be getting back in rebate, they will have more than paid with their tax on fuel oil alone. In many of the low income bracket people and where they live in low assessed land, the amount of rebate they will get will just not be any more than what they will have paid by their fuel oil tax.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone, 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 Ethelbert-Plains and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. M. E. MCKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Madam Speaker, I am going to be very short on my reply on this resolution, partly because in the session in 1963 I think the First Minister explained very fully the differences between the Comptroller-General and an Auditor-General, and I think he stated in no uncertain terms that in Manitoba today we have a man acting in the position of Comptroller-General which serves our needs very well.

Now I'd like to quote here from Hansard on Page 415. The Honourable Member for Ethelbert-Plains, he says here in the third paragraph, "Now there is a big difference between the Comptroller-General and the Auditor-General. The Comptroller-General is responsible to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council whereas the Auditor-General is responsible to the legislative body and naturally answers to them. Now when he would report, what would he report on? He would report on any neglect or omission to collect money. He would report on any public money not duly accounted for; whether appropriations were exceeded or used in a manner not authorized; and lastly, if there were any fraud in the process."

Well, Madam Speaker, I think then the duties of the Comptroller-General that we have in our province today, he does a free audit, a post-audit, which in my opinion serves the purpose very well. Most of us know on looking on our cheques that we receive, his signature is there and I would consider that before he has authorized expenditure of that money that he has approved of it and checked every aspect that needed to be checked upon. So I would consider, Madam Speaker, that we in Manitoba are served very well by having our Comptroller-General look after the affairs of our province and I would ask the members to vote against this resolution.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C., (St. John's): Madam Speaker, I feel bound to speak very briefly just on the points raised by the last speaker. It seems to me that he overlooked the important distinction between our present Comptroller, who I am sure does an excellent job, and what is proposed here for an Auditor-General.

The Comptroller's task, as I understand it, is to make sure that monies are spent in accordance with a budget allowed and after same has been approved and certified by the responsible minister or other person having authority to approve of an expenditure. What that is is a very important task, and that is to make sure that monies are spent in accordance with a budget and

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) . . . . . the law.

As I understand the proposal dealing with the appointment of an Auditor-General, which is really what we're discussing today, it is to give an objective person an opportunity to view the method in which monies are being spent on behalf of the people of this province and to indicate whether or not same is being spent in a proper and careful manner. The question of prudence is important. The question of proper methods of obtaining the lowest possible price, or the best services, or the best returns for the money would be a matter for the Auditor-General to review and report on. And certainly the last speaker must realize that when reports are brought in to the Federal House from the Auditor-General they are brought in with a view to indicate where there has been waste or error, bad judgment, which could be corrected in the future.

I think he must know that our Comptroller in this province has no right to indicate that there was a bad purchase made, for example. All he can say is money was spent in accordance with the budget which was passed, and approved and certified by the person in authority so to do. This is a very good check on how monies are spent, not whether or not they are spent legally but whether they are spent prudently, and no government need be ashamed of having a review of this nature because we know that when you have an operation the size of our government, this type of review, a constant review, is beneficial to the people of the province.

I would therefore like to suggest that this resolution be viewed from the standpoint of this second review, this second opportunity to inspect, and be looked at in that light rather than in the light of redundancy of the position of the present Comptroller.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I intend to support this motion because it won't do any harm but it may do a lot of good. When I was a young boy, I was troubled about my stomach and my grandmother put a hot plate on my stomach and then she said a prayer. I asked her whether it would help and she said, I don't know if it will help but it won't do any harm. I think that's the very same thing. I think perhaps if people think security and a watchdog of the treasury in Manitoba is not sufficient, the extra expense is very little, why should they come up to beefs and bouquets every evening and criticize because I am not in favour of something that apparently I have . . . . .

I have a story where there was a sentry post at the residence of the Prime Minister of Israel, Ben-Gurion. He came out and said to the sentry, "Have you had your breakfast?" He says "No." He says, "You go in the house and have your breakfast and I'll stand here to maintain the dignity of the country." But as it is, I think there should not be any opposition to it because we are dealing with a certain people who are very suspicious from day to day on almost anything. If I send a letter in to a father or mother who had another child as a Member of the Legislature -- for my future elections -- somebody suspects you want another foot. All right, supposing I do, that's what it is. It doesn't do any more harm. I don't know what good it will do, but if there is a demand from the public to know that somebody is a watchdog for the Provincial Treasurer, let's have it.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that the debate be adjourned.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion

MR. GRAY: . . . . . make the decision -- carry the motion -- I would like to know how long will this resolution come to adjourn the debates, because we are on the fourth day of spring and we cannot stay too much longer. I think perhaps the people should be ready to speak.

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

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

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that we got a brochure on this matter yesterday, I would like a little more time to compare it and would like the matter to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Lakeside and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, with your permission and the permission of the House, I would like to have this stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Logan. The Honourable the Member for Roblin.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Madam Speaker, first of all I would like to thank the Honourable Member from Logan for bringing this matter into the House and introducing it to us

(MR. ALEXANDER cont'd.) . . . so we could debate and discuss it, because I think it is a matter that has to be discussed. To use a favourite term, I think we have to enter into dialogue on it, because there are very extreme and opposite opinions on the subject. Before entering into it, I would like to give my definition of it -- of automation. I would like to define it as a transfer of work, possibly from man to a machine, or a change of pattern or production, or a change of method of manufacture brought about by technological methods.

As I said, there are many different opinions and many different attitudes on this subject and I'd like to quote from an article or a press release recently in the Winnipeg Free Press where there was a meeting on this, and Mr. Goodman had one statement on the matter where he said that, "Workers unemployed because of automation are going to fill the madhouses of the nation." "Speaking in a panel discussion on the problems of increasing leisure, Sam Goodman said, 'many unskilled and semi-skilled men are being driven to frustration because they can no longer find jobs.' At the same seminar, Mr. R. O. Hunter, Vice-President and Secretary of the Great West Life Assurance, said, 'automation did not necessarily put people out of jobs. It is a bogey that two percent of the population can produce for 98 percent. With proper education, employment can go hand in glove with automation. No one in our firm has lost a job because of automation. Our staff is larger and many persons have been re-trained for higher calibre jobs. He said the possibility of new expansion in automation and job opportunity is unlimited'."

So there, Madam Speaker, we have two radically different approaches to the subject of automation and I'd like to take a period of time now and go back and consider the impact and the effect of automation in the past, using the definition that I gave in the beginning. And here I'd like to bring the attention of the members to the development of the loom, the bobbin and the shuttle, which changed the whole pattern of textile development in Britain from the old method of hand weaving and really developed that country as the leader in the textile industry. The further development of machines and the lead of Britain in this regard led to the factory system which brought about the Industrial Revolution in Britain, which developed it as the major trading nation in that historical period and which has had a great effect on the development of the world. This, Madam Speaker, was automation.

To come a little closer to the future, I'd like to use the example of the Automotive Industry when the old gasless buggy first challenged the carriage industry, and then further automation brought about the principle of the assembly line. This industry has continued and its development has continued to automate and its auxiliary industries of steel, rubber and other side businesses have continued to automate until we have today the development of the automotive industry as we know it. I don't think we can even possibly begin to analyze the effect and the impact that the development of the automobile, and the fact that it was made economically available to so many people through automation, we can't estimate the effect that this has had on the economy, the development, and the whole social life and the whole pattern of life in this continent.

I would also like to take the example of agriculture. Since 1941 we in Manitoba have been losing approximately 700 per year decline in the number of farmers engaged in agriculture, while at the same time the output and production per man has gone up two and a half times. We look at the figures on investments in machinery and equipment on our farms and in 1941 it was a total of \$59 million for an average of \$1,000 per farmer. In 1961 it is \$272 million or an average of \$6,300 per farmer. The figures in combines themselves give a more radical picture of automation on the farm. In 1941 there were 1,714 and in 1961, 23,662.

I think also, Madam Speaker, we can look at the rise and the recovery of West Germany, and particularly Northern Italy as well, after the Second World War, where these areas have come back and recovered as competitive industrial powers. They have challenged and have provided very strong competition to our part of the hemisphere. They started from scratch. They started from nothing in many cases and had to establish an industry, but this meant that they started with modern machinery and they started with modern up-to-date methods. They did in effect, Madam Speaker, not have to go through a process of evolution. They started at a very advanced technological position and this enabled them to offer a very serious challenge to manufacturing in our part of the world and led very substantially to their economic recovery.

So, Madam Speaker, I would like to by this means point out that automation is not new. I don't think automation is a thing to be feared really. There are many benefits that can be derived from automation. It is also though not something to be taken lightly because there are many benefits we can get from automation as well. I think too often some people in their anxiety

(MR. ALEXANDER cont'd.) . . . . to theoretically forecast conditions fifty years from now let themselves get carried away, and I think this has presented in some cases a wrongly painted picture as to what might possibly happen in the future with automation, because I don't think we can take examples of some of the more readily adaptable fields for automation and extend them and use them as a means of projecting what conditions are going to be like fifty years from now.

I would say, Madam Speaker, that one thing I think that history has proven to us about automation is that we cannot hold it back. We cannot maintain a status quo with it because if we use it for this purpose and it had been used this way in the past, we would still be weaving by hand and we would still be manufacturing buggy whips and we would still be farming with horses. I think on the contrary that we must use automation and we must make its benefits available to all. I think we must use it for the increased production it can bring about, for the cheaper production it can bring about, and particularly to meet the great need and the great demand in other parts of the world for our production.

I think it odd that we have been unable to realize that this age has opportunities to supply the wants and the needs of over two-thirds of the world's population and raise their living standards by making available to them, on an economic basis, our means of production. To me, it is inconceivable that in this affluent society, in this high standard living society that we're living in today, that we say our major problem is leisure time. Madam Speaker, I can't reconcile myself to this situation when, as I say, we can see the requirements and the needs all over the rest of the world for our production and our products.

Some people say, Madam Speaker, that if at the present time we have 100 men on a 40-hour week doing a particular job, producing a certain product, and if by automation the number of men is reduced to 50 men on a 40-hour week, then these people advocate that we should keep the 100 men at the same rate of pay and only work a 20-hour week, but get the same pay as we would have a 40-hour week for. Madam Speaker, I feel myself, that this is a form of feather bedding. I think that these 50 men who are not now required to perform the same volume of production must be re-educated; they must be retrained; and they must be re-employed in useful production.

In other words, we must use, I feel, automation to increase our production. Some people say there's no point in doing this, we can't distribute what we're producing now. I feel that this is the great challenge. I feel that necessity is the mother of invention, and if we produce, I think we must force our society, we must force our economical theorists to devise methods of distribution. It must come.

I'd like to quote from the same seminar where Miss Anne Dumoulin, Executive Director of the Community Welfare Planning Council, called for a change in attitude which would cease to make a god of work. And she says further, "The society has an attitude of snobbery about the way people spend their free time." And this is a quotation of her statement, "What makes beer drinking any worse than basket weaving if that person gets satisfaction?"

Well, Madam Speaker, this is the attitude, part of the attitude that I'm talking about, where we feel that our goal today is personal, selfish self-satisfaction. I couldn't disagree more. I don't think basket weaving might be a productive means of passing one's time, but I certainly think that there are other means of production which must be available to the individual where he feels that he is doing something of value, producing something of value for somebody else, for the community and the world in general.

There's no doubt, Madam Speaker, that automation in the past and in the future has and will bring about changes in skills; changes in our consumption patterns; change in our international trade patterns; change in our social relationships, not only within our community and within our own country, but relationships between peoples in the world at large.

As well, Madam Speaker, automation issues a great many challenges to us all, a challenge to our social institutions, a challenge to our churches to try and get people to develop a sense of value, a sense of worth, a sense of worth of what they are doing. I think in many ways we've fallen greatly behind in this that we haven't yet managed to adapt to the changes that the assembly line brought about in working conditions where a person could no longer identify himself with the ultimate end of his product.

And there is a great challenge here, I feel, in our social institutions to bring about a change in values and a means of identification for the individual where he can still feel that he is of some value, that he is of some need, that somebody is actually using and getting benefit from his work, from what he is doing, and from what he is producing.

I think, Madam Speaker, as well, that automation challenges labour, management and

(MR. ALEXANDER cont'd.) . . . . government to adapt and adjust to new conditions that automation is bringing about. I think, Madam Speaker, that man and his history has proven that he has developed to the point where he is today because of his ability to adjust and adapt to new conditions. There are two areas, I feel, that we can emphasize at the present moment where government, labour and management can aid in this period of adjustment. The first is in creating a favourable climate for developing an expanding economy which will provide new jobs for people coming onto the labour force. And I would here say that in Manitoba, the things I have in mind are examples like the Manitoba COMEF Report and Survey, the Economic Consultative Board, the Manitoba Development Corporation, the Manitoba Design Institute, the Research Institution, the Export Corporation, the Agricultural Credit, and agricultural research projects. These I think, Madam Speaker, are fields whereby government working hand in hand with labour and management are trying to make available new jobs in the economy of the province.

MR. PETERS: You're sure doing a poor job of it.

MR. ALEXANDER: Well that's a matter of opinion.

MR. PETERS: A lot of people have the same opinion.

MR. ALEXANDER: Maybe you can help us do a better job.

MR. PETERS: We're trying.

MR. ALEXANDER: Well, Madam Speaker, the second area I think is in education and retraining. I'd like to quote a little article that was in the Manitoba Co-operator a week or so ago when Education Week was being honoured in Manitoba. They say, "Automation has intensified the need for office workers with specialized training. In the business world of today there seems to be no place for the untrained worker. Business training can be used as an entering wedge into almost any field of employment. Students graduating from high schools in rural or urban areas who do not wish to continue their studies in a university can find commercial colleges and technical schools in almost any large city. With techniques becoming more and more complex, specialized training is a necessity. More young people are being turned away from job opportunities every day because they lack the specialized training needed. In many cases these students have a substantial education but lack the skill in one particular field." Madam Speaker, I think the increased emphasis on technical vocational training in this province is one area where the government is taking positive action to help people to adjust and adapt to the conditions that might or are at the present time being brought about by automation. I can remember in the brief presented by the Premier in 1960 to the Federal-Provincial Conference where he said at that time, over four years ago, that the demands for technical and vocational training brought about by automation required immediate and increased assistance to the province from the Federal Government. I think we have to give them credit for accepting this principle; we have to give them credit for the help that they have given us; but I think we have to also emphasize that the problem is still with us and much work still remains to be done.

The program of in-plant training is another method of assisting people to change their occupation, to change their trade and develop new skills. So, Madam Speaker, I feel that we must continue to emphasize the need for an expanded educational program, for more training not only for young people but also for a large number of adults who find it necessary to change their vocation and change their skills so that they can fit in to our society and partake themselves of the ability to bring about more useful, more economic production.

So, Madam Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Rupertsland, that the resolution be amended by striking out the words "of every Manitoban" in the second line of the first paragraph and substitute therefore the words "in Manitoba"; and by striking out all the words following the word "solve" in the second paragraph and substituting therefore the following: "And whereas the gradual process of manual work being transferred from man to machine throughout a wide range of industrial and commercial undertakings and occupations has been going on for many years; and whereas this process now commonly referred to as automation is resulting in the necessity for employees to acquire new skills and change their occupation; and whereas the Government of Manitoba has developed a comprehensive program of action designed (a) to maintain a high level of employment so that employees affected by automation would have a good opportunity to obtain alternative employment, and (b) to expand and improve our educational facilities, including training and retraining in schools and on the job with a view to developing a work force that is capable of adapting to changing job requirements; therefore be it resolved that the Government of Manitoba be encouraged to pursue its programs in connection with attaining and maintaining a high level of employment and the best possible



(MR. ALEXANDER cont'd.) ... educational and training facilities as the most effective means of coping with the problems attendant to automation, and that participation in these programs by labour and management be continued and expanded where necessary, and that the matter of automation be kept under continuing study by the government and its agencies in co-operation with labour and management."

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question? How does the honourable member propose to distribute increased production, especially farm production?

MR. ALEXANDER: Madam Speaker, as I said in my speech, I'm a believer in the fact that necessity is the mother of invention and I said that one of the main challenges facing our theoretical economist, one of the main challenges facing our society as a whole, is a means of distributing our production to those segments of our rural population which are not receiving it at the present time. I'm afraid I cannot qualify as an expert who is able in one or two minutes to be able to give you a complete resume of how that might be done. That's beyond my scope but I think it is within my scope to point out the terrific need and assign the responsibility.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, in my humble opinion the resolution of the Honourable Member from Logan was the most important one that I have heard for years in this House -- very important, timely and urgent. When the Honourable Member from Dauphin got up to speak -- Roblin, I'm sorry -- got up to speak, I made a couple of very complimentary notes for him, but I'm sorry that I cannot repeat it now.

There was a story told by the Prime Minister of Israel who had to have a sentry, a soldier, watching his building. He came out of the building and he said to this soldier, "Have you had your breakfast?" He says "No." He says, "You go and have your breakfast and I'll stand here in order to comply with the rules and regulations." I think that this was entirely the last half of his speech -- I hope he'll excuse me -- was entirely away from -- not from the wilderness -- but you remember the phonographs where someone listened to His Master's Voice. He absolutely changed in a few minutes the wonderful, florid, idea that was had in connection with this resolution. Then he comes up with an amendment which kills him, kills the government and kills the idea of the resolution.

MR. ALEXANDER: Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege, I'd just like to assure the honourable member that I didn't listen to any "master's voice" except my inner self. It's my voice and my speech.

MR. GRAY: Anything you say, I accept, because I don't want no arguments. The amendment is all A-1, and I don't think the members will believe me as this is to wash down the resolution, which is a good one, but the "powers that be" hate to accept it but then the other way they hate to reject it, so naturally they move an amendment.

I think, Madam Speaker, we are nearing an age of automation and we don't have to fool ourselves. We need a time when they didn't need me, the Honourable Member of Inkster to dig the sewer with a shovel and a pick, which I did, but they have machinery to do it. They came to a time when we're trying to make the lives of the individual easier and for them to take up the rest of the time for something higher and better -- reading books, discussing peace all over the world, trying to get peace all over the world. We don't have to fight each other day after day. When we come in for a cup of coffee in the morning at restaurants we hear that a certain group killed so many people and certain groups killed so many people and it's killing and killing. We got so used to it that we don't pay any attention to it, we just drink our coffee in peace and freedom and so on. We don't even worry about it.

We have a resolution here which I think is historical. I don't know whether I should read it to you all -- you all read it -- and for anyone to come in and make an amendment to such a wonderful meaningful resolution in my humble opinion is to kill it and not to improve it. And anybody can kill; anybody can shoot; anybody can accuse the other one of everything in the world, but I'd like to hear at least one of the majority members of the Conservative group here to say one good word about something which is good irrespective of where it comes from.

So I say that I'm greatly disappointed with the amendment and I hope the members of this Legislature will defeat the amendment, not because what it says it is, but because it was made for one purpose, and that purpose was to kill the resolution of my colleague, the Honourable Member from Logan, who submitted it.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd.) . . . for Elmwood, that this debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution of the Honourable the Member for Churchill. The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam, the member for Assiniboia is out of the House, but if anyone else wishes to speak we have no objection.

MADAM SPEAKER: Anyone wishing to speak?

MR. GUTTORMSON: May we have the matter stand then, please.

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

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): Madam Speaker, at the risk of incurring the wrath of the Honourable Member from Inkster, I would ask this matter be again allowed to stand, but I have no objection if somebody else wishes to speak.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution of the Honourable the Member for Morris. The Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, while we on this side of the House can find nothing really distasteful in the contents of the resolution that is before us or in the recipes that are contained in what might be called "Harry's Hash and Helpful Household Hints Book" -- I'm sorry, Madam Speaker, that my honourable friend from Morris is not in his seat this afternoon -- frankly, Madam, we on this side of the House are at a loss to know why this resolution is on the Order Paper, and we feel that it would not be there if certain government members felt that the Minister of Industry and Commerce and the Minister of Agriculture were doing an effective job.

Now the last resolution that was introduced, I believe by my honourable friend the member for Morris, resulted in him becoming Chairman of a commission that was appointed, and I must confess, Madam Speaker, that I not only sat on that commission for about 12 months I think, but I had a most enjoyable time when I was there. That was the Manitoba Hog Marketing Commission. And, Madam Speaker, if it is the intention of the government to set up a commission and appoint my honourable friend from Morris Chairman of this one, I am serving notice right now that I want to be on it and I'm serving notice to my Leader, I'm sorry he isn't here, that I insist on being a member of it because I maintain that I am just as much of an authority, just as much of a gourmet -- is that the right pronunciation, Madam Speaker -- as my honourable friend from Morris, and surely after we spend two or three years travelling over in Italy and all over the place surveying their menus over there and sampling their wines and stuff like that, that when we return we will be able to make a report that will amaze the House.

Now, Madam Speaker, let's examine the content of the resolution that is before us and let's get right down to the meat of the resolution and the various recipes contained in it for tripe, etc. etc. The first paragraph as you will know is, and I quote, "Whereas Manitoba produces food products that are superior in quality and flavour" -- well it doesn't say that they are superior to what, and that is the point, Madam Speaker, superior to what?

Now I don't think anybody can quarrel with the fact that we do have a fine quality of most eating products, but I think that I would be safe in making a bet that the average person, the average Manitoban or the average tourist would have some difficulty in telling whether he was eating bread from flour that was made in Saskatchewan or made in Manitoba. I think even the Honourable Member for Morris and myself, who are more or less experts, would have some difficulty in telling any difference between fresh frozen peas that were grown in Saskatchewan and those that were grown in Manitoba. We would have some difficulty in doing that.

Now as regards the second paragraph, I must confess that outside of one item, I don't know what particular foods that my honourable friend is referring to. He says, "And whereas several foods are characteristic of Manitoba and have made this Province famous" -- well now I think it's generally recognized that Winnipeg Goldeyes are characteristic of Manitoba by reason of the fact that Lake Winnipeg is in Manitoba. Now I don't know what other dishes are characteristic of Manitobans outside of the fact of course that my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP suggested that there was enough tripe flying around in the Assembly here at times that probably tripe was typical of Manitoba, but apart from Winnipeg Goldeyes, I can't think of any particular dish that is really characteristic of Manitoba.

Now I must say this, Madam Speaker, that in days gone by there were plenty of foods that

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) . . . . were characteristic of Manitoba, characteristic of the western provinces anyway, and I refer to Beavertail soup, and I think that some of the members who went up to Churchill two or three years ago were treated to this delicacy. I must confess that I didn't go up on that trip and I'm sorry that I didn't. I know that presently -- I can't say that I have sampled it -- but I know that a lot of our northern Indians still eat skunk stew. It doesn't sound very appetizing but it maybe tastes all right -- maybe it tastes all right. The last time that I had the pleasure of eating with my honourable friend the Minister of Health and my honourable friend the member for St. Vital, my honourable friend the member for Lac du Bonnet, and who else -- two or three of them -- the last time that -- (Interjection) -- it is a bad combination I know, but we ate down in the Factors Room and I picked out what I considered to be one of the characteristic dishes on the menu and it was Buffalo -- what was it -- Buffalo stew or something of this kind and the waiter told us that this was the first time since they opened the Factors Room in the Fort Garry that they had the pleasure of serving buffalo there.

Now these are characteristics of Manitoba. Madam Speaker, these type of dishes: deer, deer steak, moose steak, buffalo pie, buffalo steak, skunk stew, wild ducks and wild geese, wild turkey and all these things, beavertails -- yes I mentioned that -- frogs legs, but where in Manitoba can you go and enjoy any one of them? Where can you go?

Now at the risk of being thrown in jail I'm going to tell you of a little story, a true one, and I was involved. I attended a little gathering in Erickson in the fall of the year, at which time they served wild duck, and pickerel I think, and Lake Trout and a lot of the native dishes. My guess is that the fellow who served them up shouldn't have been doing so because it was probably against the law to do it, but I must confess that it was a wonderful meal. But if there was some way of treating our American tourists to dishes of these kinds, then I venture to say they would come back and they would stay longer than the one day that they are presently doing.

Now, Madam Speaker, my honourable friend the member for Morris talks about New York Dressed Turkeys and New York Cuts of Beef, suggesting that both of them are imported here from New York. Now I am amazed that my honourable friend who professes to be a farmer, or certainly represents a farming area, would get up in the House and display his ignorance of farming matters in this fashion, because I believe that even the Minister of Industry and Commerce who admits at times that his knowledge of farming operations are rather limited, my guess is that he knows that a New York cut steak is just a name that the trade applies to the way a steak is cut, that is you can go into Hy's Steak Loft and get a -- (Interjection) -- and yes, New York Dressed Turkeys. Do you know what this is, Madam Speaker? You would know because you have certainly come from a farming area. It means a turkey that has not been eviscerated. A New York Turkey is one that has not been eviscerated, that's what it means. It doesn't mean that it was brought in from New York, but my honourable friend the Member for Morris suggests in his speech that they are brought in from New York. Ask my honourable friend the Member for Emerson. He raises more turkeys than all of the people in the Assembly could eat in five years. I think he grew about 24,000 of them last year. He knows something about turkeys.

However, Madam Speaker, the whole point is that my honourable friend is making a terrific condemnation of his honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and we say on this side of the House that there is real justification for that, but what we can't understand is why the Honourable Member for Morris is doing it.

MR. PETERS: He's preaching for a call.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well that could be it, Madam Speaker. They say he's preaching for a call, and I've already said that if it is the intention of the government to set up a commission then I for one want to be on it.

Now let us suppose that it would be helpful and practical -- and I'm going to confess right now, Madam Speaker, that I don't mind going along with this resolution and we will probably end up voting for it. There may be an amendment or something to it, but we'll probably go along voting for it. As my honourable friend from Inkster just said a little while ago, while it doesn't maybe do any good, it doesn't do any harm, and it's one of those kind of resolutions.

But let us suppose that it might be very helpful. I wonder if my honourable friend who was also chairman of the commission that I referred to, that is the Hog Marketing Commission, I wonder does he realize that it would present certain problems. Why? Because, and I want to quote from his report because this report, Madam Speaker, was always called the Shewman report -- not mine but his -- the Shewman report -- the Shewman report. Mr. Schreyer's name is on there along with mine, but it was referred to in all of the papers and everything else

(MR. SHOEMAKE cont'd.) . . . as the Shewman report, and reading from page 2 of the summary of that report, I quote, "In 1964" -- example it says -- "it is estimated at 183,000 slaughter cattle and 259,000 slaughter hogs moved into Manitoba from the two other provinces. Most of these animals were slaughtered in plants located in Winnipeg before moving on in the form of red meat to eastern markets for consumption, and in 1960, 49 percent of the cattle and 33 percent of all the hogs slaughtered in Manitoba came from Saskatchewan and Alberta."

Now, Madam Speaker, you can appreciate how difficult it would be with 49 percent of all the cattle slaughtered in Winnipeg and 33 percent of all the hogs that are slaughtered in Winnipeg coming from other provinces, how in the world -- how in the world could a restaurant set up a refrigerator or two or three refrigerators and keep only Manitoba products in the one and then the run-of-the-mill in the other ones? It would be rather difficult in light of the fact that 50 percent of the meat that is slaughtered in Winnipeg comes from other provinces. However, as I suggested before, there is no doubt but what we will support this resolution condemning my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

Well, my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce, as you know, Madam Speaker, tabled a -- he didn't table it -- it was mailed out, an Information Services Bulletin, so it's nice to quote from this source. It emanates from the Department of the Provincial Secretary dated January 15, 1965 -- "where tourists see Manitoba in record numbers." Madam Speaker, I mentioned this when I was speaking on the Throne Speech, and this report says that one and a half million visitors spent \$45 million in Manitoba in 1964. I said at that time that it wasn't too difficult to figure out how much they were spending per tourist because that worked out to a nice round figure of \$30.00. If you divide 45 million by a million and a half, in my books it's an even Steven \$30.00 -- no cents. Now back in the good old days of 1950 . . .

MR. PETERS: Not '58?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Not '58, Madam Speaker, but in '50. It is interesting to note that the tourist of that day was spending \$38.00, and the dollar was worth something in those days, in 1950. They were spending \$38.00 and of course my honourable friend would certainly love to know where I got that information from, I know, and I don't blame him. I'm pleased to inform the House that it is the Annual Report of the Department of Industry and Commerce and Manitoba Development Authority for the period ending March 31, 1963, and I won't be asked to have this tabled, I don't suppose, because it's already been laid on the table, this one. But I'll refer you to Page 32 and it reports in 1950, 581,000 tourists in Manitoba spent \$22 million, for an average of 37 point something, but it is 38 cents -- 38 dollars. Now the point is, that back in 1950 they were spending \$38.00 per tourist; today my honourable friend admits that they are only spending \$30.00. That is kind of discouraging.

Now what I say is, Madam Speaker, what in the world is the use of preparing a nice dinner, preparing a nice dinner of superior quality goods and having it served up well in some of our wonderful eating establishments, and then having nobody come for dinner. That's exactly the position we're in now -- (Interjection) -- Well, I didn't say I was going to pay for the dinner, Madam Speaker. I know my honourable friend would come if I would offer to pay the bill. But the point is that if the tourists that are coming, as my honourable friend the Minister says in such large numbers, are only spending \$30.00 a piece, they're sure not staying very long in our province. They're not eating at all. They're not staying for dinner.

Now the last figure that I was able to obtain in the library on the subject matter of the volume of highway traffic entering Canada or travelling vehicle permits -- on travelling vehicle permits, Madam Speaker -- the reason that this is difficult to read is that the library stamp is stamped right over top it, and I'm not complaining about that -- it's dated March 9, 1965. This was the last one that I was able to obtain and it is for the month of January, and I suppose that that is the last one that was issued by the DBS.

But there's some interesting and alarming statistics on here, because it is noted that comparing January of this year to January of 1964, that the number of people entering Manitoba is down 16 percent -- down 16 percent. It's also interesting to note that 69.4 percent of the people entering Manitoba stayed for one day. That's what it says in the DBS report here. The percent that were in for one day in 1964, 69.4 percent. So I think that this clearly points up what my honourable friend the minister has been saying all the time, that they're not staying long enough; they're only spending \$30.00. We've got to do something to get them to stay longer, get them to stay not only for dinner but get them to stay for several meals. If we can encourage them to come long enough to eat one meal, no doubt that alone will encourage them to come back and spend some more money.

Now, Madam Speaker, I have before me a bulletin, just a one sheet bulletin put out by

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) . . . . . Industry, the Canadian Manufacturers Association, and I'm just going to quote a short paragraph here. It says, "Travellers Deficit. Big, wide and wonderful as Canada is, a growing number of Canadians still evidently prefer to take themselves abroad. Pity," it says, "but there it is. The latest figures out of Ottawa show that last year travelling Canadians spent a cool \$627 million in other countries, up nearly five percent over 1959. This was nearly twice the sum spent in Canada by U.S. tourists." So, we're a way, way off balance. Something has got to be done.

Now, Madam Speaker, my honourable friend the Minister published a little three page propaganda sheet back on November 6, 1959. I like quoting what my honourable friend says and then there's no argument about the authority. -- (Interjection) -- "Straight from the horse's mouth," so my honourable friend says. It is headed, "Manitoba Mirrored by Tourist Replies." And I quote again, "Manitoba Mirrored by Tourist Replies." Now that is a heading that you would expect my honourable friend to use because -- but anyway, anyway the Minister is reporting on the certain replies that came back from American tourists as a result of questionnaires that were left at motels, hotels, eating places, etcetera, etcetera.

I'm quoting here from this propaganda sheet. "The Minister said that the volume of replies was sufficient to warrant their use as a basis for factual appraisal of the tourists' opinions about Manitoba. In addition to answering 20 direct questions, each respondent was asked to submit criticism or suggestions as the result of their visit, and Mr. Evans was careful to stress the fact that these opinions reported as received did not necessarily reflect the point of view of his department." Well that would be understandable.

"Sample comments include" -- this is what the tourists were saying about Manitoba -- "Hotelkeepers could certainly be more courteous." That's one comment. It said, "We met some very nice people and some who seemed resentful. Why, I don't know."

Mr. Evans said that the tourist respondents threw a series of 'roundhouse rights' at Manitoba drivers and traffic laws. He suggested that resident drivers show more consideration when a licence plate from another province or state flashes by. 'Remember that these people are driving under unfamiliar driving conditions,' he said.

"Tourist comments included bad traffic control on Winnipeg's main streets. 'In all my travels across Canada', one said, 'you have the most discourteous drivers I've ever met.' Mr. Evans said that a great many tourists complained of the high motel rates charged in Manitoba."

Now I hope that most of these complaints have been dealt with by my honourable friend because he was in receipt of them, and I say that they must be corrected in order to encourage these people to come back and spend -- stay for dinner, stay for breakfast, stay overnight, and spend the week with us. Something has got to be done, so I can understand, Madam Speaker, my honourable friend the member for Morris being as concerned as we are over the inefficiency of the Department of Industry and Commerce.

Now we on this side of the House, Madam Speaker -- incidentally, Madam Speaker, just in last night's paper, this is pretty recent information, the Winnipeg Tribune, Monday, March 22nd, 1965, and no doubt most of the members read it, particularly the people opposite, they would read the Tribune from front to back, and it is headed, "Manitobans Ignoring their Own Province", and the opening sentence is, "Who sees Manitoba first or knows it best? Not Manitobans that's for sure. Ask the operators of 300 motels and hunting and fishing lodges that dot the province and they'll tell you that US tourists make up 90 percent of their customers. Some resorts have never played host to a Manitoban," this article says.

Well it's bad enough, Madam Speaker, to not be able to encourage people to come in from outside of the province but it's even worse if you can't get them to shift around a little in their own province and see it. I must confess that I have been, by the nature of my work and desire to see the province, I have been all the way from Melita to Churchill and back more than once, so I'm not one in this category.

Now speaking about the quality of the products that we grow within our boundaries, I have absolutely no quarrel. I said at the beginning, Madam Speaker, that we do grow a fair quality of product -- a fair quality of product -- not perfect by any means. I have before me, Madam Speaker, and you will have too no doubt, a brief that was presented to us by the Manitoba Stock Growers on February 26, 1963. It says on the one that I have that it was presented to the Honourable George Hutton, Minister of Agriculture, but the group met with us I remember very well and I want to just quote you what they say and what concerned them. "Our Association is of the opinion that there is still a great deal to be done to improve the quality of our cattle. It is discouraging to say the least to see the large percentage of trash cattle that pass through the various

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) . . . . markets in our province day after day after day. If the producers of these inferior animals could just be impressed with the amount of money that they are losing, surely the situation would change more rapidly. We realize that there has been a definite improvement in the percentage of reds and blues, but this is due chiefly to the increased feeding in our province rather than the improvement in our breeding herds."

Now this isn't very much of a testimonial for the quality of cattle that we have, Madam Speaker. In the eyes of the Manitoba stock growers, they are concerned. I know that our honourable friends opposite are forever suggesting that a market is far more important than price. My honourable friend, one of the few farmers we have in the House, the Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne, said two or three days ago when speaking on this wheat resolution that markets were more important than price, and I know that there would be some who would agree with him. As a matter of fact, I had thought that here was a Conservative turned Liberal, that he was certainly giving a wonderful testimonial for our friend the Honourable Mitchell Sharp. and I expect that come the next federal election that he will likely be voting with us because it is quite common for you to vote one way federally and another way provincially. otherwise a lot of us characters wouldn't be in the House. But there are those who would disagree with him, with my honourable friend, and say that price -- what is the use of being in business if you don't get a price for what you produce? And I think there's a good point there.

My honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture who is absent today, and I guess he will be happy that he is absent because I want to have some complimentary things to say about him in this regard. He is the fellow who publishes the green propaganda sheets, and quite frequently you will see one headed, "The farm production is up and the income is down," as if that was something to be achieved. To me this is a disturbing kind of a statement to make, or a disturbing kind of a statement for my honourable friend to admit, my honourable friend who talks about markets being more important than price.

And I want to refer you, Madam Speaker, to another wonderful source of information called "The Yearbook of Manitoba Agriculture, 1963" emanating from the Department of Agriculture. On page 35 under income -- sub heading, "Farm net income -- this is production value minus cost." That's what they define as the farm net income. "The farm net income in 1963 dropped 31 percent due to lower production and higher costs than in 1962. Higher costs resulted from greater quantities of resources used and a small rise in their prices. These comprise home-grown resources as well as cash and overhead expenses. Home-grown resources in this case refer to resources grown on the farm where used as well as brought from other farms without going through commercial channels."

Now that's a disturbing kind of statement, that farm income, despite the fact that production was away up, the net farm income dropped 31 percent. So I think, Madam Speaker, before we start doing a lot of worrying about a lot of these matters, that something has to be done not only to improve the quality of our product but improve the price of it, and I know that my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture, is often at times a little concerned about what the outlook should be.

I heard my honourable friend make this statement and it is headed, "Social and Economic Adjustments Required in Agriculture. An address made by the Honourable George Hutton the Minister of Agriculture, Province of Manitoba, to the Third National Farm and Business Forum on Friday, March 30, 1962." I'm quoting here and he says, "I sometimes am asked what philosophy the Department of Agriculture has in developing agricultural programs." Well he was asked back in 1962 what his philosophy was. He admits that he is sometimes asked that.

There has been a lot of people ask him in recent years, more recent years what his philosophy is in light of certain developments that have taken place, because he is the man that is forever talking about preserving the family farm, and in this article that I have before me, he is explaining his philosophy. "The main idea to me is the development of programs which provide social and economic good to the farm family within the harsh realities of a market-oriented agricultural production. The main objective is to carry forward programs which allow the farmer the opportunity to make an income comparable to that received in secondary and service industries. All this must be done within the concept of the family farm as the basic unit in agriculture. I am sure that the family farm will persist as a permanent institution due to the important place of the family farm in Canadian life and to the fact that the family operated farm has many inherent strengths over the field and factory concept of farming."

Now nobody could hardly disagree with that statement, Madam Speaker, but when my honourable friends opposite design legislation to put the family farm out of business, then it

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) . . . . does make a fellow wonder what the philosophy is. Someone suggested in the House here the other day, and I don't think it was denied, that the Department of Industry and Commerce had loaned three-quarters of a million dollars to the family -- what is it -- The Friendly Family Farms at Steinbach, and I believe that the Order for a Return that was on the Order Paper today asked this very vital question: Was it a fact that they loaned three quarters of a million dollars?

Now if it is a fact, and we will sooner or later get to know whether it was I guess, then it seems to me that here is legislation that is deliberately designed to put the family farm out of existence. So what in the world, Madam Speaker, is the point of my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Industry and Commerce talking about preserving the family farm on the one hand and then deliberately designing legislation to put them out of business on the other hand. I must say that my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce and I had a most enjoyable -- Madam Speaker, I have a note here from someone and it isn't signed, so I must return it for a signature.

Now, Madam Speaker, I started off to say that my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce and myself had the pleasure one day last September 11th of attending a ceremony at Gladstone to mark the first anniversary of the Gladstone Auction Mart.

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to remind the honourable member that he has four minutes left.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I guess perhaps, Madam Speaker, that I should inform you that it is my intention when I get through to move a motion of regret, and I think that this probably will allow me to speak beyond my -- want of confidence -- I suppose my honourable friends will consider it to be a want of confidence because the word regret is in there.

Well, I'm getting advice, Madam Speaker, from the honourable member the Leader of the NDP Party and he is ruling on the matter that's before the House. But, Madam Speaker, I was about to report to you about a happy incident that took place at Gladstone. I'm getting plenty of interruptions here -- marking the first anniversary of the Gladstone Auction Mart, and on that occasion they had sold \$1 million worth of livestock. That marked the day and they had quite a celebration there and my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce was there as well myself, and my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce, to point up how little that he knew about agriculture generally, told a little story at the noon luncheon that I'm not permitted to tell here in the House because it might be considered unparliamentary, but what he was doing was pointing up how little he knew about agriculture and told a story about a certain steer to point this up.

But while he admitted on the one hand that he didn't know anything at all about livestock, I noticed that about three days after that -- that was September 11th we were at Gladstone -- and on September 15th, four days later, there was a heading in the Free Press headed, "Livestock -- Bright Future." And who do you think made that statement? My honourable friend, an expert and an authority on agriculture, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and he says that he predicts -- "A bright future for Manitoba livestock producers was forecast by the Honourable Gurney Evans, Provincial Minister of Industry and Commerce, the guest speaker of the 1964 Convention of Canadian Hatchery Federation on Tuesday. 'But,' he said, 'the trend towards farm mechanization and its resulting increase in the size of Manitoba farms would displace about 19,000 farm workers by 1975.' This was the estimate of the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future that industrial production must be expanded to absorb these workers." Well that's a pretty bright future for us farmers, Madam Speaker. There's going to be 19,000 less of us by 1975, but that's what he calls a bright future for Manitoba.

Now on the 16th of October -- 16th of September, the next day -- the next day after my honourable friend spoke to the turkey growers there was an article in the Tribune headed, "Small Family Farm is Fast Vanishing. Small family farms across Canada are facing extinction unless steps are taken to make them more efficient", four Manitoba agricultural experts agreed on Thursday night." -- (Interjection) -- Madam Speaker, my honourable friend the member for Brokenhead wants to know who the four experts were.

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member is exceeding his time.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, Madam Speaker. I will then move, in the light of the content of the resolution and the fact that we concur in it, I will move an amendment, seconded by my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside, that the motion be amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "But this House regrets that it has been found necessary to propose this

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) . . . . resolution constituting as it does want of confidence in the government and especially in the Departments of Industry and Commerce and Agriculture and Conservation."

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MADAM SPEAKER: I think that I would like some time to give some study to this resolution and I will take it under advisement.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, that is quite all right with me but I would just ask you the question now, will I be allowed to continue -- if you rule favourable on the amendment, will I be able to continue my speech?

. . . . . continued on next page



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

MR. RICHARD SEABORN (Wellington): Madam Speaker, first of all I would like to thank you and the members of the House for the courtesy and understanding to allow this matter to stand until this time, and as I rise to take part in this debate, no one knows better than I do the magnitude of the task that is before me.

The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, with his customary thoroughness, has endeavoured to present some facts to support his contention that we should have a comprehensive medical insurance plan in this province, if not across the whole of Canada, and he has left me in the rather uncomfortable position of having to cover such a wide area, but I know that he will forgive me if I am unable to deal with all aspects of his proposal.

I believe it was Friedrich Hegel who wrote that peoples and governments never have learned anything from history or acted on principles derived from it, and indeed the exceptions are very few. But the force of Hegel's assertion, the force of his observation lies in the nature of the error itself; for, ordinarily, rational activity is self-correcting to a very high degree in the field of science; in medicine, for example; even in business and many other activities. Men progress by virtue of rationality. Their mistakes are recognized and they're analyzed and men try to avoid making these mistakes in the future. However, it seems in the wide realm of politics that men are inclined to adopt a policy of what I would call almost anti-knowledge, and build an elaborate body of false knowledge instead. Anti-knowledge by definition rules out any self-correction and it is ultimately fatal for any civilization that indulges too much in it. Our country -- indeed I believe the whole world, civilization -- stands at the brink of fulfilment of Hegel's observation, and the conditions for our survival as a free civilized people involves knowledge of our history and a willingness to take intelligent action based upon the best and most accurate knowledge we can obtain.

Now, the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks gave us an extremely long list of countries who, according to his presentation, had government-sponsored health programs. Now he did not elaborate on these plans but he felt, because they were in existence elsewhere, that the recommendations of the Hall Commission were legitimate and practicable. I believe that the Socialists claim that there are some 59 countries that provide state medical care, but I think it is exceedingly important to point out and stress that very few of these countries actually make medical care available to the entire population. In most countries medical care is only available to certain parts of the population. However, we are told that compulsory health insurance is part of the march of history, that before too long we too will have a similar pattern of government-sponsored, obligatory health insurance, and even if this were true and it could be demonstrated by some yardstick that socialized medicine is a strong historical trend, it still would not prove its merits or its superior performance in my opinion. So I think that we may profit by taking a look at some of the countries our honourable friend mentioned, and try to find out what is actually taking place.

I believe that one of the first countries that he referred to was Australia. Well, I went down the alphabetical list, but Australia was referred to -- and I'm sure that my friend was not really serious when he included Australia in the list because -- (Interjection) -- it is in the list -- it is a voluntary health insurance plan. Sir Earl Page, who is the previous Minister of Health in that country, states "that Australia has been very fortunate indeed. During the war years and immediately afterwards we narrowly escaped the trap of socialization set to enmesh medicine and other aspects of daily life, and having escaped from the trap Australians have not been faced with the problem of working their way out of it. In Australia we have made up our minds in favor of a contributory health benefit scheme on a voluntary basis which is working smoothly and efficiently. There have been some changes made in the light of new experience but both in principle and practice the plan is well established and widely approved by the Australian people."

Apparently, why the Australians do not favor a compulsory health insurance plan is probably because they are so close to New Zealand, and I know that my friends opposite will be very glad that I'm approaching New Zealand, for this is one country in which socialism was fervently embraced, but I think it is very interesting to note, Madam Speaker, that this country was very much in the news in 1961 because it elected a Conservative government which committed itself to retrench some of the welfare statism in that country that has developed under previous Labour governments, and one of the measures promised was the restoration of some charges for medical care. Health benefits in New Zealand are a part of a very comprehensive

(MR. SEABORN cont'd) . . . . . social security program. Although it is admittedly very difficult to disentangle the medical situation from the other areas of welfare benefits as far as costs and . . . . . effects are concerned in that country, the health program is considered to be quite crippling financially. I think it is interesting, too, to note that New Zealand leads the world in taxation by any standard of comparison. In any income bracket from \$4,000 to \$28,000 New Zealand's income in social security taxes far exceeds those in Great Britain, Australia, the United States and Canada.

The political analysts have stated that the welfare principle in New Zealand can go nowhere except to gradually dismantle itself to a reasonable level. They have also noted that New Zealand is the one democracy where promised cash benefits will no longer win election, and I believe the word for the situation in this country, I believe the word that should be used is "disenchantment," but apparently we will not heed the warning.

Now let's take a look at Austria -- I believe that this is one country that my honourable friend mentioned -- and Austria is interesting for more ways than one. With an academic and a scientific tradition very similar to their German cousins, Austria has contributed greatly to the achievements of modern medicine, but as in Germany it has carried into the second half of our century a tradition and system of compulsory sickness insurance introduced by those benevolent but authoritarian monarchies of the 19th century. Eighty years ago the emperors were advised that the only way to keep the followers of Karl Marx under control in parliament would be to rescue the proletariat through an imposed system of government health care, and today Austria has a chronically troubled compulsory scheme which is trying to blanket in the remaining free population, and is almost entirely the political property of the Socialist Party in that country.

Seventy years of compulsory health insurance in Austria should dispel the notion that, given enough time, government health plans will solve their inherent problems, and I think it is of particular interest, too, that in 1958 a newspaper in Vienna ran a series of articles under the title "The Malingerers Among Us" and the reporter examined in full detail the various techniques of getting ill for the specific purpose of acquiring social security benefits, and in 1959 the Director of the Control Board for the Austrian Health Plan concluded his report by saying, "It is vain for the Health Plan to appeal to the Federal Government. Even if their deficits were continually covered by general revenues, the root of the evil would remain, the thoughtless irresponsible claims for benefits," and he goes on to say, "We suffer from a vicious circle. The compulsory health plan, as everyone knows, makes only half-hearted efforts to plug the holes through which their resources vanish. As a consequence, the other participants in the health scheme show little inclination to help reach fiscal stability. The doctors receive so little for each registered patient per quarter that they have to carry a patient at least three if not all four quarters of the year. Indeed, it might be economic suicide for a doctor to discourage the hypochondriacs. The beneficiaries, of course, seeing ever larger amounts of their pay cheques deducted for social security, are literally trained to maximize their claims."

Now Madam Speaker, I think it is very important that we include Sweden in our investigation, for according to our friends across the way this is the land of our dreams, the great Utopia of welfare statism that they envisage for our great country, the great example of Socialism at work, and it is well that we consider what is taking place in that Scandinavian democracy.

MR. PAULLEY: You admit it's democracy.

MR. SEABORN: Yes, in that definition of the word.

MR. PAULLEY: Thank you.

MR. SEABORN: I said, with the definition of that word. Prior to the Socialist government bringing in its compulsory health insurance scheme in 1955, the proverbial health of the Swedish people was described in a New York Times Editorial as follows: "If a high expectancy of life at birth and the lowest infant mortality rates in the world mean anything, the Swedes are an exceedingly healthy people." So if there was one place on this earth it should have been possible in Sweden for compulsory health insurance to avoid the costly developments experienced in other countries, for Sweden has a small homogeneous population, conscientious citizens, and a very high level of health to begin with. There was really no logical or compelling reason for the compulsory health insurance scheme in Sweden, but it seems, to top off a welfare state, it takes in the eyes of some, a comprehensive and compulsory health plan for all people; and it's very easy to be swayed by the current argument that a modern

(MR. SEABORN cont'd), . . . . . prosperous and progressive nation needs some sort of compulsory medical care. Without it, some people seem to feel that the claim to leadership and social progress is not quite complete, and to me this assumption is highly questionable. There are other countries that have gone a remarkably long way without compulsory health insurance, Madam Speaker, and in Sweden, a comparative newcomer to state medicine, few can see what compulsory insurance has contributed that could not have been done under the previous voluntary arrangement.

As I mentioned before, it should have been comparatively easy to inaugurate a health scheme in Sweden. There were no great gaps in health to be remedied under the new system. The statistics before and after the introduction of the compulsory plan should not have been too different. However, as we shall see, the cost of health insurance and the overall expenditure for the health service since the introduction of the compulsory system, have increased far beyond anything its proponents anticipated.

Sweden is a country of 16 million people and 70% of the Swedish population carried voluntary health insurance prior to the introduction of the compulsory scheme in 1955. The total expenditures of these voluntary plans rose between 1946 and 1950 from \$25.6 million to \$38.8 million, and by 1954 the expenditures were \$55.4 million. In 1955, however, during the first year of the compulsory service, the expenditures jumped to \$136 million. Within five years the expenditures had grown to \$200 million, and in 1961 exceeded \$240 million under the compulsory health scheme. In 1961, Madam Speaker, a married couple in Sweden with an annual income of \$3,000 -- which is a modest standard of living even in that country -- had to pay 27 percent in taxes on every dollar of additional income, and a couple earning \$5,000 had to surrender 42 percent of all additional income to the tax collector. Even the Social Democratic Party in Sweden admitted that the direct tax on income had moved beyond the critical point, and the public in our province, which has so far avoided the pitfalls of compulsory health insurance, would be well advised to take a real hard look at the claims that state medicine will cost only pennies a day.

It is reliably reported, Madam Speaker, that the people in Sweden are beginning to ask whether the welfare state is not merely a nonsensical merry-go-round of income distribution, a complicated and costly bureaucracy busy taking money from the very people who receive it back in all kinds of state subsidies. What was the word we used for New Zealand? Ah, yes -- "disenchanted" -- and in Sweden we have this disenchantment with the principle of socialism that has enslaved them under burdensome taxation--(Interjection)--You can make your contribution after, my friend.

Two years ago I read from the Hansard of November 25, 1961, covering the debate in the British Houses of Parliament. Lord Taylor, the great exponent of compulsory medical insurance in England, and well-known in this country as the mediator brought in by the Saskatchewan Government in the now historical medical dispute in that province, expressed great concern over the National Health Services Plan in Great Britain. He opened his speech by describing the situation both as a ghastly, awful picture and a desperate situation. Now, I have tried to make it a point to give the actual figures involved in the various plans in effect, and in each case, Madam Speaker, you will have noticed that the actual cost was far beyond the original estimates. I must therefore state that I do not trust the figures presented to us as the cost of a compulsory medical plan for this country. Conjecture and actual experience have proven to be two entirely different things. We were just speaking about England, so let's retrace the history of the compulsory medical care plan in that country.

The original estimated cost was given as 70 million pounds; the actual figure was 170 million pounds, within ten years had risen to 800 million pounds, and last year was one billion pounds. All this for a system that has proven itself wasteful, unmanageable and far short of the idealistic dreams of the planners. If you don't believe me, I would strongly suggest that you subscribe to the Hansards from England. It is being found that there is a new type of patient emerging in that country, similar to those found in Austria and Germany after their 70 years of experience with state medicine. This is no longer a group with imaginary illness, but these now are people who are trained in illness, referred to by the reporter in the Vienna Express newspapers. These people strongly resist any requirement to pay for their medical health other than a flat increase in their contributory contributions. --(Interjection)--You also will have your opportunity to make your contribution.

Now, if we had the opportunity to examine all of the facts of the countries given to us as participating in the compulsory health insurance plan, I think we would find that similar diffi-

(MR. SEABORN cont'd). . . . . culties exist in each one of them. I would like to point out, and I feel that this is very important for us to consider, that ill-advised health laws, once enacted, are the most difficult to repeal, and also are very difficult to amend -- far more difficult than any other legislation. And the first line of defence therefore is here more important than any subsequent one. This was not understood in Europe; it was not understood in Saskatchewan; but surely it is possible for us to learn from their experiences. Health insurance legislation, perhaps more than any other law, soon acquires an immunity from any thought of repeal. It is extremely doubtful whether freedom for either doctors or patients can be regained even though a state system has proven itself harmful and wasteful. Indeed, it is unlikely that even a national health scheme once established with an arm of the government can win independence from the political institution and be brought back under professional public administration as was attempted in both France and Great Britain.

I would submit, Madam Speaker, that a compulsory health insurance plan is not a part of history, that there are countries which have gone remarkably far without it, as I said before. The Federal Government of Switzerland, for example, introduced and passed a law in 1911 which made subsidies available to the various cantons if they would introduce a compulsory health scheme. A small number of them brought in a partial scheme to cover a small part of their population, but not one canton has introduced a compulsory health scheme to cover its entire population. In fact, most of the cantons rejected compulsory health insurance in favour of the voluntary insurance that is now in effect in that country. And perhaps if we too lived closer to other countries where compulsory health schemes were in effect, we would do likewise.

But before I leave this subject, Madam Speaker, there's another important factor that takes place when the state substitutes its power for what I will call social power. When Winnipeg was hit with the disastrous flood of 1950, social power was immediately mobilized and applied with the greatest intelligence and vigour. Its abundance in money alone was so great that when everything was finally put in order several millions of dollars remained. But if such a catastrophe happened now, not only does our social power, perhaps, too, depleted for a similar experience, but I believe that the general instinct would be to let the state look after it. The general attitude, I would expect, would be, if the state has made such matters its business and it's confiscated the social power to deal with them, why then, let it deal with them.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . . my honourable friend would permit a question on that point?

MR. SEABORN: Afterwards, if you don't mind. I think we can gain some rough measure of this general attitude by our own disposition when approached by a beggar. A few years ago we would have probably moved to give him something. Today we are more likely to refer him to the nearest state relief agency. The state has in effect said to society, "You're either not exercising enough power to meet the emergency or you're exercising it in what I consider an incompetent way. So I will confiscate your power and exercise it to suit myself." Therefore when a beggar now asks us for a quarter, we instinctively tell him that the state has already confiscated our quarter for his benefit so he should go and see the state about it. I think we will all appreciate the danger that faces us if we continue to go in this direction, and I would suggest that every positive intervention the state makes has a similar effect upon society.

I am convinced, Madam Speaker, that the people of Manitoba, acting on their own initiative and with their own resources, will take care of themselves far better than they will be taken care of by any number of politicians who endeavour to apply the theories of Karl Marx. If the government takes over in the manner that the honourable member suggests, it will mean that charity will give way to politics. Funds forcibly collected are dispensed to individuals according to group, class, or occupational category. This has no semblance of charity as we know it. It is the robbery of Peter to pay Paul. And further, when the government constructs a feeding trough and fills it with fruits extorted from the people, it creates new claimants and aggravates the problems it was supposed to solve, as I have endeavoured to show you.

How much better it would be, Madam Speaker, if we approached this whole question of health in a climate of freedom rather than compulsion. I believe the whole approach can and should be done on a voluntary basis. In Australia, in fact in our own country, in the Province of Alberta, they seem to find this system working quite efficiently and quite effectively. The Province of Manitoba some time ago made a presentation to the Royal Commission on Health

(MR. SEABORN cont'd). . . . . Services which, while suggesting that such a plan should be not only comprehensive and universally available, also in my opinion contained that very essential ingredient that is dear to the hearts of free men, namely, the right of free choice. To me, the greatest security a person can have comes from within himself, not from the outside, and nothing that anyone can do for you can begin to match what you can actually do for yourself. However, I do recognize that there may be those in our society who need our assistance and, because I am persuaded that such help can be given without the repulsive element of force, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that the resolution be amended by deleting all the words after "Whereas" in the first line of the resolution, and substitute the following: "the Government of Manitoba appeared before the Royal Commission on Health Services in January 1962 and presented concrete recommendations respecting national health problems; And whereas these recommendations included a plan of health insurance coverage; Therefore be it resolved that this House urges the Government of Canada to call a Dominion-Provincial Conference with a view to establishing a Federal-Provincial plan of health insurance that would be comprehensive, universally available, and consistent with the principle of need."

MADAM SPEAKER commenced to present the motion --

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if, Madam Speaker, before the motion is formally put to the House, I might ask my honourable friend a couple of questions?

MR. SEABORN: I'd be glad to.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, during his discussion a moment ago he made reference to the 1950 flood and the voluntary contributions from outside and within the province. I would like to ask my honourable friend if the state did not come to the aid of those affected by the flood in the year 1950 by making provisions for rehabilitation of their homes, etc. to considerable degree.

MR. SEABORN: This is probably quite true but I think that a lot of people got more satisfaction being able to do it out of their own hearts voluntarily.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . .the same matter, Madam Speaker, is the state not now making an expenditure in the neighborhood of \$63 millions by the building of a floodway in order to prevent a recurrence? Did you not hear me?

MR. SEABORN: I heard you.

MR. PAULLEY: What is your answer?

MR. SEABORN: I think the answer is obvious.

MR. PAULLEY: Certainly it's an answer. It's the state coming to the aid of individuals.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SEABORN: Madam Speaker, the answer to that question is obvious.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I assure you, Madam Speaker, I will not be reading this speech because I didn't think that I would be making one at this time, and I didn't have an occasion to prepare anything in line with what I want to say. Mainly it is because I feel provoked by what has been said by the Honourable Member from Wellington, and I don't want the opportunity to go by without dealing with some of the things which the honourable member referred to. I might say to begin with that, having heard the amendment, I am under the impression that this was prepared by a more rational approach to the problem than is evidenced by the words spoken by the person who moved the amendment.

This amendment, as I listened to it, spoke of a commission or a committee or a study to be made which is reasonable. We have had studies made which I think could have been dealt with by the honourable member, but another study is always worthwhile especially to prolong a problem which has to be dealt with, so this is both rational and consistent with this government's program of legislation, and the purpose for the study is to review what can be done to set up a government scheme -- and I wonder why a government scheme in the light of what the honourable member said preceding his moving of the amendment -- which will provide for comprehensive care -- I think he used the word comprehensive, but care, in any event -- based on need and if it's a government scheme there must be an element of compulsion; there must be an element of the use of tax money based on need. And this is completely inconsistent, Madam Speaker, with what was said by the honourable member, before he actually gave us the words of his amendment. And I would think that if we were given a free

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd). . . . . vote on the amendment -- and I must say, Madam Speaker, I intend to be very careful to speak on the amendment only, because I want the opportunity to speak on the main motion later -- that if there were a free vote on this amendment I would think that the honourable member would vote against the amendment in the light of what he said and what he appears to believe. And I sometimes wonder, Madam Speaker, what goes on in the minds of those people who decide who shall speak on what issues on the other side of the House. How they could come to pick on the person who has the contrary point of view, or at least expresses the contrary point of view, to move an amendment which appears to be government policy. The government member in his amendment, as I say, indicated that he wants government interference in the question of the provision of health services. He wants, I am sure by reading the amendment, that the government shall provide tax monies for the benefit of some people involved in receiving health services, and he speaks of need which is the term of "needs test," I suppose, as compared to the philosophic difference from "means test" but it does mean contributing to people and to their need, and this is completely contrary to what this honourable member wishes, because what he wants -- and this is really what prompted me to speak at this occasion without preparation other than listening to what he had to say -- was satisfaction, Madam Speaker. He wanted the satisfaction of being the giver, and I hope he never, never is in the position of having to be the receiver because I think this would be a traumatic experience for him from which he could not recover.

He spoke, Madam Speaker, in answer to the question of my Leader, about the flood, and about the portion contributed in tax dollars to the sufferers from the flood, and I wrote down what he said, that what the people gave through taxation could not compare -- this isn't word for word -- well, word for word what he said was: "The people got more satisfaction out of giving voluntarily." Madam Speaker, what people was he speaking of? The people who suffered? The people who needed help? The people who had to be rehabilitated? No, Madam Speaker. He spoke about the people who gave. These are the people that I think concerned the honourable member. The people who got satisfaction. The satisfaction one needs when one is hungry? The satisfaction that one needs when one needs a roof over one's head? Or the satisfaction that one needs, in his terms, of giving?

I am not one to quote the Bible, Madam Speaker, especially to the honourable member, but I have read somewhere that the best way to give, the most satisfying way to give, Madam Speaker, is to give not only anonymously so that no one knows that you gave, but to give in such a way that you don't know who receives, so that you don't get that feeling of satisfaction which I think is said is pretty good, but not as good as knowing that you have made a contribution. And that is quite different, Madam Speaker, a contribution to society, a contribution to a class, is something which makes you feel that you participate in the lives of people, but a contribution to a direct recipient, knowing the recipient, knowing that he is in need and knowing that you've given, is a pretty selfish form of contribution, Madam Speaker, and I use those words advisedly.

Charity, Madam Speaker, is a term which I must equate at times, at times, and I don't want to generalize too broadly, but there are times, Madam Speaker, when to give charity is a very selfish thing because you can give in different ways and be much more a part of your community. And when the honourable member used the comparison of the days -- he didn't say the good old days, but it seems to me he thought of it, good old days -- when one would give a quarter to a beggar and now one is more inclined to say to the beggar, "Go to a state relief agency." And I think he deplored that, Madam Speaker. I really think he felt that those days are good old days, that one could give a hand-out to a beggar, give him a quarter. And think of the immense feeling of warmth within oneself. One can go home and say, "I have done well for my fellow man." I don't think I'm exaggerating, Madam Speaker, the attitude which I read into what the honourable member said, because he used that comparison: "in the days when one could give a quarter to a beggar, now one is inclined to say, 'Go to the state relief agency!'"

If ever there was an occasion even for the need expressed in the amendment, then this is the occasion to say that only through an agency which knows, which judges, which assesses the need, do you then give in a way which is helpful, which is a contribution to the society of which one forms part. So if the honourable member may think back with nostalgia to the days when he was inclined to give the quarter to the beggar, I say thank God for the fact that all governments nowadays have said, "Let's forget about this hand-out to the beggar; let's think in the terms of the government acting on behalf of the people as a proper agency to help those

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd).....who are in need,'and in this sense I accept his word "need".

The honourable member spoke in terms of the fact that legislation of this kind -- and he was speaking of legislation of the type that is proposed in the main resolution -- is legislation that cannot be withdrawn. Obviously the amendment to the resolution which he has brought before us doesn't put us in any danger, Madam Speaker. We haven't done a thing. If we pass that amendment there's nothing we can withdraw because there's nothing we have accomplished. There's no step taken which one then has to worry about, because the appointment of a commission which the honourable member wants done is no irretrievable step either forward or backward. But I wonder why it would be difficult to withdraw legislation such as the honourable member did not want to have brought in. Is it because the people want it? Is it because the people feel it is necessary? Is it because people feel that the provision of health services to all of the people is important for all members of the group? If that is the reason, then surely that is the type of legislation that is needed. I need only recall to members of this House that the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs -- maybe sometimes he has fears too -- but the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs gave me the impression two days ago, Madam Speaker, that the reason for this upheaval that we had last August was it, where there was a redistribution of the sources of income of certain of the tax revenues of this province, were based -- and I think he gave me the idea -- they were based not so much because this government felt that there was an unfair load, an unfair burden placed on a certain class of taxpayers, but rather because this government felt that the people thought there was an unfair burden placed on a certain group of people, of taxpayers in this province. And because --

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell):  
Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I did on that occasion say that I believed that real property taxes were too high and that it was time that steps should be taken to alleviate the burden on the real property taxpayer.

MR. CHERNIACK: I think that's correct, Madam Speaker, because I read Hansard and I think that's what he said at the end of all the questions which he answered, and I think he redeemed himself at the time. But I was careful, Madam Speaker, when I said -- I was careful not to quote him, and I was careful to say that that is the impression which I received from what he said, and I must say, Madam Speaker, that the last sentence that he said and which he has just repeated, was stated but it did not change my impression as to what I think he set out as being the government's attitude. Now I don't think there's any quarrel about the words that were said and I don't see any value in going back to read Hansard at length, but I think if one reads about half a page of Hansard one might reach the conclusion which I reached as to an impression, and I was careful to say it was an impression. Now, if it is a fact that governments are motivated by what they think the people want, and I think that's a pretty accurate statement, then it appears that governments that bring in resolutions such as my Honourable Friend from Wellington deplores, bring them in because they feel that they are doing what the people expect them to do, what the people elect them to do, and having done that they find it most difficult to change their minds and back down; and that's natural because if the people later wanted them to back down and to change, then there would be no problem because they would be doing again what they think the people want them to do and what they understand is the purpose for which they were elected. If they find it is difficult, as mentioned by the Honourable Member for Wellington, then obviously it's difficult because the people don't want them to change the legislation. That's so obvious I don't think I need dwell on it.

My honourable friend went on to speak -- and again I think he deplored the fact when he said that charity will give way to politics. Madam Speaker, we all of us here are politicians. We may call ourselves statemen, but in effect there's nothing bad about the term politician. I don't reject it and I don't know how many Members of this House reject it. I think, I don't know the correct dictionary definition of politician, nor the parliamentary definition of politician, but to me the politician is a person who attempts to understand what it is that the electorate wants, and to carry it out in that type of legislation which he thinks will be advantageous for the people who elect him and other members of the House. Now that's an off-hand snap definition. I don't know if it will stand up to searching enquiry but I think it's good enough for the purposes, and I think in this case if the politician decides that what he wants to do is to carry out the wishes of the people and to raise taxes and to obtain funds from tax revenues in order to provide certain health measures to the people of the province, that he is doing something in a political way. He is carrying out the instructions, what he understands are the instructions of his electorate and if that is deplorable and if charity is better,

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd).....then let my Honourable Friend from Wellington find out whether that is the attitude of the members of his caucus, because I think that the people of this province would be entitled to know that. I think that in bringing this amendment before us he is speaking on behalf of the caucus and I am most anxious to know whether the caucus endorses a statement such as that it is deplorable and these are my words -- I don't remember his exact words, but the fact that he appears to regret that and these are his words, "charity will give way to politics."

Need I remind Members of this House what the Honourable Member from Wellington, near the conclusion of what he said, spoke of providing a feeding trough of fruits extorted from the people. Madam Speaker, is that the policy of this government as is envisaged in the amendment before it? Because again I say the amendment is something that as one reads it, is reasonable, is slow, is hesitant, but is at least a reasonable approach to an attitude. It is one with which in itself we cannot quarrel, but let us recall, Madam Speaker, the paragraph preceding what was said -- to provide a feeding trough of fruits extorted from the people. I don't know, Madam Speaker, what we do with the monies we collect. Are they extortion? Are the revenues of this province extortion from the people? Is that the attitude that we have to consider in this House, Madam Speaker? Is it that when we provide some sort of service, and it may not be too long and may well be within the lifetime of the Honourable Member from Wellington, that a Conservative government will bring in more and more measures of aid to the health services, on a universal basis in this province. It may well be, Madam Speaker. Will that be a feeding trough of fruits extorted from the people? Are the present services provided by this government provided through a feeding trough of fruits extorted from the people?

Madam Speaker, I recognize that the Honourable Member for Wellington has a right to his opinion and to his nostalgia for the good old days, but Madam Speaker, in providing for us an amendment which I believe, from the way it was drawn, is done on behalf of the caucus of which he is a member, that unless this caucus provides us with other thoughts and other philosophies, that other attitudes to support the amendment which we have before us, that the caucus as a group must accept the words and the sentiments and the attitudes of the honourable speaker. I want to say, Madam Speaker, in all sincerity I do not believe that this caucus -- I mean the caucus of the majority party -- shares those sentiments but I think that this caucus is tarnished by the brush of the words that were used in depicting or in picturing for us, the whole attitude to this problem and I am looking forward that my faith in the majority members of the caucus will be justified in suggesting that they will not accept the attitude expressed by the honourable member, but if they do, that, Madam Speaker, is their problem. I'm happy that I don't share the problem with them.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

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

MRS. CAROLYNE MORRISON (Pembina): It gives me a great deal of pleasure, Madam Speaker, to support this resolution because of the high regard I have for the fine folk who have come from far away lands to make their homes among us. In my own community, and I feel this speaks for every community throughout the length and breadth of our province, we have new citizens making a tremendous contribution to our way of life, both economically and socially. Not only have these newcomers proven themselves to be excellent homemakers, but from many lands they have brought with them talents and skills that have greatly enriched this Canada of ours. It would be impossible, Madam Speaker, to describe their many accomplishments, their many areas of learning, but certainly they have made a real contribution in many lines, in the field of medicine, in many sciences, in music and opera, in ballet and folk dancing, as painters and sculptors, as teachers in our schools and universities, and in the field of radio and television they have been very active, and most assuredly many of the handicrafts which flourish in Canada today were brought to us by expert craftsmen from other lands.

I am sure, Madam Speaker, it is our hope that the skills these many ethnic groups have brought with them will never be lost, that they will be passed on from generation to generation. What a pity it would be for instance if the music and dance of the Ukraine were to be lost to



(MRS. MORRISON cont'd).....posterity and so, Madam Speaker, I say again these new Canadians have made a most valuable contribution to the economy and artistic life of our country. Surely we owe them something in return.

When these folk have made their decision that they desire to make Canada their home, when they are ready to carry out the all important step of taking out their citizenship papers, surely they are entitled to a ceremony that provides not only solemnity but a real sense of dignity and importance to the occasion. I believe we have a duty to help them fully realize that, having chosen to become Canadian citizens, we are privileged to accept them as members of a Great Canadian family. Let us give them a feeling of security in the knowledge that we not only need them and appreciate them, but also that although we are of many different backgrounds we have now an equal responsibility in building for the future welfare of our great country.

Yes, Madam Speaker, with privileges there also come responsibilities and one of the greatest responsibilities is promoting peace and harmony regardless of our many backgrounds. I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that we do have much in common with our new Canadian citizens. Even if we are not immigrants ourselves, have many of us not listened with real interest to the amazing stories and experiences of our parents or our grandparents, who journeyed from far-away places to make a new life for themselves in Canada at a time when slowness of travel made those places much further away than they are today. The circumstances which prompted brave souls to leave their native lands have been very different indeed. For some it was the spirit of adventure, for others it has been their hope that this might be a land free from political upheaval where they could find peace and at least some measure of security for themselves, but more especially for their children and their children's children.

And so, Madam Speaker, I think it is most fitting that when these newcomers are ready to take on the responsibility of Canadian citizenship, they should be honoured with a ceremony suited to the importance of the occasion. In this way we as Canadians can help the new citizens realize that we consider this to be a very special occasion, that it is an outstanding event in his or her life. By so doing we will promote a closer bond, a deeper understanding between the Canadian citizen by birth and the Canadian citizen by choice. I would pay tribute, Madam Speaker, to Judge Chapman of Winnipeg; yes, to all members of the judiciary wherever they may be who, realizing the significance of the occasion, do arrange colourful and impressive ceremonies for those taking out their citizenship papers. I would pay tribute also to those patriotic organizations who in recognition of the importance of the occasion have added distinction to the ceremony. I would emphasize, Madam Speaker, that we should all be proud of our status as Canadian citizens, the status which, as the Honourable Member for Brandon reminded us, we have only had since the passing of The Canadian Citizenship Act, January 1, 1947. Let us do all we can to help our new citizens be proud to say, "I am a Canadian." Madam Speaker, I am pleased to second this resolution.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, as one.....

MR. ROBLIN: .....my honourable friend's convenience if we were to call it 5:30 seeing it is so close, and he can continue at 8:00 o'clock, rather than get started on a speech now?

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