

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. D. Watt	Reston, Manitoba
ASSINIBOIA	Steve Patrick	189 Harris Blvd., Winnipeg 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Hon. Robert G. Smellie, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	E. R. Schreyer	2 - 1177 Henderson Hwy., Winnipeg 16
BURROWS	Mark G. Smerchanski	102 Handsart Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARILLON	Leonard A. Barkman	Steinbach, Man.
CHURCHILL	Gordon W. Beard	Thompson, Man.
CYPRESS	Hon. Thelma Forbes	Rathwell, Man.
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	William Homer Hamilton	Sperling, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Kimberly St., Winnipeg 15
EMERSON	John P. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT-PLAINS	M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q. C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	Emil Moeller	Teulon, Man.
FLIN FLON	Hon. Charles H. Witney	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	Nelson Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	Morris A. Gray	406 - 365 Hargrave St., Winnipeg 2
KILDONAN	James T. Mills	142 Larchdale Crescent, Winnipeg 15
LAC DU BONNET	Oscar F. Bjornson	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
LA VERENDRYE	Albert Vielfaure	La Broquerie, Man.
LOGAN	Lemuel Harris	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEDOSA	Hon. Walter Weir	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MORRIS	Harry P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Hon. Obie Baizley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
PEMBINA	Mrs. Carolyne Morrison	Manitou, Man.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	Gordon E. Johnston	7 Massey Drive, Portage la Prairie
RADISSON	Russell Paulley	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
RHINELAND	J. M. Froese	Winkler, Man.
RIVER HEIGHTS	Hon. Maitland B. Steinkopf, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROBLIN	Keith Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	Hon. Abram W. Harrison	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	Hon. George Hutton	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	J. E. Jeannotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent Desjardins	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
ST. GEORGE	Elman Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guildford St., St. James, Winnipeg 12
ST. JOHN'S	Saul Cherniack, Q. C.	333 St. John's Ave., Winnipeg 4
ST. MATTHEWS	W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Fred Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	Room 250, Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q. C.	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	Arthur E. Wright	168 Burrin Ave., Winnipeg 17
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	Fred T. Klym	Beausejour, Man.
SWAN RIVER	James H. Bilton	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	P. J. McDonald	Killarney, Man.
VIRDEN	Donald Morris McGregor	Kenton, Man.
WELLINGTON	Richard Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	James Cowan, Q. C.	412 Paris Bldg., Winnipeg 2
WOLSELEY	Hon. Duff Roblin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, February 18, 1964.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

Notices of Motion.

Introduction of Bills.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, I wonder if I might have leave of the House to have this item stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed?

Before the Orders of the Day I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are 70 Grade 11 students from Teulon Collegiate, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Revel. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Fisher. We welcome you here this afternoon. We hope that all that you see and hear in this Legislative Assembly will be of help to you in your studies. May this visit be an inspiration to you and stimulate your interest in provincial affairs. Come back and visit us again.

Orders of the Day.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. Last evening on television, I believe it was Reverend Mutchmor was quoted in an interview as saying that the bars in Winnipeg were using home-brew rather than Government liquor. Could the Minister indicate whether this is a fact, or...

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): I am certain, Madam Speaker, that this is not the case. We will be glad to have a look at it.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Has the Honourable the Attorney-General conducted experiments to be sure of where he ....

MR. McLEAN: No, Madam Speaker.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Would the Honourable Attorney-General bring samples into the House so's we could make up our own minds?

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to give some information to the Honourable Member for Brokenhead in respect to a question that he directed to me, asking what was being done by the Department of Agriculture and Conservation to take remedial action in respect to the lowering of the water table, which could be attributed to the construction of the Red River diversion. I might say at the outset that some 3,600 -- 3,600 wells were investigated, beginning about two years ago. These were all catalogued and pertinent data taken. The owners of these wells were interviewed, and a catalogue was made of the wells in such a way that the department would be able to determine the responsibility if the construction of the diversion proved to be detrimental to the water supply. The number of complaints that have been received to date is 45. The number of wells inspected as a result of these complaints is 36. Nine complaints were rejected as being beyond the influence of the floodway works. Three new wells have been constructed, one of which required a new pump. Six new pumps have been installed. Nine tail pipes have been extended. One pump has been converted and extended. One family is having water delivered. Two have repaired their own wells before reporting to the department. Seven were inspected but still had an adequate supply of water. Two are still being worked upon at the present time. One special case has been referred to the Chief Engineer for further direction. Four were deemed not to be due to floodway works following inspection.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, I would want to have time to look at this. In the meantime, I would like to thank the Minister for a comprehensive statement.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): ..... Madam Speaker, if the Minister could indicate to us the location of the wells referred to, or is it general throughout the length of the floodway?

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, to my knowledge the wells referred to are in the northerly reaches of the floodway.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, a supplement question. Have there been complaints

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)... in connection with the area just east of the City of Transcona?

MR. HUTTON: I can't answer that question.

MR. PAULLEY: Could the Minister find out?

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I rise on a matter of the privileges of the House. I charge, Madam Speaker, this government with contempt of the Legislature. I have here a full page of one of the Winnipeg newspapers for Thursday of last week. There are three separate items on that page, Madam Speaker, where the government has given information -- obviously to the press -- on what is going to happen here in the Legislature at a future date, before this Legislature has been advised of such. One headline - "Government to Hike Social Allowances - Welfare Minister J.B. Carroll said Thursday in an interview, he will be announcing the increases when his department estimates come up" -- proceeds to tell what's going to happen -- "Tighter Rein on Utilities - Members of the Boards of the Manitoba Hydro and the Manitoba Telephone System will have to appear annually before a committee of the Provincial Legislature under legislation which will be presented at the current session." Third one. "Mortgage Licenses Proposed"-- again with details of what the government intends to do at this session, without having given prior notice to this House. I charge that this is against the rules of this House, Madam Speaker, and this is contempt of the Legislature. When we are here sitting in session this government has no right to be giving information outside of this House to other parties without providing it first to the members of the Legislature. This, Madam Speaker, is government by press release. Yesterday, the Attorney -- pardon me, the ex-Attorney-General stood up in this House and complained that they were hearing about actions of another jurisdiction altogether, the one in Ottawa, regarding certain activities here in the province. He complained that this was an improper system. Well, Madam Speaker, if it's improper for another jurisdiction to be putting out press releases, what about this government while this House is in session proceeding with this type of activity, and I demand, Madam Speaker, that this practice cease immediately.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I think the Leader of the Opposition has every right to raise in the way he did any question that appears to infringe the privileges of the House, and no one would for a moment suggest that he shouldn't do so. Confronted with this at this moment it's impossible for me to make a reply. I think the point that he has raised must be considered, and will be considered, and at the first convenient opportunity some comment will be made on his remarks today.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Madam Speaker, speaking to the point of privilege, I would just like to say that with respect to the Social Allowances Act and any changes which might be made I said nothing that had not been said in the Speech from the Throne. I gave no details of what the changes might be. Presumably someone chose to speculate as to what changes might be taking place under this Legislature.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, I wish to lay on the table a Return to an Order of the House dated Friday, February 4th, on motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table the Return to an Order of the House No. 6, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the House Leader. I apologize, since I did not give him notice, and he may find the question to be rather awkward or inopportune to answer at this time, in which case I hope he will take it as notice and answer as soon as possible. I've been requested to ask the House Leader whether he would be able to arrange for a hearing for students from St. Pauls College and other groups at the University of Manitoba respecting the school question, and if so, if such a hearing could be granted, could it be granted so that it would take place in one of the larger committee rooms at which members of this Assembly who are interested might attend, at the time of one o'clock if at all possible, or any time that is convenient soon thereafter.

MR. EVANS: It would seem to me this question could be answered that it would not be proper to convene a special committee or anything of that kind . . . . He doesn't -- the Honourable Member didn't indicate as to who might hear these students. It would seem to me that

(Mr. Evans, cont'd)... so far as the Legislature is concerned, it is proposed that a special committee be created to consider the whole matter, and quite clearly they would have the right to appear as anyone else would, so that at the moment I see no possibility of arranging a special committee of the Legislature for example, to hear this party tomorrow.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, a supplementary question, for clarification purposes. The House Leader, I am sure, is aware that a hearing was granted to a delegation from Portage la Prairie and Lakeside last week, and at that delegation, or at that hearing, certain interested MLAs were present, and I'm asking the House Leader whether it wouldn't be possible to provide just such a hearing in one of the committee rooms.

MR. EVANS: Hearing by whom?

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, by members of the Cabinet and any interested MLAs that would like to attend.

MR. EVANS: It would seem to me that this is a request for a hearing to be arranged by the Minister of the department concerned, and that those wishing to see him and have him arrange a meeting of this kind should apply to him and discuss the matter with him.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Education then, and again I would ask that he take this as notice if he's not prepared just now to answer. The question is, would he be prepared to make arrangements for a hearing to take place some time tomorrow, or soon thereafter, such hearing to be granted to students from St. Pauls and other groups of the University, and which might allow interested MLAs to attend?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, I would like to take this under advisement. Could the Honourable Member, before I sit down, indicate how many students he would have in mind?

MR. SCHREYER: The number of students involved would be somewhere in the neighborhood of 30 to 40, and all they ask for is a dispassionate rational discussion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question of the House Leader. The Premier indicated his intention of bringing in the Budget tomorrow. Does this still hold?

MR. EVANS: Yes, insofar as I can answer for him. Yes.

MR. MOLGAT: Is it also the intention then to proceed with Estimates tomorrow as well? Will they be presented to us tonight at the conclusion of the Throne Speech debate and entered into tomorrow?

MR. EVANS: Yes. Madam Speaker, I put a question to the House because it has been raised with me. As this is private members' day and it is also the last day of the Throne debate, a member has asked me whether consideration would be given to calling the item on the Order Paper first, that is, the Throne debate. I said this matter is one to be decided by the private members of the House and that I would ask the Leaders of the parties concerned to let me have their views in that connection.

MR. MOLGAT: .....the Order Paper as it is.

MR. PAULLEY: One further point if I may, Madam Speaker. I was thinking of this matter this morning. As a matter of fact I did endeavour to get in touch with yourself or the Clerk of the Assembly. While our rules say the vote shall come half an hour before the end of the seventh day of debate, the question which I wished to pose to you, Your Honour, was what exactly would an interpretation be of the rules respecting the seventh day of debate, because it is quite conceivable, today being private members' day all day, that the resolutions which stand on the Order Paper now could conceivably take us until eleven o'clock this evening, in which case, while it would be the seventh day of meeting after entering into the debate on the adjournment, it wouldn't be the seventh day of debate actually on the adjournment. Now maybe my friend Perry Mason the ex-Attorney-General might be able to give me the information. He seems to be the expert on the rules across the way, and I respectfully ask this now because I think this is pertinent to the point raised by the House Leader.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, I rise to assure my honourable friend that my knowledge extends only to the field of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Public Utilities. In view of the announced deficit in the Manitoba

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd)... Telephone System, is it the intention to introduce any increase in rates?

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF (Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, I believe this has to do with future policy and the matter will come up in its proper time.

MADAM SPEAKER: I have a note handed to me late. I would like to acknowledge, in connection with the school from Teulon, that there is also a school here, 40 pupils in number, from St. Jean Collegiate, under the direction of their teachers, Mr. P. Humniski and Mrs. E. Lansard. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Emerson. We welcome them along with the others.

In answer to the question raised by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party, if we refer to our Rule Book, No. 34, in the first section, it refers to seven sitting days and in this particular instance we are on the fourth section where it says "on the seventh of the seven days." In my opinion this is the seventh sitting day.

MR. PAULLEY: ..... get the rule changed so it's the seventh debating day, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders for Returns. The Honourable the Member for St. Johns.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. John's): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing (1) the number of firearms accidents which have been reported to any governmental agency or department, (including the RCMP) in the last twelve month period for which records are available; (2) the number of these which were fatal; (3) the number of each type of firearm involved in such accidents; (4) the location or occasion of such accident (for example, whilst hunting, home accidents, in vehicles, etc); (5) the age of the person in possession of the firearm when it was discharged.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders for Returns. The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing (1) copies of all applications for certification presented to the Labour Board from January 1st, 1961, to December 31st, 1962; (2) disposition of all applications for certification presented to the Board during this period with statement giving reasons for Board's decision.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I might, with your leave and with leave of the House, make a motion relating to the Standing Committees of the House.

MADAM SPEAKER: Leave granted.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that by leave the names of Messrs. Barkman and Tanchak be stricken from the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations and the name of Mr. Patrick be substituted therefor; that the name of the Honourable Mr. McLean be stricken from the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Conservation and the name of Mr. Bilton be substituted therefor; that the name of Mr. Groves be stricken from the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and the name of Mr. Beard be substituted therefor.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for St. James and the proposed amendment of the Honourable the Member for Wellington and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

I have taken this amendment under consideration and reviewed it, and I see no objection to it. Anyone wishing to speak on it may do so.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I think your decision is quite proper in this regard, but it does seem to me as I look at the amendment to the amendment that it's rather difficult to enter into precise debate without reviewing the whole question of TCA here in Manitoba. It seems to me that in the amendment to the amendment that the proposer attempts to slough off onto the management of TCA many of the responsibilities which are primarily those of the federal government, because if one analyzes what has happened and the statements that have been made recently in respect of TCA in Winnipeg, one cannot help but see that the Prime Minister of Canada, in statements which he has made in the press and in other places, stated

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)... that insofar as the Government of Canada is concerned the responsibility of the actions of TCA insofar as the government are concerned are limited, in the words of the Prime Minister as contained in the Winnipeg Free Press of February 15th, and I quote: "Mr. Pearson's wire said the government policy to stay in Winnipeg until 1973 is at least not expressed as a directive because the government has no legal power to issue any such directive. Government control of TCA is exercised only through general control of the capital budget. Government policy is therefore expressed in the only possible way, namely, TCA concurrence with my statement of November 22nd."

So I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that when we're looking into the whole context of the question of TCA we first of all should look at the statements as contained in the amendment to the amendment, where the Liberal Party in Manitoba are attempting to get the Liberal authority off the hook and directing all of the blame at TCA management itself.

I say, Madam Speaker, that this is not a proper approach, neither is it an accurate one, because while I can find a considerable amount of criticism to levy at management of TCA, and while I am convinced that they haven't been clear and aboveboard with their employees, they have been doing this with the full knowledge of the Liberal Government at Ottawa; and for now, the Government -- the Liberals here in Manitoba to lay the onus upon management alone, I say is incorrect and unfair. I do suggest, Madam Speaker, as I mentioned a moment ago, that there are faults that can be laid at the door of TCA but not the faults that the Liberals here in Manitoba are attempting to lay at the doorstep.

I would like first of all, Madam Speaker, following this, to review my participation as Leader of this Party in the venture to Ottawa. May I first of all recall that we had a delegation which left Manitoba back in January, I believe, of 1963, when we still had the Diefenbaker government at Ottawa. That delegation was arranged by the Minister of Industry and Commerce, the Honourable Mr. Evans, on receipt of information that there was a likelihood of the TCA installation closing down in the year 1966. At that time, I phoned to my honourable friend, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and asked to be allowed to accompany the delegation to Ottawa, because I was so vitally concerned, as indeed I thought all Manitobans were, that this was one of those types of delegations that should have the united backing of all those in political life irrespective of party. I regret to state to this Legislature, however, Madam Speaker, that my offers were rejected; that I was informed at that particular time that it was deemed inadvisable to approach the Conservative ministration at that time being the Leader of a political party other than those responsible for the delegation. I must say in all fairness to my honourable friend, he did say to me, "Russ, if you want to come along, that's fine, but we will not recognize you as part of the official delegation." And I believe that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was in a similar situation to myself at that particular time.

However, Madam Speaker, that having been done, I'm sure that the Minister of Industry and Commerce of our province, when it was deemed advisable to go to Ottawa with the second delegation, possibly had taken consideration of the wisdom of my offer at that time, and extended an invitation to all political parties in Manitoba, indeed representatives of the whole community of Manitoba, to go to Ottawa to see whether or not we could bring about a greater amount of stability insofar as the TCA was concerned, and to unitedly endeavour to have this great enterprise which is so needed in the Province of Manitoba retained fully here in our province. And I was pleased to go along and take part in the delegation along with many others. A case was laid before the Government of Canada. We had a very attentive hearing from the Right Honourable Lester Pearson, certain members of the Cabinet, in this regard, and I say, Madam Speaker, that when we left Ottawa after our meeting in June, that on arriving back here on June 18th of last year, that I was convinced that the delegation had made its point on the Government of Canada, because if I recall the words of the Right Honourable the Prime Minister of Canada at that time, they were something to this effect: "I know that the delegation, when they get out final word, will be satisfied with the decision that we make."

Now, Madam Speaker, here we were, a delegation from Winnipeg and Manitoba, because it was truly a Manitoba delegation, that after being given a very attentive hearing by the Prime Minister and he makes the statement to the effect that we would be satisfied, he was sure, with the decision of his Government, there was only one decision that we of that delegation would be satisfied, Madam Speaker, and that was that the TCA would be retained and expanded here in

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)... the Province of Manitoba.

Then following that, it seemed to me things were going along fine, until statements were made in Parliament at Ottawa November 22nd by Mr. Pearson to the effect that we were assured first of all that the plant was assured for Manitoba at least until the year 1973. Now, that didn't seem too unreasonable, except for a joker, and that joker became more evident as time went on, when we heard then from the President of the TCA in committee of the Railway committees at Ottawa, that there wasn't too much substance to what Mr. Pearson had said. I wish to quote from Page 140 of the Sessional Committee on Railways, Airlines and Shipping, dated December 5, 1963, whereas Mr. McGregor, in answer to the question posed by Mr. Muir, a representative from Lisgar constituency here in Manitoba, which is, quoting Mr. Muir: "I think we all realize that the number had dropped to 34. I believe Mr. McGregor corrected me"-- that was dealing with the Viscount planes, Madam Speaker -- "I believe Mr. McGregor corrected me on that statement, when I said 35, by saying 34. I'm not talking about aircraft, I'm talking about people at the . . . ." Then Mr. McGregor went on: "I think I have given this answer, but if I have not, I will do so now. It's not the TCAs intention in respect to the Winnipeg base to employ at any time more employees than are required to carry out the workload presented by aircraft based there. As the number of Viscounts are reduced from the present 40, which are expected to be maintained through to 1966, when it starts downward toward the forecast figure of 35, it seems quite obvious that prudent management would call for a corresponding reduction in the number of employees. This reduction may not be directly related to the number of Viscounts in service at one time. It is related specifically to the workload which they present on an overhaul basis. As the aircraft get older, then the workload in relation to a specific number of Viscounts may go up. I think this may be what the Minister was referring to when he mentioned possible increase. The workload may remain level or may go down with the number of Viscount decrease or if their life is short."

I quote that, Madam Speaker, because of the fact of the statements of the Honourable the Prime Minister when he said that it was anticipated that from their observation that the numbers of employees at TCA would remain constant, or if there was very much change, then it would be an increase. And the Prime Minister of Canada, Madam Speaker, I suggest made those statements in full knowledge of the statement that was made to the Railway Committee by the President of the TCA, Mr. McGregor. So I say, Madam Speaker, that we haven't had firm commitments from the Prime Minister of Canada respecting this, and that the statements that have been made by the Prime Minister are without full substance or worthy of acceptance.

So, we went back to Ottawa again on December 18th, and Mr. Pearson then reiterated his belief that they would be held -- the numbers of TCA would be held. Then, at that particular time, certain members of the delegation that were appearing on behalf of Manitoba, drew to the attention of the Government certain inconsistencies in the action of TCA and what they had promised and said that they would do, and what they were in effect carrying out. The Prime Minister undertook, after hearing of these inconsistencies between announcements and policy of TCA, he undertook to draw these to the attention of the TCA management, and I want to quote from the Winnipeg Free Press of December 18th, a news item date-lined Ontario, where Mr. Pearson is being asked questions in the House of Commons at Ottawa in respect to the delegation which then had appeared at Ottawa the day previously. Mr. Orlikow, in this article, is stated as saying: "Mr. Orlikow, NDP, Winnipeg North, noted that in November the Prime Minister said employment in Winnipeg would not be reduced. He said that in January the former Minister from Winnipeg, Gordon Churchill, had said that there would be a freeze on jobs. This refers to a year previous. But in the interval close to 200 jobs have disappeared in Winnipeg. He asked the Government to direct TCA to maintain the freeze on jobs. Mr. Pearson replied: 'As I have said, it is the policy of this Government to do everything possible to maintain employment at TCA base in Winnipeg, and if possible to increase it.' Mr. Orlikow then, according to this article, suggested that the Prime Minister convey the desire of the Government to Gordon McGregor, President of TCA. The reply of the Honourable the Prime Minister was: 'I shall be very glad to do that, and also convey to him the proceedings of the meeting this morning.'" Then, further on in this article that I am referring to, Mr. Pearson said in a subsequent paragraph -- he replied in answer to a question from Mr. Churchill, as follows: "Mr. Churchill replied that the information given the Government by the delegation



(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)... would be taken up with the TCA."

Now, Madam Speaker, on February 13th, in the Winnipeg Free Press, comes the famous statement of the President of the TCA, Mr. McGregor, where he stated that he had received no directive, he had received no instructions from who? The Prime Minister, who on December 18th in the House of Commons had told a former member of this House, Mr. David Orlikow, MP, that he certainly would draw to the attention of the management of TCA the desirability of the Government of Canada to retain the TCA installation here in the Province of Manitoba. Who's kidding who? I suggest, Madam Speaker, that in this little by-play that is going on the ones that are suffering because of lack of decision, because of the hodge podge of verbiage that is going on between Gordon McGregor and Mike Pearson and the Liberal Party even here in the Province of Manitoba, the ones that are suffering because they know not where they are going, are the employees of TCA.

The Honourable Leader of the House sent a telegram the other day to the Prime Minister drawing to his attention that he did not like the method by which the matter was being developed. In the second telegram a copy of which I have here, that the First Minister of this Province sent to Mr. Pearson, the Premier noted that newspaper reports showed that TCA President Donald McGregor had confirmed his company had received no directive from the federal government to stop phasing out the Winnipeg base before 1973. Then in subsequent reply to this telegram up comes the statement, which I read earlier, from the Prime Minister that they have nothing to do with TCA except control of its capital budget. What hodge podgery!

It wasn't so long ago, Madam Speaker, that we had a tour at the opening of the new terminal here. With loud fanfare and gusto the Minister of Transport, the Minister of Veterans' Affairs, who happens to be my representative at Ottawa and the Honourable Roger Teillet, toured the plant here on opening day. They were invited to do so by the Union representatives of the employees of the TCA. And Madam Speaker, one of the things that the employees of TCA here in Winnipeg have been trying to convince the Government of Canada and the TCA, that they have the skills and the qualifications to service any type of aircraft that the TCA may possess now or are likely to possess in the future, and I think that they have convinced them of this, but they want it located here in Manitoba so that they will not be uprooted. One of the answers of TCA has been that we can't handle this matter here, that it would require considerable amount of alterations to the facilities here in Winnipeg. Well, what was the comment of the Honourable Roger Teillet, the responsible Minister of the Cabinet from the Province of Manitoba after that tour? He said that this had confirmed his original feelings that the Winnipeg facilities are sufficient to handle jet aircraft, he was convinced that the plant could be extended here in order to do so, and that on behalf of Manitoba he would fight. I wonder how much the fight is going on in the inner cabinet of the federal authority today to hold here in Manitoba this installation.

While we were down at Ottawa a proposition was made to the Government of Canada to consider all aspects of aviation here in Canada. A request was made that before any firm decision was made respecting the supplanting of the employees out of Winnipeg to Montreal, that a firm policy be resolved. But no, it has not been done as yet. The amendment to the amendment suggests that we should consider as one of the alternatives to many other things, a provincial enquiry with TCA officials attending, as the Prime Minister of Canada indicated might be done. Madam Speaker, we don't need any provincial enquiry insofar as we're concerned, to decide whether or not TCA should remain in Manitoba. We know it should remain in Manitoba, and this is what we have been fighting for but we have been receiving very little assistance from our representatives at Ottawa.

In this amendment to the amendment reference is made to the fact that an offer was made to the Government of Manitoba that it might be able to investigate into the Dixon-Speas Report, which is a confidential report. If I recall correctly, a sort of a half-baked offer was made to the Government of Manitoba, if I recall press releases correctly, that they might look at it for their own satisfaction in confidence and not be able to use any of the contents thereof, in order to substantiate as to whether or not the base should be moved here from the Province of Manitoba.

I say, too, Madam Speaker, that while we were down in Ottawa on the 17th of December, a meeting was being held between the Union representatives and the management of TCA, and

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd)... one of the items under consideration at that time was the question of temporary employees at Dorval Airport. The Union raised the question as to what effect the recent press announcement on the Winnipeg base will have on understandings agreed to at the 1963 negotiations in the temporary employee situation at Dorval. Then the company replied -- the company stated that they did not have enough detail on the government's decision and its intent to deal with the subject at this time. However, the company is vitally interested and will keep the Union advised as the information becomes available.

So here even again you have this teeter-totter between management of TCA and the Government of Canada, in the meantime nothing of a concrete nature to allay the fears of the TCA employees here in the Greater Winnipeg area. And I say, Madam Speaker, this has got to stop. There are precedents in Canada for holding employment in certain . . . . on and in Crown corporations. I say that it's the responsibility of the federal government to now come to a conclusion insofar as an air policy for Canada is concerned. I think that it's vital for the whole of the Dominion of Canada that in arriving at that decision that it's necessary to expand the facilities here in the Greater Winnipeg area, and that we have the base for that expansion in the present hangars of TCA.

So I suggest, Madam Speaker, that we in this House should unitedly get behind the whole of the Dominion of Canada, in having an air policy devised which will be for the benefit of our whole country, stop this buffoonery, get on with the job, and insist that either TCA or the Government of Canada, or both, assure the employees of TCA that their jobs will be saved and those jobs will be retained here in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, if no-one wishes to proceed at the present time, I move, seconded by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks. The Honourable the Member for St. Vital.

MR. FRED GROVES ( St. Vital): Madam Speaker, I adjourned this debate for the Honourable Member from Wellington.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member from Rhineland.

MR. GROVES: Wellington.

MADAM SPEAKER: Wellington -- sorry.

MR. RICHARD SEABORN (Wellington): Madam Speaker, first of all I'd like to thank the Member for St. Vital for holding this for me, and I would like to express my appreciation for the concern being shown by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks over the probable bad effects of television on our children. I would like to suggest, however, that the facts are not nearly so obvious as, say, the consequences of cigarette smoking among our youngsters, and the matter cannot be resolved in such a neat manner as he suggests in his resolution. In fact there is a strong feeling among many people in the television industry that television is being turned into the country's number one whipping boy. One of their spokesmen recently expressed this view when he wrote, "There seems to be a propensity in our time to lump current social evils into a large glob so that both identification and assault can be handled in a simple, single process. Hence, the television industry has been made the target of a national skeet-shoot and is being held responsible for everything from payola to what appears to be a lapse in national morality."

This is the end of the quotation, but I did notice with a great deal of interest that the writer, one Mr. Rod Serling, did not deny that television bears a heavy share of the blame for whatever is ailing us, but he wants the press and other mass media to shoulder their share of the responsibility as well. There can be no doubt that his complaint is a legitimate one, particularly when a noted psychiatrist by the name of Frederic Wertham maintains that so-called comic books are, indeed, the worst offenders. In his book "Seduction of the Innocent" Dr. Wertham heavily documents the wide assortment of torture, assault, sexual delinquency, truancy and mayhem triggered by comic books. All one has to do is to walk into any drug store and examine the books of all types available to our youngsters to realize the danger that lies in this direction. It is evident, however, that this noted doctor also feels that television has some responsibility, for I noticed that he stated in a fairly recent newspaper interview, that: "By the time he's sixteen, a boy may have seen some 20,000 homicides on television and

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd)... in the movies. He hears talk of five, ten and fifteen million deaths in the event of a nuclear attack, and this symbolizes the devaluation of life which has resulted in an increasing number of murders among juveniles and at an earlier age."

Many others, too, have written about this matter, and, I must confess, with considerable heat, for there are few things in our society that generates as much difference of opinion as television, and nothing else angers us so much as the thought that someone may be harming our children. So, consequently, we have very widely divergent views ranging from outright condemnation, as expressed by Walter Lippman, who states: "There can be no real doubt that the movies and television and the comic books are purveying violence and lust to a vicious and intolerable degree.", to those who claim that television programs have a very limited influence on the child -- in fact, one psychiatrist maintains that rather than cause delinquency, television provides, to use his own words: "A direction for the delinquent's behaviour to take."

The difficulty here as I see it is the fact that there are very few facts to support any of these points, although two or three years ago a study was concluded which will, I believe, give much valuable information on this subject. And when we approach a matter as important as this one, I think, first of all, that we should remove the picture we have created in our own minds that our children are helpless little victims being attacked by television. When we begin to discuss the effect of television upon our children we are, in reality, talking about how the children use television. We know, with a fair amount of certainty, that children who have television in their homes are at least a year ahead in vocabulary over children who come from homes where there are no television sets. But actually, little of the information learned from television comes from seeking, for much of it is incidental learning usually gained as a by-product of fantasy materials. The point that I'm trying to make here, Madam Speaker, is that the child does not go to television typically to learn, but he more often goes to television to escape boredom or forget their problems. Knowing this fact, however, does not change our concern, for the question of what the child learns from television has been second in the public mind only to the question of what the child is learning from school. Where, as there has been worry lest the child does not learn enough in school, there is the corresponding fear that he might learn too much and the wrong sort of thing from television.

I would like to refer to an editorial by Jerome Ellison in The Nation for December, 1963. He points out that our population is not homogeneous and therefore the same story could mean different things to different people. In one home, for instance, fighting is seen to be just-pretend -- the same as in a story book. In a disadvantaged home, however, where parents are always ready with the belt and where the child may belong to a gang, it is real life. Here, Mr. Ellison maintains, further violence in make-believe reinforces a deadly reality and diminishes the margin of public safety. This approaches the basic proposition of the resolution before us. The thing we want to know is whether or not television is a factor in the rise of juvenile delinquency, and we can find both figures and charges to support this relationship. For instance, in the ten years of television's greatest growth, the United States authorities reported that the number of juvenile crimes had more than doubled. But when we look into this situation and examine the record more carefully, we will find that the increase in reported crime cases is quite closely parallel to, in fact just a little behind, the increase in juvenile courts. Many states and cities have opened their courts within the last ten to fifteen years, and the result is, of course, that more juvenile cases are being handled and reported.

I think it is worth noting what Dr. Ralph Banay has to say on this subject, for he has worked very closely with these children, and he states that television may be, to quote his words "a preparatory school for delinquency for young disturbed adolescents." In other words, this psychiatrist suggests that the young people who are influenced by television towards crime seem to be different from others who are not so influenced, even before they are influenced by television. Another group, engaged in research on this important subject, have found that almost invariably the delinquent children who blamed television for their crimes had something wrong with their lives quite apart from television. For the most part they have had some other troubles, like a broken home, a home lacking in affection, or parents that seem to reject them; and with very few exceptions, these problem children had problems before they learned anything about crime from television. These problems grow from the home life, the neighbourhood life and the disturbed personality. The most that television can do, it is suggested, is to apparently feed the strong impulses that already exist.

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd)... Children who bring an aggressive attitude to television are more likely to remember the aggressive acts on television. Children want to be like the characters they see, whether these characters are good or bad, but they have very little delinquency traced to the actual television itself -- at least this is the finding of a committee who has looked into this problem for the last three years in the United States and Canada. Their belief is that the kind of child we send to the television, rather than the television itself, is the chief element in delinquency. The roots of delinquency, therefore, are much lower and broader than television. To further support this view, I would like to quote Doctor Otto Billig, of the Vanderbilt University, who was appearing before the Kefauver Committee. He said, "My clinical experience has led me to believe that television programs, movies, etc., have a very limited influence on the child or juvenile. We have performed rather exhaustive psychiatric and psychological studies on juvenile delinquents. Most youngsters do not seem at all influenced by such outside factors. The well adjusted personality can resist them without difficulty. A very occasional case was triggered into some delinquent act and possibly received specific ideas on how to carry out a crime. But only the emotionally disturbed and insecure individual appears susceptible to such outside forces."

And in conclusion, the Doctor said this: "There is little question as to the disturbing educational or artistic value in the poor taste of the mentioned programs, but I would consider it as disadvantageous and even detrimental to the problem of juvenile delinquency to blame them as the actual cause. In so doing we would avoid the main issues. We need to focus our efforts on the principal causative forces rather than on surface appearances. Our clinical experience has shown us that insecurities in the individual family play a major part in juvenile delinquency."

Recently, I read a list of programs that were broadcast on what we would term the "Children's Hour". These covered 100 hours of televising, and a generous estimate of what I term "reality programs" would be roughly about 15 percent. More than half of the 100 hours were given over to programs in which violence plays an important part. Now, it must be understood that not all of this violence was to be taken seriously, for the cartoons and the old slapstick films were intended to be funny rather than exciting. So, disregarding this type of material, we still had within the 100 hours supposedly dedicated to the children: 12 murders, 16 major gunfights, 21 persons shot, 21 other violent incidents with guns, 37 hand-to-hand fights, one stabbing in the back with a butcher knife, 4 attempted suicides, one of them successful, 4 people falling off or being pushed over a cliff, 2 cars running over cliffs, 2 attempts made to run over persons on the sidewalk, 2 mob scenes in one of which the mob hangs the wrong man, a horse tearing a man under its hooves, and a great deal of miscellaneous other violence.

I purposely itemized this heavy concentration of violence, Madam Speaker, because this is the parade which passes before our children week after week -- men packing guns, packing knives, shooting at each other, slugging each other -- and the amount and intensity of it must make us pause. The succession of violent and sadistic acts on television is proving a shock to many parents who look at television over their children's shoulders. That this concern is shared by some doctors is revealed in the worried questions of E. D. Glynn. He said, to quote him: "It is too soon to know what children so massively exposed to sex on television will consider exciting and sex-stimulating as adults. A critical question is raised here: Is television ultimately blunting and destructive of sensibility? This, too, one wonders: Will reality match up to the television fantasies this generation has been nursed on? These children are in a peculiar position -- experience is exhausted in advance. There is little they have not seen or lived through, and yet all this is second-hand experience. When the experience itself comes, it is watered down, for it has already been half lived, but never truly felt."

Personally, I would like the broadcasters to take a real hard look at those programs which, without offering a real diet of extreme violence, still earn high ratings from our children. We must also face the fact that we cannot hope to create leaders and thinkers without a concrete approach towards making television a source of reality experiences, and this must, I agree, remain the responsibility of an industry that controls so much of the child's life. I do not believe that the responsible leaders of the television industry will really want to shirk their responsibility to our children in this direction.

It is true, too, that the parents share the responsibility, but there is only just so far

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd)... that the parents can go. There is only so much they can do about the situation. For one thing, most parents do not have the knowledge to know whether or not the children is, as Dr. Banay describes them, one of the group of "disturbed adolescents", and no parent can point his child to a kind of television that, so far, does not exist, or expect his child to waste his time watching a program that is scarce, under-financed and placed in awkward hours. During the last week I have read a great mass of material on this subject, and it seems to be the unanimous opinion that a child is not likely to be harmed by television if he has warm, secure social relationships, and if he has no real or serious psychological troubles.

Now, Madam Speaker, the resolution calls for an appeal to the Broadcast Board of Governors, and I really don't think that the Broadcast Board of Governors can do much about this situation. No really informed person can say that television is either bad or good for children. It really depends upon the child itself. I do know, however, that the television people are very sensitive to outpourings of intelligent opinion and that many programs are scheduled awaiting public support to justify their continuance, so letters to the station can well determine whether programs will continue or not. Parents also have it within their power to write the advertisers who support these programs. Sponsors do not usually hear from viewers, so that a few letters could have a very powerful effect.

So I would suggest, therefore, that the parents have a real weapon at hand to compel the stations to comply with their requests. I read that the parents in one American city have organized and their spokesman has become a very important factor in the broadcasting industry in that community. While I agree that there is a distinct possibility that our very young children are being harmed by the torrent of sadistic violence, I do feel that the parents themselves have a greater power than the Broadcast Board of Governors if they would only wield the weapon.

So, Madam Speaker, while I respect the motives of the honourable member, I do not feel I can support a resolution of this kind when there is no concrete evidence that television, in itself, is harmful to our children. There are comprehensive studies going on at the present time to ascertain whether television does have a long range effect on our children and if the facts support our fears, I will be very glad to join with the honourable member in protesting against it. Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the honourable member from Brokenhead, that the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

. . . . 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 Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, like the honourable member who has proposed this resolution, I have been vitally interested in this subject for a long time and have tried, like him, to make some reasonably objective study of it. I think that sometimes in this House I have been thought to be guilty of not showing sufficient conviction with regard to my interest in the subject, because I have more than once said to this House that I personally -- and at the time that I had some influence on the government of the Province of Manitoba -- to the extent that I had that influence, the Government of Manitoba would be inclined to agree to any voting age between 21 and 18 that the Federal Government would agree to. And those who think that I am a great believer in uniformity -- perhaps fault me for that -- but I think that in many of these vital subjects that the higher degree of uniformity that we can achieve the better.

And so I had promised to the House several years ago that when either the Federal-Provincial Financial Conference or the Federal-Provincial Constitutional Conference next convene, I would raise this question before that conference and that I would suggest that the discussion should take place at that time on some degree of uniformity in the voting age, because I was conscious at that time that the four western provinces had four - three, not four -- the four western provinces had three different voting ages, this province having 21; the province just to the west having -- it's usually quoted as 18, but actually I think it's a little bit over 18 because I think the citizen has to be 18 a certain length of time before the date of the issue of the writ; but 18 for discussion purposes; and the Province of Alberta and the Province of B. C. both having 20 or 19, I have forgotten which -- 19 I believe.

So on that occasion at least I was as good as my word because I did raise this question, not only before either one of those conferences but before both of them, because it happened soon after that time that both a Federal-Provincial conference on fiscal matters and a Federal-Provincial conference on constitutional matters was convened. I made the statement there that, as far as we were concerned, we would agree to any of these ages from 21 to 18 that the Federal government would go along with. I made the suggestion then that we should try and get some uniformity across Canada as a whole in this matter.

Well, arising out of this study that I was almost forced to give at that time and which I was glad to give because of my interest in it, I formed some conclusions and became a little better acquainted with the history of this matter than I otherwise would, and I'm going to follow the example of the Honourable Member for Wellington and attempt to share with the House some of the recent reading that I have done on this subject. But I'm not going so far back into history, not as far as one could go, but I would suggest that a good place to start in this connection would be with Magna Carta in 1215. The point about Magna Carta, as far as I'm concerned, is that at that time, so far as I have ever understood the situation, there was no mention whatever of elections or voting, for the simple reason that there weren't any elections; There wasn't any voting. Magna Carta came about because the nobles of the day, the powerful nobles decided that the king was exercising the great power that he had unfairly, and they gathered together and called the king into account and they laid down certain rules that he must observe from then on, but nothing about elections and nothing about voting.

We go along 50 years later or thereabouts to what has been called the time of Simon de Montfort Parliament, which wasn't a parliament in the modern sense at all but where another step was taken, not toward the franchise or elections or the method of voting, but towards the beginning of a sound parliamentary system, which of course has its basis as an electoral system. And there Simon de Montfort's parliament, which was simply a gathering of the nobles again, was significant because of the fact that some common people were invited to sit in at that time and take part in dealing with the curbing of the power of the king, and even of some of the greater nobles.

And then when we come to Edward the First's parliament, which I believe the historians agree that so far as the United Kingdom was concerned was the first true parliament. We have another major step, because added to the nobles on this occasion we have the lords of the church and we had also an extension of the common people. But still nothing about elections or voting because here again these parliaments, if parliaments they could be called at that time, were simply summoned, and it is uncertain, as far as I can find out of exactly when the methods

Mr. Campbell, Cont'd)... of voting or the extension of the franchise began. Perhaps it was close around that time. Perhaps soon after Edward the First's parliament which, by the way, I believe was in 1295.

And when some time in that area we first get mention of voters, as such, the qualification at that time was a financial one. The voter so far as the rural districts of England was concerned --and at that time of course it was greatly more rural than it is now-- the qualification so far as the rural district was concerned was that a man, and of course it was the franchise extended only to men, a man must be a freeholder with property of such value that the annual rental would be 40 shillings or thereabouts. The interesting thing that I feel worth emphasizing at this time, Madam Speaker, is that that property qualification continued for something in the neighbourhood of 400 years. During that time parliament made great strides, or parliament greatly consolidated its position, but the position of the voter himself didn't gain practically at all. In fact in one regard it diminished, because as the country developed the freehold owners of that amount of land became fewer and fewer and there were actually fewer people voting as the time went on -- I should say fewer people entitled to vote as the time went on-- and it wasn't until 400 years later, the time of William and Mary, that free voting was established. It was true that in the towns that had grown up there was some difference to the land holding system in the shires but, in general, the property qualification continued, not to help people to gain the franchise but actually to limit the number that had it.

In the time of William and Mary free voting was guaranteed in one way, that the Bill of Rights decreed --these are pretty interesting terms-- that there must be no interference with the election of members of parliament --because it is to be assumed that up to that time there had been considerable interference-- but even in these days and for many years after, the course of parliamentary representation and the right to vote didn't run very smoothly because even as late as 1790 or thereabouts one of the greatest prime ministers that Great Britain ever had, William Pitt the younger, actually suspended habeas corpus for a period of time and many people were charged and condemned for doing nothing more treasonable or more serious than to advocate parliamentary reform and the extension of the franchise, because these suggestions had been very widely considered by a lot of people, especially because this system of the property qualification had so limited the number of people voting and had failed completely to take into account that towns were growing and some towns had been left resulting in the so-called rotten burroughs, that it was literally the truth that there were cases where almost depopulated places continued to elect one, or in some cases two members, and there were no more than that number of people eligible to vote in the community, and this as late as 1790 or thereabouts; and William Pitt the younger, one of the greatest prime ministers of the United Kingdom, refused to alter that situation for a considerable length of time.

Perhaps we ordinary politicians, we folks who sit around here and are justly modest about our attainments, particularly when somebody on the other side points out to us our lack of qualifications, we might take a little bit of comfort perhaps by thinking that these really great men of other days --and they were great men and they made great services-- they made their mistakes too -- because just imagine the great Pitt defending a system of that kind. And the Duke of Wellington--. The Duke of Wellington is quoted to have said in those days that the electoral system of England could scarce be improved upon. Incidentally, one of them was a Liberal and one was a Conservative, so I am trying to draw no invidious comparisons. I mention these things simply to show that it takes a long time for social matters to get under way. They perhaps move very slowly for a long time but eventually they move, and I must try and move along too.

But speaking of the mistakes that the great men make, I want to quote another great parliamentarian, another of the greatest prime ministers that the United Kingdom has ever had, and I think that perhaps when later histories are written that these two, along with Winston Churchill, will still rank as three of the greatest that ever lived. But Gladstone --William Ewart Gladstone, a Liberal, when making his maiden speech in the House of Commons as quite a young man too --I think at only 24 years of age or thereabout -- actually defended the principle of slave labour. When we think of these things we realize that we're not very far from some pretty be-knighted times. Those of you who think that I'm a bit old-fashioned should, when you accuse me of finding it difficult to move into the second half of the twentieth

Mr. Campbell, Cont'd)... century or even the twentieth century, at least give me credit for this, that when I read these histories I am rather appalled at the fact that such great men --and acknowledged to be great men-- could on some questions have such extremely limited vision. I give this as a background, simply as an introduction to how slow many of us have been to adopt some changes in these regards.

Well, to continue with my story. It was in 1832 that the first Reform Act was brought in and this was the one that really seemed to start the franchise system moving in the United Kingdom. It greatly added to the electorate rolls and it put on many of the people who were now becoming more or less prominent and certainly active because of their connection with the industrial revolution. It was the Reform Act that did away with those rotten burroughs that I spoke about a minute ago, and it gave many new towns, when doing away with the rotten burroughs, it gave many new towns which had grown up in the interval and had been completely unrepresented until that time, some reasonable share of representation.

But even after the Reform Bill of 1832 came into effect with its greatly enlarged franchise, there still was less than one person in twenty --adults of course, and men of course-- eligible to vote in the United Kingdom. And so it wasn't very long until the second Reform Act came in, in the year 1867, the year that Confederation became a fact in this new land. And even at that time when the franchise was considerably extended and many skilled workers taken in, we still had a small proportion of the people voting.

In 1872 secret voting in fact was established, because up until that time the voting for all these members had had to be held in public, and you can imagine with the landholding system that they had in those days and the influence that certain individuals wielded, how secret voting was under a public system, and it wasn't until 1872 that the free vote which had been guaranteed away back in the time of William and Mary actually became a fact.

Then the third Reform Act of 1884 added agricultural workers, as such, to the list for the first time and again considerably increased the number of people voting. This meant that by this time, 1884, Great Britain had practically universal adult male suffrage, so the next thing of course was, what about the women? And now we're getting down to sufficiently modern history that the oldest among us at least can remember, the time of the suffragettes and the Pankhursts and the others who worked for the emancipation of women, at least so far as the franchise is concerned. But even so it wasn't until 1918 that the women of the United Kingdom were given the vote, and then only if they were 30 years of age or over, and who, Madam Speaker, would want to admit that she was 30 years or over? But the women got the vote in 1918. Perhaps I might mention in passing that they had been given the vote in the Province of Manitoba two years before that by a Liberal government --a first in Canada and one year before the right was given to women to vote by a coalition government. But it was eleven more years, 1929, before women were given the right to vote at age 21.

Now I have finished my brief review of history. I do it only to lay a bit of the background for the question that is before us today. This is a very, very brief review of what's gone before. We know what the situation is now. What do we do at this stage? What should we do? This is the question that we are called upon to give a pronouncement on.

I am aware of the implications of adulthood that have been raised before when this matter has been discussed. I know that we have a good many laws where some pretty important principles and practices are based upon the fact that a man at least is not an adult until he is 21 years of age, and I know that there are other considerations, legal and technical, that would have to be considered if the voting age were lowered beyond below that figure.

I am aware, too, that one of my friends for whom I have an intensely high regard, Bobby Bend, is quoted in a recent news article in this fashion. This is from the Portage la Prairie Leader of February 13 this year, and I quote: "On the question of the vote for 18 year olds Mr. Bend admitted that in the 1940's I advocated it, but I'm telling you now don't do it. The majority do not know - our curriculum has not taught them." I have the highest regard for Mr. Bend and I certainly recognize the connection that he's had with young people, but I think in this instance I am unable to go along with him and I would put my argument on the one that he is the most familiar with of all, and this is the question of education. If we must have a question, a standard of measurement at all, surely that standard for voting should be education as well as maturity.



Mr. Campbell, cont'd)...

Taking education in its true senses and that is the combination of the academic with experience, I am convinced that the boy and girl of 18 today --I'll change that-- I am convinced that a larger percentage of the boys and girls of 18 today have a wide ranging education arising from both academic and experience than people of 21 had a couple or three decades ago. So on the ground of education, I would think that they're at least as qualified as 21 year olds were when I started voting. I think that from the other point of view, of maturity, that because of that education and experience that they are also as well qualified as 21 year olds were a few, comparatively few years ago, and so I think that it's time that we gave this matter consideration.

To come back to my original question of uniformity, it appears to be at least likely that this suggestion will receive favourable consideration by the Government of Canada, and if it does, I think that's a mark in favour of it being considered here. I know it is no argument to suggest uniformity at the expense of all other considerations. It's no advantage to be uniformly wrong. That is correct. But we have, as has been pointed out here on many occasions, such difficulty in getting the people to exercise the franchise that they have, that I would think there would be some advantage in having as big a uniformity as possible in the voting age and in other qualifications with regard to the franchise.

So I'm inclined to come down on the side of making this extension, and I compliment my honourable friend the member for Seven Oaks on the fact that he continues to bring in to this House some questions that differ slightly from the general turn of our discussion and causes us to take a look, in some cases ahead and in some cases to wider fields. I think that's advisable. I think perhaps it's advisable sometimes that we get away from these tendencies to discuss controversial matters in rather too controversial terms. I think we have seen examples of that recently. Maybe it's good for us to temper our discussions once in a while by getting onto some of these more far-ranging subjects.

So my vote, for what it is worth, will be going in support of this resolution, and I haven't got, I think, the reputation of being a wild-eyed radical. I don't consider this to be a radical step. I don't consider people to be necessarily reactionary because they think that it is well to consider such steps as this one before a change is made and I have a good bit of appreciation, in fact respect, for those who hold the contrary view. But as one of the subjects that I have been interested in for a long time, as one who would like to see more interest taken by the voters in general, not only the 21 year olds, not only the 18 year olds, but all the people who up to date have not in Manitoba shown the interest that they should, I think, in public affairs, I would like to see this enlargement made with the hope that perhaps the young people can inspire we older people as well to pay more attention to this birthright that we have; that took a long time to win, through many centuries; which expanded very slowly for so long, but which now, I think, is capable of this small still further expansion.

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND: (HAMMOTA): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill, that the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY: (INKSTER): Madam Speaker, before the debate is adjourned, may I say a few words please? Thank you. At the outset, I feel quite happy of being a member of this House for a number of years to see today when the Liberals are becoming real liberals. Listening to the address of the Honourable Member from Lakeside and his conclusions, I felt quite happy about it, and it indicates that the democratic world is progressing. In the last few years many countries --new countries-- have been established, in Africa, in the Near East, in Asia and other places. The trouble down there now is, in my opinion, that they have no leaders and the result is, instead of becoming democratic countries as it was intended that they will when they established their independence, they are now following the trend of dictatorship. In my opinion this was due that they did not have trained people to take over the government and carry on in a democratic way. There is a trend of dictatorship all over, one comes and one goes, and no one in my humble opinion has any training to carry on a democratic system of government. The result is that democracy, which is the only system under which it is worthwhile living, is disappearing from many parts of the world from day to day.

As to the resolution itself, I was born in Russia under the Czarist regime. No one has

MR. GRAY, Cont'd)... a vote there. All they had is a bullet, and many of them have stopped the bullet in order to defend and protect someone else. The only reason of mine and hundreds of thousands of other immigrants that came here since 1900, --I believe almost half of the population in Canada-- is because they want that little bit of freedom, a little bit of democracy.

Those who have established an age of 21 --I don't know their argument why 21, it could have been 25, it could have been 18-- no one can judge the mentality of a person between the 18 and the 21, particularly here in Canada in this province when the young man is eligible to get married and provide a home for himself, his wife, and raise a family. The very fact that the majority of the 18 are taking part in the sports of our country; the very fact that the majority of the age of 18 have just as much education as those of 21 who are not having any university diplomas; the very fact that a boy of 18 today is ready and willing to defend our country, ready and willing to assume full responsibility, makes a contribution to the economic life of the country, works; and nowadays when a person reaches his sixties being eliminated and he'll take any time a boy of 18 rather than a man of 60 or 70 --I couldn't get a job anywhere in this city, for one reason only, because of the age-- why they should be deprived of exercising their rights to elect or be elected, I cannot see.

The time has come when the older people should retire. They don't do it now on account of the existence, economic existence. Open the door for the younger element to take our place. That applies to me too and probably I shall get a hint of it, but I don't see any particular reason, in view of the democracy that is not being followed by so many countries in the world, I think that as far as we in Canada is concerned or in Manitoba is concerned, we should give our boys the opportunity which they fully deserve.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN: (BRANDON): Madam Speaker, before this debate is adjourned, I wonder if I might say a few words. I do not intend to make a lengthy speech, so there is not much point in thinking of preparing anything to any great length. However, the member for Lakeside in his very reasonable approach to this subject and argument, made one or two comments that I feel should not go completely unchallenged, in that he suggests that because the children of today receive a better education they are better prepared to vote. Now, all things being equal, I think that I would be inclined, as any reasonable person in this Assembly would be inclined, to say that this is fundamental reasoning but I wonder if he would not agree that the world of today is a far more complicated world than it was just even a few years ago, and that relatively, are these young people of ours better prepared to form judgments, to vote at the age of 18, than their elders were, say, at 21? I recall once speaking to school children on Citizenship Day and urging them that the best way for them to be good citizens would be to provide themselves with the best education possible in order that they might always be able to look after themselves. Now, here we have today children more and more attending school to a greater length of time, and this is good for the country, but is, relatively, the maturity greater today than before? And I would like to suggest that it may not be. I think that our very form of schooling tends to condition young people to believing a speaker, and one of the things that I have quarrelled with so much in my own mind with our form of education is that our schools teach one method of doing a thing, and there are dozens of methods, but the imprint is established in a child's mind, if I may make the suggestion, that there is only one method that is right. Now, with people conditioned to this extent I wouldn't like to suggest that a politician should be the next lecturer that they listen to and draw conclusions from, because we all know that in the heat of elections promises are made that have to be looked at in at least a skeptical form of mind, and skepticism, questioning of a lecturer is not necessarily a product of our teaching at the age that these children are at that time.

I have heard a lot of suggestions that the Federal Government may be making some general action on this, and then I suppose, as the Member for Lakeside suggests, there may be very worthwhile values in going along with this for the reasons of uniformity across the country. And I think that if this does occur, probably then all arguments to the contrary would have a lesser meaning in the face of the desirability of uniformity. But I would suggest this main theme, that this is a more complicated world, that relatively our young people are not better prepared to cope with it. I rather suspect that setting of the age at 21 in the earlier days may have been set with a view to giving young people some of the experience of the knock-about world, the hurly-burly world of profit and loss, the matter of facing the hard facts of

MR. LISSAMAN, Cont'd)...earning a living -- goodness knows, the conditions were much harder for young people in those days than they are now-- and that a person did relatively reach maturity much greater than our young people reach maturity now, in a relative position. So that I would suggest that the Honourable Member for Lakeside, while he's taking the obvious argument, may not necessarily be taking the correct position in this instance, and I felt that this should be drawn to members' attention, because the Honourable Member for Lakeside, quite rightly so, carries quite a considerable influence in his argument usually, and is usually so sound and basic. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

MR. STRICKLAND: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, that the debate be adjourned.

MADAM SPEAKER: The motion before the House that I have already given was moved by the Honourable the Member for Hamiota, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Churchill, who was then in his seat. Are you ready for the question?

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, what is the question before the House?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjournment of the debate.

MR. EVANS: Thank you.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Carillon. The Honourable the Member for Fisher.

MR. EMIL MOELLER: (FISHER): Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of this House that this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Emerson. The Honourable the Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR: (SOURIS-LANSDOWNE): In the absence of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, I would like the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster. The Honourable the Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON: (SWAN RIVER): Madam Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand. However, if there is anyone who wishes to speak to this resolution, I would hope they will do so.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable the Member for Brandon.

MR. LISSAMAN: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I may be granted the indulgence of the House in having this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? Proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Yes, I'd better have it stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? Second reading of Bill No. 17. The Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (WINNIPEG CENTRE) presented Bill No. 17, an Act to incorporate Tri-State Mortgage Corporation, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, under the law of Manitoba, in order that a corporation can carry on in a mortgage business, it is necessary that they be incorporated by the federal parliament or that authority be given by this Legislature or an incorporation by this Legislature, and this Act is for the purpose of incorporating this company so it can carry on the mortgage business in Manitoba. It will be a subsidiary of Tri-State Acceptance Corporation, which has its head office in Winnipeg, and also carries on business in British Columbia.

MR. GROVES: Madam Speaker, I'd like to ask the proposer of this bill one question. If this bill passes, does it mean that we would now have a lending institution for every resident of the province plus one?

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . . I, too, would like to ask a question on this. I do not read in this that there is the power to lend money on real property mortgages. Now possibly I didn't read far enough, but I haven't seen that here and I was wondering if the mover could indicate whether or not this is correct, whether they do have that power.

MR. COWAN: They have the power. In Section 5, it provides that they shall have the powers and so on as provided under Part XIII of The Companies Act.

Madam Speaker put the question, and after a voice vote, declared the motion carried.

MR. CHERNIACK Presented Bill No. 4, an Act to amend The Change of Name Act for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote, declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Dufferin. The Honourable the Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, at the outset I want to assure the House in this late hour of the Throne Speech, I'll be very, very brief. At the same time, however, not feeling perfect in my health today, I would appreciate very much if I could have the attention of the House.

First of all, it is with the utmost pleasure that I offer my compliments to you, Madam Speaker, in the way we carry on our duties in this House.

May I also compliment the mover and the seconder. I was interested in the mover's remarks about the welfare of his constituency. We do not have the opportunity of visiting every part of Manitoba too often, and the information given us by the different members of the House concerning their little corners of the Province are quite interesting and enlightening.

As to the seconder, the constituency is to be proud of being honored by the appointment of the member who seconded the reply to the Speech from the Throne. I also wish to tell him that I have a lot of sympathy with his remarks about Metro. I strongly feel now, as before, that Metro should be given more time to prove to the public its usefulness before it is condemned.

At this time I want to thank those responsible for arranging the inspection trip to Grand Rapids. What we have seen at this particular Hydro enterprise we will not see again in our lifetime. It was very educational and interesting, and at this point I wish to again thank those responsible for their kindness and hospitality. I have already expressed my appreciation in a personal letter to Mr. Stephens.

At the same time, I wish to express my regret at the action of the First Minister in changing several important portfolios. All of them, without exception, had performed a very useful, difficult and important service in the position they formerly held, and I may state now, although they were appointed by a government which we oppose that while the government is in power we would like them to maintain the best men at their positions in the interest of the people of the province. It is sometimes not always a good policy to change horses in mid-stream. However, I was not consulted and I may as well say no more.

The other day -- I think yesterday-- one of the Ministers criticized the Opposition for not suggesting improvements instead of criticizing or condemning what they have done. I am anxiously awaiting the Estimates, at which time I will bring up such matters as --and this is suggestions to the government-- increase of Mothers' Allowances, sanitary conditions in summer places, cost of text books, cost of butter, high cost of living, social allowances, and perhaps even cigarette smoking.

Many subjects have been covered in the Speech from the Throne, the Reply to the Speech, and the amendments submitted by the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of our group. Fortunately, the rules governing this debate are fairly liberal, and allow for coverage of a wide range of subjects, providing of course, that the Honourable Speaker will be as kind as ever.

Actually, the time allotted for proper study of all matters that should be dealt with by this Legislature is far too short, with the result that many important issues are left hanging in the air, with no proper decisions made in this Chamber, leaving far too much to be dealt with by the Premier and the heads of various departments. This is not good democratic procedure, and I hope this Session will not be rushed and perhaps even have an opportunity to try to get the improved conditions which have not been done to the extent that we would like to see it for a long time.

Now here are just a few of the important matters that have been left hanging for years:

MR. GRAY, Cont'd).....

The whole procedure of taxation, with every effort being made to other forms of tax on income tax by both this government and the federal government, by digging deeply underground to unearth schemes of hidden taxation which will not bite too deeply into the revenues of the earthly sector of the population. Yet, income tax, which should be more steeply graduated than at present, is the fairest form of taxation.

Education. In this rapidly changing society, education, not only of children but of adults too, is of supreme importance. The whole structure needs thorough revision. The curriculum --this needs extensive broadening. More teachers, with higher standards of training are needed. Accommodation and extended facilities are needed. Perhaps there should be a special school even for the MLAs. Promotion of better community life, and here I read from a clipping, "Toronto: income in each province and outlays for education. The expenditure for education, Manitoba is the seventh on the list, 4.00 whereas Saskatchewan is 6.00, Alberta is higher and the others. On the other hand, the personal income per capita, Manitoba is the fourth on the list. In other words, they take in more money and spend less on education, with the exception of Quebec and Ontario.

Now, we need promotion of better community life, and prevention of delinquency should be important aspects of our educational system, and I do not state that the government is not doing anything. We always congratulate them and praise them for the work they do, but our position is that in our opinion it's not enough.

The structure of Metropolitan government and municipal governments need a lot of study and considerable revision. Health and welfare, and provision of hospital and medical facilities to assure proper care for all the people of this province --these need considerable improvement.

Development of our natural resources for the benefit of Manitoba people; conservation for water and prevention of flooding; the improvement of soil fertility; preservation of our forests, and improvement in parks and recreational facilities, development of livestock --all of these call for a great deal of consideration.

Then there's the matter of Manitoba Sugar and the general increase in prices of food-stuffs. That calls for a thorough investigation. There are one or two resolutions on the Order Paper about it. Perhaps we could elaborate a little bit more then.

More and more of our population is being concentrated in urban areas, calling for much closer co-operation between the provincial and the municipal authorities. This also brings in the need of amplification of areas of employment, in addition to the extra facilities needed for servicing the larger municipal population. And we haven't made too great a progress in connection with the unemployment which perhaps will be discussed under the Estimates.

Then, of course, there's the whole question of working and living conditions, wage rates, hours of work, and also, and of the greatest importance, provision of pensions and proper living facilities for those who are too old to carry on their regular work, or for whom no work is available.

The last report of the Unemployment Insurance Commission ending October 19, 1963, indicated that unemployment rose by 15,000, or a total of 265,000 in Canada today known, of those receiving unemployment insurance, and although the unemployment situation in Manitoba is not as bad as the other provinces, it is still of importance for those out of work.

Before leaving the provincial sector, there are some very controversial subjects for which time should be provided. Those provinces which are in less fortunate economic positions should be aided by the more fortunate ones, just as the less fortunate countries outside of Canada should be aided. We are selling wheat and other of our produce to China. We have made credit arrangements with China. Yet, up to now, the Government of Canada has not recognized the Government of China. We are definitely interested in this, our party, and should take the steps necessary to get the situation changed. This is just a small percentage of the matters that need consideration, emphasizing the fact that we do need to give a great deal of study to a great many subjects --local, and even national and international, since the last two affect our provincial economy in a very direct way. We cannot any longer build a fence around Manitoba and not be interested in the entire world situation, because these days, with the speed of transportation, with all the deadly ammunition, with the fast planes, and what

MR. GRAY: (cont'd). . . . have you, any trouble in Cyprus or in any other country must of necessity affect our province. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I would like at this time to offer my respects to you, and to call to mind again what an honour it is to preside over a parliament in which the affairs of the people are decided by the people by the due process of the parliamentary system. I want to thank my honourable friend from Lakeside for the statement that he made today concerning the history of parliament, which, speaking for myself, I found interesting and enlightening and entertaining. It reflects, I think, a very great care and affection for the subject on the part of my honourable friend, and I think he does well, as he has done on a number of occasions, to call our attention to our history and our traditions, because after all the traditions are the effective force in this Chamber. The Mace lies upon the table, a pretty ineffective weapon of force, but it is the custom and the goodwill of the members of the Legislature itself that are the effective forces in a parliament, and you, Madam, preside over those forces, and do so, if I may say so, effectively and with dignity.

I would like to congratulate my honourable friends who moved and seconded the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, quite as much for the way in which they did it as upon the honour which comes to them on the occasion of being able to do it. I would like, if I may, to speak a special word to and about my lifelong friend, the Honourable the Minister who succeeded me as Provincial Secretary. I think that he is already contributing in a marked way to the affairs of the Government and in an increasing way to the deliberations of this Chamber, and his influence will be felt to an increasing degree. It is a matter of pleasure to me to welcome him and to work with him as I have done in other spheres, and I can speak from experience when I say that I think we will all benefit from being able to work with him. I would like to deal with one particular matter on this occasion, COMEF has been mentioned repeatedly in the Speech from the Throne itself, and I would like to deal with it and a related matter concerning the question of employment in the industrial sphere in Manitoba, and to offer some comments on that subject which I am going to take up in an impartial and dispassionate way. It is perfectly satisfactory to me to have members opposite use this as a club to beat me with if they wish, and I could take it up in that sense and we could have a lively debate, and I'm sure this would improve our understanding of certain matters. Nevertheless, I think there are some additional facts that I would like to place before the public, and far from regretting that this matter has been introduced, I think I would have liked to introduce it myself if it had not been brought up from the other side of the floor, because a very great deal depends upon the public taking an interest in these matters, and it is a little hard to make this come real and practical as I speak here on my feet in this Chamber, to say how firmly I believe that we will not make progress in the economic field unless, first, the public understands it, and second, that they are willing to take up the responsibilities that come to them in their different fields.

Now what do I mean by that? I feel quite sure that action cannot be taken by management in its sphere unless the people who make up the management community in our industrial society -- those who belong to Chambers of Commerce and Manufacturers Associations and other trade groups -- do in fact understand the situation that we face, and are for that reason better able to cope with their responsibilities. The same applies, if I may say so, to labour, that the labour unions and their organizers and the people who speak for them obviously cannot take up any new course of action, or back any move that is made, unless their membership is aware of and supports the reasons for the action and supports the action that is proposed by their leaders. And so it goes with each of the communities that make up that industrial empire that we have here. It applies to the farming community. It will apply, I think, in an increasing degree to those in the academic field who are responsible for the education, not only of the workers, but people in the management sphere, and to people in the public relations, or advertising if you will, or the communications function in our society. And so, it is a most welcome thing to me that this debate has been introduced. I welcome the discussion. I think the public is entitled to know the facts and to have a discussion of all the facts.

The reason I am glad of it is that I think the situation that we are facing now, and have been facing, is serious. I think it is going to require every effort and every intelligent study that can be made by everyone concerned with the economy, and I was perhaps the first one to point this out in this House, because some three years ago I invited your attention to the fact

MR. EVANS, Cont'd). . . that our guess in the department at that time was that by the year 1970 there would be 40, 000 too few jobs in the Province of Manitoba for the students who would be graduating from our schools, together of course with the other people already employed. This was a guess, according to the best estimate we could make at the time. This was the urgent reason for putting into being the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future. Surely we would not have launched a thing as massive as that was, as expensive as that was-- and perhaps as much as three quarters of a million dollars was spent by the public and by this government, and by others who contributed research and work to the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future-- we would not have invited, and I am sure this House would not have permitted us, the public would not have permitted us, to undertake as massive a study as that and to invite the co-operation, as we did, of upwards of three hundred individual private citizens of this province to co-operate in the study, if indeed we had not thought that we were facing a serious situation. So there is no misunderstanding as I rise to speak. We realize that it is a serious situation that we are facing in Manitoba over the next period, and there is, I assure you, no sign of complacency, certainly not in my make-up, with regard to the economic situation of the province.

I would like to turn to the oft-quoted figure of the increase in 260 industrial jobs in the province in the period 1953 to 1961. Well, technically this is correct. You can find those figures in the records, but I would like to call attention to one fact, and to wonder, not as to the motives that were used, wonder why the year 1953 was chosen, because in that year there was a total of employment of 43, 740 --and that figure was given to the House-- in industrial employment in Manitoba; but why didn't they start the next year, because 1953 was the last year of the "honeymoon after the war" --during and after the Korean period, when to sell anything pretty well all you had to do was to make it. This was the period during which a great many manufacturing industries operated with a maximum use of manpower. They were employment, --or employee-intensive, at that time, and the effort had not yet begun to automate, and the process of automation had not taken place to any very great extent by that year.

Look what would have happened if, first of all, the reporter of The Free Press --and I have no quarrel with him over this; I think he has done a service to call this situation to mind-- but if the first figure, whoever undertook to deal with these figures in the first time, had begun with the next year. Because, from 43, 740 in 1953 the employment fell to 41, 224 the next year, the year by which this honeymoon, as it were, in the industrial development of our province had come to an end, and the employment in that year was 40, 224, and if anyone had wanted to make a comparison in manufacturing employment between 1954 and 1961 instead of 1953, we would have shown an increase in this province of some 2, 776, and why I should be belaboured by my political friends opposite for being responsible for the situation in the employment field, when during their administration, I might point out, the first year the comparison was given shows a drop of 2, 776 employees in manufacturing in the province. Well, the figures were technically correct, that that comparison can be made between 1953 and 1961 and show an increase of only 260. But as I have already indicated, we were in a process of losing jobs in Manitoba at that time, and losing them quite heavily. There were two special things that happened shortly after 1953. As I mentioned, the boom of the war years came to an end and came to an end fairly suddenly, but in addition to that two things happened. Automation set in, and in a very considerable measure whole industries, or branches, or forms of occupation moved away from Manitoba to elsewhere. In many cases they moved to Eastern Canada. In some other cases they moved farther west.

Let me give a few illustrations of some of the the things that happened either by way of automation or by moving elsewhere or, in some cases, a combination of the two. In the rail-way shops, for example, there was a decline between the years of 1953 and 1961 of 2, 582 jobs, largely associated with the conversion of the motive power from steam to diesel. There were some of those people who moved away; there were some of them merely reduced in numbers. We need only to say that the TCA overhaul base continued to be bled away during this period, and how many of the people of the TCA overhaul base would be classified as manufacturing employees I haven't been able to find out. Some of them are. Those who worked at machine lathes or those who worked --if there's any carpentry work, would be classed in that way and others besides, and when you consider the numbers of operations all the way from the wireless

(Mr. Evans, Cont'd)...

repair shop up to and including the phasing out of the DC-3 program and others, there was some reduction in the TCA overhaul base that would be classed as manufacturing employment.

There were other partial and smaller industries that moved away and quite a number of them in the soft goods industry. I recall one fair-sized plant that moved away from quite close to the TCA overhaul base. That was Fairfields. They simply picked up lock, stock and barrel and moved down to eastern Canada. There were others where complete departments or complete operations were moved either east or west to be consolidated with larger head office operations.

I should recall to the House that one of the big things that has been happening and one of the things that my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture has been very much concerned with is the transfer of the meat packing industry out of Manitoba. Very large numbers of cattle which used to come to Manitoba to be slaughtered and dealt with here --and my honourable friend sitting over there will know something of this-- has brought us to a situation where from time to time our great meat packing industry over here in St. Boniface has been occupied only to the extent of 20 per cent of its capacity, at other times 50 per cent, at other times different proportions, because in Alberta, and to some extent in Saskatchewan, other facilities have been built up to attract cattle there; and if there are only so many cattle, only so many man hours are going to be occupied in slaughtering them and dressing them, and if the cattle are diverted elsewhere the man hours required are diverted elsewhere too, and to that extent employment is removed from Manitoba.

I haven't been able to trace this exactly but certain it is that in the period we are discussing there was an increase in Saskatchewan and Alberta of 748 jobs in the meat packing industry, and I suppose it would be a fair assumption that a very large part of that was at the expense of Manitoba. There must be a number of hundred jobs that were lost here because of the transfer of that industry. A "guesstimate" --and I must admit that it's only a "guesstimate" -- but the best one that I can make and I offer it to you for what it's worth, whether that be worth much or worth little, is that removals have cost us something in the neighbourhood of 3,500 to 4,000 jobs in the period.

The other factor which has come in, and it's partly mixed with it of course, is the factor of automation. If we take out of the statistical picture the amount of production measured in dollars that's accounted for by the fall in the buying power of the dollar, or the rise in prices, it appears that the increased productivity per worker in Manitoba during this period has been about 12 per cent. That means that if we had continued with the same physical volume of production that we had in 1953 it would have been put out or produced by 12 percent fewer men. This is the process that began, and when one follows the amount of capital invested in machines and manufacturing plants in Manitoba in the period in, particularly 1955, '56 and '57, one sees the very ominous march if you like --for those who are concerned about employment-- the ominous march of automation which has replaced a very large amount of work opportunity in Manitoba and has brought about the shortages of work opportunities that we have seen to a very considerable extent.

Again, how can one estimate this? A mere mechanical application of the 12 per cent to the 44,000 jobs that existed in 1953 yields something of the order of four to five thousand jobs that were probably lost to automation. I don't offer that as a definitive estimate of the amount of work lost. I'm sure fault can be found with it but I think it gives us the order of magnitude of the jobs that were lost from men to machines. The work was done by machines and the work therefore was no longer open to the men. If you add all these figures together it can be said that there may be some jobs in the order of 8 to 10 thousand that were lost by these means in Manitoba from the year 1953 to the year 1961 in manufacturing, and I emphasize that all of the figures I have been dealing with have had to do with manufacturing in Manitoba, that single classification known as manufacturing in the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figures.

So there was a removal from the work force of 10,000 job opportunities during the period 1953 to 1961. Well then supposing the original 260 jobs had been an exact statement of what happened, I don't wish to quarrel with the fact that 1953 was chosen instead of 1954 and I don't attribute any sinister purpose to choosing that one year and not the year that followed;



MR. EVANS, Cont'd). . . . I think it serves a useful purpose to call what is a startling situation to the minds of the people. But supposing we accept that 260 jobs and say yes, there were in 1961 no more jobs except 260 than existed in 1953. At least it can be said this, that the economy --not the government-- the economy itself and those who are concerned in its management, those with money to risk, those with imagination and those willing to take a risk, at least got to work and replaced the 8 or 10 thousand jobs and did well to maintain an economy in the face of a decline of that kind. Manitoba has been going up on a down escalator during this period of 1953 to 1961 and I pay tribute to the men who stood through the worries of that and who invested their money and who organized, who went out and sold, and the people who would not be discouraged by the situation that they faced and who have themselves managed to hold the line while a decline or recession of this magnitude was in fact in progress in the province.

So I think this helps to put things a little bit into perspective. We have held the line during a period of very considerable stress, and when I say "we" let me be quite sure that I give the credit to those who are running the industries, those who are taking the risks, those who are doing the work, those who are running the farms, those who are re-organizing the agricultural system that we have. I could say to you that I hope we will put these figures and these matters into perspective because we do not want to lose confidence in our economy, because if we do lose confidence in it, how can we encourage other people to come in here and help us with our drive forward. And so if we are able to find some signs of encouragement, as I think we can, then we should rejoice in that.

I point out to you that from 1959 to 1961 there were 181 new manufacturing firms established in Manitoba; that there were 2,100 new jobs created in manufacturing in Manitoba and, incidentally, that in that period 1,200 of them were in industries assisted by the Manitoba Development Fund.

Well that's the dark side of the situation that we face in this economy. I have warned you that I think that the task faced over the next period, the 40,000 jobs that was at first foreseen eventually turned in, as far as the COMEF Report was concerned, into 75,000 jobs by 1975, indeed a task upon which anyone would hesitate before entering. Nevertheless, during the last month there has been a satisfactory employment situation in total in the province and my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP over here quoted the figures himself. I have his figures here. He shakes his head at me now but he himself has said that this year unemployment is probably only 3.2 per cent and that last year it was 4 per cent. I'd say . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Madam Speaker, if the Minister would also go on further to say that I said the picture was still a grim one for those who are unemployed and it's nothing to be proud of.

MR. EVANS: There is no question about that. I was not discussing the distress that falls upon the single man. Any man who is without a job is 100 per cent unemployed and we must never forget that. I acknowledge it, but I do take some comfort from the fact that there was a decline from 4 per cent the year before to 3.2. That's a reduction of 20 per cent and from the year before that again when it was 5 per cent down to 4 per cent, which itself also was 20 per cent, and that to all intents and purposes there is what is known these days as virtual full employment in Manitoba and I must say a very much better situation than can be found on the average in Canada where we have --in 1961, the comparison that I must use from these figures is for the prairies, but the prairies was 4.6 compared with 7.2 for all of Canada; and in 1962 was 3.9 compared with 5.9; and in 1963, and this brings us more closely up to date than this other series allowed me to do, was 3.7 for the prairies and 5.5 for Canada as a whole on an estimated basis. And so this situation is not nearly as --you will agree with me -- is not as unsatisfactory as it was three years ago by a substantial margin. So I think we're really together, we have nothing to quarrel about so I think I'll stop quarrelling.

MR. PAULLEY: There's nothing I'd like better to see than that happen here.

MR. EVANS: Yes, so would I. I'd like to see it rubbed out altogether. I'd like to see us have. . . .

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . move to do that.

MR. EVANS: Even in the European countries where they've had to import workers to fill the jobs that were waiting for them, they report some figures of unemployment, varying

MR. EVANS, Cont'd). . . . . around the percentage of 2, 2½ per cent, and so in the situation of over full employment they are forced to report some unemployment figures.

I think we can also look with some satisfaction on this point and it's this, that industrial output in Manitoba during this period in question, 1953 to 1961, increased by one-third the value of output when these machines were put in. When the job opportunities were reduced and when the new factories were opened up we did in fact increase industrial output in the province by one-third. That's just about the Canadian average - not quite up to it- but just about the Canadian average.

Well, you might say, what good is this if people don't have the jobs, if we lose jobs but increase the output? Well I've emphasized that up to now the figures of employment that have been quoted in this debate have been manufacturing employment only. Anything that is manufactured in a factory has to be carted away. It is carted away by a truck driver; it may be driven on the road by a truck; it may be taken by railway; it may be transported some other way; but further employment is created by the very requirement to transport raw material to the factory and carry the product away. This is pretty obvious, and the point that I am making now of course is that increased production itself, increased physical volume of production does call for employment in the service industries, and that if I want to move now from considering only manufacturing employment to the question of the service industries, and in the period in question in Manitoba employment in the service industries moved up by 54, 000 jobs in the period that we have in mind --54, 000 jobs in the period.

Now let me be quite clear about this, and let me be quite sure that, even if some of my honourable friends are scribbling over there to beat the band, that I am not claiming that the rise in the service industry employment was all caused by the increase in employment or the increased output of these factories. Of course it wasn't. There was a very considerable increase in hotels, in restaurants, and the other facilities that we have, in the tourist industry, and in others. But even these, even the hotel industry I think owes a good deal to the increase in industrial development here because salesmen, visitors, officers, inspectors, and others have to travel, and when they are here they have to sleep and they patronize our hotels and our restaurants.

But during this period there was a substantial increase in employment in Manitoba. Allow me to make a correction there, if I may. The 54, 000 figure is 1951 to 1961, not 1953. There is a two year difference there. But it was 54, 000 - it was a very substantial increase in employment in the province and it is the total that counts. I think it's beyond question that the increased physical volume of business going out of the factories, the increase in value of production of these factories by one-third in the period that made possible some part, some substantial part of the increase in the service industries and so employment has resulted from the increase in industrial production that I speak of. Well I would warn those of you just in passing, as an aside, not to rely too completely on the statistics for the period 1953 to 1961 because the Dominion Bureau of Statistics changed its series within that period and some of the comparisons cannot be drawn.

Well, the job of providing jobs for the people who will join the work force in Manitoba in the next period still remains as serious as COMEF said it was, and it will require every effort and every combination of effort that can be made in this province to fill that need. The fact that I have been able to quote some statistics partly to fill out the picture, called to attention by my honourable friends who have quoted the manufacturing statistics only, must not be read as any indication that I think that all is well, or any indication of complacency on the part of the government.

Then we turn to COMEF, the plan which offers expert professional advice as to how this staggering job of providing 75, 000 new work opportunities which would not have come by themselves if present trends had been left to themselves. How is this report faring? What is being done about it? It has been given a searching scrutiny, not only by the government here but by something like a hundred daily newspapers in Canada and every important business publication in the country. International publications such as Time Magazine, the London Times Review of Industry and Technology, and a number of research organizations who have studied it and have reported upon it call it a practical scheme for accomplishing the job it was intended to accomplish. I think it can be said that there is now a widespread acceptance by

MR. EVANS, Cont'd). . . . Manitobans that the task of economic development in this province is an urgent one.

The report emphasized that the economic growth is achieved mainly by private enterprise, that future economic growth will require maintenance of our free market system and adaptation by all sectors of our province to changing conditions. The government expenditures alone are not the key to Manitoba's economic growth, and the report concluded that Manitoba has the potential to become a leading industrial area, but stressed that this can only be accomplished when the citizens of our province become better aware of Manitoba's overall economic potential and the opportunities for growth. All responsible groups that make up our industrial society, management, labour, agriculture, university and government, must cooperate in making the long-range adjustment needed to provide full employment for the continually increasing population.

Well I would like to put the job of implementing COMEF a little bit into perspective. It is nothing less than the revolutionizing of an economy. It is a 12 year project. It needs big planning and a patchwork job of intermediate measures will not do it. The report itself stated that Manitoba is at the economic crossroads. Well COMEF gave the government or government of all sorts a very limited role. They said that private enterprise must be the risk-takers and those who provide the know-how to do it. They assign government a very difficult role, as between the responsibilities on the one side of those who believe in a laissez-faire policy and those on the other side who believe in state management and state control of everything, and I think the philosophy suits the philosophy of this party over here, and we say that we seek the sensible middle course. We believe there is a place for government to help, but we believe that the major actor upon the stage is the enterpriser who knows how to do it and is willing to take the risk, and who is willing to put his own money into it.

Well progress with government responsibilities has been very considerably advanced in the past year. This will be reported upon in detail by each of the ministers in turn when it comes to his estimates, and it will be seen perhaps from the Speech from the Throne that certainly, as the debates progress, that each minister through his own estimates and through his own programmes is implementing a considerable part of the COMEF report. In the first year of a 12 year program, they by actual count of the items that have been assigned to government responsibility or in which government has the initiative, the government has already taken action on at least one-half of them, and that when you add together the items that have been proposed already in the Speech from the Throne, as many as three-quarters of the items called for under government responsibility in the COMEF report have been acted upon or in course of being acted upon. Now since the time has progressed I am not going to detail even for my own department --I'll reserve until a later stage and some other debate the details of my own department and place myself with the other ministers in the position of accounting for the implementation of the recommendations of COMEF when it comes to my estimates or in some other debate.

Well I emphasize in closing that this is a 12 year job. In the first 11 months not only has the government analyzed what it must do, and 900 pages of advice to anyone is a large job to even analyze and find out what should be done, but we have organized the machinery to carry out the COMEF program as far as we are able at the present time and have started action on at least 75% of the recommendations for which COMEF indicated the government has responsibility.

The next step will require the active participation of the private sectors of the economy, and I must say in passing that we are having the most understanding and cordial supply from the labour unions, from management organizations, from the farm organizations and from the university. We are at the stage where we look to the many co-operative programs needed between management and the other factors, and with the leadership that we intend to give it, I predict success for this program after prodigious effort.

Now at this stage I would like to resume my seat, Madam, because I sense that there is a willingness that the vote should be held at this point, and that would enable us to do so before the normal hour of adjournment.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, may I ask the House Leader if it is the intention if we do have the vote that we will not resume sitting this evening? Is that the idea?

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, the advice that I have received when I have consulted the House has been to follow the Order Paper. I cannot speak for those in whose hands the resolutions that follow this debate rest. I suggest that we call the Orders. I don't know whether Madam Speaker would wish to stop the clock at 5:30 and allow that process to take place, but if all the items were stood we would have finished the Order Paper and would naturally adjourn.

MR. PAULLEY: Well on that understanding, Madam Speaker, I am agreeable. If this isn't the understanding and if we are going to meet this evening, I would suggest it be 5:30, but on the understanding -- and I understand that this is an understanding -- then I am prepared to receive the vote.

MR. FROESE: I agree to have my matter stand.

MR. EVANS: Well, I take it that ...

MR. PAULLEY: I'll reserve my comments until Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Yes, I'll look forward to that occasion. I have no doubt that there will be comments. Now, Madam Speaker, perhaps we have come to the point where you might wish to put the question on this debate.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. EVANS: Yeas and nays please, Madam Speaker. I don't know whether anybody else called for them but I certainly do if nobody else has.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Dufferin, an Address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in answer to his Speech at the opening of the Session.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows

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

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 31; Nays, 19.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I take it I have the unanimous consent of the House to complete these formalities.

I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that the address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be engrossed and presented to His Honour by such members of this House as are of the Executive Council and the mover and seconder of the address.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that this House will at its next sitting resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that this House will at its next sitting resolve itself into a Committee to consider of ways and means for raising of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I have a message from the Honourable the Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Administrator of the Province of Manitoba transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba estimates of sums required for the services of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1965, and recommends these estimates to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, that the message of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor and the estimates accompanying the same be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.  
MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that the House do now adjourn.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Wednesday afternoon.