

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, March 17, 1967

MR. SPEAKER: I would just like to make a short announcement before we proceed with the afternoon's business and refer the honourable members to Votes and Proceedings No. 43 of Thursday, March 16th. Bill No. 29 was inadvertently put under the Standing Committee of Municipal Affairs. Would you be good enough to amend your copy and bring Bill 29 under Standing Committee on Law Amendments at the foot of the page. Is it clear to everyone? Page No. 8 - Bill No. 29.

Adjourned debate on second reading of Bill No. 21. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 42. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, speaking to this Bill, I've been advised that on second reading, that moving second reading, I should confine myself to the principles of the Bill rather than to the details section by section.--(Interjection)-- Not yet.--(Interjection)-- Oh, I see. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Brokenhead, that Bill No. 42, an Act to amend The Shops Regulation Act, be now read a second time.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, as I said, in dealing with this matter I have been advised that I limit myself to the principles of the proposed Bill. There are quite a number of amendments and some members may recall that a Bill very similar to this was brought in to the House last year. I say similar because there have been additions to the Bill proposed last year. At that time there were 36 members in the House and the vote was 18 to 18. The Speaker at that time ruled against the moving of second reading.

Now, I'm hopeful that this situation will not develop this year because I think this is a Bill that requires study and this is a Bill that should be given an opportunity of being heard and an opportunity to those parties who are interested in it to state their case and to explain their position. The purpose in general of the amendments is to clarify certain parts of this Act. The Act, the way it stands today, has caused a great deal of confusion both in the interpretation and in the enforcement of certain sections of this Act. The municipalities can't really enforce many sections of the Act as they stand today.

Now The Shops Regulation Act is a part of the Statutes of Manitoba, and if it's to be retained at all, then I suggest it must be brought up-to-date, otherwise there's really no sense in keeping on the statutes regulations which just don't reflect today's new methods of merchandising. They don't reflect the new economic life of our community and this really is what the problem is, that the Bill we have, that we're trying to live with now, was designed for a different period and as a result it has grown unwieldy and, as I say, it is difficult to interpret and difficult to enforce.

In Ontario, they have faced the problem, and as a result, in 1965 they introduced in Ontario amendments to their Bill or to their statutes which up-dated it and took into account the problems that confront the small merchant, the public, and particularly the municipalities, in the interpretation of the clause for example - and I have to refer to some - the definition of "sale by retail" or a method whereby the municipality can determine the classification in which a business may be placed for purposes of this Bill, because as it stands now, if two-thirds of any group of merchants come to a municipality with a petition duly authorized, duly signed, then the municipality has no choice but to accede to the request of the petition and to enact legislation. On the other hand, twenty-four hours later, if they so desire, the municipality can rescind that legislation, and I think it's nonsense to put the municipality in that position; I think it's nonsense to put the petitioners in that position. By amending the Act at this time it would more clearly define these areas which, as I say, are now beclouded and very difficult to judge.

The change from last year, and one of the significant ones, is being introduced this year on the request of the legal department of one of the larger urban municipalities, and that deals with the matter of law enforcement with regard to the closing of retail establishments on provincial or federal holidays. Apparently, it would appear that there is no provision really

(MR. MILLER, cont'd) for enforcement of the closing of retail establishments on federal or provincial holidays, even when those holidays are proclaimed by the municipal corporation. This is a situation that has never been a problem before simply because apparently no business was trying to take advantage of it, but at the present time the situation has developed whereby there are businesses that are taking advantage of the loose wording in the Act and they are remaining open despite the fact that there are provincial or federal holidays but they cannot be enforced; the municipalities have not got the power to do so.

Another thing I'd like to stress of course is this, that none of this is compulsory. It is not binding in the sense that every municipality will still be left with the authority to act as it will. There are no compulsive features in this; it is not mandatory. These are permissive, and for this reason particularly, I urge this House to allow this Bill to go to Law Amendments and to provide an opportunity for those interested parties, whether they be businessmen, whether they be municipal officials or even the public and consumer groups, to be heard and to express their views because - and I think it is the important thing - if we are going to retain statutes on our books, we should not retain statutes that are unworkable or that have outlived their usefulness perhaps. If we do that we are not being fair to anyone.

And so to achieve this end, I think in my opinion, and I'd like to urge the House to consider this, that we move to allow this to go to Law Amendments Committee and permit the various interested groups to bring their views to bear on this matter, and in Committee any changes of course that can be considered or might be considered by members due to these representations, can of course be added to this. But I think it would be wrong on our part to simply at this time turn it down and to permit the old regulations, the old Shops Regulation Act, to exist in its present form and to let it remain on our statute books in its present form.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 55. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 55, an Act to Validate By-law No. 371 of The Village of Teulon and By-law No. 2233 of The Rural Municipality of Rockwood, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, the Rural Municipality of Rockwood and the Village of Teulon agreed to share the cost of a Community Hall at Teulon known as the Teulon-Rockwood Centennial Community Centre, and at the time that estimates of the cost were obtained, the estimate of the cost that was going to have to be paid by the two municipalities was \$59,000 and the ratepayers approved of the necessary money by-laws to cover this cost.

However, by the time that the building was constructed, costs had gone up considerably and also the volunteer labour that the municipalities had counted upon did not come forward and so the costs of the Hall exceeded the estimate by \$26,000, and this Act is for the purpose of validating By-laws of the Village of Teulon and the Rural Municipality of Rockwood authorizing them to borrow money - \$13,000 each - so that the whole of the cost can be paid. I understand that the people in these municipalities are quite happy with their new Community Hall and that everyone is quite agreeable to the additional money being raised for paying the cost.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead in further amendment thereto. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate and to suggest that the House should give consideration to the resolution or the amendment proposed by my colleague from Brokenhead. I appreciate and realize, Mr. Speaker, that this is a matter and a proposition that has been to the fore on a number of occasions here in Canada and also in the other wheat-producing countries. I think there is no difference of opinion, Mr. Speaker, in the approach of the main motion and also the amendments to the motion, and that is a recognition in this House and similar assemblies, in Western Canada particularly, that the farmer of Canada is not receiving a fair return for his products and his labour; and also, that we'll have to face up to this problem to a greater degree than we have been doing in the past, because we're going to be faced, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, with a number of problems insofar as

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) the agricultural industry is concerned unless we do something about it insofar as increasing income of the farm population is concerned.

Now it's true that as the motion and the amendment indicate that this can be achieved at least to some degree by increasing the initial payments on the crop year as suggested by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, and also to some degree by the proposition of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne insofar as price is concerned that we obtain under the International Wheat Agreement but at the same time if we recognize that it might be possible to obtain increased price for wheat under the International Wheat Agreement, may I suggest, Mr. Speaker, we're also faced with the problem on the international scale of the provision from our bread-basket here - to use that term - in Canada, the provision of sustenance to peoples all over the world as well. And as much as I think that the proposition, particularly of the amendment, if adopted will gain to the farmer of Western Canada a greater amount of dollars and cents, the question naturally arises as to whether or not we will be able to obtain from - particularly the underdeveloped countries - the financial payment under the International Wheat Agreement as suggested.

Now the other day, back on February 10th, the Honourable Member from Virden who took part in this debate, he really didn't question the proposition suggested by my colleague from Brokenhead that we should have a two-price system for wheat, he did question, and I quote from Page 981, my Honourable friend from Virden he said, "My honourable friend the member for Brokenhead is justified in asking if this be my view, then why not support his motion for a two-price system of wheat?" The Member for Virden said, "The sad fact is that there are too many 'ifs' attached to the workability of a two-price system, and until these are resolved I would be reluctant to plunge into a pricing system that has its strongest support based in some university I know little about."

Well I can appreciate my honourable friend making a statement of that nature, but I also would suggest to him that we have over the years here in Canada repeatedly suggested increases in the initial payment and also in the maximum payments insofar as the minimum payments under our International Wheat Agreement, but the plight of the farmer hasn't changed; it hasn't changed in relation to the national economy in the income. So I say to my friend - and I'm sorry he's not with us this afternoon - I say to my friend that he might be perfectly correct if there hadn't enough detailed investigation into the proposition of my colleague from Brokenhead, but I suggest that this should not be a reason for opposition into the feasibility or the possibility or a study into the effects of the two-price system for wheat.

And again on my same page, Mr. Speaker, 981, my honourable friend the Member for Virden says, and I quote, "As a farmer, Mr. Speaker, I'd feel honour bound to support such a motion if it were not for a number of unsettled questions." Well then I respectfully suggest if there are unsettled questions, and I appreciate that there are unsettled questions, the way to have these questions settled or answered, Mr. Speaker, is not the rejection of the proposition at all but further consideration of the proposition introduced by the Member from Brokenhead.

And again the member for Virden states on Page 982, "The main argument which has been advanced in support of the two-price system for the domestically consumed portion of the Canadian wheat crop is that the wheat producer need some relief from, or compensation for, the cost-price squeeze in agriculture." And then he goes on to say in the same paragraph, "Furthermore, the two-price proposal has a much greater appeal to farmers and taxpayers than the one dollar an acre payment made to Western grain growers four or five years ago." Now isn't this true? I don't think there's much argument with what my honourable friend the Member from Virden had to say at that particular time.

Then my friend goes on to say, "However, the two-price proposal is in conflict with international trade policies. Canadian farmers were extremely angry during the latter part of the 1950's when the United States did have a two-price system for their wheat. "Canadian farmers of that day," my friend says, "accused the United States of dumping policies, unfair competition, etc. It does not appear to be wise at this time for Canada to adopt a policy that was a source of serious concern to Canadian farmers. Furthermore, it is likely that a two-price system for Canadian wheat at this time could have significant repercussions for the present International Wheat Agreement negotiations which are being carried out at Geneva." Now I appreciate this very much, there was this consternation at the time, but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, one of the major basis for the consternation was because it was the farmer of Canada as the individual producer at that time that was competing with the treasury of the United States,

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd)and the farmer in Canada was not able because it was him, as the individual farmer, to carry on the competition to the same degree as he would have had we in effect had the same proposition here at that time in Canada. And what to me, Mr. Speaker, is the important factor insofar as the income of our farm population is concerned, is the production of wheat or crops at the same time as a fair return to the individual producer.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, in a nation as affluent as we are here in Canada, a nation which just the other day with the tabling of the estimates for the ensuing fiscal year at Ottawa is going to allocate the sum of 1.7 billion for defence and destructive purposes, surely we can justify a position where the Canadian economy can well afford to give to the farm industry a greater return of our national income. And may I suggest that out of the 1.7 billion that is allocated for military purposes, for defence purposes, as justifiable as they may be in some quarters, that we could well afford under a two-price system for wheat to give unto our farmers a fair return at the domestic level for their production, and if need be to assist in supplying the World Food Organization with wheat for distribution to other countries less fortunate than ourselves, that we should be prepared to do it. I'm not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that what we should do is to say here to China or India or any South American country or the likes of this that here's a hundred million bushels of wheat; we know you're hungry. This brings into it political connotations, but I do respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that through one of the agencies of the United Nations that we all support, we could well allocate a percentage of our crop - our export crop - and at the same time ensure that irrespective of what the International Wheat Agreement countries may arrive at a purchase price, that the farmer as a result of contributions to other nations would not suffer at home.

And also the other day, Mr. Speaker, I read with a considerable degree of interest the contribution to this debate by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, and he states on Page 1370, and I quote, "As I see the amendment to this resolution, I have given it considerable thought and I think we have before us two situations, namely, the two-price system of wheat versus an increase on the International Wheat Agreement. Insofar as the amendment is concerned I think we're all generally agreed in this House that an increase in price of wheat to the farmer is essential." With this I concur. The methodology may not be in quite the same degree of agreement, but I do respectfully suggest that there is room for both, Mr. Speaker - both. If necessary, a two-price system of wheat up to an amount of production per farm and with those countries outside that are well able to pay for our products under the International Wheat Agreement, and that can be done as well.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, in all due respect to the arguments that were prevalent in the '50's when the United States did in effect dump wheat as the result of them being able through their public treasuries to guarantee to the farmer or producer in their areas to the detriment of the Canadian farmer, I think that our economy now is so much better that we're able to achieve a better position in the international field with the recognition of our responsibilities to our underdeveloped countries and at the same time ensure to the farmers of our community a better price.

What is happening at the present time? Every time we're issued with a new statistic insofar as our farm population is concerned, it's gradually - and sometimes even more than gradually - being depleted. We're bewailing the fact in this House and in other Houses the loss of agricultural producers, and while it is true that there has been a tremendous increase in mechanism of farm-producing implements, it's equally true I believe, Mr. Speaker, and now becoming recognized more than ever, that the question has arisen as to whether or not our farms are not becoming too large and the use of mechanical equipment becoming so great, that we're losing efficiency of production, because bigness by itself is not sufficient to produce. All over the world today, in every land, emphasis is being laid on the need of making available, to the highest degree possible, the productivity of land. This is going on all over the world, and yet our scientists at the present time are beginning to question whether or not the trend in Canada and the United States, in Argentina and others, is a proper trend because we're losing productivity by bigness in the agricultural industry.

No one needs to be told here this afternoon of the plight of many of our fellow humans in other parts of the globe. Every year, so we are told, in other countries the equivalent of the total population of Canada is dying of starvation. Well maybe we are not close enough to the source to realize how much this means, but I think, Mr. Speaker, if we just for a moment considered as we celebrate our year of anniversary of our 100th year, if suddenly or within

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) this year of celebration the total population was eradicated or died as the result of starvation, maybe somebody would take some note of it. But this is happening, Mr. Speaker, and we are only talking in Canada about not supplying the needs but principally price. I say we can have a combination of both, but if we are only going to continue to put our emphasis into obtaining solely that return on the basis of international agreements by payments in cash, I don't think we are doing the job that we could and we should for humanity.

We know that scientific investigations are taking place into other areas of supplying the requirements of human sustenance; we know that scientists are scouring the oceans and the depths of the oceans for different types of vegetation in order to feed the hungry; and yet here in Canada, while it is true that production is going up, Mr. Speaker, we still have an exodus from our rural communities. And for what reason? I suggest basically for the reason that in this affluent society of ours we are not ensuring to our producers sufficient to give them any sense of equality, or part of being Canadians and part of being members of this great society that we have here in Canada. So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is true that the details are not yet in some respects, as suggested by the Honourable Member for Virden, as to how a two-price system actually would work and the mechanics of it. We have had some illustrations of it before. The Honourable Member for Rhineland in speaking in this debate the other day - it seems to me rather strange in some respects, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Rhineland and ourselves in this group find something of a common interest - he agreed with the contention of looking into the question of the two-price system for wheat. --(Interjection) -- Yes, my honourable friend says, Mr. Speaker, he has been advocating it for years, and so have we. I don't know whether this makes me a Social Creditor or him a Socialist, but it doesn't matter - that aspect - it does indicate, however, that it is a matter that has to be given consideration.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, in the terms of the resolution it is implied, "Be it further resolved that this House urge the Government of Canada to institute a two-price system for wheat and that the Federal Government negotiate with the farm organizations to arrive at a price." Now this is basic, but I say that in the context of the resolution there is nothing to prevent my honourable friend the Member for Virden from saying, "O.K., we'll accept your resolution but we want a further investigation, not only by the farm organizations insofar as a price is concerned but further investigations into the methodology of the application of a two-price system for wheat."

And I say to my honourable friend the Member for Rock Lake, that as he said the other day there is no argument about the need to give to our agricultural industry a fair return, I respectfully suggest that one of the methods that can be used to accomplish, not only a fair return to our agricultural industry but also to make provisions so we in this great Canada of ours can play a greater part in the feeding of the underprivileged of the world through the United Nations agency by contributions of wheat, can reduce the net cost to Canadians of the defence expenditure by giving the hand of love and friendship rather than the methods which are so historic in this democracy of ours.

I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the House should give full consideration to the proposition of my colleague from Brokenhead.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party a question or two? I would like to ask my honourable friend these two questions. First of all, what does my honourable friend mean by the phrase that I understood him to use, "we are losing productivity by bigness." And secondly, I would like to ask him what amount per bushel would he suggest should be added to the domestic consumption of wheat and what amount per bushel does he estimate would accrue to the grower from this on the allotted quantity?

MR. PAULLEY: I must confess, Mr. Chairman, that I am unable to answer the last two questions. One of the reasons that I was holding back on this particular resolution for a number of weeks was to enable me to be in the position to answer the questions of my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside, and I apologize to him for that.

The first question though, Mr. Speaker, is a very interesting one and it is one that I have just recently read articles in connection with. Over the last weekend I had an opportunity of attending a layman's Anglican Conference in Carman and at that conference a film was shown with Stanley Burke being the commentator. I believe the title of the film was "A World to Feed", and it was illustrated in this particular film that scientifically and agriculturally some of our specialists in the field are coming to the conclusion that as the result of the

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) vastness of farm areas and the mechanisms on the farm areas - the application of mechanical devices to it - is tending to decrease productivity by comparison to what smaller units used to. That is the source, my friend, for my statement.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): I wonder if I could ask the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party a question? I was just wondering - I would like to congratulate you on your speech because you made an excellent speech - but I am just wondering if you would be in favor of delaying the Medicare plan which is coming into effect on July 1, 1968, so we could use this money to finance the two-price system.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think we can have both, and as a matter of fact I am sure that if the farm population received adequate income for their labours and for their products, rather than delay a Medicare scheme we might have had one a number of years ago. It is only because of the fact that those that my honourable friend represents in this Assembly have not had the wherewithal that the Honourable the Minister of Health and his predecessors have had to delay, because they place the economic value on Medicare as against our proposition. The answer to my honourable friend is "no."

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

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, yeas and nays.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there other members of the same Call in the Members.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, what happens if your ruling is not carried. You just said that the motion was carried.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable gentleman for bringing that to my attention. I have declared the motion as carried.

MR. LYON: Speaking on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, your Honour always declares the motion carried, and after the motion is declared carried it is then within the option of any member or group of members in the House to ask for yeas and nays, and I understand that the Member for Souris-Lansdowne asked for yeas and nays. There is nothing unusual in the circumstance at all.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Clement, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shewman, Shoemaker, Tanchak and Uskiw.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Roblin, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

A MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, before the count, I completely forgot, I am paired with the Honourable Member for Rupertsland and in the heat of battle I completely overlooked it. I don't know whether this is the time to report it or not.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 25; Nays, 28.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost. Are you ready for the question on the main motion?

MR. LYON: There is an amendment. I believe there is another amendment to the main motion.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable the Attorney-General for that opinion.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Now the main motion as amended.

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

A MEMBER: Yeas and nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Craik, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Roblin, Shewman, Shoemaker, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Tanchak, Uskiw, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

NAYS: Nil.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment carried.

MR. CLEMENT: Mr. Speaker, I might say that I am paired with the Honourable Member from Rupertsland. Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion. It's rather embarrassing

(MR. CLEMENT, cont'd) not to vote on your own motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution

MR. LYON: have the vote count from the Clerk.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 52; nays, nil.

MR. SPEAKER: I was a little previous in declaring it carried, but the motion is carried. The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, this resolution was submitted to the Clerk before the reading of the Throne Speech and then the Throne Speech suggested this action will be taken in the House. But my resolution was in two parts and still stays on the Paper in two parts. Nothing had been mentioned in the Throne Speech on the second part, but since we got Bill No. 59, in view of the fact we've got it before us now, and after reading it, I find that it does make reference to other languages besides the French, therefore I am willing to withdraw this Bill at the present time because now I am assured that I will be able to speak on the importance of multi-lingual conversational ability which is so desirable internationally.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have leave to withdraw the resolution? --(Agreed). The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand over.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I have spoken on the amendment to this resolution that at one time was before us. There are just two or three comments that I wish to add. Firstly, with respect to minimum wage being reviewed every two years, I suggest to you, as I have in dealing with this matter previously that a period of two years is too long a lapse of time between periods of review of minimum wages. This, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you should be a matter of continuous concern for the Minister and for the government. With respect to the minimum wage itself as proposed in this resolution, an interesting article appeared not too long ago, a few weeks ago, in the U.S. News and World Report dealing with a survey that the editorial staff of this magazine had conducted of the effect of the increase of the minimum wage in the United States from \$1.40 to \$1.60 an hour. --(Interjection)-- That is right.

Now I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that some of the observations, or particularly some of the conclusions reported in this article may not have too much validity because it is rather premature to conduct a survey on a study of this type. The minimum wage was increased on the 1st of February and this magazine was published on the -- or it's dated the 6th of March. In view of the fact that the March 20th issue of this magazine is already on the news stand, it was probably on the news stands on the 1st of March and goodness knows when it was written, but it must have been written a day or two after -- or the survey must have been conducted a day or two after the minimum wage was raised, so it's hardly enough time within which to assess and evaluate the effect of the increase in minimum wage on our economy.

However, this report does proceed to draw a number of red herrings across the scene pointing to the danger to our economy if the minimum wage were raised. It deals with hospitals, with restaurants, the effect it would have on small stores and businesses in the south and so forth. It quotes one person as saying that within three years half the laundries and dry cleaning establishments in the United States will be out of business; the motel owners would not be able to operate; the cotton plantation owners would not be able to operate and so forth if the minimum wage were raised to any further degree, and even the present increase will have a serious impact on the economy.

Now I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that all that this report and all that any other arguments of this type tend to point out is weakness in our present economy as it now stands. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to be party to perpetuating a system wherein the only manner in which business can profit, the only manner in which business can operate, can succeed, is by having the rich on the one hand and the poor on the other hand. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we can not accept this type of reasoning that is put forth in this article that I've referred to. We've heard arguments of that type in this House and in other arenas wherein this topic is discussed, the argument that I can not afford to pay my staff a respectable living wage

(MR. HANUSCHAK, cont'd) because if I do it's going to drive me out of business. If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, then I suggest to you that perhaps our business operations in our community, in our society, should take a close look at themselves. Perhaps there's some room for a little bit of housecleaning within their own operations as to the efficiency of their operations. Perhaps they should give some second thought as to their concept of profit, their concept of a successfully run operation and so forth rather than continuously blame wages. If a business must impose any economy measure, we turn to the wage earner; we reduce his wages. We reduce his wages; we keep his wages down to a minimum. We daren't allow his wages increased, using this argument, that if this should happen, then it's going to drive many commercial enterprises out of business. This type of argument, Mr. Speaker, in this day and age just simply does not hold water.

For that reason, I suggest to you that the resolution as it stands here is not going to achieve the minimum or provide the workers with a minimum standard that every human being is entitled to, and therefore we can not support the resolution in its present form.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): I move that the debate be adjourned, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN: May I have the indulgence of the House to allow this motion to stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): In the absence of the honourable member, can we have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: I adjourned the debate for the Honourable Member for Inkster -- St. John's, and he is not in his seat. I'd like to have this matter stood, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. EDWARD L. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I'll be very brief on this resolution. We are asked to vote on something which in my opinion looks fine and has quite high moral principles, but to me really the resolution is asking for a sweeping endorsement of matters which in my opinion no Legislature would adopt without first giving very detailed consideration to. For example, even though such persuasion may result in a loss of trade to other persons or termination of employment relationships, the laws in Manitoba as I see them at the present time are not clear now for picketing, whether it's legal in such a situation or not. Personally, I can not make a blanket statement like the motion proposes to do, and in my opinion I would say it's somewhat irresponsible.

We are aware that many and some other jurisdictions are at the present time spending very large amounts of money and time and have commissions standing and working and studying this problem in very minute detail, and so I would be inclined to say that this problem is greater than the solution that the Honourable Member from Inkster has proposed to this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to ask that the debate be adjourned, but if I do I'll be closing debate, so if anybody wishes to speak on it before I do that. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too shall be brief on this because I do think this is a simple resolution and it only asks that certain things be done to give people who are organizing the privilege to have their own wishes incurred in and not others interfere when they're asking to have this done.

Now the first whereas says, "the underlying principle of The Labour Relations Act that every employee has the right to belong to a trade union and to join with his fellow employees for the purpose of collective bargaining. I think we all agree with this, but what's happened? An exercise takes place before the Labour Relations Board which kind of twists and takes this right out of context of what it's supposed to mean. You have employers coming there asking

(MR. FOX, cont'd) for all kinds of information. I have before me a number of certification procedures which give you examples of what occurs. They object to one thing or another. For instance, the employer challenges the union saying that the majority of the employees in the proposed unit are members in good standing of the union. Now this is something that the Labour Relations Board has the jurisdiction over. Why should we have an exercise with a number of solicitors arguing back and forth that this is right? This entails money; this entails time; and it does not accomplish the purpose that the section was meant to accomplish. All it does is delay.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, when things of this nature are proceeding, people are in the spirit of doing things. If they cannot do them at the time that they require, they get frustrated. Not only that, as time proceeds certain other events occur which intimidate, coerce, or make people change their minds which are not right. This is the reason why this should not be introduced into this kind of relationship when the employers come in there asking for a delay. As I said, they are spurious reasons why they come in here, because after all if you want to join something or want to create something, that should be your choice. This free choice under The Labour Relations Act is denied when the employer comes in here to do these things.

I'll give you another example, Mr. Speaker. Here's the employer again protesting, and he says that the category of the employees specified does not constitute a craft union. Now shouldn't this be the choice of the people that want to, or have a union, and not the employer's choice as to whether they are choosing the right one or not the right one. I think this is the kind of thing that occurs continually that makes the labour movement angry when they are trying to organize themselves, the employers coming in there, interfering and telling them you cannot have this kind of a union or that kind of a union, that you are not choosing the right kind of a craft. I'm sure that when you wanted to join the farmers' union or whatever other union you wanted to join, you would not like it if someone else came along and said, "Don't join the farmers union, that's not your good choice." I think the choice should be the people who are creating this form of organization and this is not the case under The Labor Relations Act now. That is why we are asking to have this thing altered, Mr. Chairman.

When it comes to revocation of certificates, the same thing occurs, Mr. Chairman, not the employees concerned come in to ask for revocation but the employer comes in. Now he's coming in to say he's representing the employees, but if the employees want to have revocation then they should have the choice to do it themselves and not the employer coming in there for them, because there's always the danger that he has twisted their arms - and I am saying this intentionally - that he has twisted their arms so that they should ask for revocation, because if there's just a few of them involved this is quite easily the case. As you know, when you have a small shop, an intimate relationship, Mr. Speaker, the employer has considerable sway over the employees that are working for him.

Now I could go on on a number of other cases like this, Mr. Speaker, and recite case after case where this occurs, but I think that these few examples should be sufficient to indicate to you why we are asking for this resolution to be adopted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I note that the mover of this resolution addressed this House on the 7th day of February, and it was obvious after he spoke, presented his argument, that the spokesmen for the Liberal Party were fully familiar with the problem, were ready to deal with it and they did indeed deal with it, because on the next Private Members' Day, February 10th, both the Honourable Member for Selkirk and the Honourable Member for St. Boniface spoke and they spoke with a recognition of what problem was involved.

The Honourable Member for Selkirk addressed himself to the problem and indicated what I believe is his opinion, that the purpose of having an employer appear before the Labour Board on certification is not to raise an objection to his employees belonging to a trade union, and he said, "The main purpose" - and I'm reading excerpts from Page 998 of Hansard - "The main purpose of him appearing before the board is to submit to the board a list of his employees which is private as far as the board is concerned, and if he has any objections to any employees as being included in the bargaining agreement, any employees who may occupy managerial position or a supervisory position," and he pointed out that the employer has a right to object as to whether or not a bargaining unit is appropriate to the particular form of employment.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we realize after hearing and reading what was said by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that apparently in this respect the proposal we had to make had been

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) misconstrued. We agree that the employer is needed in order to assist the board in ascertaining what is the appropriate bargaining unit, because that is the first step the board must make, and the employer should not only have a right but should be given the opportunity and be liable to debate or discuss with him just what it is that the bargaining unit ought to consist of.

We then waited to hear the words of wisdom that would come from the government side of the House. The matter was adjourned in the name of the Honourable Member for Kildonan on February 10th, and it stood February 10th, February 14th, February 21st, March 7th, March 14th - what is today - March 17th, and not a person, as far as I can see from the record, on the government side had the courtesy nor the interest nor the concern in this issue to express a point of view. I find this rather -- well, I was going to say shocking, but I'm no longer shocked that easily, Mr. Speaker, I am just amazed that matters that are brought before this House - and I admit that it was only brought by the New Democratic Party and maybe it doesn't warrant to be dealt with by the government side - but the Liberals saw that there was a point in discussing this.

Even if we were wrong we would be entitled to have the matter discussed, because a goodly number of people in the Province of Manitoba not only support the New Democratic Party but are concerned with matters that issue with the Labour Board, and we find that this government has not spoken on this issue. The Attorney-General says it's 'shocking', and now that he says it I will agree with him. He and I both agree that it's shocking, although as I said earlier I was not really shocked, I was not even surprised, I was dismayed. -- (Interjection)-- Well now, the Attorney-General indicates that he's embarrassed I'm sure - he didn't say that - but I am sure he's embarrassed at the thought of my according him as saying that it was shocking would be misconstrued, and certainly he had a genial smile on his face which belied the word that he didn't find it shocking at all.

Well now I do, Mr. Speaker, because although I wasn't so shocked earlier, the mere fact that the Leader of the House - and I won't give him the other appellations which have been accorded him by others - is so casual about the lack of the government's participation in this debate that he's inclined to smile and say in a - I suppose it's a sarcastic way - "shocking, isn't it?" Well, I don't know. I won't comment further for the record as to his appearance here. The fact is he's amongst a fairly small number of members of his Party that are here at all to listen to this debate, so that I could only by force address those that are still concerned with affairs of this nature and who happen to be present here.

I am glad the Minister of Labour is here because I presume that this is a matter which should be in his interest. I presume that he would have seen to it that someone would have spoken on his behalf, assuming that he felt that he should not lower himself to discuss this matter. But what we are dealing with is a basic matter of what goes on in the Labour Relations Board and the practice conducted therein, and when the Honourable Minister of Labour was asked the other day by a member on this side of the House - I don't remember for the moment who it was - but the question was -- the Honourable Member for Assiniboia apparently asked a question as to whether or not the Labour Relations Board had to give a reason for its decision, and the Honourable Minister had to find out. I think that if he didn't know it, and obviously he didn't, that he's not close enough to how that Board operates. I would like to suggest that the Honourable Minister of Labour has removed himself from many of the problems in his department, and I say that because I quote him now as saying, "Well, we have a balanced board", and he calls his Minimum Wage Board - I shouldn't say 'his' because I don't know whose it is, the fact is we don't even know that it's compelled to report at any time to anybody - but the Minimum Wage Board is what he calls a balanced board and the Labour Relations Board is a balanced board and the Wood Commission is a balanced commission and he looks for the consensus -- he likes to get a sort of feeling that these balanced people work out their problems because negotiation is a good thing, and therefore I think that the Minister of Labour feels that once a problem has been thrown into the lap of what he calls a balanced board, that then whatever comes out of that churning in the board is OK, he'll accept it; but until it does, he's not prepared to do so. Maybe that's why he hasn't felt it necessary either to speak on this issue nor to see that someone else from the backbench should speak on this issue.

Well, the government of course must decide for itself what its obligations are to the people of this province and whether or not they ought to deal with it. It's very seldom I know, Mr. Speaker, that the government does not deem it advisable either to amend or oppose a

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) resolution, but here we are, members on this side of the House who have the courage, if you will, of expressing a point of view, and we don't even have an opportunity to learn from the vast experience and knowledge and the responsible position which no doubt the Conservative Party takes unto itself. We haven't had their guidance on this problem; we haven't had their opinions on this problem. Presuming they have opinions, surely they're worth hearing so we can possibly be swayed in making our vote. But I am bound to conclude, Mr. Speaker - and I'm not joking about this - that either they have no opinion or they don't think it's worth expressing an opinion on this issue.

Now there are many people in this province, and especially in the labour circles, that think that this is a very important issue, and the members of the Liberal Party who spoke dealt with it as an important issue and they did point out something which they felt that we had overlooked or something that they felt we had not given proper consideration to, and having already said that we agree with the point made by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, I want to assure him that before I sit down I propose to bring in an amendment which I think will clarify our position in this regard and with which I trust he and his Party will agree.

But unless I have accomplished something in prodding somebody on the other side of the House to say something, then we are going to be in a position, as will the people of Manitoba, of having no idea how they think - and I'm assuming now that they do think on this issue. But when we vote, then we will discover that, whether they think or not, they will have made a decision to vote and they will of course either have to vote "for" or "against" whatever resolution or amendment appears before them. So we will then know that a decision was made. Whether it was made in caucus or by an individual and the rest will have followed like sheep, we don't know. We won't even know their reasoning for that, and surely at this stage - surely at this stage, I can't be accused of jumping up and attempting to belabour this government too soon, because surely somebody on that side isn't going to get up and say, "Well, we were planning to speak on this but you have jumped in too quick and you have not given us an opportunity. You have taken the first possible chance that you had to attack us for not speaking, whereas we were going to speak on this; we were planning to review it." Well, I'm just guessing that that might be a tactic that might be used on that side, and I want to point out that from February 7th until March 17th was ample time not only to think through the problem, not only to do the research, not only to find out what's happening, but also to formulate an opinion and to designate an individual to speak on behalf of the government.

This the government has not done and for this I feel this government is derelict, because if it has opinions it should express them; and if it doesn't have opinions, it should get out of the position it occupies and say, "All right, we don't have the right to express our views on the matters of labour," because they have spoken on other issues. But this is one matter which apparently they have not taken up at all and I accuse them as strongly as I can for either ignoring, neglecting or deliberately flaunting this House by not participating in debate.

Now maybe I will have accomplished something; maybe we'll get somebody on that side to say something and I hope we will.--(Interjection)-- Well, I don't say the Minister should - I don't want to distress him any more than I may have done up to now - I think maybe the Minister would want to take counsel with some of the backbenchers, with some of the people who are close to the field of labour relations. --(Interjection)-- Well, I'm suggesting that they might be willing to discuss it with backbenchers who have experience. I don't quite see just who in the backbench might have had experience with the Labour Relations Board but I'm sure there must be a Conservative somewhere that can advise them and possibly then, either the Minister or somebody else, would be prepared to speak on this issue and deal with the problem and let us know their opinions so that we could be influenced or educated on the way they think.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): They have a Conservative, Bud Wocks.

MR. CHERNIACK: I wonder, Mr. Speaker --(Interjection)-- Pardon? Now we are told by the Honourable Minister of Labour that he is waiting for the amendment. I don't know whether he wants the amendment so quickly so I can sit down or wants the amendment so that he could speak on it, but not having known until now that there would be an amendment, I certainly don't feel he can say that he has been waiting for it.

So we'll give him the amendment and that will give him an excuse, I hope, so he will be able to say something. I'm only sorry that if he speaks, as I hope he will, that I won't be able to join debate with him because I will have been precluded from that by doing this, but there may be somebody else in our Party, in the New Democratic Party, that feels that he can enter

(MR. CHERNIACK, cont'd) . . . into this field, which I admit is a very difficult one and one which needs a lot of thought, but I'm sure there are members in our Party who would be prepared to debate with the Minister if, as and when he is willing to do so, the question that has been raised by this resolution. So let me just repeat, Mr. Speaker, that we say that it is an underlying principle - I'm just reviewing the resolution as was done by the Honourable the Attorney-General a few days ago by pointing out the importance of it - that it is an underlying principle of The Labour Relations Act-(Interjection)- Did the Honourable Minister of Labour wish to ask me a question?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour)(Osborne): Mr. Speaker, it's not that I'd like to help my honourable friend to read, but it says, "Whereas it is the underlying principle".

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the contribution by the Minister of Labour in helping me to read. I've been trying to help him to speak for quite a while and maybe I'll succeed too. He points out that in the resolution it says, "Whereas it is the underlying principle of The Labour Relations Act that every employee has the right to belong to a trade union and to join with his fellow employees for the purpose of collective bargaining." If this is not correct, then I wish the Honourable Minister of Labour will point out to us the extent to which it is not correct and what is the underlying principle of the Act in his opinion. But our opinion is expressed in the resolution. And "Whereas it is the intention of the Act that employers have no effective interest in the question of whether or not their employees belong to a trade union" - that's our understanding. Now if the Minister thinks differently, he'd better tell us that because if he thinks differently to that statement, then that is a complete philosophy which I'm not aware has been accepted by the Conservative Party, that is the one contrary to this statement that employers have no effective interest in the question of whether or not their employees belong to a trade union. "Therefore be it resolved that the present legislation, giving an employer the right to appear in opposition" - and these are the two words I'd like to point out to both of the members of the Liberal Party who spoke before - "to appear in opposition to applications for certification and the right to apply for revocation be repealed for that same reason."

Now the point that we made in the resolution is that an employer has no right to appear in opposition to an application for certification, because an application for certification is an application by a group of employees saying that we represent amongst us a sufficient number of employees of the employer to be able to appoint a bargaining agent that can bargain for the employee group collectively, and it is the job of the employees to pick that person or that agency and it is the right only of the employees to decide in what manner they shall form together, and what the Labour Relations Board is supposed to do under the Act is to make sure that the employees have all had an opportunity to know what has gone on, to express themselves one employee as against another on the rules of the game by which the employees will operate, to make sure that indeed it is an effective body, that there is a true membership paid, that there is a positive decision, that it isn't a one or two man decision, but that's as between the employees.

We say that the employer - and now we agree with the Honourable Member from Selkirk - the employer is needed there in order to define the type of operation he has. Firstly, we have to make sure who his employers are - the employees don't always know - so we have to find out who are your employees; what are the jobs they do; are there some employees who are in a managerial or a capacity other than that of a straight worker that should not be in the bargaining unit; and what is the nature of your situation so that we can describe your bargaining unit and the positions of employment that should be included in it. For that we need the employer, but for the employer to assert the right to come in and oppose a certification means that that employer is arguing that the employees should not have the right to belong to a trade union of their choice or to bargain collectively or to have this certified bargaining agent represent that group. We say the employer should not have a right to oppose. We believe that's what the Liberal Party also had in mind and that what the Honourable Member for Selkirk pointed out was that we seemed to overlook the responsibility, duty, of the employer to come and be present to describe and discuss the bargaining unit, but what we stress is the words to appear in opposition to applications, and since it was pointed out by the Liberal Party that this - since it appeared that this seemed to have created confusion, I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that the motion be amended by adding the following words at the end thereof: "Provided that the employer's right to provide information in order to assist the Board to determine the appropriate bargaining unit remains undisturbed".

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to have heard the submission of my colleague the Member for St. John's since I think that he has been able to elaborate on this matter in a manner which I have been unable to make clear apparently in the first instance.

I do wish to point out, Mr. Speaker, that if there has been any misunderstanding it comes from the weakness of my explanation and not the intention of the resolution; and I would also indicate, Mr. Speaker, that if there is a misunderstanding it's not because I didn't deal with it in my initial submission, that is this is not something that we are now introducing as a result of a failure to comprehend the situation in the first place. And I would refer the honourable members, and particularly the Honourable Member for Selkirk, to Page 852 of Hansard where I state as follows, this is in my initial submission on this resolution: "I concede that the employer has a role to play, that is that the board can't get by without receiving information from the employer, they have to know how many people are in the shop, they have to find out things about the bargaining unit; but I don't think that the employer should participate in a hearing where the question is: do the members wish to belong to a union or not." That was the stipulation that we made and I believe, Mr. Speaker, as my honourable friend for St. John's pointed out, that that's what the resolution says, that the only participation that can't be engaged in by the employer is the question of whether or not the members want to belong to a trade union.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quote the Honourable Member for Selkirk, because I think that he makes several submissions out of which an acceptance of this resolution must follow if he is to be logical because he says: "I can't take exception to the first two paragraphs in the preamble, the first paragraph being that the underlying principle of labor relations is that every employee has the right to belong to a trade union and to join with his fellow employees for the purpose of collective bargaining." And the second paragraph, and he agrees with this too; "Whereas it is the intention of the Act that the employers have no effective interest in the question of whether or not their employees belong to a trade union", and he agrees with that. Well, if he's to have no effective interest then he should not be permitted to participate in a hearing where that question is involved, that is, whether or not they will belong to a union. He should be able to participate - and I indicated that in my opening remarks - he should be able to participate and we don't disagree with this - in the hearing to the extent of telling the board what is the appropriate bargaining unit, who are the employees that are employed and what their functions are. But if my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk thinks that that is now what goes on before the board, then I must respectfully say to him that he has been misinformed, that that is not what now goes on before the board. I think, Mr. Speaker, that I can say without fear of correction that I appeared before the Manitoba Labour Board as much as any lawyer in the Province of Manitoba does and I know what proceedings take place before the board, and I am prepared to bring to this Chamber if it's necessary or give to my honourable friend if he wants to see them numerous contestations where the employer says that his employees don't want a union and brings evidence, calls the employees, makes them get in - let's correct that - has them get into the witness box and say that, well they didn't understand what the union was when they were called upon to join. And if an employer can do this, Mr. Speaker, isn't it demonstrable that what he can then do is to start discussing the union with his employees after an application for certification is made; and if he can do that then the relationship of employer and employee makes it inevitable, inevitable, that that discussion will have some effect on the employee's view.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I've been before the Labour Relations Board and the Honourable Minister knows that I'm not making any mis-statements where the employer has said that his employees don't want a union. The employer has said that his plant is not ready for a union, that it's not the kind of an organization that a union should be organized in, where the employer has said that his employees have been misrepresented as to what a union is, where the employer has said that his employees have been intimidated into belonging to a union; and in any of these cases, Mr. Speaker, I'm not suggesting that the employee should not have rights, or the employee should not be protected. All I'm suggesting is that the person who is last able to defend those rights and the person who should be last entitled to represent those rights is the employer, because what the employees are doing is seeking to appoint a bargaining agent and if the employer is able to say who that bargaining agent should be or even able to influence who that bargaining agent will be, then presumably the employer could be the bargaining agent, and this defeats the purpose of the Labour Relations Act.

We in this Party, Mr. Speaker, want to have the Act read as it read in 1954. The Liberal Party was in office at that time, and these two provisions regarding employer appearance before

(MR. GREEN cont'd).... the board were not in the '54 statutes. What the board did and what the board could do was get information from the employer as to nature of his staff and the existence of his plant. That is not what they are doing at the present time; they are carrying on lengthy proceedings and I have been involved in many of them. They're expensive proceedings to the employees and I suppose they're expensive proceedings to the employers; generally the bills of those who act for management are at least no less than those who act for employees. But nevertheless these proceedings are carried on in a protracted form and the man on the job who has been told that he has a right to belong to a trade union and to participate in the activities thereof - and this is exactly the wording of the Act - begins to wonder whether the employer can do things before the Labour Board so as to prevent him from joining a trade union, and if he gets that feeling, and many of them do, their main purpose is to keep their job, and if they feel that they will look more favorable to their employer if they don't support the union than if they do, then this is the way an employer can eat away at the union's bargaining position. He couldn't do that before the Act, Mr. Speaker; before the Act a group of employees who had established themselves as desiring bargaining rights, if the employer didn't want to negotiate with them, they could withdraw their services and the employer would then either bargain with them or not bargain with them.

We are saying that the Act was intended to prevent this kind of disruption, but if it's to do this it should do it without employer interference - not without employer participation, without employer interference. I don't know why, but perhaps I wasn't forceful enough, I said this in my original submission, I repeat the words for the Honourable Member for Selkirk today - or I have repeated them. There is no intention of not having employer participation, but as to the question of bargaining and of membership of the employee in his union, this should not be a subject in which the employer has an interest.

I do want to say a few words, because my honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface asked me to, and I think he's entitled to an answer. He said that I impressed him - I'm trying to recall his phrase - with my apparent sincerity; he thought I was sincere and then I introduced the resolution which purports to destroy an employer's rights. Well, Mr. Speaker, if I was to stand here and fight for the rights, let us say, of a trade unionist to organize a trade union and then a moment later to say that an employer should not be able to loot the employee's premises I am sure that my honourable friend would not say that I am taking away any employer's rights, because I'm not. One has nothing....

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): On a question of privilege, if I may. I think that the honourable member spoke on two resolutions, one on.... and the other.... It wasn't the right as much as freedom I mentioned because I mentioned at the time that he wanted the freedom, recognizing the lawful right of all citizens the peaceful use of public streets and the right of all citizens.... There was one before, but even if this did some damage to the employer as far as he wanted to go on right, and then I was talking about freedom on this resolution - this is what I asked the honourable member.

MR. GREEN: The Honourable Member from St. Boniface, if he will follow me all the way, I will agree with him 100 percent. As far as I am concerned, without the Labour Relations Act an employer has the right to try to convince his employees that they shouldn't belong to a union. I think it is a very unwise thing to do, but he has that freedom to do so. The only reason that I am suggesting that at present the employer not be able to participate in that activity is that the Labour Relations Act has taken away the equivalent right of the employee. If the employee is prevented from withdrawing his services to achieve recognition, what the Act says is you cannot withdraw your services in order to get your employer to recognize you. That is now against the law; that freedom has been taken away from you; and I am only suggesting that that freedom having been taken away from the employees, if we are to put them back into their original position we must take the equivalent or the balancing freedom away from the employer. My honourable friend will agree - I think that I will agree with him, and I make this statement, and I know that many trade unionists in the province, most would disagree with me completely - I say eliminate the Labour Relations Act altogether, restore these parties to their original position, I won't ask for the freedom of the employer to be taken away and the freedom of the employee would not be taken away by the Act, but if you create a statute which is an attempt to put these parties in an equal position, and you take away the rights of one of them, then in order to counterbalance that taking away you have to take away the right of the employer.

But your Party agrees, your Party as represented by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, agrees that the employer should have nothing to do with whether or not the members belong to a

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . . trade union; and if you agree with that position, if you agree that he has no effective interest, then you should also agree that he shouldn't be able to appear on an application where the only question that's being decided is whether or not they want to belong to a trade union. This is what I say when I say that that particular right of the employer is taken away, not because it's the removal of his right but so as to compensate the employee for the position that they've been put in.

Now if my honourable friend wants to suggest that the Labour Relations Act be repealed and everybody have equal rights, that there be no prohibition of the right to withdraw services, then I would be the first to agree that the employer should then have whatever rights he wants to participate in that particular event. I would say that it would be unwise and unfair for him to do so but I would give him the right to do so. I might say that it might be unwise and unfair for a group of employees to walk with signs in front of a particular premises; that might be unwise and unfair in a particular situation but it's not a right that I would take away from them.

So I hope I've made myself plain to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. I'm glad he listened with sufficient interest to at least try and understand what I am saying and I hope that I've clarified it. As far as I'm concerned, I'm willing to restore these people to their original freedom, but if the freedom of some of them are taken away then that has to be compensated for by balancing it with what they have lost by virtue of this freedom having been taken away.

In any event as I see it, as I see it as a result of the amendment that has been made by the Member for St. John's - and I'll wait anxiously to see whether I'm correct - the members of the Liberal Party in any event who have spoken on this subject and the members of this party agree with everything that is in that resolution. At least that's what they say they've done because we do not wish to in any way interfere with the right of the employer to describe the bargaining unit; and if we are now in agreement, then I agree with my honourable colleague for St. John's and whether or not you are in agreement, let's hear what the government has to say about. Do they not agree with everything that's in this resolution?

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, it's most interesting and enlightening to have such capable labour lawyers to tell you what would be in the best interests of a specific group in the community. It just so happens that our job as government is to provide legislation which in our opinion is in the best interest of the whole community and if there is any doubt in my honourable friend's mind should our socialist friends ever be government, I know they would tell the Labour Relations Board what they should do, but I don't think a democratic community - in fact I think that even at this time,

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. There's nothing in this resolution, nor does my honourable friend have any right to say that we would tell the Labour Relations Board what to do. There's nothing at all to substantiate that statement on the part of the Minister and I would ask him to retract it.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, I probably should explain that I was referring to statements made by the Honourable Member for St. John's, prior to moving the amendment to this resolution.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I on a matter of privilege say that I never made any such statement and I would like the member to read tomorrow or Monday to see whether he can justify the statement that I said that we would tell the Labour Relations Board what to do. If he really believes I said it, then I'm going to wait until he has an opportunity to read it. That's what he quoted me as saying and if not I would ask him to clarify or retract.

MR. BAIZLEY: Well I believe, Mr. Speaker, I would withdraw that, but I would say this: I believe he did say that I was not close enough to the Labour Relations Board. I think that it might be well intended but I'm sure every member of this House knows what might have been and was, I believe, inferred when he said that I wasn't close enough to the Labour Relations Board.

MR. CHERNIACK: May I have an opportunity to point out, Mr. Speaker, that I indicated that if the Honourable Minister of Labour did not know whether or not the Board had to give reasons for its decisions, then he was not close enough to the workings of the Board to know the problems of the Board. That's what I said and I don't withdraw that. But it didn't suggest that I would direct the Board if I had an opportunity to tell them what to do as a Minister. That's completely false.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. (Interjection) Order please. I wonder if we could have

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) order in the House in order that the Minister may continue.

MR. BAIZLEY: Well Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this resolution and trying to dispel the suggestion of my honourable friend the Member from St. John's that I as Minister of Labour have no interest in this resolution, I might tell him that I have no interest in inequity; I have no interest in a specific pressure group having peculiar benefits, Mr. Speaker, that aren't provided to all segments of the community. If we're talking about the trade union movement being a fraternal organization of brotherly love and really just interested in the social life of its members and really of not being of any import or advantage to the members who belong thereto, why then he could be right; it could be that an employer is not interested in what his employees do. But I want to suggest to the honourable members of this House that trade union members, thank goodness, belong to an organization for the social, economic benefit of the employer? No, they belong to a trade union organization for the social economic benefit and advantage of the worker. This is right and this is their right. I think, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman will question his colleague about this right, I believe it has been challenged all the way to the Supreme Court, and I've been informed that the Supreme Court have ruled that the employer does have a very definite right in appearing before the Labour Board and questioning the Board.

Now, let's make it perfectly clear: we the Progressive Conservative Government of Manitoba have no objection to this practice. It is not inequitable and it works to the benefit of the whole community. You talk about coercion and intimidation. Turn the coin over you have to have the checks and balances as my honourable friends well know. It is a little disturbing to me in this field where all of us have to live in the practical workaday world, where the matters that we are discussing so philosophically have to be translated into terms that provide a basis for reasonable labour-management relationships. Let's get this clear. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the duty of a Department of Labour, of the Minister of Labour and his staff is to try and provide a climate and help to maintain and sustain reasonable normal labour-management relationship. We have not backed away from this duty and I have a sneaking hunch my honourable friend, the Member from St. John's is a little disturbed at the labour-management record that is taking place in this province. It's fine for him to scorn consensus; it's fine for him to say there shouldn't be balanced boards; it's fine for him to say labour shouldn't have a voice on these boards or say what is in their best interest

MR. CHERNIACK: May I -- the Honourable Minister has just quoted me as

MR. SPEAKER: Are you making a request to the Chair? Have you a point of privilege or . . . Would you say so.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm sorry. I thought I did ask for an opportunity on a matter of privilege. The Honourable Minister of Labour has just quoted me as saying that labour should not be represented on the Labour Relations Board. Does he honestly believe that I said that labour should not be represented on a Board? Or did I say that there should not be a Board?

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, let's start over again and I will try and recall exactly what the Honourable Member from St. John's said - that the policy of this government seemed to be that it waited for a consensus from balanced boards; that they had no opinions or would not accept responsibilities because we left it to these balanced boards. I'm assuming that he doesn't want this type of action taken; that he doesn't want labour members on these boards and he doesn't want management discussing these labour management problems, but we, partisan political people, partisan political people, will satisfy selfish interests to determine what is going to be in the best interest of labour-management relations in this province.

So Mr. Speaker, while philosophically there may be some support for this motion and for the amendment, that in practice I can't recommend it. I have to tell the honourable member that I am going to vote against it, and I am going to vote against it because it has been held in all parts of the land that it is a legitimate right of employees to belong to a trade union organization, that it is also the right of the employer to appear on his behalf before the Labour Board - nothing wrong with this, not interfering with freedoms at all - and I would suggest when my philosophical friends with the socialist attitudes that says when I say this, this will be, why when that attitude becomes government -- and God forbid that that would happen -- that possibly we will be prepared to be dictated to. But I don't think as long as the Progressive Conservative Government is responsible for reasonable labour-management relations that you are going to find us acting for special interest groups. But I can assure you it will be our aim and desire to act in a manner that is in the best interests of the whole community.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister a question. The Honourable Minister said that the Supreme Court held that an employer has a right to appear before the Labour Relations Board, and of course our Act makes that right available without a decision of the Supreme Court. Is my honourable friend suggesting that the laws of Manitoba are going to be made by the Supreme Court of Canada or by this Legislature?

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, the laws of Manitoba are made by this Legislature and we happen to support and believe in the law as it is at the present time.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of getting into this debate, to use that well used phrase. --(Interjection)-- Yes, it is the old story and we've listened to the old story of the Conservative philosophy this afternoon from the Honourable the Minister of Labour. I regret very very much that on a resolution such as we have before us this afternoon, that the Honourable Minister of Labour, who in my opinion should know better, than he's given evidence of this afternoon, should go into such a tirade of declaiming and degrading the political system that we have here in Manitoba and Canada to the degree that he says "God forbid that we ever have in this province a government" - and he made reference to this group - "of our philosophy, a Party which has selfish political purposes alone, a Party who has only special interests, a Party of dictators." I'm surprised at my honourable friend. I had previously considered him to be a man of reasonable intellect who would not make such stupid asinine statements in this House. Yes, God forbid, God forbid, Mr. Speaker, that we've come down to this type of oratory of my honourable friend the Minister of Labour. He bewails us because of the fact that we propose from time to time resolutions pointing out shortcomings, pointing out areas which in our opinion are in law or in practice detrimental to the citizens of this province, and I challenge my honourable friend the Minister of Labour to try and attribute to this group here special interest because we raise these problems in this House. Us being dictators? Would my honourable friend the Minister of Labor suggest that we shouldn't bring into this House matters that we think require to be aired; would he be the dictator that would deprive us of this opportunity? Certainly by the way he spoke this afternoon he would. And yet at the same time, Mr. Speaker, accuses us of being this type of a political party or having this type of a philosophy. God forbid, God forbid, that if we're talking about philosophical approaches and philosophies, thank heaven we don't have too many, or have we, in the Government of Manitoba today that has the philosophy exhibited by my honourable friend the Minister of Labour this afternoon.

But, Mr. Speaker, I did say at the offset of my remarks that I was surprised to hear what the Honourable Minister of Labour had to say, and I think Mr. Speaker, that on reflection when my honourable friend and Minister of Labour has an opportunity, as I trust he will on Monday or Tuesday to read what he said in Hansard, that he will send over to me as Leader of this group or to my left, apologies for the accusations that he levied at this group. My honourable friend, the Attorney-General, says 'how ridiculous'. Maybe, maybe with the type of approach of my honourable friend the Attorney-General, maybe because I'm suggesting fair play that the Honourable Attorney-General has a similar philosophy that he doesn't believe in it, but I do suggest even to the Attorney-General, that he read too and maybe he would co-sign a transmission to us with the Honourable the Minister of Labour.

What are we dealing with? We're dealing with the question of a fair play to all. The purport of the amendment suggested by the Honourable Member for St. John's was to recognize that here in the Province of Manitoba a spirit of understanding between labor and management, and there was some misunderstanding in the original motion, that might have left the situation that we were casting out, by the original resolution, the rights or employers to sit in or take part. This was drawn to our attention by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, and that was the purport, the purpose of the amendment suggested by my honourable friend the Member for St. John's. But for my honourable friend the Minister of Labour to turn around and say to us that we have no consideration for any other than labour. You know, Mr. Speaker, that is is a truism that if labour gave the support to the group that the Honourable Minister suggests that they are doing, they wouldn't be over there at all, we'd be over there. There'd be no question or doubt about that; and we'd also be the Government at Ottawa if labour voted insofar as a group was concerned for a political Party, which they do not.

But I want to say to my honourable friend that he said that by inference insofar as the trade union movement was concerned, that men banded themselves together in a trade union movement solely for the social and economic benefit of the employee. I want to say that labour also recognizes its responsibility and is just as concerned with the social and economic benefit

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).... of the employer as they are in many instances with the employee. We have to recognize this, and the trade union movement does recognize this, because of the system of society economically that we're living under at the present time. So I say to my honourable friend, even in his first remarks he was all wet, and he needs in my opinion to review what he had to say a few moments ago. Sure it was under heat, I know it; sometimes toward the end of a session or halfway through a session, even Ministers of Labour get a little edgy and I'll forgive my friend; I'm sure that he will come to realize the error of his ways.

In his concluding remarks, my honourable friend says well there's a lot of logic, or inferred this, a lot of basic agreement - he has a lot of basic agreement with the amendment that was proposed by my colleague from St. John's, and having this basic agreement in principle, he turned around and he said, "But I'm going to vote against it." I suggest, not only my honourable friend reflect what he said during the initial part of his remarks or oration that possible he should also consider the final sentence that he uttered and maybe vote for the amendment instead of opposing it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member from Logan; the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party in further amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, it's been some time since we last discussed this particular resolution. For the last couple of days when we were able to discuss Private Member's resolutions, we never got this far. However, I want to make some comments on this resolution today since it has been amended - we have two amendments on the main motion before us. When speaking previously on this motion I stated that the government as such should not get into this business or establishing this kind of service, and that I felt that the mother's place was in the home. This was more or less my statement around which I had further things to say. (Interjection) Well, I said that it was not incumbent on the government to provide this service and that there were many other services that in my opinion needed money more urgently and other requests that were waiting that I felt were more important.

However, in the discussion of the estimates, we find that the government has been giving grants to certain organizations that are providing this type of service and this is more or less what I had in mind. I mentioned that people interested in providing this type of service could organize clubs or other service organizations that could carry on this type of work and in this way provide a service for themselves. I think subsidizing these organizations in the way they do, this principle has been accepted, and I find nothing wrong with it because naturally we're there to help those that want to help themselves. I think this is the principle that I at least have always endorsed; this is a principle that we endorse in our credit union movement; this is a principle that is endorsed in many other organizations, and I certainly find no fault with it.

But to go out and establish these day nurseries on the part of the government, I think this is a completely different matter, because once you embark on a venture of this type then I feel that all people in the province or those that require such a service are entitled to such a service. I notice the resolution says "only where the demands are warranted", or something to that effect, where the communities want this service and where they're warranted to have this type of service. But, Mr. Speaker, I feel that in providing a service of this nature, that not only do the city people, not only are they entitled to it, but all the other rural centres that we have should be entitled to the same type of service once it is being established by the government as such.

I know in the preamble of the original resolution we find various 'whereases' where they mention such items as mothers that are forced to work. Well certainly if they are forced to work maybe they should get some consideration, but as I already pointed out on a previous occasion I think we have legislation setup for this to provide help for these people and I'm just wondering which is not more economical, to have the mother stay with her children than to hire someone else and look after them. Certainly it would appear on the surface that it would be a much wiser one to assist such mothers and have them remain with the family than to organize services of this type and have the children away from their mother and their home.

I notice that there is an article in the Winnipeg Free Press dated Thursday March 16th

(MR. FROESE cont'd) where we find matters in connection with deserted wives and so on. This is more or less in line with what the amendment proposed by the First Minister is outlining and which asked for an inquiry into the status of women in modern society. Then it lists that we should check into any inequities that are existent today. It mentions that we should review the situation and then finally coming to the study, and as we know the Federal Government has set up a commission to look into this very matter and that we're asked in this amendment that we in Manitoba will be co-operating and assisting in this commission and that we at the same time also study this matter.

Under the various points listed here of specific areas relating to the status of women which might benefit from the study, we then find that fair employment legislation affecting women could be one of them. Just recently I read in, I think it was one of our daily newspapers where B. C. apparently is opening up as far as work in the mines is concerned to women. Naturally this is more in the administrative field but still they're opening it up. Is this what we're asking for in this resolution?

Under point four the First Minister mentions day nurseries, that the needed services should be checked into and he also mentions other programs under that very item. Then he also mentions in item 6 the economic and social position of widowed, separated and deserted mothers. Naturally, Mr. Speaker, I think these are areas that are worthwhile checking into because we find in this article in the Free Press of March 16th, and the headline is: "Deserted Wives State Their Case" and they mention a number of cases here where these deserted mothers and wives find it very difficult to get along and where they're not getting legal aid as fast as they want to, they're told that it will probably take months before they'll get assistance and so on, so that they have a lot of beefs and certainly in some instances I'm sure they are justified in making these complaints.

But then we find on the same page also another article headed: "Equality for Women Gives Soviet Men a Holiday" and this is an article by John Best and it's CP, and I take it's Canadian Press, and comes from Moscow. The opening paragraph of this article reads this way and I quote: "Emancipation of Women in the USSR frequently means the right to do heavy manual labour while men stand around watching." Certainly I think this is far from the enquiry that we are going to have here in Canada - it's far from what they're looking for here in this country.

Then I find a little further on in the same article it says: "The Soviet Labour Code is supposed to forbid the employment of women in strenuous or injurious branches of industry. In practice where there is strenuous work to be done, women usually get tagged to do it." This is what takes place in the USSR.

It also mentioned that they do their work attired in rough and baggy worksuits and clothing, and then a little further on we read "On a nearby construction project women were seen to do most of the heavy work such as carrying bricks, wheeling cement while the men spent much of their time watching."

A little further on "Soviet propaganda told that Soviet women enjoy more genuine equality than their counterparts in the west. They make much of the fact that a large percentage of Soviet engineers and specialists are women, as are the great majority of doctors."

And in the final paragraph of this article it says: "The newspaper cited a hydro-electric station on the Volga River where 119 of 136 ditch diggers were women; 184 of 208 plasterers and 156 out of 177 painters and 512 out of 630 truck drivers." So that here the women are doing the hard jobs, the heavy jobs and from all appearances the men are watching.

I'm sure this is not a thing that would be endorsed in this country but this is what is happening in a socialist country, and this is what we hear every day about championing the socialist cause. Now I'm not blaming my fellow partners in the House here for the situation in this particular country but I don't think this is something to look up to or look forward to either and something that we in this country can well do without.

On previous occasions, Mr. Speaker, I've always come out strongly in opposition to commissions. I don't feel that we should have as many commissions, government appointed commissions in Canada and in the various provinces as we do have. I feel more of the work should be done by the members of the Legislatures themselves. However in this case since we already have an appointed enquiry commission appointed by the Federal Government, I will go along in endorsing the amendment setting up this, or assisting this enquiry. Naturally it is probably designed to delay matters, which is a matter that I do not endorse, just to delay matters, but the next amendment or the last amendment that we're going to vote on first has to do with giving the job of this enquiry commission as a first matter to look into is the day nurseries. I don't know whether the Federal Government enquiry would think that this should have priority over all other matters

(MR. FROESE cont'd)... so that in my case I'd be satisfied to hear the recommendation with any others that will be coming along when they make their report.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are a few points I thought I should raise in connection with the resolution having already spoken at an earlier time and when certain members took exception when I made certain references. But I feel whatever I said had merit and I still hold the same opinion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I would wish to join in this debate and deal with the subject of day nurseries and related matters and the need for them. I shall probably repeat things that have already been said but in a different way, but emphasizing the fact that I am supporting the idea of day nurseries and the need for them.

It has been said by some speakers that day nurseries are a matter foreign to the needs of people in certain parts of the province. I understand that that situation can exist where the populations are small, in small towns and things of that sort, mainly farming areas, it would be difficult to band together a sufficient number of children to justify the setting up of a day nursery or a nursery school. But the nursery schools are things that are needed where there are many people that live together and therefore many children live together in a populated area and the requirements are quite different from what they are in rural areas. I don't think that we need a commission to determine the need - I'm not opposing the commission for the purposes which are set out in the Honourable the First Minister's amendment, I'm not opposing these at all - but I am urging that if we wait for a commission to study all these various things - nine in number - while the ninth one says "other related matters" which gives a great deal of leeway - if we were to wait for a commission to study all these areas and bring in a report it would probably be a long time before we would have such things as nursery schools in Winnipeg. In the meantime there are many women in the city with children, women who must support themselves but find it very difficult to go out and work gainfully unless their children are placed in capable hands, trained hands, which know what to do with children and know how to treat them in an organized way and in a pre-school situation. These women could fill the need for teachers - and our schools suffer from a shortage of teachers. They could fill the need for nurses, nurses aides, secretaries, stenographers, any number of jobs that women are trained to do and capable of doing. I doubt whether there would be any call for women or any need of women to do some of the several jobs that the Honourable Member from Rhineland was mentioning in the article that he read from. He said that in one instance - I didn't quite get the full purport of what he was saying - but the women were working and the men were watching but that's a common occupation of men wherever there are women; they like to watch the women, especially if they're young and good looking. I used to indulge in that sport myself, in my younger days, but women can fill many needful jobs. But even working they wish to have some assurance that their younger children in their families that they are trying to support will be taken care of and one method of doing that is to see that nursery schools are organized so that the children can attend them while the mothers go out to work.

The school board of the City of Winnipeg is even now taking the first halting steps towards the setting up of day nurseries, and it seems to me as I look back on things that the day nurseries as far as the city schools are concerned, are now pretty much in the position that kindergartens were some 20-odd years ago when the honourable my deputy leader and I sat together on the Winnipeg School Board. There was a time when kindergartens were not known in Winnipeg and it took a great deal of persuasion finally to persuade the Winnipeg School Board, as an experiment, to organize three or probably four kindergarten classes, but once started there was nothing that could stop the flood. People saw the benefits of having kindergartens in the schools and immediately demands were made from all over the city to organize more kindergartens until now we have kindergartens in every school in the city as far as I know. The same need is now being felt for the setting up of nursery schools and as I say the first halting steps are being taken in the direction of doing that, and the nursery schools once set up will help to alleviate a situation, a condition, which now results or causes great hardship on a great number of women.

In the paper the other evening, I don't know whether that is the column from which the Honourable Member from Rhineland was reading from or not, but in the paper the other evening there was mention made of deserted wives - I believe it was last night's paper - and this is not the first time that they have been mentioned in this House. The Honourable the Member for - I don't remember - I know his name but I don't remember the constituency - Emerson -

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd)..... mentioned the plight that deserted wives found themselves in with children to look after and having to care for their children they were unable to go out and work. The alternative or the only recourse which they seemed to have would be to apply for welfare or for mothers' allowance and in doing that it would demean- and this is not in any derogatory sense, but nevertheless it would demean many of these women to have to ask for welfare or ask for mothers' allowance, because in their married state before their husbands left them they had been used to a rather good standard of living, a standard of living which many of them would be able to keep up if they were permitted to, or enabled to go out and work at the jobs for which they had been trained or prepared in other ways, but having their children, which they also wished to take care of, they are put in a very difficult position, and the setting up of nursery schools where the children could be taken care of would in a very large degree obviate that difficulty under which they now suffer. For many mothers and for many children and for the community in which they live, it's a particularly important thing and it's an urgent thing that some provision be made whereby they can be freed to earn their living while their children are being taken care of in the manner in which they want these children looked after; and one of the solutions or a partial solution, I don't say that it is a total or a complete solution, but nevertheless it would go a long way, would be the setting up of nursery schools in the city, and by pushing the Department of Education and the government, or persuading them, to do these things or to encourage it, it would be a great step, it would relieve other departments to which now these women have to turn. Some of them in some instances are being, they are actually being kicked around from one department to another, not getting too much help and not really knowing without guidance of some sort where to go and even with guidance they are not receiving the kind of help that they really need. I feel that the nurseries are such a needful thing, as I said a moment ago, that once set up in city schools there will be no stopping the tide, just the same as it was with kindergartens. The first steps have now been taken or are being taken and I am sure that next year and the year after that that further nurseries will be set up, but this is under the auspices of the Winnipeg School Board and not under the auspices or by the direction of the Department of Education.

It may be that the amendment presented by the Honourable the First Minister will be effective in holding back any action in the direction of setting up nurseries, calling for what can't be otherwise than a long-term study and a postponement; we can't in conscience vote against because it has many aspects which we would be willing and prepared to support, but in the meantime while the suggestion is being made that a commission to study certain aspects of the relationship of women in society, while that suggestion is being made, then children and their mothers who would be working mothers are being deprived -- and it isn't only mothers living alone without husbands or deserted wives, it applies also to families in which the income of the husband must be also added to to help the families meet the continually increasing cost of living.

While the amendment of the Honourable the First Minister may serve as a delaying tactic there is an urgent need, a pressing need now being felt which it will in no way meet, so we urge the support of the amendment of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party for the immediate setting up of the nursery schools and then setting up the commission to make this long-term study which also appears to be a very laudable suggestion. But by the insistence upon making this long-term study I believe that the government will find that with this delaying tactic they will in one way or another have missed the boat, if the example being set by the Winnipeg schools will be followed and the tide rise and run in, that the government will feel that it is not any longer giving leadership, it is following something that is already taking place and that they will be forced to run and run very hard to catch up.

On that basis, Mr. Speaker, I would urge support of the second amendment and I would trust that it will receive the support that it needs. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member, could we have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that

WHEREAS there is an increasing demand for additional skills beyond the high school level; and

WHEREAS a large number of students will not proceed with university training and yet have the ability to further their education; and

WHEREAS the new Adult Education Centre in Winnipeg has demonstrated the need for such services;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of establishing a system of community colleges throughout the province in areas where the population can support them.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, the first part of this resolution deals with the point that there is an increasing demand for additional skills beyond the high school level. The second report of the Economic Council of Canada made an analysis of the differences between wages and productivity in the United States and Canada, and I think it's normally assumed by Canadians that American wages are higher but that Canadian skills and ability and education are equal. But I think that with the report of the Economic Council and its distinguished Chairman, John J. Deutch, this was effectively destroyed because it was pointed out that, if I understood it correctly, that not only was productivity higher in the United States but this may be the direct result of a larger amount of education. In other words, the average American worker appears to be more skilled because he appears to be better educated. For example, the Free Press in an editorial yesterday referred to the Economic Council's report. I'll refer to that article in a moment.

I think, to myself at least, that it's self-evident that education is a good thing in itself, that it leads to self-development and self-realization, as the Greeks refer to, and for that reason alone I would say that we should support better education. But some of us are not taken by that kind of argument and it must be shown to them on economic grounds that education is a good idea or a good investment, and I contend, Mr. Speaker, along with others, that education is our best investment. I think if a person is going to invest funds for the purpose of drawing the interest, if he can get an investment between six percent or better up to 12 percent, he's doing very well, but I think it has been shown by some educationists that in terms of direct benefit based on education, education pays a return of 15 to 20 percent, and I might just cite one example. If it costs something like four or five hundred dollars a year to educate a high school student - and the cost may be even higher than that - but if it is four or five hundred dollars apiece in terms of actual cost, it would normally be paid by tuition in a system that wasn't similar to ours. It is also shown that a person who has a better education has a higher lifetime earning, so that a person, say with a completed high school compared with one with just a junior high, may earn an additional 10 to 50 thousand dollars over a lifetime. I think these statistics can be demonstrated.

And then in terms of taxation, that person would undoubtedly pay additional taxes which would probably range from one to six or seven thousand dollars over a lifetime, so that you could actually show I think that it actually pays, if you want to just take this straight question of where does the money come from, I think that you can show that by educating people more you will actually get more taxes back. They will pay double, triple five or ten times what you invested in them. And similarly this is an argument that could be applied to more scholarships or bursaries.

Now it is a fact that change has become a part of our society. In the old days I suppose Canada was a strictly agrarian economy, but I think that has changed. We've gone originally from an economy based on fish to an economy based on lumber, to an economy largely based on agriculture, and I think now we are mainly an economy of mineral production and pulp and paper production, etc., maybe moving to a manufacturing or a highly industrialized economy, but we're still very much involved in primary industries.

In the last few decades we have been confronted with a fantastic operation, a fantastic invention called the computer. I believe it was about 200 years ago that James Watt invented the steam engine and it was only in the last few decades that computers came on the scene and we now are developing a new vocabulary. The word "cybernetics", which I heard for the

(MR. DOERN cont'd). . . . first time about 10 to 15 years ago because of someone I knew who was engaged in the field, has now become a common word, or it's much more common, and there are tremendous ramifications to the effects of computers and automation on society. There's a tremendous effect that is just going to be felt in the near future on middle management. Many people who feel they're professional people and above the ordinary white collar worker and above the blue collar worker are going to have their jobs wiped right out. A lot of the decisions today are made by computers. Inventories and so on are adjusted by these machines. Clerical workers are going to go by the thousands and the hundreds of thousands. Their skills will not be necessary, and blue collar workers too will be in serious trouble. All kinds of occupations and jobs will disappear; so in a sense maybe the only people who are safe are politicians, assuming that we can't program a computer to make our decisions for us.

Another thing that we have to consider is leisure time in the future. The future work week will undoubtedly be small, of the nature of 20 hours and eventually even beyond, and only a few may work. So the one thing we must do is prepare our people for the period of a shorter work week so that they spend their time usefully on hobbies and perhaps reading, perhaps education, and some just normal leisure, recreation and human relationships rather than for example sitting in front of a television set drinking beer. Although that may be a useful occupation, it's not one that would be useful if we had a nation of beer drinkers and TV watchers who spent eight hours a day on that pursuit.

Of course other people have argued that this is not so, that even though we have shorter work weeks, the result is that there is not more leisure time. I've heard Robert Theobald speak at a New Democratic Convention on this and I read the remarks from an Alumnae Conference of a couple of years ago that people really don't have this leisure time. They get more leisure time and they spend it on other jobs. Advertisers create more wants and people, instead of being satisfied with their income, go out and get another job and buy more goods. It has been said many times, and I say it just again as a matter of repetition, that the average person may be faced with a retraining program, that he will have to be retrained two to three times in a lifetime. I think there are probably men in this Legislature who have gone through several occupations already, but this will be due to technological change that will make certain occupations obsolete.

And the second whereas: a large number of students will not proceed with university training and yet have the ability to further their education. It was said in the paper the other day that we now have something like 13,000 university students in Manitoba, and if my memory serves me correctly, there are something like 200 to 250 thousand students in the Province of Manitoba in all levels. Well, I think that there has been all too much emphasis on the university in our society. I think the emphasis on education is correct, but I think the emphasis that education beyond high school must be education within the confines of a university is not correct, because not everybody has the ability to go to university but a very large number of people have the ability to improve themselves.

I put in an Order for Return which was issued on January 23rd of this year asking the percentage of the number of students in each high school course in Manitoba. Now of course this doesn't include all the people in that age group because some choose to work and others are what we call "drop-outs", etc. Some drop out because they haven't got the ability; some are forced by circumstances to work to help their families and so on. So we have 13,000 university students. We have something like six percent - five or six percent of all the students go on to university. This is much higher than when I went, which was in the period starting about 10 years ago to about five years ago when I was in university. About 10 years ago there was only three or four percent. It has increased dramatically but we still have a long way to go relative to the American scene.

Now if you look at the high school setup in Manitoba as it is today and gear it to the university situation, it's completely disproportionate. Sixty-seven and a half percent - over two-thirds of all high school students are in the University Entrance Course and eventually six percent go to university. So in other words we have a situation where two-thirds of all students are registered for a course leading to university and 15 percent make it. Well, somebody is getting lost in the shuffle. Then we have 18% in the General Course, which I think is the course where most students should be, and in my opinion and in the opinion of others half the students should be in the General Course, there is only 18%; 11% are in Commercial, and maybe that's relatively correct; but only 2.7% are in technical and vocational courses - 2.7. That surely is completely disproportionate, probably one-fifth of what it should be.

(MR. DOERN cont'd).... So we have a very peculiar situation in our province.

And then of course the government in that same Order for Return, I asked them whose option it was or who should direct where students should go or who should give guidance, and the statement comes back, the option is exercised by the students and their parents. Well, I could spend quite a bit of time on that point but I'll simply let it pass other than to say that these people want more education and about the only way one can get it - although we now have MIT and a few things - is to go to university. So this is why they are in a university course.

I could deal at great length about the kind of research being done in the department but I'll leave that for a resolution that I submitted today.

And the third part of the resolution: "Whereas the new Adult Education Centre in Winnipeg has demonstrated the need for such services." The Adult Education Centre in Winnipeg I think is a smashing success. It was planned for 100 students or so. It was opened last September and there are now some 200 or more than double the number of students enrolled there in part-time and full-time courses. And talking to people who seem to know something about it, they believe that this will double and triple and quadruple in the next few years, so by 1970 we will probably have, facilities being there, 1,000 students in the Winnipeg Adult Education Centre.

But there's a very unfortunate thing connected with that centre. I support it entirely but you know what's unfortunate is this, there's only the University Entrance Courses offered there as I understand it. Now some of these people probably dropped out because they couldn't take some of the physics and chemistry and some of the complicated mathematics and so on and so on. It's just strictly geared for university. Now they're going back to school, now they're making an attempt as adults, taking full-time and part-time courses and they have to go and take the same old stuff which they're probably not suited for anyway. They don't have any choice.

So therefore in the Resolved part: "That the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of establishing a system of community colleges throughout the province in areas where the population can support them." I think there's a need for a study right now in Manitoba. I know that we're not going to have community colleges opening up next fall but I would like to see the government take some action now. Somebody showed some foresight when the R.B. Russell Junior Vocational School was opened. I think the Minister can take some credit there as well as the Winnipeg School Board. They appointed an outstanding educator named Reevan Cramer, and I believe he spent a full year before the doors were opened to prepare the way. I think there's a need in Manitoba for anywhere from half a dozen to a dozen community colleges. There's various areas where I can see community colleges being established throughout the province, because we want equality of opportunity and we also would like some autonomy on the part of these local colleges and some independence in the sense of curriculum. This also relates to the question of decentralization so that we have some variety.

I'm going to save, because I'm running out of time, a great deal of information I have for my concluding remarks. I could say that there are 850 colleges in the United States and a million and a half community college students. I could say that B.C. has 30 full-time directors of adult education and 30 school boards. I could talk a great deal on Ontario with its progressive system for beyond high school or tell you about Alberta which has had this since 1958. So in short there is a demand for education beyond high school and there is a demand for a variety, not just academic and university but for general education, and I would like to see the government investigate this and I would like to see the government eventually establish community colleges throughout the province.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, before I move adjournment perhaps the House would give me leave to mention an important fact about today because there is a great deal of green being worn in the House and I take it it's in tribute to St. Patrick, and while I can't presume to speak on behalf of all Irishmen because I'm not an Irishman, I'm sure that all of us wish all good Irishmen a very happy and delightful St. Patrick's Day.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, perhaps I have more "Green" in my caucus than anybody else in the Assembly.

MR. ROBLIN: has got considerable green in his eyes.

March 17, 1967

1795

MR. PAULLEY: No, they are rosy.

MR. SPEAKER: I would remind the House that time is a-flitting.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I couldn't resist the fact that the two Icelanders in the House have green on today. That goes back to the old days when the Norsemen found the Irish ladies ready, willing and able.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 o'clock Monday afternoon.