

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, February 14, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

HON. STERLING R. LYON Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry):.....present the first report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments begs leave to present the following as their first report.

Your Committee met for organization and appointed Honourable Mr. Lyon as Chairman.

Your Committee agreed that, for the remainder of this Session, the quorum of this Committee shall consist of Ten (10) members.

Your Committee has considered the following Bills:

No. 8 - The Official Time Act.

No. 9 - An Act to amend The Partnership Act.

No. 10 - An Act to amend The Planning Act.

No. 14 - An Act to repeal certain Acts relating to certain Corporations.

No. 34 - An Act to amend The East Kildonan Charter.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered Bills:

No. 3 - An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

No. 11 - An Act to amend The Portage la Prairie Charter.

No. 12 - An Act to amend The Companies Act.

No. 13 - An Act to amend The Real Estate Brokers Act.

No. 22 - The Water Control and Conservation Branch Act.

No. 30 - An Act to amend The St. Boniface Charter, 1963.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

MR. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin) introduced Bill No. 57, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate The Co-Operative Credit Society of Manitoba Limited.

MR. SPEAKER: If I may take a moment and direct the attention of the members to the gallery. We have 90 students of Grade 5 and 6 standing. These students are from the William Osler School and are under the direction of Miss Greenberg and Miss Block. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. On behalf of all the members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

Orders of the Day.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to inform the House of an announcement that was made this morning between representatives of the Rural Municipality of Gimli, representatives of the Department of Industry and Commerce, and a representative of the House of Seagrams. At this meeting an announcement was made of a ten million dollar distillery and maturing facility to be erected at Gimli commencing this spring with completion in 1968. This will be staged over a six-year period and will have a capacity of twelve 50,000-barrel maturing warehouses, which I understand will equal the largest distillery now held by the buying resources of the House of Seagrams. This project has been planned for some time and I would like to inform the honourable members of the House that this is one of the projects that has come as a result of the imagination and hard work of the members of the Department of Industry and Commerce. I think it's particularly appropriate that on St. Valentine's Day we are capable of giving to the people of the Interlake and to the people of the rural municipality of Gimli a gift. I may say also that I have been informed by the company that the first million dollars of the ten million dollar contract will be tendered immediately in Manitoba. It's expected that there will be a hundred people employed from the local area during the period of

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd). . . . construction, and that \$4 million of the \$10 million will pour into the community both in labour and materials. Upon completion there will be a minimum of 65 people employed. Almost all of them will be locally employed. They will have an aggregate payroll of \$300,000 and in addition it is also contemplated that the Company will purchase annually approximately \$2 million of products produced on the farms in the surrounding area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I missed the first part of the announcement; unfortunately I was not in my seat. But I gather that the Minister is announcing a new industrial development for the Province of Manitoba and I certainly want to express my appreciation at any industrial development in the province, and my thanks to the members of his department who have been involved in this. We all want to see development in the province. I understand the Honourable the Minister of Education will be the first beneficiary so far as location - speaking of location only, of course, not of product - and I hope that the project will go through to a very satisfactory conclusion.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education)(Gimli): Mr. Speaker, if there has to be a distillery in Manitoba and Western Canada, I can't think of a finer place. Our water finally paid off.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the expressions of appreciation that we are going to have this distillery built in Manitoba. I'm sure the Honourable Minister of Education is happy that it's in his particular constituency. And may I say, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is quite timely that a distillery should be built in Manitoba because surely Manitobans need something to soothe their troubled minds at the present time, and what better soothing agency than that as suggested by the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I have one question, though, I would like to direct to my honourable friend. Can he assure us that the product which will be produced at this distillery will be equal to or better than one or two that have historically been distilled in the area in years gone by?

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I too wish to congratulate the government on getting some industry in this province. I still recall the days when the Honourable Member for Fisher at that time, Mr. Wagner, spoke of the various stills that they had in that part of the province. Now they're going to go into this business in a much larger way I understand. Certainly it's a good thing that we do get industry of this type into the province. I'm just wondering whether that is the best area for this project. It seems to me that another area might have been much more convenient, but at any rate I wish to congratulate them in getting an industry of this type and of the size as far as investment is concerned into the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can make one other reference, and I think this is important. The considerations of course were that of the House of Seagrams; they made the decision. But the reason why Gimli was chosen was because of the water, and Dr. Johnson can take full credit for that.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask a question but preface my question by congratulating the government on having established this large plant and wondering - this isn't the question - but just wondering whether the House will be treated with samples of the first outpourings of this large distillery. The Honourable Minister suggested that money and other things would be pouring into the general area, in the Gimli area, and I was just wondering how much pollution would be pouring out of the plant and into the lake after the plant gets into operation, or is that going to be under control? Because the lake is being polluted sufficiently now without any added pollution being added to it. I would be interested in knowing just how they're going to handle that particular problem or whether they have come to it yet.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have been assured by the members of my department, who in fact checked it, there is no need for concern; they were going to take and do the things that are required of them. This has already been checked and I can assure him that nothing like this will occur.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Will the Industrial Development Bank be assisting with the financing of this project?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have been led to believe by the representatives of the House of Seagrams that they are capable of financing their own development and they will be financing themselves.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Highways)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day may I lay on the table a Return to an Order of the House No. 5 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Portage; and Return No. 30 standing in the name of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I should like to lay on the table of the House the following items:

1. A copy of the Return under the Controverted Elections Act for the year 1966, first from the Court of Queen's Bench, and secondly from the Court of Appeal. No rules were made by the judges under the Act.
2. A copy of a nil return under the Trade Practices Inquiry Act for the calendar year 1966.
3. A copy of the Report of the Commissioners on Uniformity of Legislation in Canada for the year 1966. I might add that there is only one copy of this report available at the present time.
4. A copy of the Report of Jails for the calendar year 1966. Five copies have been forwarded to the Clerk of the House for distribution.
5. A report covering the operation and enforcement of the liquor laws in Manitoba for the calendar year 1966. Embodied in this report, Page 30, is a statement of the general administrative and prosecution expenses for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1966. Eight copies are available at the present time and the balance, 50-some odd copies, will be handed to the Clerk of the House for distribution at a later time.

HON. MRS. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Cypress): Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit the annual report of the Municipal Board for the year ending December 31, 1966, and I also wish to submit a nil return for the Winter Employment Act.

HON. J.B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, in answer to a verbal question yesterday put to me by the member from Portage la Prairie with respect to a new service, wheel chairs by taxis, which resulted in a news story a few days ago, I would like to advise the member from Portage la Prairie that this is a service that was introduced at the urging of the Society for Crippled Children and Adults who are a private agency in the Province of Manitoba and doing wonderful work on behalf of handicapped people in our province. They recognized some months ago the need for better transportation facilities for people who were handicapped. They have their own fleet of specially equipped vehicles; however, this is not adequate to meet the demands and they were using taxicabs to transport children to and from schools. Unfortunately, the return from schools happened to arrive at a time when there were other peak demands on the taxicabs with the result that there were many handicapped children who were having to remain in school from 3 o'clock in the afternoon until they were picked up about 6 o'clock in the evening. So this was quite an unsatisfactory arrangement. Many of the taxicabs, incidentally, were reluctant to take patients in wheel chairs because of the difficulties in getting them in and getting them out and these sorts of things, so that they did have a meeting; they did undertake to find out how other areas were handling this particular problem. They investigated what was going on in some of the American cities as well as other cities in Canada. They found that the Society in Calgary had worked out a very reasonable arrangement with the cab operators there. They were invited to come to Manitoba as consultants. They were, at that time, able to convince at least one of the cab operators in the Metropolitan area that they should get into this service, that there was money to be made in it, and presumably that's how the service came into being. I don't know whether there was any competitive tendering for the service. I suspect that there wasn't much inclination on the part of the cab drivers to accommodate the Society up until the time the consultant came and was able to convince at least one of them that this was something they should be doing. I'm very happy to be able to report this new service and to be able to commend the Society for Crippled Children and Adults for this advancement in taking care of handicapped people in the Metropolitan area.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the Minister for his statement clarifying the matter. The person who had asked me about it to make enquiries was one of the cab companies who would like to have had an opportunity of either discussing it or entering into this type of business also. Now I believe the second part of my question was: is there any government grants given to the newly formed company to start up, or is there a subsidy paid by way of special fares by the government either directly or indirectly?

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, there's certainly no question of any government subsidy with respect to the provision of this service. We will, of course, through our various

(MR. CARROLL cont'd).... departments be paying the costs of transportation for some of the children or adults that will be transported in these cabs.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, is there a Bill 34 in existence? And if so, are copies available, because I had a call in connection with Bill 34 asking for copies. I wasn't aware that it was in existence at all. Is there such a thing? And if so, when can we expect it?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, Bill 34 was dealt with in the Law Amendments Committee this morning by my honourable friend among some others.

MR. FROESE: This was a particular Bill referred to in connection with education that they mentioned. Then they've given me the wrong number -- sorry.

MR. ROBLIN: Bill 34, Mr. Speaker, had to do with the East Kildonan Charter.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of the communication I received yesterday afternoon I thought I should pass it on to the House immediately. It's a communication from the Local Boundaries Commission - Local Government Boundaries Commission - Winnipeg, addressed to myself. "Dear Mr. Minister: The Commission has studied carefully the White Paper on Education presented to the Legislative Assembly by the Minister of Education on January 20, 1967, and also all of the available information concerning the Lord Selkirk School Division No. 11, the Whitehorse Plains School Division No. 20, the Interlake School Division No. 21, the Evergreen School Division No. 22, and the Lakeshore School Division No. 23. We have examined the alternatives available to these school divisions so far as their administrative structure is concerned and have come to the conclusion that the best form of administration for each of the said divisions is one in which a single elected board is responsible for both elementary and secondary education. Our reasons for this conclusion are as follows:

"1. The single board concept provides a continuity of purpose in local administration of education services from the beginnings of formal education in the primary grades through the secondary system. This can have a great advantage over two separate forms of administration each primarily concerned with a particular area of the educational process.

"2. The single board concept will allow a much greater flexibility in the provision and utilization of the educational services within the administrative unit.

"3. The single board concept will allow for the improvement of both quality and quantity of educational services.

"4. The single board concept will equalize the costs of the enhanced Foundation Program announced by the Minister of Education not only across the division but also on a provincial basis.

"The single board administration will derive from the new formula for sharing education costs many financial advantages which will enable it to attain the potential of education services of which the new form of administration should be capable.

"The Commission therefore unanimously recommends that Lord Selkirk School Division No. 11, Whitehorse Plains No. 20, Interlake No. 21, Evergreen School Division No. 22 and Lakeshore No. 23 each be declared to be a school division within the meaning of Section 443 of the Public Schools Act. The Commission is continuing its study in detail of the area included in the said school divisions with respect to representation, board boundaries and other related matters, and will make further recommendations under Section 313 C 1(a) of the Public Schools Act after having further examined the viewpoint of residents of the areas affected through a series of public meetings."

Mr. Speaker, I thought I should draw this to the attention of the Legislature. This has received the approval of the government and will require an Order-in-Council which will be brought forward tomorrow.

In addition, I have received a copy of a letter from the Commission addressed to those affected in the Interlake, setting out a schedule of meetings and stating their main purpose is to hear the views of the local people re boundaries and possible school consolidations in this area. I understand on inquiry that this is to get the local feeling of the people before making further recommendations and I am prepared to table fifteen copies of each of these communications which I have received, and would ask that these be distributed amongst the -- anyone wanting a special copy I will do my best to obtain same.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that in addition to the tremendous development we heard earlier this morning, which will involve most of the Interlake in agriculture, production of grain and so on, and in addition to this communication from the school districts Boundaries Commission that Valentine's Day in our Centennial career has finally seen the arrival of such tremendous measures in the Interlake area of our province.

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd).....

While I'm on my feet I would also like to table copies of letters sent by the Department of Education last December to school board superintendents and school principals in Manitoba re government regulations for the education of handicapped children. This was asked in the Legislature yesterday and I think this communication would be helpful to honourable members, and if they wish to discuss it with me further, each or any one, I would be happy to do so.

Also while I'm on my feet, in reply to a question from the Member from Burrows yesterday concerning the advertisement placed in the newspaper where he asked that this advertisement -- is this not indicative of a lack of interest amongst students in teaching as a career or indicative of the shortage of teachers for the coming year? I would like to point out to my honourable friend that the increased amount of recruitment activity on the department I think has paid off in this past year and, as you know, we have a full-time man in this position and we have visited every high school last year and will be this year throughout the province, talking about the teaching profession on Career Days. We also are involved with, at their request, the university UMSU, the Students' Union. Representatives are going out through our schools talking about university to high school students. While we prefer the teachers planning to teach in high school, we trust that they would take the winter course, there are a great many people no longer attending high school and university who might be suitable for teaching but who because of personal problems or for some other reason they're not able to take it during the winter months, and we encourage -- this is an attempt to encourage those who might be interested in coming back into a teaching career to do so, and through an advertisement such as this we are hoping that we will have people making enquiries. I can inform the honourable members we have already had some interesting requests as a result of the advertisement asking for interviews with our recruitment officer as to the opportunities in this field. I believe that's all. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Highways. I understand that work is about to start on the construction of a dam on the Dauphin River. Could he give us any additional information, when this is supposed to start and completion date?

MR. WEIR: No, Mr. Speaker, I can't. I'll take the question as notice.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Well, could he tell us whether it is going ahead this spring?

MR. WEIR: I'll take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GUTTORMSON: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. There's a report circulating the entire area that the Department plans to lower the lake by two feet immediately for this construction and they're asking me a lot of questions and I won't be able to answer them.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I said I'd take the question as notice.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, several days ago I asked the Attorney-General a question in regards to the dumping of sewage from the Headingley Jail in the Assiniboine River, and he took it as notice. When could I expect the answer, Sir?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, there is an answer to the question. I'll be happy to discuss it on estimates. It's really not a matter for Orders of the Day.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Honourable the Minister of Education's statement that he just made. Did I understand him correctly that the Boundaries Commission would be conducting hearings in the area, in the Interlake area? Was it for the purpose of consolidating divisions or school districts?

MR. JOHNSON: Well this is -- my interpretation of their hearings is to discuss ward boundaries with the local people throughout the area now that they have made this decision and consolidation -- this would be within each division -- the closing, I imagine, and consolidating of elementary schools, just what the facts are at the local level. I understand they've done a great deal of research on the whole matter. They have a great deal of information at their fingertips and they're going out and setting up these ward boundaries to listen to the reaction of school boards at the local level. It doesn't mean consolidation in the same way as the divisional level as the word has been used to date because, as you can appreciate, to date the word consolidation has meant that individual districts one at a time could come in. This is an attempt to rationalize education in that area and I imagine they'll be hearing submissions from different areas asking about ward boundaries and trying to get as representative a ward system as possible, and at the same time to hear the views of the local people on certain schools -- that maybe they feel in one area that three or four schools should be joining into one. I don't know. They told us in this letter they'll be reporting to us further after this

MR. T.P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C.(Selkirk):Mr. Minister, that they have recommended to the government the single division in those particular districts that you have mentioned. That will not be considered further at public meetings.

MR. JOHNSON: No.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I have a question that I wish to direct to the Honourable Minister of Education arising out of the answer that he had given me to yesterday's question. My question is this: does the Honourable Minister's answer indicate that there is no intention to discontinue the twelve-week teacher training program followed by a series of summer school sessions; and secondly, that the Department of Education does not -- is my interpretation correct, then, that the Department of Education does not look upon this as a stopgap measure to fill the teacher supply, and do I take it then that the Department of Education looks upon this method of teacher training as being equally effective to the regular one year course or whatever other training course the university may institute?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I think -- I was trying to communicate that through high schools we can recruit and through -- at the university and so on. There are a lot of people in the community who may be interested in a teaching career and we can always get them in. We may start them off with the twelve-week course, they become interested, they come back for two six-week course. We have no intention of phasing that out at this time. I don't think we can until our teacher supply is in a better position. But it is an attempt to reach a group in the community who apparently are there and would be interested in mature people to come back.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, I would pick up from where I left off last week when time ran out. To recapitulate very briefly, I had referred to the fact that the Holland report on the supply of nurses had indicated that there -- had not only indicated, had shown, had stated that there was a shortage of hospital personnel. I also named a number of hospitals that were either in construction or in prospect of being constructed, and I was raising the question whether, if there was a shortage such as indicated in the Holland report, whether there was any prospect of manning the hospitals that were being proposed, and asked the question of the Minister of Health about steps that might have been taken to fill these needs which would seem to be very obvious. Without going into that matter any further, Mr. Speaker -- it's all recorded in Hansard and I think recorded correctly, the names of the hospitals that I gave and so on, which seem to run into a considerable number -- I would still be pleased if the Minister of Health would provide the information about where the construction of these hospitals stand; at what stage they are at; whether in the building, still proposed, or completed; but I would go on to another matter and deal very briefly with that and then finish my presentation.

It's the matter of not only actual shortages as pointed out or indicated by the Holland report but, in a sense you could call them manufactured shortages -- created shortages by the need of hospitals to keep within a budget, and I mention very briefly the situation of the General Hospital which had so over-budgeted -- or appeared to -- that the Manitoba Hospital Commission was unable to meet their requests and asked them to re-submit another budget, make a re-submission which the General Hospital Board felt it was unable to do and still keep in operation. I think it ran to \$1,700,000 that they were over what the Manitoba Hospital Commission felt was possible to meet. Some of the Board members threatened to resign; some did, I believe, if I am correctly informed, submit their resignations which were held up for the time being, and now it seems after the intercession of the Honourable the First Minister things are beginning to straighten out.

But I have reason to believe that some of the reasons for the -- I hesitate to use the words "inflated budget" but for lack of another term I use that -- some of the reasons for that excess budget are the fact that there was need of a great number of additional services in the hospital and the Hospital Commission, the Manitoba Hospital Commission, in requesting the General Hospital to reconsider, has done the same thing as it has done with the Manitoba municipal hospitals, which also submitted a budget figure that was larger than what the Manitoba Hospital Commission felt it could meet in its appropriation to the municipal hospitals.

As an indication, the municipal hospital asked for 15.6 supervisors. The .6 is because of a turnover and so on -- they come and go, the fluid situation to which I referred, but 15.6

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd)....supervisors, head nurses 15.3, and the municipal hospital urges upon the Manitoba Hospital Commission that it cannot cut this figure below what they originally asked for. Registered Nurses, they number at 79, but then licensed practical nurses which they budgeted for, numbering 70 and a fraction, they have cut to 55 in an attempt to meet the Manitoba Hospital Commission's requirements; and Nurses' Aides they have reduced from 201 to 182 which means a total reduction in the personnel of 33, 34 individuals. This is all contained in the re-submission of the budget made by the municipal hospital to the Manitoba Hospital Commission.

In reviewing the personnel standing in the hospitals, someone going in there would say, "Now, how many nurses aides and how many licensed practical nurses do you require?" They would give the figure that they require and then, "How many do you have?" The figure would be given that fitted in with the Manitoba Hospital Commission's feeling that would fit into the budget, and there they would show a shortage of nurses numbering somewhere in the 30's, and the same picture follows throughout. In the operating room there was a suggested reduction there. In the central supply room there was a reduction of personnel there; in the pharmacy, in the physiotherapy department and so on. The staff in the physiotherapy department, which is one of the critical departments in the municipal hospital because of the condition of the many patients that are there, they require six staff physiotherapists and three staff occupational therapists, and the Manitoba Hospital Commission asked them to reduce this number of nine, reduce it by three - cut down by one-third, and for nursing education, social service department, the laundry department, the dietary department and so on. In each instance the municipal hospitals tried to meet the demands of the Manitoba Hospital Commission - or the request - to cut the budget down; and so this re-submission was made.

Now you may wonder why I have these figures, this information. I happen to be one of the citizen members that sit on the Municipal Hospital Board and the information was available to me as it is to anyone who might wish to enquire about it, and I have it rather than some others.

The Manitoba Hospital Commission even suggested that the municipal hospitals could cut down on the amount of coal that they would burn - not the amount actually, but in the amount that they were to pay for coal, but overlooking the fact that the price of coal has gone up. Tenders were called for it. There were three bids received and the lowest of the three was accepted and from that lowest tenderer the coal is being purchased. I won't go on with this report but what I am driving at is this; that there may be a real shortage of hospital personnel and then there may be an additional shortage indicated by the fact that the hospitals are trying to meet the budgetary requirement that has been set by the Manitoba Hospital Commission, and I don't know where the figure 472, which I quoted as being a shortage shown in hospital personnel, I don't know whether that is a figure that has been divided between the realities - that is, the people just weren't there - or whether the people weren't there because they haven't been able to budget for it and weren't able to hire more people. In the meantime, hospitals are running into difficulties as the General Hospital seems to have run into, and at the same time also the services of the hospitals are being depreciated, which members who are on hospitalization have a right to object to. They have a right to expect a certain standard of treatment in the hospitals but if by virtue of having to reduce their budgets they cannot continue to hire the same personnel, the facilities are reduced; the efficiency or the effectiveness of the hospital is decreased.

It is possible that the General Hospital in its submission may have budgeted far beyond what it really needed under the terms set by the Manitoba Hospital Commission, be operating or venturing into programs which are not directly involved in the operation of other hospitals. If the General Hospital is carrying out some special programs which it is initiating on its own, then of course the troubles that it has brought upon its head are its own troubles and these will have to be resolved in some way, but I find it difficult to understand the Minister's insistence that there is no shortage of hospital personnel and that we are being well served, and I would let my remarks just stay where they are at the present time until I get what I hope I may receive - a reply to some of the questions that I asked about hospitals that are being projected, about accredited hospitals, the number in proportion to the total number of hospitals in the province, and why there aren't more accredited hospitals in the province than there are, and what are the reasons for the non-accreditation of some of the hospitals that have failed to be recognized as being up to that standard.

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd).....

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will close my remarks. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, 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 for Russell, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, may I have the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand?

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

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): May I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate of the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. George; the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Highways in amendment thereto. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: I would ask leave to have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Burrows in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You caught me a little by surprise there. Thank you Russell Doern.

Mr. Speaker, I had not intended speaking on this resolution. I thought that the points had all been covered by the members on our side here. However, when I was paging through some old Hansards I thought it was rather funny, some of the statements that were made on this resolution in the past, and I thought it might be refreshing to read the comments and make my comments about the comments that were made here.

Now to say that young people are old enough at 18 to vote because they are old enough to go to war - this is true. However, I believe that at 18 years of age a young person is twice as clever as any person in this House that was 18 when he was 18 because of the increased methods that we have in education and TV etc., and everything else, that our young people are really educated and ready politically to vote at 18.

Now one member mentioned that I think most of us would admit that our young people are radicals, and I think this is one of the greatest factors that enabled Lenin and Mussolini and Hitler and Mao Tse-tung to rise to power. These people were capable of capturing and misusing the youth of their countries, particularly in the revolutionary countries. Hitler captured the hearts of German youths and he brought near disaster to the continent of Europe. We have witnessed on TV the riots in these countries, the snake dance in Japan and Korea, and these were all by youths in the various countries. "It seems to me, Madam Speaker," he said then, "that young people are rebelling against government, law and order and they have lost all respect for authority." --(Interjection)-- The previous Member for Hamiota. So he goes on to say, give a million reasons why these young people can't or shouldn't vote, but I thought it was rather funny that he would say that a person was able to capture the imagination of an 18-year old and he could become a dictator. Well we had one person that was Prime Minister a few years ago by the name of Mr. Diefenbaker, who captured the imagination of old people and many people sitting in this House, and had he wanted he could have become a dictator, so this is a very very poor excuse not to let our 18-year olds vote. Another thing that strikes me - it's rather amusing, is the fact that there isn't a Party in this House that are not entertaining the 16, 17, 18-year olds trying to form political clubs, etc., yet we say they are not old enough to vote yet they are old enough to get involved in politics in other ways. As we all know, during the campaigns we have many 18 or 17-year old boys helping out, and I firmly believe that this is an excellent resolution and I think we should be supporting it and giving our young people the opportunity to express their opinions.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Portage, 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 for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, let me first of all say that I do not have a great deal of confidence in the fact that raising the general minimum wage level of the people in the Province of Manitoba will do a great deal for raising of the opportunity of Manitobans to earn fair wages. In this small regard I would have to agree to some extent with what the Minister of Labour said, that the real way of increasing wages in the Province of Manitoba is to permit organized labour to increase those wages. I would, however, differ strongly from those people in this House who say that Labour is so organized and is given the permission to organize so as to effectively increase their wages. At the same time as I state, Mr. Speaker, that I don't have a great deal of confidence in the fact that minimum wages will increase the capacity of Manitobans to achieve what I would term fair wages, I cannot help but recognize that there are people in the Province of Manitoba who are unable to organize for one reason or another, either because they are employed in industries which can't be organized or, in the alternative, they are restricted from organizing themselves because of Manitoba's labour laws, that I must state, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot sit with a clear conscience in this House and permit myself to go on record that these people should earn \$1.00 an hour, \$8.00 a day for having their selves at the disposal of an employer for a full day, and I don't think that statistics are a great deal of help in this subject, Mr. Speaker. I don't think any member of the House needs statistics to tell him that a person cannot get by, cannot receive the things which are required for a bare subsistence living at a rate of \$40.00 per week, approximately \$170.00 per month; and this, Mr. Speaker, is the existing minimum wage that is paid for by this province. And I, Mr. Speaker can't apologize for the fact that we in this Party have moved a resolution suggesting that these people be paid \$1.50 an hour. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it's not, as the Honourable Minister of Labour put it, an auction sale. I don't think that asking for \$1.50 is something for which I should be congratulated. If anything, I should be drawn and quartered for suggesting that a person should work at that rate for eight hours a day, but nevertheless, there has to be a minimum wage and the minimum wage of \$1.50 an hour is the minimum wage which this Party takes the position since June of 1966 should be paid to these people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another thing that I don't like engaging in is arguments over statistics because they never come out right. We never find that someone has established something by statistics and the other person has been found wrong by statistics, but I do want to refer to the Minister of Labour's remarks which he made on December 13, 1966 and which he repeated before the House the other night, that Manitoba is among the highest minimum wage payers in the Dominion of Canada. In particular, I would like to refer to several things that he said. I'm reading from Hansard Page 186, December 13th: "I think the public has a right to expect from we, the honourable members of this House, to look carefully at all the facts." Mr. Speaker, I agree that it's expected of us that we would look carefully at all the facts.

Secondly, the Minister of Labour said that some of the statistics that were put forward by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party were - and he hesitated to say it - hashed up statistics. He said he wouldn't use that word, but of course he used it in suggesting that he wouldn't use it, and I waited anxiously for the Minister of Labour to show where the Leader of the Opposition had gone wrong and where the Leader of the New Democratic Party had gone wrong in quoting the general wage statistics and the general position of Manitoba with respect to wages which were cited by these two gentlemen; and of course, Mr. Speaker, we all waited in vain because the Minister of Labour didn't say anything which contravened the statistics with regard to general wage conditions across Canada which were proposed by my honourable leader and the Leader of the Opposition.

Another thing that the Minister said: "...but I merely want to make a point that they should know and we do know that statistics alone never tell the whole story." And I agree, Mr. Speaker, that statistics alone never tell the whole story, and I'm going to indicate that the statistics which were cited by my honourable friend the Minister of Labour did indeed not tell the whole story and cannot sustain the proposition that Manitoba is amongst the highest minimum wage provinces in the country.

(MR. GREEN cont'd).....

Another thing that the Minister of Labour said was that, in referring to minimum wages he said: "It is the least amount of money that an employer can pay an employee." Well Mr. Speaker, that's not the whole story; that's not clearly the facts; because the minimum wages in many provinces and indeed in Manitoba leave out many people who are employees. They declare that these people are not covered by the Act, and then do not cover - and the Minister can correct me if I am wrong - people under the age of 18, that is, the \$1.00 minimum wage doesn't cover people under the age of 18, so that's not the whole story.

Now, my honourable friend then referred to various provinces and their minimum wages and I think it is significant, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable the Minister of Labour was speaking on December 13, 1966, which was 13 days after the \$1.00 per hour minimum wage came into force in the Province of Manitoba, so that for 13 days he used statistics to compare this province with other provinces and what they had been doing, in some cases over a period of two days. For 13 days people in Manitoba earned \$1.00 an hour and the Honourable the Minister of Labour compares this with provinces where people had been earning that kind of wage for a whole year, so that for the amount of money that would be earned in this 13 days as against the 365 plus 13 days is certainly not one which tells the whole story, to use the Minister's words.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, in citing the statistics for British Columbia - and the sheet which the Honourable Minister gives us says, "no general rate; 85¢ for the first six months of employment; industrial minimums range from \$1.00 to \$2.00" - in quoting Manitoba we have the succinct and proud statement, "\$1.00 for male and \$1.00 for female." Well Mr. Speaker, I think that if we are not going to compare apples with oranges and if we are going to tell the whole story, and if we do quote the minimum wage of 85 cents for the first six months of employment in British Columbia, then surely we should do the same thing for Manitoba, or is it the fact that Section 4 (c) of the existing minimum wage regulations is no longer in effect? Perhaps I'm wrong, because Section 4 (c) says: - and this is in Manitoba - "Inexperienced workers not covered by a learner's permit issued by a Minister" - and by the way, with a learner's permit you can pay still less - "shall be paid at the following rate: for the first three months of employment 15¢ per hour less than the minimum wage." Is that not the existing regulation? If it is then why does the Minister say, when he refers to British Columbia, 85¢ for the first six months but when he comes to Manitoba he says \$1.00 and \$1.00, and he leaves out the 85¢ for the first six months? Is it because the Minister is proud of the dollar rate or is it because he wants to make it appear that British Columbia has the lower rate, 85¢ for the first six months, and Manitoba's rate is \$1.00? Manitoba's rate is 85¢, I suggest, for the first six months - and the Minister can correct me if I'm wrong. If he invited the members to correct his statistics I invite him to correct mine. And I agree that statistics are a very dangerous and rough waters to get into and I don't like to get into them. I know, Mr. Speaker, without statistics that it's not right for a person to work for 40 hours and get \$40.00; that it's not right not because the rate is low but because the \$40.00 will not sustain that person and the kind of life that I say he is entitled to in this province for giving up 40 hours of his time in a week, or 48.

For the second three months of employment it's five cents per hour less than the minimum wage, and after six months, Mr. Speaker, the minimum wage. So if we're to compare Manitoba and British Columbia, then surely we should make a fair comparison. And if we're to bring in British Columbia, Mr. Speaker, then let the members of this House know that we should be speaking - let's use the Minister's words - we should be speaking about the same thing. "And we do know that statistics alone never tell the whole story." Well, indeed they don't, Mr. Speaker. Because in British Columbia there is what is called minimum wage orders under the male and female Minimum Wages Act, Mr. Speaker, and it occupies - and I'm going very quickly - approximately a dozen pages of the CCH Labour Reporter giving different categories of employment and different categories of minimum wages. For instance, ambulance driver, \$1.50 per hour. Apprentices, exempt in accordance with the Apprenticeship Act. Automotive and gas service station, \$2.00 per hour, first month 85¢ per hour. My learned friend gleaned that statistic that during the first month they get 85 cents. By --(interjection)--Oh well, there are lots of them. Barbering, \$50.00 a week. Bicycle riders and foot messengers - he should have picked that one out except that those people are generally under 18 years of age and he would have had to compare 50¢ for British Columbia with 48¢ for Manitoba, so let's tell the whole story. Bus operators, \$1.00 per hour. Construction, \$2.00 per hour. Cook and bunk

(MR. GREEN cont'd)...house, \$1.00 per hour. Electronics technicians, \$1.50 per hour, and so forth and so forth, Mr. Speaker. They go from \$1.00 to \$2.00 but surely, once we accept the fact that British Columbia has gone about it in a different way, it's idle to compare Manitoba minimum wages with British Columbia minimum wages. They just don't tell part of the story. Not only do they not tell the whole story but they don't tell part of the story.

Then he referred -- and I'm sure he looked very enviously and with longing eyes at the good Liberal Province of Newfoundland and found a minimum wage of 70¢ for males and 50¢ for females, and I'm sure that the Minister of Labour yearned for the good fields of British Columbia and thought that certainly maybe if he pushed this comparison he could convince this Legislature to do as Joey Smallwood does. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can deter him from further dealing with that particular statistic.

He dealt with Nova Scotia. Mr. Speaker, in Nova Scotia he cited \$1.10 for male and 85¢ for female employees, and indeed the figures are right but in Nova Scotia it's for people over 17 years of age - 17 years of age and over, whereas in Manitoba it's for people over 18 years of age, and I suggest that this makes a difference in the total amount of money that is being paid to these people engaged in these industries.

In Ontario, indeed it's \$1.00 an hour for male and \$1.00 an hour for female, but standing in this House - and I believe today is February 14th - if the Minister of Labour in Ontario were standing before his House today he'd say that minimum wages in the construction industry are \$1.25 an hour because indeed today they start at \$1.25 an hour, on February 14th....

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour)(Osborne): My honourable friend will be happy to know in Winnipeg they're \$2.10.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, this is February 14, 1966, that they went to \$1.25. My honourable friend is referring to the statistics that he used yesterday, that in the construction industry - and I think he is referring to various trades according to the Fair Wage Act - that he referred to this as being the minimum wage in the construction industry. Well Mr. Speaker, statistics never tell the whole story. The minimum wage that he is referring to in the construction industry is, and I am sure he will admit it, in fact the effective wage; it's not a minimum wage. What happens in the construction industry is that all the trades unions get together and negotiate with the General Builders Exchange and sometimes, Mr. Speaker, they have to go on strike to force their demands; they go through great hardship; they pay dues; they organize for the purpose of getting a wage with their employers. And after they do this, after they do this so that other people will not have to organize, the Minister of Labour passes an Order-in-Council which says that everybody else in this deal is also entitled to this wage. So it's not a minimum, not a minimum of the nature that my learned friend, my honourable friend keeps talking about. In the construction industry it is the effective wage and it doesn't apply to everybody engaged in construction; there are different areas. And my honourable friend can elucidate upon that when he takes the floor.

In Prince Edward Island, my honourable friend says this is \$1.10 for male and no minimum wage for female. Well, I'm not sure that there is no minimum wage for female. I know that the CCH Reporter carries a women's Minimum Wage Act regulation which says that "the following Labour Relations Board orders regulate for female workers the conditions of employment including probationary and permanent minimum wages." Now Mr. Speaker, the Order-in-Council isn't cited here but I would venture to say that if the regulation says that it provides for minimum wages that it would, and it's also interesting that in Prince Edward Island - and this is part of the untold story - there is an Equal Pay Act which says that women will be entitled to the same pay as men - women doing the same work. Now this wouldn't apply to women in different forms of employment but nevertheless there is an Equal Pay Act. So, Mr. Speaker, I'm suggesting that from my remarks we do not get the whole story, but what we do get is the absolute certainty that it's impossible to say with any degree of validity that Manitoba's minimum wage compares with other provinces because we're not comparing it with the same things. Different provinces have dealt in different ways with this question of minimum wages.

In Quebec, my honourable friend tells us that the minimum wages are \$1.10 for men -- excuse me, \$1.00 for men and women in Greater Montreal and 90¢ for men and women in the rest of Montreal. Well, the CCH Reporter carries numerous provisions in Quebec with regard to the minimum wage; one of them: Section 28, skilled employees such as saw pilers, stationary engineer men, \$1.25 in zone one and \$1.15 in zone two, down to \$1.10, \$1.10, 70¢ and 65¢ for employees under 19 years of age. It's not something that can be compared with

(MR. GREEN cont'd)...Manitoba because in Manitoba employees under 18 years of age are entitled to 48¢ an hour. They also have minimum wage rates of \$1.30, \$1.15, \$1.10, and then again employees under 19 years of age, 75 cents. And they have another interesting form of minimum wage in Quebec which can't be compared with Manitoba. Pick workers and job workers engaged in the cutting, making of wood, skidding, piling or assembling of bolts, are entitled to the following rates of wages; measured by the cord, 128 apparent cubic feet, \$6.50. Now how can we compare an hourly rate of a \$1.00 to \$6.50 per cubic feet?

I don't, by this discourse, Mr. Speaker, suggest that the Minister's figures are inaccurate; what they are is misleading and they don't put us any further ahead than we were before we heard the statistics. What we do know and what everybody in this House knows is that nobody should work for \$1.00 an hour; \$1.00 an hour is not enough. A dollar an hour is not enough to keep life and limb together, and we in this province don't feel that people should have to give an hour of their time and their service for a dollar's wages.

I go now, Mr. Speaker, to Saskatchewan. Again, the statistics are not comparable. In Manitoba we have a 48-hour week for men, 44 for women. Is that not correct? In Saskatchewan they have a 44-hour week, so if we transposed the Minister's statistics we find that for working 48 hours in Manitoba one would get \$48.00 whereas for working 48 hours in Saskatchewan one would get \$51.88, using the same number of hours.

MR. BAIZLEY: Working steadily or temporarily?

MR. GREEN: Well Saskatchewan has a different situation, Mr. Speaker, and I welcome the Honourable the Minister of Labour acknowledging that these things can't be compared. But in Saskatchewan they have a weekly minimum rate so that whereas in Manitoba if one works 30 hours one would get \$30.00, in Saskatchewan one would be entitled to - and I don't have the rates handy, Mr. Speaker; they're here but they are based on weekly pay so that a person would get \$41.00 a week or \$39.00 a week instead of being paid entirely by the hour. All that we learn from these matters is that, indeed as my honourable friend has said, statistics alone never tell the whole story. What does tell the whole story? The man who works for 40 hours and gets \$40.00 will tell this House it's not enough, and the reason that it's not enough is not because he's greedy, it's because \$40.00 for 40 hours' worth of work, or \$48.00 for 24 hours' work is not sufficient pay for that man to live what we regard as being a decent existence. It puts a man with a family on the minimum rate and I suggest that there are many people in this category at below the poverty level. The honourable minister says no? Then we of course differ in our opinions.

The big thing that the statistics don't tell, Mr. Speaker, is that most of the wage rates that I have referred to are wage rates that were established long before the Manitoba rate, and just as we are having debates in this Legislature with regard to the increasing of the minimum wages, there are debates in probably every other legislature in Canada to the same effect. And just as the Manitoba rate was increased on December 1st, 1966, I suggest that in a very short order all of the provinces will leapfrog Manitoba and Manitoba will be where it was on November 30th, 1966; that is, behind the average minimum wage rate if it's possible to determine such a figure. And possibly, Mr. Speaker, this is another reason why the Legislature should have been called into session in September, then my honourable friend the Minister wouldn't have had the opportunity to boast proudly about Manitoba's minimum wage rate. I couldn't boast about \$1.00 per hour as a minimum wage rate if it was twice as much as every other province is paying. And Mr. Speaker, let's recall that this Legislature doesn't pay the minimum wages. The minimum wage is paid in effect by all of the people of Manitoba saying that we are willing to have the prices of products to us, the amount that we spend, reduced by the fact but to the extent that it won't be necessary for a person in Manitoba to work for less than \$1.50 an hour. And I say, Mr. Speaker that the people of the Province of Manitoba are willing to do this; they're willing to say that nobody should work for less than \$1.50 an hour. And that's why this amendment was put by the members of the New Democratic Party. I know that -- and I was very surprised to hear one of the members of the Liberal caucus in the House congratulate the Minister for enacting, or for acquiescing the possible 120-hour week. I'm surprised that the Liberals would take that position, but I guess I'll never cease to be amazed at the kind of -- I'm sure I surprise you as well. But nevertheless this is not something which I feel that the government should be congratulated for.

There's another effect, Mr. Speaker, on the question of the minimum wage and that is that if we are to have general wages in the province go up -- and this is the important

(MR. GREEN cont'd)... statistic that the Minister keeps staying away from. He refers to it or he declines to refer to it as a hashed up statistic. He declines to make that reference while making it. But he never said one word about that statistic, about the statistics that were quoted by the Leader of the Opposition and about the statistics that were repeated yesterday by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. Those are the effective and meaningful figures. What is the average wage rate in this province? And if the minimum wage is kept down, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this effectively keeps the average wage down and it inhibits the bargaining power of organized labour.

The other thing that I say, Mr. Speaker, with respect to minimum wages is that somebody has to negotiate for these people. Generally they are in unorganized industries with the exception of possibly those in the garment industries that are most vociferous and effective, the employers, in establishing this minimum wage. But generally they are in unorganized industries. All of the increases that are given to other people, that are given to organized labour, that are given to Cabinet Ministers, that are given to executives who get an increase every time the employees negotiate one - and this is an interesting feature of Metro Council. You had your employees negotiating for months with the administration, prepared in the last analysis to lose several weeks' wages or several months' wages, rather than to work for less than they wanted to, finally coming up with a 7, 8 or 9 percent increase, and what happens? Within moments, the administration comes in with a recommendation that everybody in management, everybody in the administration should get the same 9 percent without working for it, without organizing, using in effect the bargaining power of the Canadian Union of Public and Service Employees to get themselves a raise, and all of this, Mr. Speaker, all of these increases are passed on to those who can't organize. They're all passed on by those who have some control of their economic position to those who have no control of their economic position - generally the minimum wage earner.

The same thing with income taxes. Income taxes are supposed to tax the people that have the ability to pay. I've said it before, Mr. Speaker, and I say it now. Generally the people who have the ability to pay income taxes also have the ability to pass those taxes on. Because if it's going to happen to a lawyer, if it's going to happen to an organized trade unionist, all that he will do is make sure that his net income doesn't go down. When this sales tax, this 5 percent, is levied against

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the honourable gentleman but I think he's leading away from the contents of the resolution. I wonder if he would bring himself back to where he was and stay with the contents of the resolution rather than talking about income tax and other matters that he's talked of that are not in this at all.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker. With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I am now trying to urge upon the House the need for legislating at the \$1.50 rate and why this has to be done and can't be done

MR. SPEAKER: I fully realize that and I'm sure the honourable gentleman appreciates my position too, that I must keep him within the rules or ask him to keep within the rules, and all I'm asking him to do is to contain himself to the resolution and the principles of the resolution. I think he's covered an awful lot of ground away from it.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: may I on this point, because in all due respect there has been considerable interruptions from time to time of the trend of thought and development of an argument from this side of the House in this particular corner that I happen to be the Leader of, and may I respectfully suggest, Sir, that a person doesn't have to continuously talk, say, of minimum wage if they're establishing a principle, if they're establishing the fact, as my honourable colleague was, that as a result of an increased minimum wage the field of income tax comes into the picture for the benefit of all. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is within the rules of the House, and I respectfully suggest in this case at least, Mr. Speaker, that you consider this aspect of debate. It's historic that debate has to be by establishing corollaries and other factors in debate. I suggest that my honourable friend is quite legitimate in the way he was talking this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: the opinion of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party and I presume he's referring to me when he's suggesting that there has been considerable interruption in that corner of the House. Probably there has but it has all been in the interests of containing the debate within the rules regardless of what he has said, and the gentlemen that support him have been aggressive and shown aggression and I feel that I have

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd).....been considerate in every degree, but I must insist that we keep within the matter being discussed, that's before the House, rather than wander off. I appreciate the honourable gentleman's opinion but I think he appreciates mine too.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I cannot enter into an argument. It's not my purpose. The only thing I do suggest respectfully to you, Sir, that there may be a difference of opinion as to whether or not a debate must be confined strictly insofar as the use of verbiage is concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to make this clear without going any further, that I'm not suggesting, nor have I insisted that they strictly remain within the contents of the resolution. I think as the House has gone along that this has been very evident and I expect it will continue that way. It is not my purpose to interfere with the discussion of the House whatsoever, other than to contain it within the rules. This is all I'm trying to do and I want the honourable members to understand that in no uncertain terms.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll try to confine myself within your injunction. The point that I was attempting to make - and I'll stick specifically to minimum wages - is that it is the minimum wage earner who requires the assistance of the Legislature, because everybody else has some economic power of their own. The trade unionist when he is charged with a 5 percent sales tax will go back to the bargaining table next year and the first thing that he'll get from his employer is enough to put him back in a net position before the 5 percent sales tax was imposed. It's the same thing with the income tax earner. The only one who can't do this, the only one who has got to come to this Legislature for the purpose of carrying on these negotiations is the minimum wage earner, and that is the wage earner that this Legislature has got to be considering when they are fixing a minimum wage. Statistics aside, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that nobody in this House needs any verification of the fact that a person should not be required to give eight hours of his time, his service, of his bodily powers for less than \$12.00 pay.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think that I really hadn't intended to take part in this debate but now that we've all agreed that statistics in this particular area are meaningless and that we, the government, have agreed that the fair and equitable way to set the minimum wage in the Province of Manitoba is to have this reviewed periodically by a Minimum Wage Board that takes into consideration the needs of a single person -- they're quite capable and competent people and I'm sure after the debates that have taken place in this House that that arena, the great community outside of this Chamber, are quite thankful that we, the government, see fit to ask the Board, composed of labour and management and a neutral chairman, to decide what is the least amount of money that an employer can pay an employee in the Province of Manitoba. I must thank my honourable friend the Member from Inkster for not suggesting that I was pleased that a minimum wage of \$1.00 was announced and I have to tell him that I have never been proud - and I'm sure he knows this - that the minimum wage of \$1.00 is a magnificent sum.

But I suggest to the honourable members of this House, Mr. Speaker, that the basis of establishing a minimum wage in Manitoba is on the premise of considering what are the basic needs of an individual, minimum needs if you will. Further it's interesting to note -- then my honourable friend doesn't get along too well on bread and water: he's not familiar with the rates for welfare for a single person in this community and that a person, a single person, working at minimum wages is three times as well off as his counterpart who has to exist on welfare. These are not things that you can be proud of, but they are certain economic facts that in a free society, that in a free economy, have to be coped with, and we just happen to believe on this side of the House that this is the kind of economy we want to have.

We have economic planning. We realize that it is the responsibility of the government to try and provide a climate for all our citizens to live in affluence, but we are not like our honourable friends opposite who would have a planned economy, who would tell everyone how much they could make, how long they could work and possibly even when they may have to leave this place. Well I think it's rather ridiculous that we, the members of this House, feel that the government is responsible for wages.

I'm sure honourable members know that wage levels are dependent primarily on the resources of an area. I don't think that the honourable members of the New Democratic Party are congratulating Mr. Thatcher in Saskatchewan for high wages, or I don't believe that they think

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd.) that Mr. Bennet and his Social Credit Party in British Columbia are responsible for the high wages there. But I think we all agree, we all agree that we want higher wages in Manitoba. We do have some disagreement as to how we would set it. My honourable friend says arbitrarily that this House would say it was \$1.25. Somebody else says, "They should say it's \$1.50," and there are other people in the community who say it should be \$1.75. I must tell my honourable friends that we are going to wait for the recommendations of the Minimum Wage Board and we will take into very serious consideration those recommendations, and if we feel they're adequate those are the recommendations that we will pass and I doubt very much, regardless of what my honourable friend from Inkster says, that there will be too many provinces leapfrogging. It's really interesting as you get into wages, and I suppose this is why I rise to the bait, you know, because it's most interesting and there are so many people in Manitoba who are doing so well that it gets awfully tiring when you look at the percentage that we're talking about. God bless them, I'm sorry for them too, but the percentage of our population that we're talking about are very small. We're talking about that group of people who are not capable of having collective bargaining, who are not capable of individual bargaining, who happen to be working in something where there isn't a going rate, or possibly even for an employer who doesn't pay a fair rate.

The other thing is that there seems to be -- the honourable member suggested a very good motive of why the minimum rate should be improved -- a very good motive. He suggested by improving the minimum rate then the trade unions can go back to the bargaining table and demand more, because there has been an increase in the minimum wage, and that this great group of people, this great group of people who have the strength of collective bargaining, are going to bargain from the minimum wage. Now this is not true. If he looks at bargaining over the past 18 months it does not occur from the minimum wage. We are in changing times and my honourable friend knows that as well as I do. I say we have had practically full employment, Mr. Speaker, in our area for the last couple of years. Our employment rates, even though our minimum wage, Sir, has at times not been quite as high as our neighbours, have been much better.

And then, too, I must, for the edification of the honourable member who just took his seat and for members of the House, talk about minimums in the construction industry, and what he said about the construction industry in greater Winnipeg is partly true, partly true -- but it is the establishment, it is the establishment of a minimum rate. But then he doesn't tell you that the minimum rate for labourers in rural Manitoba in the construction industry are \$1.35, helpers are \$1.55 and journeymen \$1.85. He doesn't tell you this. So we know as we look at statistics, we move them back and forth, we are in the business of politics, we want to have the best image. But I'm suggesting to honourable members when we are talking about images and we are talking about wages and we are talking about the people of Manitoba, we are talking about a climate, dammit, that will provide the best economic base for these people to exist and thrive on.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question.

MR. LEONARD A BARKMAN (Carillon), Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside), Could we have this stand please?

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

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): May we have this matter stand please.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. May I say at this point, there was an error -- it was named for the Honourable Minister of Labour. It should have read "The Honourable Member for Logan." So I call on the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan), May I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand please?

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

MR. HARRIS: Again I would like the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

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

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan), Mr. Speaker, may I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand?

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

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this resolution after I noticed the way the ire of the Minister of Labour is raised every so often, I almost hesitate to get up - but I think I shall take the chance anyway. He tells us everything is rosy and that there is no need to change things and in particular with this resolution on the employer changing the bargaining position during negotiations, this is one item that I think if he would check his files, he would find that he has had communications in a number of instances; he has also had representations by trade union representatives and business agents.

I have a number of examples here of what does occur in some of these instances. I won't quote them all, I may quote one or two, but I do think that this is one area that should be looked into. When a bargaining agent has been agreed upon between the two parties, then an employer should not go beyond the bargaining agent to the employees and usurp the position of the bargaining agent. This would not be tolerated in any other instances and I don't see why it should be tolerated during negotiations with a bargaining agent.

There is one instance that I can cite here where an employer this was in regard to a bakery unit - he changed the route of the salesmen and he cut down on the number of sales routes they had, thus increasing the wages, and when the bargaining agent tried to negotiate the contract he found out he didn't have the support of the employees any more, because the employer had done this. Now it was very hard to prove what reason the employer had for doing this but nevertheless the bargaining agent was left out in the cold. There was also another instance where the employer increased the wages from \$5.00 to \$15.00 per week more and the bargaining agent was not able to conclude a successful agreement.

There were a number of other instances, and as I said, I believe if the Minister of Labour would check his files, his correspondence, he would realize that he does have representation in these instances. I think that I can get quite a few more of these instances and I could table them in the House if it would become necessary; but I think just one or two of these are necessary to point out that this resolution should be adopted.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if nobody else wishes to speak, I beg to move the adjournment of this debate, seconded by the Honourable Member from St. John's.

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

. continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan and the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I think the issue before us really, or at least what we originally started out with, was the question of whether or not nursery schools are required and I think that there is little doubt that in terms of an objective study, that they are. I am going to refer to a study in a few moment which was made a few years ago which dealt with this problem. There are actually two kinds of children who could use such facilities. These are children who require day long care, who are of pre-school age; and there are children who are of school age who require some care before going to school, sometimes care at noon hour, in particular being fed lunch, and then after four o'clock. Now the amendment refers to the need for a broad study, and there is no doubt that this would be of some value, but the question is of course, again on the original motion of the Honourable Member for Logan, pointing out the need for nursery schools.

I would like to refer to a study that has already been made. I see no need for duplicating some of these studies. Perhaps one could update it, perhaps one would find out there is a greater need, because there is undoubtedly more working mothers now than there was four years ago, five years ago, when this study was made, a larger population, and there is a generally increasing tendency of women to work. For example in 1951, 37.9% of married women were working and by 1961 this was up 20% to 57% - or at least these were of women working - so that within a ten year period, you had a 20% increase out of the total number, not just 20% of what it was ten years before but a 20% on top of the percentage previously, up to 57.6%.

Now there was this study made - and I'm referring to a study in 1962 on this whole problem by the Community Welfare Planning Council - a report on the study committee on day care services for children of working mothers. There were 200 interviewers went out and took part and they conducted almost 1, 200 interviews with families, 1, 200 families were interviewed, and their statistics are most interesting. They point out that in their study they took great care to make sure they didn't duplicate other studies; for example, they first began by interviewing the available literature and they found out that of course this is a different province, much of the literature was American, and they had to of course dig out their own statistics. They also felt it was necessary to gather this information because they point out for example, that there is a popular attitude toward working mothers which is emotional rather than rational, and I suppose that in this category we could put the comments of my honourable friend for Rhineland who pointed out that in his opinion he didn't think mothers should work. Well of course, I think a lot of us tend to think the same thing, but that's not the issue at all. If that's your basic premise that women shouldn't work and then you turn and find there is a woman who has to support her own family, because she is divorced, separated, widowed, etc. - what are you going to say to her?

Well what you should say logically is since we don't believe you should work and since you have to work, that what we are going to do is of course pay you to stay at home. Because that's the only thing that follows. You can't say starve and stay at home, let your children die. What you have to say is simply, believe women shouldn't work and since you must work, we'll give you the money to stay at home. I suggest to my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland that should be his position logically.

But that is not really the issue. The issue is very clear. The issue is women have to work, can we do anything about it to help them work and can we help protect their children, because we are primarily concerned here with the children. We are not ignoring the women, but we are primarily concerned with what happens to the children of working mothers. And of course, a second thing that they did in this particular study, it says here, "was that the best planning for services to meet a specific social development can be done on the basis of factual data regarding that social situation." So they went out and gathered the necessary data.

Of course, another important question that comes up in regard to working mothers is delinquency - you know this is one of the natural implications - mothers work, kids run around wild and commit crimes. Well there is some truth in this, but the interesting thing here is that the largest percentage - and I'm referring again to this study - of juvenile offenders come from economically deprived groups in which mothers have to work and all other conditions such as housing, recreation and moral climate are below standard. So you are going to get the biggest percentage of delinquency I suppose from lower economic homes. And then what are you going to say to the mothers of these homes? They have to work because they have to go out and

February 14, 1967

(MR. DOERN cont'd). . . . earn a living to support their families. So it's not simply the fact that a mother is working that causes delinquency; it's often because it's from a lower economic area and the important thing here really is the question of how well does the mother care for her children. I think some women if they stay at home with their children will do such a rotten job that the kids will grow up with certain difficulties, personality and social, anyway, so you can't necessarily say that it's because of a working mother that the child for instance, turns out to be a delinquent. What about a good mother who goes out and works and earns a good income and comes home and takes care of her children and gives them affection and so on and so on? She can probably do a better job by working and taking care of her children after hours and before hours than a woman who isn't a good mother who simply is home all day. That doesn't necessarily mean she's a good mother because she's at home.

Well they give all sorts of interesting findings in this study and they point out for instance some of the large numbers of working mothers. For example, there are apparently - this was done four or five years ago. Women who work with children, there were 8,645. Working with no children, these are married women, 9,093. So there's a total of working women of 17,738. And of those not working who had children, there were 22,000 -- about 3 out of 4 of course don't work there; and those not working with no children 22,000, again about 3 out of 4. So you get a grand total of 62,712 married women and 8,645 have children and of course are at work.

Now I notice that the Honourable the Minister of Welfare points out there's going to be a new study being made in the near future, it's going to include 4,000 people and a social service audit. They're going to take inventory of all the health, welfare and recreation services in Metro Winnipeg and of the people who use these services, and they're going to produce a report, an appraisal of what it says we are accomplishing and what we should be accomplishing. It'll take two years. Now we had a report that took a couple of years, five years ago; we're going to get another general report that's going to take two years and the Premier himself proposes we should have another study. All we're doing is we're having studies.

During the noon hour period today I dropped into one of these nurseries. There are I believe four of them in town. I happened to go to one of them and have a short little tour and get an idea of what goes on there. And I must say to the Honourable Member for Churchill and people like him who believe that this regimented socialism and these are baby snatchers who pop children into grey uniforms and drill them in the principles of communism, that it doesn't look like that at all. It looked like happy healthy children, all between the ages of 2 and 5, enjoying themselves, enjoying themselves so much that I also just spoke to a lady who had called me on this very question, that her children loved it so much -- and this was sometime ago, 15 years ago at the Stella Nursery, the nursery that's I think in the old Stella Mission in the north end -- that their children said to her can we stay an extra hour. You take us out at 5 o'clock, we want to stay till 6 o'clock. And they liked it so much that for seven years after they left the nursery they went back every Christmas to the Christmas party; they just loved it there. Now the thing is these nursery operations, and there are four of them approved ones in Winnipeg, and I don't know I guess there are many sort of unapproved or unofficial ones, but if this nursery is an example of the approved ones then we're in good shape, in terms of the quality of the ones that exist, there aren't enough, but those that exist are excellent. And for example they charge fees at all of these nurseries, ranging from something like 50 cents a day to \$2.50 a day depending on the mothers income and so on, and this is all subsidized. The actual cost per child is something like \$5.15 a day and of course no mother who can get her children in there is paying more than half; some are paying 10 percent of the cost. Now these nursery schools as far as I can tell, are not for school age children, which is unfortunate; they seem to be for pre-schoolers. So there's a problem there of what one should do when one gets to school age children.

Now of course some members of this House do believe in let's say fair and free enterprise and all those other laudatory terms about individual freedoms, they seem to argue that we shouldn't get into this, the government shouldn't get into it. Let the private agencies do this. And in general I think if the private agency should do it, that we should let them do it. But they're not doing it. They can't meet the demands. The supply is inadequate; they have to be subsidized. If the Honourable Member for Churchill wishes to establish a day nursery in Winnipeg, he's going to have problems - or any other area - because I suggest it would cost, in terms of actual cost of staff and so on and a small profit, \$6.00 a day. You show me a woman who can pay \$6.00 a day just to have her child looked after. She'd have to be at least earning \$10.00 and maybe \$15.00 a day to make it worth her while. Otherwise, she should

(MR. DOERN cont'd).... stay at home, it's not worth it. So you can't have a laissez-faire nursery system; you have to have some kind of subsidy or you have to have a tremendous volunteer organization to get the money. Now that's for one child - on a free enterprise basis, \$6.00 a day. What if you have two children, \$12.00 a day. And five days week, that's 60 bucks a week. Where are you going to get money like that to pay for baby-sitters? Impossible!

So anyway we have the facts from the 1962 study and if you talk to women for instance and ask them about what it costs to get babysitters and so on, I've heard figures like this: it costs \$1.50 a day, which is cheap, to have a young child sent to somebody's home for a hot lunch and for an hour after school, \$1.50. Not very much, but you know if you're only making \$6, 7, 8 a day it's a fair amount; and that's cheap, and that's for a young person who is going to school; and for a pre-schooler it's \$3 or \$4 a day. So I would say that if you look at the present situation, you'll see things like this, in terms of how this affects women in our province, working mothers -- and let's not say they shouldn't work and so on because they do work because some have no alternative, they're the breadwinner, they have to go to work.

I appeal here to my friends in particular on the opposite side of the chamber when they think of this particular issue, in particular to some of the members from the rural communities. If your community doesn't require these facilities and so on, don't be against this point for that reason. If you feel it's socialism or something, well that's your business; but because your own community doesn't require these facilities you should not vote against this because there are many communities that do require these facilities. It's a fact. Ask members from certain constituencies in your own party, ask them. Not from the swanky districts but from the working districts. In fact you'd better ask many of the New Democratic Party members because we seem to represent most of the working class districts, so maybe you should ask us. Well women, since they don't have proper facilities and so on often have to stay at home because they can't afford to pay these baby sitters and some of the nursery school costs, they have to live on very small budgets. Or they have to work only occasionally and so on. Or they have to live with their families. There are young women who are divorced with children living with their families, living on meagre amounts of income. Then of course there are women who can't work and they have to go on welfare. So we add to the cost of the Minister of Welfare and his department. And then of course there are the women who do work and what about some of them? Well of course some pay such high costs for baby sitters and agencies they have very little left. It's hardly worth their while but they work. And of course some leave their children with -- what I wouldn't like to call undesirable friends and relatives but let's say undesired friends and relatives -- they feel that they don't want to leave them with a particular relative or a particular friend or a particular neighbour. What's the choice? They've got to, so they do it, they don't like it but they have to do it. Or you take the women who work and they might be what you'd call a no care gambler. They gamble, their kid doesn't have proper supervision, they go to work and gamble, they hope junior doesn't get into trouble with the police or set the house on fire or bring the gang in at noon hour. These people are really playing with life, the lives of their own children. And then there are women who make some arrangements, it's not all proper, but they have somebody keeping an eye on their children. And what about the effect on children? Well a lot of children don't have proper care, they're not properly watched or supervised. And I can tell you that this nursery school that I visited - and there's several that the members should take a look at, if they've never seen one -- one of the social workers there said "you know I'd like to have had my own children brought up here, it's so good." For 40 children, they had a staff of four people to take care of the children, four sort of supervisors, and many of them were social workers. They had a director; they have one or two full-time social workers; they have a cook and a housekeeper. That's about eight employees, for 40 children. It's expensive.

And other effects on children. The children may have to have lower economic and lower social standards as a result of the fact that their mothers can't go to work. And then of course there can be a higher delinquency rate. And what about the women, the working mothers. Often they have guilt feelings because of the situation they're in. Those that leave their children without proper supervision don't feel very happy. Those who can't provide enough economic material for their families or provide too little, they have guilt feelings. Some may resent their children because their children are a burden and they can't get out enough and so on; they can't leave their children, they're locked in the home and so on. They can't provide extras for their children. I think a lot of this boils down to basic human dignity, that's the issue.

Some of our honourable friends talk about socialism and so on, they say everybody's trying

(MR. DOERN cont'd).... to go on the dole. I'm talking about women who want to work, who want to go out, who want to raise their families properly. I'm not talking about the dole. I'm talking about people who want to earn a fair living to give their children a decent standard of living. You're the ones who are depriving them. The New Democratic Party will make it possible and this kind of a policy will make it possible to free those people to work. We don't want them on welfare. We want them to have jobs.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I think the issue is very simple. It's a question of need. Is there a need for nursery schools. Not a question of socialism and laissez-faire. It's a simple question. Do we need places where mothers can put their children during the day, pre-schoolers and school age children of working mothers? The answer is yes, the need is obvious. The studies have been made and they have established the need and I think the question now is leadership and will. So let's not just waste our time with more studies; let's look at the studies that have been made, let's talk to the working mothers and so on and let's see whether there is a need. I say there is a need and I say the government knows there is a need and let's not delay it with further studies.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I just have a word or two to say in connection with the resolution that is before us and the amendment of the Honourable the First Minister. It seems to me that in his amendment he is attempting in this case to follow the lead of Mike down at Ottawa and look into all of the ramifications of women and their status in society.

Now as far as I'm personally concerned I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that I've long been aware of the status of women and do not require a commission, as far as I am concerned, to look into this very interesting subject. However my honourable friend the First Minister suggests that there are so many things that require investigation that we should have set up a commission here in the Province of Manitoba to parallel, it appears to me, the one set up at Ottawa.

The original resolution that was introduced by my colleague from Logan was pretty specific insofar as one aspect of the matter that the Honourable the First Minister seems to think that we should consider. I am not going to argue with my Honourable friend the First Minister as to the advisability of an investigation into the status of women in the Province of Manitoba by a commission of inquiry. If my honourable friend thinks that this is necessary and he as the Leader of the majority group in this House, assured of support, feels that it's necessary for a thorough investigation into women -- and I presume that he also will investigate into two of his very charming colleagues in the process -- but he, having a majority in this House, who am I to really say that women shouldn't be looked at or into. So therefore I suppose I'll go along with my honourable friend, because after all is it not a case, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend just as recent as last evening suggested that after his wife took a look at him they discovered that his eyes were grey, they weren't blue as he was suggesting, so possibly the kinship of women is very, very important.

My colleague from Elmwood this afternoon gave us quite an interesting discourse dealing with the question of day nurseries. We've heard some comments from some of the members opposite in opposition to the proposition of my colleague from Logan; however, the First Minister agrees that this matter should be looked into.

It is not my intention to belabour the House, Mr. Speaker, and the First Minister having suggested that there should be a commission of inquiry into the status of women, I suggest that this commission of inquiry should be charged with some specific recommendation and I would therefore move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert, "That the amendment be amended by adding the following at the end thereof: Be it further resolved that the Commission of Inquiry give first consideration to the advisability of establishing public day nurseries where there is a demand for such services and recommend positive action required to resolve this problem to the Legislature at this Session."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage that 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 Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution that has been under consideration by the Legislature of Manitoba for two or three years now and it is one that always sparks a

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . . . considerable degree of debate and discussion. I think that I am fair to say that the mover of the original resolution, my colleague from Logan, did so in 1965 and again in 1966 and the Honourable Member for St. Matthew has now proposed an amendment to the original resolution. And I want to suggest to my honourable friend that in proposing this amendment really he's turned the clock backwards. Of course this might be indicative of the progress that the Conservative Party is making in Manitoba, because the reverse of the forthright attitude or positive action insofar as automation is concerned that the previous sessions of the House considered by way of amendment to the resolution by the government has now been set aside. It seems to me that the Government isn't quite so positive as to which direction they are travelling now than they were back in 1965 and 1966.

And I'd like to illustrate, Mr. Speaker, by reminding the House of the previous resolutions. I am not going to stick strictly to the resolutions that were proposed previously but a general synopsis of the intent of the resolutions. In 1965 my colleague from Logan introduced the following resolution: "Therefore be it resolved that the Provincial Government give consideration to the advisability of establishing a committee comprising representatives of government, management, labour and agriculture to consider the effects of automation and recommend such measures as will enhance the moral, economic, and sociological well-being of Manitoba in relation to the effect of automation." Well on this particular occasion as apparently today, the government didn't agree with my colleague so they amended the resolution at that time as follows: "Resolved that the government be encouraged to pursue its programs in connection with attaining and maintaining a high level of employment, that the matter of automation be kept under continuing study by the government and its agencies in co-operation with labour and management." So the government at that particular time, Mr. Speaker, were continuing their study of the significance of automation.

And then my friend the Honourable Member for Lakeside introduced a sub-amendment to the effect that the House recommend the establishment of a committee representing government, labour and management to consider the probable effects of automation and plan to deal effectively with them. Well the government in 1965 didn't want to have a committee to consider the probable effects of automation and didn't want to have anything to do with plans to deal effectively with automation at that time, so they voted against the combined opposition of the Liberals and the New Democrats at that particular time.

Then the amendment of the government carried, because they had a majority of course at that time, a little more of a majority than they have today. However, the Honourable Member for Selkirk put forth another amendment at that time for the consideration of the government to include a study of the best possible means of insuring that man will not have to become a mere robot but will retain his natural and human dignity. Well the government didn't agree that man should retain his natural and human dignity and they voted against the resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

Then in 1966, we couldn't impress upon the government in '65, so we thought we'd have another whack at it. Maybe by this time that after the government had had time to repent of their sins that they might consider the question of automation. So my colleague at that particular time, just about a year ago now, moved "that the government give consideration to the advisability of establishing a committee of government, labour, management and agriculture to consider the effects of automation and cybernation and to recommend measures designed to avoid adverse social and economic effects as the result of technological change; and that pending implementations of the recommendations made by the committee the following measures be implemented." Before the committee would consider it then these would be positive steps. "That employers be required to notify employees or representatives six months in advance of any intent of lay-off as the result of automation. Secondly, employers be requested to cooperate with government in re-training programs; and thirdly, that consideration should be given to severance pay of one week for each year to an employee who may be adversely affected as the result of automation." Well the government wouldn't buy that and they had their labour expert at that particular time -- I presume he was the labour expert because he introduced the resolution. Of course that was prior to the present Honourable Member for St. Matthews - and I refer here to the Honourable Member for Springfield. A year ago -- my honourable friend has just expanded his chest so he must have been the labour expert at that particular time -- he moved this amendment: "this Government continue to study and co-ordinate along with labour, management representatives measures that will ease the social and economic effects of technological change." How profound! The government to continue its study.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).....

And then the Honourable Member for Assiniboia on behalf of the Liberal Party at that time moved a sub-amendment, "That pending implementation of recommendations from study the parties be governed by the following guidelines: (a) maximum gain and minimum dislocation from automation requires wholehearted co-operation of government, labour and management. That notice should be given six months before as notice of change; that there should be flexibility in interpretation of seniority and union jurisdictions, the government take the lead in re-training, etc." The sub-amendment once again was defeated and so the amended resolution of 1965 introduced by my friend the labour expert from Springfield carried so that the government would continue its study into this very important field of automation.

This year again we have before us, Mr. Speaker, we have a new expert backbancher in the field of labour, my friend the Member for St. Matthews, and he is suggesting that rather than having what the government last year and the year before supported, a committee comprising representatives of the government and management to consider the effects of automation, he now suggested we should convene a conference, and he doesn't like apparently, the word automation in one respect, in part of the resolution he substitutes the words "for technological change." Very interesting.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there have been numerous conferences regarding the question of cybernation and automation and technological change and I want to suggest to my honourable friend the Member for St. Matthews, the Honourable Minister of Labour, the First Minister opposite, that we don't need to have a conference in Manitoba dealing with the question of automation. There have been conferences held in other areas, and recently at that, and if my honourable friends would only study a paper which I have in my hand, issued by the Federal Department of Labour, called "Teamwork in Industry," they will have here a composite documentation of one of the best conferences on automation that has been held in recent years. The conference was held at Guelph, Ontario and there were representatives of labour, of management and of government. Some of the conclusions reached, or suggestions made, at that conference are well worth I think, Mr. Speaker, investigating into.

I want to just say now what the Honourable J.R. Nicholson, Canada's Minister of Labour, said at that conference, and I quote: "In my view" said the Minister "The implementation of change in our society is ably handled by the free enterprise system." Now this ought to appeal very much to the Minister of Labour after his scolding of this afternoon. But then the Minister went on to say -- and he's a free enterpriser, as well - the Minister of Labour at the Federal level, he went on further by saying - "but innovation, whatever its definition, does involve government the moment it affects substantial numbers of individual Canadians through loss or change in their employment."

Here we have this free enterpriser at the Federal level of course, quite concerned with what is happening in the field of automation. And he attended the conference. So I suggest that the Minister of Labour in Manitoba might take a leaf from the book of the free enterprising Minister of Labour at the Federal level that while changes may happen in a free enterprise system, which we are burdened with at the present time, that when as a result of that system changes affect a considerable number of people then it is a function of government.

And at this conference was a chap by the name of James W. Singleton, the educational director of the Board of Education of Burlington, Ontario and I want to quote a few of the remarks stated by the honourable gentleman at that conference because I think, Mr. Speaker they are worth while listening to and I quote from the paper presented by Mr. Singleton: "Theoretically," Mr. Singleton noted, "automation could if society wished, handle all production and activities with a minimum of labour input, except those services that are fully creative and original, or require personal face to face relationships. All the goods required in a country such as Canada could again, theoretically speaking, in a fully automated productive society, be produced by a fantastically small percentage of the labour force." And then Mr. Singleton goes on to say, and I quote again: "Despite this apparent failure of automation to reach its theoretical potential, we must not ignore the fact that it is one of the major factors influencing labour displacement and mobility. People are displaced actually and potentially. It is true, he says, that new materials, new uses and extended uses may re-absorb many of those displaced but the basic premise does remain that the aim of automation is displacement of men."

Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot these days of the field of education in respect of automation and I think that it is well to listen to a person of the capabilities and the qualities of Mr. Singleton in this particular field. I found it most interesting, because we have almost become

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).... indoctrinated into believing that all we need are better educated workers and more educated workers and half the problems of our labour market will be solved. But Mr. Singleton had this to say: "One area which obviously suffers heavily is that group of workers of low education. Every survey made has consistently shown that the displacement of such persons and their percentage among the unemployed is far in excess of their percentage among the population. The simple solution, make them stay in school longer, does not stand up to examination. Frequently the very qualities that cause them to drop out of school, the lack of motivation, poor attendance, limited ability, no aptitude, are the very qualities that cause them to be poor and inconsistent workers. In addition, Mr. Singleton says, "to send a boy of low ability back to school, to accomplish what he was unable to achieve before, is not likely to be fruitful. The boy with a low educational background could make a valuable contribution to society, even with his handicap, except for the fact that he is kept as an outsider in two regards. There is work he could do, but he loses in job selection to those with better education regardless of whether such education is a requirement of the job. And in addition, his low educational background rules him out from certain classes of further training. Educational requirements are being used as a job and trade selection devices throughout our society. Artificially high standards are used to weed out a number of applicants. This fact is observable at all levels from the unskilled to the professional." Then he goes on to say: "The plight of the young person of low educational background is one of the most serious dilemmas and the solution is not easily found."

Then there was a representative of labour at this conference, a Mr. Emond Park of the Field Workers of Canada. Mr. Park had this to say, among other contributions: "To date we have failed as a society to plan for the introduction of automation and technological change." This I say Mr. Speaker, was the purport and the purpose of the resolution originally introduced by my colleague from Logan.

Mr. Park went on to say, continuous research to keep abreast of the ever-changing needs of the labour market today and tomorrow was strongly urged by him. He said without such research it is impossible to develop fully any aspect of manpower policy. How can we determine what courses to offer in adult training if we do not know which skills are experiencing an expansion of demand and which are becoming less important. Then management also were represented at the conference, but Mr. Park had this to say before I refer to management directly, Mr. Park had this to say: "Management also has great responsibilities in helping to solve the problems inherent in technological change and consequently their present attitudes must alter. It is a usual attitude of employers that they are free to make decisions which may have disastrous consequences for their employees, their employees' families and the communities in which they live without any obligation to discuss them with those directly involved."

And here, Mr. Speaker, may I just deviate from the document that I have before me to support what Mr. Park had to say in respect of some lack of concern on the part of management on occasions insofar as displacement of manpower is concerned - and I refer to the investigation which was made by the Chief Justice Samuel Freedman into the displacement of railway personnel of the Canadian National Railway. I think Members of the House will be well aware of the fact that Mr. Justice Freedman, in his report on railway displacement suggested to management and to government and to industry as a whole, that the employees should be taken into their confidence prior to any change as a result of automation or technology.

I might say too, Mr. Speaker, that dealing with a recent arbitration proceeding, between the Railroad Workers of Canada and the major railways, that one of the suggestions of the Goldenberg report, which was rejected by some of the employee organizations, it is true, but nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, the recommendation of Mr. Goldenberg was - and the company was prepared to accept it - was that due notice should be given prior to the impact of automation on the employees.

Then as I said, Mr. Chairman, also management was represented at that conference. This particular individual, a gentleman by the name of Mr. MacNeill who was the technical superintendent of the Imperial Tobacco Company of Canada, and he had this to say: "Personally" said Mr. MacNeill "I like the definition of automation which describes it as an attitude toward production; but however one chooses to define automation, good or bad, it is here to stay and for that reason all of us are obliged to participate in planning how we are going to live with it. The ill conceived application of automation creates far more problems that it solves."

And then he went on a little later on in this article to say: "We should clearly define the fact that automation by itself is not a cure-all but that intelligent planning is required in order

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).... to obtain maximum benefits from its application." And then my last quote from this paper will be back to the Honourable the Federal Minister of Labour, Mr. Nicholson, and he said in his opinion, automation will leave our society radically changed and that the final result of the change may depend largely on how well we are prepared to control and to direct those changes during the ensuing year.

So, Mr. Speaker, while I can appreciate very much the intent of the amendment introduced by my honourable friend, it really isn't going to get us anywhere, is it? We've had conferences galore. The Honourable the Minister of Labour and the previous labour expert of the Conservative Government in Manitoba have told us that they've had this under continuing study for a long period of time. All I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is that having had the question of automation under continuing study for a number of years I would suggest to my honourable friend: take the fact of conferences as having been read now, forget about your amendment, try and assist in introducing some positive action into your caucus away from the negative approach to automation and let's face up to realities ourselves in this House.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): In the absence of the member may we have this matter stand?

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

MR. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, it has seemed to me in my attempt to debate this resolution on earlier occasions I always run into the clock. However, today I feel that I can make it. In dealing with the resolution which was presented by the Honourable Member from Burrows and seconded by the Honourable Member from Kildonan, it may be of interest to the House if I were to enlighten you on some of the background events which took place in Ottawa at the time of a discussion between the National Energy Board and Trans Canada Pipe Lines.

In August, 1966, the National Energy Board made a ruling in dealing with the application of Trans Canada Pipe Lines, and that ruling was that it could not issue a certificate and licence due to policy. The basic reason I believe was that once the proposed pipe line system through the United States had been built it would inevitably have become the main line. Then on September, Trans Canada Pipe Lines guaranteed that more than 50 percent of the volume of gas required to supply eastern Canada would be transported through its main line which would go through northern Ontario. By December 31st, 1966, pardon me 1976, it was further agreed that that 50 percent would be raised to 60 percent and then 65 percent of that volume would be transported through northern Ontario. Trans Canada Pipe Lines immediately agreed to commence looping that northern line by 1970; and then Trans Canada Pipe Lines offered to deposit shares representing its 50 percent ownership in Great Lakes Transmission Company with a trustee, under federal terms and federal conditions. And this was a guarantee that the company could not dispose of its interests in the Great Lakes without their approval. Another term that was discussed at that particular meeting was the one dealing with American Natural Gas who were a partner of Great Lakes Transmission Company, and they guaranteed to purchase an additional one hundred million cubic feet of Canadian gas for twenty-five years; fifty million in 1969 and to increase that to a hundred million by 1970.

Now the main points at debate in this particular resolution I think are the marketing of gas and the assurance that the product would never be denied to Manitoba or Canada. As I stand here today before this Assembly, I stand as a Conservative who supports corporate capitalism. This is a system which has placed in our hands, I dare say, the highest standard of living in the world. Conservatives, as we all know, have long recognized that the socialist approach to many of our problems, including this one, is the wrong approach, because in most cases it means a lower level of living if we look at it from the living approach or in this case a different approach to the resources and the money that's involved. People like the Russians in fact as I stand here today and many of the other Socialist countries in the world are moving away from their first conception of socialism. Why? They are moving away because they can't compete in the production of goods with the system which has been established by corporate capitalism. This system, a system which has no morals, no logic, no coherence, but a system

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) which produces more goods than any other country in the world. It's quite evident today in many instances that the socialist nations are making an attempt to come back to the basic incentive of the corporate capitalistic system. So I don't think it's very difficult for us to determine who is winning this battle.

Now let us attempt to analyze the debate on this particular question - Trans Canada Pipe Lines and natural gas. Were we to follow the advice of my honourable friend from Burrows, I suppose we would possibly build a wall around our country and try to live within that wall. The other choice which we have, and I feel it is a good one, would be to take a chance through the efforts of our working people, through the efforts of our business men, through the efforts of our miners, our lumbermen and many others, and let's enter competition with all the high wage and the low wage countries of the world. And what's going to happen? We'll survive. Such is the question before us at this very moment, dealing with this resolution: Natural gas, a surplus resource for Canada only; or natural gas for Canada with the huge surplus which we have in the western part of our country exported to our neighbours in the south. Expansion at home, expansion abroad.

We must, I think, get out and sell in Canada not only the products we have in our forests or our mines or our farms, but we must take a great initiative with our secondary product of industry. In this case a surplus secondary product, natural gas. I don't think we would dare stand behind these four walls to protect ourselves by restriction. I recall an incident, having read in the Saskatoon paper I believe, and it was an incident that took place in 1955, where it was proposed that the price of gas should be lowered 25 percent. The price I believe at that particular time was 96 cents per thousand cubic feet. So they lowered the price. The price was lowered to 72 cents per thousand cubic feet. And what happened? The volume of gas purchased by consumers increased tremendously and naturally the company realized a greater profit. Such I think will be the case with Trans Canada Pipe Lines. The gas industry is a fixed cost industry and if you increase the volume that goes through a fixed cost industry the unit cost immediately is reduced. Who benefits? Consumers benefit. In this case the gas corporation will benefit and the whole economy develops as these benefits become derivative of the product.

In dealing with the looping of this pipe line, if we loop that line through the United States of America the price reduction I am told will be in the neighbourhood of some 10 to 15 percent. Let's take a look at one example - Sarnia. The Sarnia area. And when you speak of the Sarnia area in the gas business you speak of the storage wells at Don. I use the figures on file with the National Energy Board at this moment. For the first three year period the price at the storage wells is 43 cents per thousand cubic feet. After three years the price will be 45 cents per thousand cubic feet; conditional, of course, on the new line being built through United States, their price -- what happens? The price drops to 39.15. This is a difference or a saving of some five cents per thousand cubic feet. And this also means, Mr. Speaker, that all the manufacturers who will be served by union gas, will have an opportunity to have reduced prices within the range that they can handle because the National Energy Board by terms of contract are required to see that no area in Canada is discriminated against as far as this resource is concerned. So what happens? These prices that I quoted will apply back through the whole system right to you and I in Manitoba. People in Toronto will benefit. People in London, Ontario, will benefit. The Lakehead will benefit. Winnipeg will benefit. Saskatchewan will benefit. Alberta will benefit and British Columbia will benefit. This is a provision in the agreement which results from a principle known as the "common carrier" principle. A wholesale price reduction of 10 to 15 percent, as I mentioned a moment ago, depending on the base figure.

Now supposing we don't build the south loop and we can't supply gas to the heavy industries in this heavy industrialized area that I mentioned a moment ago, such as Toronto, Hamilton, London, what happens? Immediately these Canadian areas will have no other source of supply except from the United States. Why? Because for the simple reason that this northern line cannot be built in 1967. And when do they need the gas? They need it right now -- 1967. And also, Mr. Speaker, the Americans, we'll have them back on our market. All the Canadian consumers using the product at the same time will have a product which will be three cents cheaper than the Americans due to the fact that the Americans pay a three cent tariff on our gas or if they bring their gas into our country we pay a three cent tariff -- three cents per thousand feet tariff. Of course this will strike very hard at many of our Canadian manufacturers who are locked in combat at this moment with our great neighbours across the border. This part of Canada, the highly industrialized area of Ontario, I dare say is very competitive in all fields of industry and

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd). . . . I don't think that we could stand up and say if we can't support them with our product up here we're not practising Canadianism. I say, Mr. Speaker, that if we take the sensible approach to this particular problem the price of gas will be reduced from 10 to 15 percent and at the same time we will be below the U. S. A. manufacturing cost and what will happen? Our industries will have what they've been waiting for, what they've been fighting for - lower costs.

The arguments that have been presented against building this line through the United States I think are very easy to explain, Mr. Speaker. First of all, it has been argued by some that this line should be in Canada because of the tremendous value of construction work to the hard-pressed people of northern Ontario. I am told by those in the industry that it is a very difficult situation to build a second line in northern Ontario due to the condition of the rock and the fact that a second line would have to be built some mile away, from a half to one mile away from the original line due to the blasting. The people of northern Ontario no doubt are disturbed, but I will prove I think in a moment that they are bound to gain with this project when it does come in there. The 1956 project was a great boon to northern Ontario. However, Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the second line in the north will be built eventually also regardless of whether we loop it to the south or not.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Will the rock be softer there?

MR. McKENZIE: No, this will be due to the demand for gas in the northern area.

Another argument that's been presented, I think, is the one that certain areas of the thinly populated northern Ontario area rely on pipe line assessments to pay their municipal expenses, and I think I'm 100 percent behind these men in their insistence that the construction of the second line must be started in 1967, not in 1970 as was laid out in the terms of the negotiation. And the main problem, I think, that we must deal with in Manitoba is what's best for all parts of Canada, and I think it's quite clear, Mr. Speaker, to me at least, that we can supply more gas at a better price to all parts of Canada if we build the southern loop. We've got to provide gas for all the Canadian industries, I think, because we have the surplus product. And when do they want it? They want it right now. For them to receive it now we must agree to the southern loop and we can't provide it now if we wait three years to build the second line in the north.

It's also been argued, Mr. Speaker, that we may lose control of our natural gas if we build the loop to the south through the U. S. A. soil. I feel in my analysis of the contract that this is a sound contract because the Great Lakes Transmission Company holds 50 percent of the shares and they have complete control of the management. We must not also overlook the fact that millions of cubic feet of gas will flow from Alberta and B. C. to the U. S. A. markets in California and the northern states. Would we care to analyze this thing and say that the United States would dare cut off their supply of gas that would go into Michigan or go into Wisconsin at the risk of having the supply which is going into California and those northern states, having it shut off? I don't think so. That country has become a deficit country in resources and in energy, and I say, Mr. Speaker, they would not dare shut it off.

Let me refer to some of the arguments that have been set up for the southern loop. Trans Canada Pipe Lines is a Canadian company with 92 percent in the hands of Canadians. We've got to support it. Another argument for the southern loop is that it's cheaper to build and we'll provide gas to our eastern Canadians at a saving of some 10 to 15 percent. It's quicker to build, naturally, as mentioned a moment ago. It's also quicker to build for the simple reason that we can get gas into storage in less than one year, while the northern loop, I dare say as I stand here now, couldn't possibly be built before three years. It is too bad that the line in the north hadn't been built larger when it was constructed in 1956. This is unfortunate.

Another reason, of course, for the southern loop is that I think we can move quickly and we can stop the American penetration of gas into markets if we move fast. I don't think we must overlook also the fact that Alberta gas has subsidized this market for the past three years, for the past ten years since '56, and now they can get a fair price for their product. I also say, Mr. Speaker, that we must also not overlook the fact that gas will be three cents cheaper in the north if we build the southern loop. We must also not overlook the fact that gas will be made available to the great Canadian steel centre at --(Interjection)-- no, up on the lakes - Sault Ste. Marie, if we build the southern loop. And we can't overlook another fact also, I think, and that's the one that the southern loop will make possible and feasible the installation of a pipe line that will eventually go from Montreal to Quebec City.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I might say that this southern loop will set up a long-range energy program for Canada, and especially the one that has the resource, western Canada. Why?

February 14, 1967

1083

(MR. MCKENZIE cont'd)..... First, the supply will be available to all Canadians; secondly, energy will be cheaper in Canada than it is to our competitors anywhere in the North American continent. And I don't think we must overlook the two main principles which are involved in this debate, Mr. Speaker, availability of gas to Canadians first, and secondly, cheaper gas for all. I suggest Mr. Speaker, that we vote against this resolution.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may vote the adjournment, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's.

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

MR. LYON: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if this might be a convenient time to call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: I now call it 5:30 and I am leaving the Chair and will return at 8:00 this evening.