

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 27th, 1965

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): I beg to present the petition of Stephen Adolph Magnacca and Others. Praying for the Passing of an Act to incorporate the Brandon Areas Foundation.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of The Interior Trust Company, Praying for the Passing of an Act to Amend an Act to incorporate The Interior Trust Company

MADAM SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

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

MR. CLERK: Your standing committee on law amendments beg leave to present the following as their sixth report. Your committee has considered Bills No. 85, an Act to validate By-Law No. 2169 of the Rural Municipality of Rockwood, and By-Law No. 713 of the Town of Stonewall; No. 88, an Act to validate By-Law No. 4525 of the City of St. Boniface; No. 99, an Act to amend the Mines Act; No. 100, an Act to amend the Ground Water and Water Wells Act; and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your committee has also considered Bills No. 84, an Act to amend the Unconscionable Transactions Relief Act; No. 86, an Act respecting Consumer Credit; No. 90, an Act respecting the Acquisition of Land by the Government and Agencies of the Government; No. 91, an Act to validate By-Law No. 715 of The Rural Municipality of Old Kildonan, By-Law No. 24/65/B of The City of West Kildonan, and an Agreement between The City of West Kildonan and The Rural Municipality of Old Kildonan executed pursuant to those by-laws; No. 101, an Act respecting the Control of Predators; and has agreed to report the same with Certain Amendments. All of which is respectfully submitted.

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of motion.

Introduction of Bills

The Honourable the Member for Hamiota.

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden that leave be given to introduce a Bill No. 104, an Act to provide for the disposition of the funds of Weather Modifications Ltd., and that the same be now received and read a first time.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are 22 Grade 6 students from Clifton School under the direction of Miss Thompson. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Wellington. There are also 29 Grade 8 students from St. Ignatius School under the direction of Sister John of the Sacred Heart. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you.

Orders of the Day

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF (Provincial Secretary) (River Heights): Madam Speaker before the Orders of the Day, I would like to correct a figure that I made yesterday. It appears today in Hansard on Page 1867, and I refer to the power rates at The Pas. I stated there that the rates were now 8, 2, 1 as compared to 8, 2-1/2, and 1-1/2, and the figures should be transposed, that the rates are 8, 2-1/2 and 1-1/2 - they are now presently 8, 2-1/2 and 1-1/2.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister that just took his seat. We asked several questions last night of him, and inasmuch as we are now past his estimates, does he intend to supply the House with the answers to the questions that were put? And when?

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Chairman, I intend to supply the answers, and I would like to have the opportunity the next time we're in committee before we start on the next estimates to supply all the answers that I undertook.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable the Member for St. Matthews.

MR. W.G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider Bills Nos. 58, 75, 80, 81, 82, 87, 89 and 97.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House Resolved itself into Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Bills Nos. 58, 75, 80, 81, 82 were each read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 87. The amendments in this bill are largely due to the fact that they've changed the name of the company from United Fund of Greater Winnipeg to United Way of Greater Winnipeg.

Bill No. 87 was read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 89, Section 1 (11) passed, 1 passed. A new section 2 has been inserted

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert-Plains): Mr. Chairman, I think that these amendments should be read in committee for several reasons. One of them is that some of the members of the Committee are not members of Law Amendments and they do not know what the amendments are, and since we're on the final reading of the bills I think the amendments should be read to the committee to be passed on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Notice of this proposed amendment was given at second reading to the members of the House and I will read the amendment. The new Section 2 will read as follows: Section 16 of the Act is repealed and the following section is substituted therefore. 16. The capital stock of the company shall be \$2,000,000 consisting of 100,000 shares having a part value of \$10.00 each and designated as Class "A" Common Shares and 1,000,000 shares having a par value of \$1.00 each and designated as Class "B" Common Shares, each class ranking on a parity with the other class, and to maintain such parity the company shall neither declare nor pay dividends on its shares unless such dividends be declared and calculated as a percentage of par value of all such shares.

Remainder of Bill No. 89 and Bill 97 were each read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Speaker, the Committee has considered Bills No. 58, 75, 80, 81, 82, 87, 89 and 97 and has adopted all of these bills without amendment.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain that the report of the committee be received.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for St. Matthews.

Bills No. 58, 75, 80, 81 and 82 were each read a third time and passed.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie that Bill No. 87, an Act to incorporate the United Way of Greater Winnipeg be now read a third time and passed.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, just before this bill passes I think that it is of such great importance to the Greater Winnipeg area that possibly some comment should be made respecting the same. Because it indicates by the list of individuals in Section No. 2 comprising as they do a broad cross section of all phases in the community life of Greater Winnipeg that here is an endeavour on the part of these people to join together, the objective of which as contained in the bill is to raise funds unitedly for charitable purposes within the area spoken of. And I think, Madam Speaker, it would be only proper for us in this Assembly to wish to this organization every good wish and

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . good luck for the future in their endeavours. There are some, and I may be included in this, that feel that there should be other methods of raising the required amounts of money necessary for the well being of the citizens in the Greater Winnipeg area and also in the province. However, in the absence at the present time of such an overall social security time system I think that we should recognize the efforts of these individuals as are mentioned in the bill and say to them, bless you and every luck for the future.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. Bills No. 89 and 97 were each read a third time and passed.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and the proposed amendment by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation. The Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I adjourned the debate for my honourable leader.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could have the matter stand. There are other resolutions I intend to speak on. I would ask the indulgence to have this stand today.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. George and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for St. Vital. The Honourable the Member for Carillon.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Madam Speaker, maybe we can put him to work. I also adjourned this debate for my leader.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I am prepared to speak on this particular debate this afternoon. The reason that we introduced the resolution in the first place, Madam Speaker, was that we feel that the particular tax on heat is an ill conceived tax in the Province of Manitoba, that here of all places, because of our climate, because of our need to get more people into the province, because of our demands for industrialization, because we want to see the northern part of our province which is very often referred to as the place where Manitoba's future lies, that the imposition of this type of a tax is unfair. Here we are at the very heart of the continent, we are faced with higher costs in this particular field than I would say any other populated area of comparable population at least and the government imposes a further burden upon the people of the province in this particular field. The government proceeds then to amend this and I cannot agree with the amendment that they recommend.

To begin with they seem to minimize the importance of the tax that they have levied and if it is unimportant as they claim, and if it is not as they claim a matter of importance in revenue then why would they object to doing away with the tax. They bring it down here and say that it's a matter of 60 to 90 cents per month for the average family. I question very much whether those figures are correct. The figures that have been given in the debate so far indicate substantially larger figures than these and certainly for northern Manitoba the figures are far beyond this amount. And to have a Member like the Member for Churchill constituency say otherwise I think just doesn't stand up. I'm surprised that we have not heard from some of the other members of that area, the members representing constituencies like Flin Flon and The Pas, Rupertsland, Swan River, where undoubtedly their people are paying substantially more than this particular amount. But coming back to the government's own statements, if it's an unimportant tax, if it doesn't amount to anything well then remove it, because it is in the minds of the public, I think correctly so, a burden.

Now the government then goes on in their amendment to suggest that a general sales tax is something that they have prevented. Well the facts are, Madam Speaker, that the government has started on a general sales tax. The bill that was presented to us last year being Chapter 10 of the Statutes 1964, second session, is clearly a sales tax bill. The only difference is that it has selected some special items. But the bill itself is sufficiently broad at this time to take in any category of items and clearly states in the title it's an Act to provide for the imposition of a tax on purchasers of land and certain products. Well since then the government has removed the land part of it. They've taken that out. The other title, "certain products", covers as wide a range as the government may wish to do and in the definition this is very clear. It's a tax on products purchased by the people in this province or purchased by people outside of this province and brought into the province. But it's a purchase tax. Well now that's the same thing exactly as a sales tax. The only thing is you refer to it on the basis of the individual buying instead of the individual selling but surely -- the same thing applies in

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) Ontario where they have admittedly brought in a general sales tax. It's the same thing, it's the purchaser who pays it.

Well now what about the taxable product then to which we refer. Well at this stage Item G simply lists the taxable products. It lists electricity, it lists telephone service, natural gas, coal and derivatives thereof, and steam or hot water. These are specifically listed. Nothing at all prevents the government from now on from adding to that list of taxable products. The Act is here, the method of taxation is here, everything is ready for them to proceed to do so. Now to say that they have not brought in a sales tax because they haven't expanded that list is simply an argument of detail. It's strictly a question as to what items they are going to add and when they are going to add them.

So, Madam Speaker, we have as of now a sales tax in Manitoba, albeit limited to these items. And what we say is that that particular item, the item of heat and the tax on that is not a proper tax in a province like ours. That is the reason we introduced our resolution and I am not prepared to accept the amendment proposed by the government because I don't think that it is accurate. I think the tax is a bigger burden than what this amendment claims it to be and I think that their statement that we do not have a sales tax is not correct.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I don't know whether I've spoken on the amendment or on the original motion in this case. I did speak on one or the other but I just want it understood that when I vote that if I reject the amendment put forward by the Honourable Member for St. Vital in connection with the sales tax that I certainly would not want a sales tax, but at the same time I cannot support the amendment attached to the resolution itself.

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

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the proposed motion in amendment by the Honourable the Member for St. Vital.

A standing vote was taken with the following results:

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

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 32; Nays, 20.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. George as amended. Are you ready for the question?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, when I introduced this resolution at the beginning of the session I described the heat tax as a cruel tax and no speaker on the government side has said anything to make me believe otherwise. In fact during the entire debate only two members saw fit to speak on this resolution and one of them I was told was the loser in a draw with straws to see if he had to speak on it. -- (Interjection) -- They laugh about it but the fact remains that only two members spoke on it. -- (Interjection) -- How the members could speak on a tax which is so discriminatory I can't understand. The Member for Churchill whose very constituents are the hardest hit by this tax got up and defended it and sloughed it off as a nothing tax and wouldn't have much effect on his constituents.

A MEMBER: The burden would

MR. GUTTORMSON: We sought correspondence by the people of Thompson who have contradicted him entirely on his remarks and there's no question about it they are rather disappointed in the stand that he has taken in this House. I'm surprised at the cabinet ministers representing the northern area who helped draft this bill because it's so discriminatory to them, their constituents. Neither one of those thought to speak on this resolution. Now the Premier has made little of it, he has said 60 to 90 cents a month. Madam Speaker, in fact, this tax is the equivalent of 3 mills on a home with an assessment of \$5,000, and I know the people when they get a tax bill of three mills increase they think it's substantial, although the government may feel otherwise.

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd.)

I predicted earlier, in early remarks that this tax would be gone by the time the next session comes around, because although they won't admit it in this House at this session I know that they've had countless representations from their constituents and I am confident that they can't live with this heat tax another year. However, I will make one promise that if they don't abolish it before the next session I will introduce this resolution again.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains and the proposed amendment of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead: The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I have spoken on this resolution on several occasions in the past when we have introduced it in this House. It would appear from the reactions of the government again this year that they are going to oppose this resolution. I fail to understand, Madam Speaker, how the government consistently says to members on this side of the House that they should be proposing constructive measures and that usually on every occasion when a constructive measure is introduced the government hastens either to amend it or to vote against it -- subsequently in a year or two to bring the matter up themselves.

This is the experience that we have had with the matters of land acquisition where my colleague the Member for Selkirk brought in a resolution to this effect at the last session, the government neglected to even discuss it or to vote on it, but bring it in themselves at this session. The matter of the public protector which was brought in on two or three occasions in the past, which has been discussed both outside and inside this House, which was turned down flatly by the government on previous occasions, and at this session brought in as part of the Throne Speech. Here we have another and I suppose that this will have the same fate, the government while complaining loudly about the lack of constructive criticism from this side of the House is going to proceed to vote against the Auditor-General at this session and presumably introduce it in their Throne Speech next session.

I think the government fails to understand, Madam Speaker, what we are proposing in our resolution. They insist on confusing the two functions, that of the Comptroller-General and that of the Auditor-General. Our resolution is not a criticism of the Comptroller-General of this province in his personal capacity or of his office. It has nothing to do whatever with his responsibility. What we are proposing is a different function. Another function altogether than that performed by the Comptroller-General. One which he is not asked to perform, and which as I understand his responsibilities, is not involved. This is exactly what business does, Madam Speaker. This is a regular business procedure. Most large enterprises have their own set of internal auditors. Most of them operating across the country have in each one of their branches of course a complete accounting department of their own with normally a comptroller present and in addition to that internally have travelling auditors as well who go from branch to branch and audit for the company itself, over and above those functions which relatively, compared to government, fall into the category of the responsibilities of the Comptroller-General. Not exactly because there are differences between the government and business but relatively, the internal control. But every one of those, Madam Speaker, in addition to that employs a set of outside auditors. This is the function of our chartered accountants. They are not the internal employees of a firm, they are the external audit. The responsibility of the chartered accountants who are employed by a business is to come in from the outside and make an audit from the outside, someone who is not an employee of the company, someone who can take a totally detached look at what is going on and make a report for the shareholders of the corporation, and also a report which in the case of public companies naturally is published and becomes the basis of the analysis of that corporation by outside investors.

So what we are saying, Madam Speaker, is this: The Comptroller-General is doing a good job; he's doing a fine job for the responsibility that he has; but we think that there is need for an outside audit to be done. Now when we say that that doesn't mean that we are critical of the Comptroller-General, but in every large corporation, Madam Speaker, this is the practice. And when the member who spoke on this says well why didn't the government do it before, well that's a favourite reply from my friends when they don't know of any other. Well maybe it should have been done before but there's a vast change, Madam Speaker, in the government of this province over the past seven, eight years. The budget for one thing has gone up three times. It used to be when I first entered the House in the vicinity of fifty

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) . . . million and it's now a hundred and eighty-five million and the government is getting consistently bigger. We are going into more and more fields and it becomes that much more important that there be that type of outside audit. I ask my friends opposite if they were the directors of a corporation would they be prepared, would they recommend to their shareholders that they not employ a set of outside auditors. I'd be awfully surprised if their answer was not that they would follow the normal practice.

The Member from Winnipeg Centre who replied presumably for the government on this said that the Auditor-General's report is made months after the event and if waste has occurred it's too late to do anything about it in any case. I don't agree with that, Madam Speaker. It would assume from his reply that he must be admitting that there is waste, he says it will only be found out months later. But be that as it may, there is no question that the Auditor-General in our Federal Government has performed a most useful function, because it isn't simply a matter of uncovering if there is waste or if there is improper expenditure -- and we have to admit frankly I think that in any large operation, be it government or be it business, that these things do go on. This is human nature. In this regard I don't think the government is in the least bit more guilty than business; the difference is that in government it's public funds with which we deal and when information comes out it is public. I think just as much goes on in private business but it's their affair and if there is no publicity about it that is their concern. But the Auditor-General in Ottawa completely in addition to uncovering whatever he uncovers makes recommendations and this is the important part in the final analysis of his function because it is these recommendations that permit the government to take the necessary steps to see to it that the same events don't occur again. I think it is fair to say that the work of the Auditor-General at Ottawa has saved the taxpayers of this country millions and millions and millions of dollars because of the fact that he makes a recommendation to change matters when he finds there is need for it and because of the fact that everyone knows that he will be coming in and making a thorough audit. So, Madam Speaker, there is no duplication here between the work of the Comptroller-General and the work of the Auditor-General. They are two different functions. They may go over some of the same ground in the same way as in private business the outside auditors inevitably cover the accounts of the business, but they do it from a different point of view and for different purposes.

So, Madam Speaker, I say to the government, don't take the position eternally that suggestions from this side are automatically something that you should vote against. Open your minds and not just your mouths when you say that you want recommendations from the opposition and be prepared to accept them in the position or in the way in which they are recommended. This resolution is not one that is critical of our civil service or critical of what the government has been doing. This is one that will improve government functioning for the benefit of the taxpayers.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains.

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

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

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

A standing vote was taken with the following results:

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

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 20; Nays, 32.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

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

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, I'd like to add my few remarks to the debate on automation. The matter of automation is that whether we care to admit it or not it will continue to dislocate people, it does dislocate people and it will continue to do

(MR. SMERCHNSKI cont'd.) this. There are some extremely big changes coming in the field of employment and as the technical and skilled requirements of our industrial world today, as this is steadily on the increase and is growing, we need to take a very hard look at the overhaul of our total manpower policy. There are constantly complete upheavals in the type of labour in terms of the development of new techniques in the production of our products. Now, industry is of course faced with a very costly job turnover problem - and when I say job turnover problem, Madam Speaker, I do not refer to the ability to try and get labour trained to do one specific type of work. The kind of job turnover I refer to is that you have people within a plant, you have brought in a part of improvement in the automation of your plant, and it is these people that you have a certain amount of job turnover. It is these people you have to retrain, and it is these people that are not qualified in terms of their educational background to be able to adapt themselves to the retraining program, with the result that as our skills increase in our industrial production of commodities, we invariably have a larger percentage of people who cannot be retrained to rightfully take their place in industry. Modern testing and placement methods do help to a limited extent, but then industry itself is torn in two directions -- on the one, industry is anxious to produce its product at the lowest dollar, and yet on the other hand, it's torn between what its true community responsibility is, because I don't think there is any industry in existence at any time where management does not concern itself with the welfare of those people that are working for that industry and irrespective of anything that may have been said or is said in the field of labour and management, I dare say that there are very few people in the field of management who do not concern themselves with the most efficient type of employment of labour, and labour does concern them at all times.

We have at the one hand, Madam Speaker, the television instrument, we have the instrument of electronics and electrical engineers. Now I made a statement in this House some weeks ago that automation does not necessarily displace labour in a direct ratio, because in the field of automation you must call in highly skilled technical people in electrical work, in electronic computer work, electrical engineers, physical engineers, and the number of hours that these educated people have to put in terms of developing a system are less than what the normal labour that would be required to fulfill the job that the machine that is being perfected will displace that type of labour. For instance, we have today, Madam Speaker, a matter of safety. I remember not so very many years ago in a simple matter of hoisting ore from underground in a mine, this entailed one man on the surface, two men operating the skip system, and two men on the bottom - a crew of five men. Today, Madam Speaker, you can set up a TV camera on the bottom of the skip-loading station, you can set up a TV circuit on the deck where the dumping of the ore took place, and this complete operation can be run by a television closed circuit operation with no additional outside help whatsoever. Now this happens to be a very dangerous type of operation. This is the operation in which there was an average of about three or four percent of the personnel lost their lives because of the dangerous nature of this industry. Now automation has made this possible, and you must also concern yourself with the fact that a closed circuit of this nature does not require any Workmen's Compensation. This doesn't require any additional outside interference so that we must look objectively at the advantages of this type of service that automation does give society as against where you have to have a crew of five personnel and working under very dangerous conditions. Now these dangerous conditions are always supervised, they're always inspected by the mining inspectors and this is a costly section to the mining company that's operating a system of this nature.

Now the question arises, who is to be the judge as to whether the mine should be forced to use labour to do this operation, or whether we should truly let the automated system of the closed circuit TV system find its logical place in society and remove the danger of somebody being injured and possibly killed. So that automation on this hand does give us a safer if not almost complete safety in the field of certain operative industrial uses. So that the advantages are there, Madam Speaker. We also have the matter of accounting which is going into more and more computer work, because the chances of error are removed, which does exist with labour; and when you have a computer system doing the accounting work you of course have no Unemployment Insurance to pay, you have no tax deductions to be made for that particular machine that's replacing X number of people.

Now the disadvantages of automation are that, and this is possibly the prime and only disadvantage, that it does displace labour; and when you displace this labour you are displacing a labour that is not a uniform type of labour. You're displacing some people that can be

(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd.) ... retrained, and then you're replacing some people that cannot be retrained, and this is the unfortunate part about it. I do not think that the problem in Manitoba is an urgent one as it is in some of the more highly industrialized areas of Canada, but nevertheless it is a problem to be reckoned with. I know that The Economic Council of Canada has been doing a lot of soul searching and has been giving this problem a great deal of study and concern, because the existing legislation is completely inadequate in almost every province in the Dominion of Canada, because every planning council in Canada today should rightfully concern itself with automation and it isn't a simple problem that in my few remarks that I am making here today am I going to solve it or try to solve it, and I am quite sure that many an economic development council across Canada has been sitting in serious judgment of automation. It's here, it's coming, it's going to stay with us whether we like it or not and we will have to tackle this problem accordingly. To sit simply by and say that we recognize the factors of automation is not enough because we do have some time within which to assess and value the impact of automation on society and I think that we should commence now.

I know that in the Department of Industry and Commerce the Economic Council has been giving a great deal of study to this matter of automation; and yet, Madam Speaker, the other side which I opened up with is that I don't think that all of us quite appreciate the full impact on society of automation. When you look back and you can have complete hydro electric powers that can be completely operated by remote control without having anybody in the power houses in our northern development power project; when you can operate a complete chemical or industrial plant without having any personnel operating that plant, this is the impact that we have to realize. And the nice part about automation is that you have complete product control. You have the most efficient, the most dedicated type of control that you could ever wish for because this is mechanical. It simply does not make an error, whereas labour is always apt to make errors, labour requires supervision, labour requires looking after, so that you have these two positions working opposite each other. Now there must be somebody that will have to come in and be the umpire, that'll have to analyze the situation, and resolve labour and management or labour and industry into its proper basis so that labour and management can live together in the same manner that they have lived together before. Automation as I mentioned is an ever and steadily growing problem and in the field of electronics we have many technical personnel being trained today, trained today to take their place and be able to operate these mechanical brains. But one step further behind these mechanical brains is really our engineers and graduates from our universities who are able to interpret and transpose the intricate steps that are taken in any process by converting that process in terms of mathematics into a formula and then that formula is fed into the computer which establishes the control of any process. So that we have got highly skilled electronic engineers who must do the research and must do the transposing of very complicated problems into a simple mathematical formula then this is fed into the computer system and which is looked after by technical people such as our technical training school is training today.

Madam Speaker, I would want to compliment the Honourable Minister of Education in what I felt was the most sensible approach - and I liked his approach and I think that possibly the Honourable Member of Roblin would have done well to have listened to his remarks because I think they were very far fetching. And if I recall rightly the Minister of Education said that the students of today will be performing those duties which do not exist today and I think that the Minister of Education's remarks are well taken because I think that in the same inference he said that we should approach the matter of advancing new ways of industry with a proper understanding, and this, Madam Speaker, is what we need. We need and require a proper understanding to the approach of automation and its impact on society in terms of making sure that labour does have employment so that it does share in the ever industrial growth of this country of Canada, and on the other hand we have industry who is also entitled to share the industrial growth of Canada.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, I would like to just - I hadn't intended to get into this debate - but I did want to speak in favour of this resolution and to share with the House some of the convictions which I know I have come to and is shared by I think some members on this side and opposite. I think probably I have - not being an economist and so on and reading so much these days about automation, I would commend to the honourable members of the House an address given to the Manitoba Educational Association last Wednesday noon by Dr. Solante who is now I believe Research Director for an aircraft firm, the DeHavilland Aircraft, but used to be in head of Defence Production - incidentally a Winnipegger

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) and a medical man by training. Dr. Solante I think jelled certain thoughts in my mind much along the lines of the Honourable Member from Burrows has just said. He said we are, more or less said we are committed to the automated state and we are in a world where ideologies will only be cured by these people, their standard of living being raised much closer to our own and this would in turn reduce world tensions, that being already committed to the automated state there was not the time that was suggested by the previous speaker. While I agree with many of the things he said in principle, I can't disagree, I think that there is not the time. I was impressed by the fact that Dr. Solante did not think we had too much time. He felt that the next five to ten years belonged to education, that in displacing the hundreds of thousands of farm workers - I think he gave the figure over 500,000 in the last few years, and as the Member from Burrows has just said in industry, in the mining operations, they can now be done by closed circuit TV and so on - but in displacing personnel we have to replace them with jobs. These people have to be adaptable and adaptability is the key. I think we have to go back to grass roots and to me the job is simply this, that our boys and girls at the local level throughout our province must get as much basic academic education as they possibly can retain or learn at the local level so that they will be more adaptable when they come into technical schools or university or to secondary education whatever they may choose, and we must pursue this vigorously because as our COMEF report said, in our province we need 70,000 jobs by '65 and the Economic Council of Canada the previous speaker has just said calls for over a million jobs across Canada in the same period of time.

But I think that what prompted me to speak briefly on this matter today was that Dr. Solante felt that our top people, our gifted people, our research people are the people we must look to in the future for the development of those ideas that create secondary industries where we have to keep on being more and more automated to produce more and more goods and so on; that the jobs that are being displaced are the back breaking jobs of the past, the mining which was referred to, the agricultural jobs and so on; and to me he gave a very simple sort of problem applying it practically within our own borders: (a) the kids have to get as much education at the local level as they possibly can; (b) we have to encourage our gifted into research. We have to train a force of adaptable children that is into different types of jobs, so that automation just doesn't create more highly skilled unemployed as it were, our efforts must produce more highly skilled people who have jobs and these jobs are going to be found by the people who do the research. But as he pointed out we are committed to the automated state; we haven't got the time in great numbers of years with which to keep on going.

The examples that were given today by the Member from Burrows, I commend him for bringing these out, that while you don't need accountants but you need computers; as United States said you still need 200,000 mathematicians to run those computers. So in other words, we need more and more of higher and better education. The automated state predicates us to it and the only answer is to continue to enhance the kind of programming we're doing here. I think that the Federal Government type of attitude initiated by the previous Conservative Government and carried on by the present federal authorities, their concept of manpower re-development I think is just going to explode in the next couple of years. I think that both provincially and nationally we're committed to this and the kind of programs that produce more and better people. But it's our job too I think as legislators in giving leadership in our constituencies to urge our boys and girls to gain just as much of the education as they can in order that they can meet the - be adaptable in our world of tomorrow.

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

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, if I might be permitted I would like to speak on the resolution.

MR. HILLHOUSE: All right with me, Madam.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I would like to give a few thoughts on the resolution. I have listened with great interest on the resolution being debated that was first brought in by the Member for Logan. I think it's very timely one and one that we should give consideration to. After all I think automation has been with us for some time already because when we think back on the threshing crews that we had on the farm, even a normal threshing crew had about 25, 30 people employed during that particular season. Today we find that probably one or two people or three at most can do the same work with a combine, and these new

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . propelled harvesters and big truck with a hoist on it, and they can perform all that work just as easily or much easier than that big crew could do in earlier years. I think this is just one of the changes that has taken place and which we all know about, and many more changes are taking place today in industries where newer methods, newer machinery takes the place of men and can do it more efficiently at the same time.

I think we also have to take into consideration the decline of the population in the rural areas, in the rural parts of the province. This means these people, they stay somewhere, and most of them have moved on to the larger centres and are looking for jobs in the urban areas, when already these find difficulty of employing their own people, so I think this matter should receive very close attention. But it seems to me there is one underlying concern aside from just employment I think this is the matter of giving purchasing power to the people who are unemployed or are being unemployed, because these people have to live and they have to receive an income, and we as people in this modern age feel that they deserve a proper income, one that enables them to live at a reasonable standard, have a reasonable standard of living; and today we find that the costs of maintaining these people falls into more or less two categories: one is the Welfare Department, the other one is probably Unemployment Insurance to a large degree. Mind you, I still feel that it's better and it's healthier for people generally, and I think they're also happier too, if they have a good job which keeps their minds occupied. I think we would have less nervous breakdowns; people feel generally more secure, and in general it is good to have full employment as much as possible. But if this is not supposed to be the case, that things might get worse, or even if things remain as they are, we still have a certain amount of unemployment with us and I think we should do everything in our power to improve this wherever possible.

I notice from the Economic Consultative Board's report which was tabled the other day, on Page 3 the Board lists its mandate and records its functions that they're supposed to carry out, and in the second function they enumerate - it says, and I quote: "To consider the views of the various segments of the economy in terms of what might be done to improve its performance." I think this covers a large area and we should do as they say. We should try and improve the performance in our economy.

Now, as I mentioned earlier, the costs of the unemployed falls in two categories in my opinion, and this is our welfare programs, and we know from past records in the Province of Manitoba that costs of welfare are going up every year. We need larger sums each year to cover the costs for welfare, and I think this is partly due to automation. As a result people are unemployed and we have to look after them. Also the Unemployment Insurance Fund has been called on and has to be replenished from time to time to carry out its functions. But, both of these are dependent on the support of taxes so that they can be maintained or retained in operation. We know that taxes reduce - they have to come from somewhere and they come from the employed people - and this means that their income or purchasing power will have to be reduced by that amount to provide for the other people that are out of work. And I feel this is an area that should be looked into. I feel that, as already mentioned, I think, by the Member for Brokenhead, that in years to come we will have to look for a source of supply of funds to carry out this program, providing purchasing power to those people that are unemployed though automation. I think these people that are unemployed because of this shouldn't be looked down to; I think they should have a right to live and that we should look for a source of funds to provide this income for them. I think this should be provided through the Bank of Canada, which can and does create debt free money, so that it would not fall on the taxpayers of Canada to dish up all the money that is needed for this. And matters will be getting worse before they get better, so that it's about time that we took a look at this.

We know that the Bank of Canada today provides funds at no cost except for the handling charge for other purposes. Why cannot we use the Bank of Canada for this purpose? This has been on one of our recommendations as far as Social Credit is concerned for all these years that they've been in existence, and were it not today for such items as pensions, family allowances and these various different kinds of allowances, where would we be? We'd be in a very serious state of affairs. So these are the props that are today keeping and holding our economy and I would like to see that these funds are provided through the Bank of Canada at low cost. These views are not only the views of Social Creditors. They've also been voiced by other people. I have here a report written by Lucien Maynard, and he quotes in his booklet on monetary proposals on Page 43, and I quote: "In his report to the Twentieth Century Fund of the economic problems of the U. S. , Stuart Chase, Page 105 of the volume entitled,

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . 'Where is the money coming from?', quotes the National Resources Planning Board as saying: 'Should the day arrive when the carrying charge on the federal debt becomes oppressive serious thought should be given to the creation by our modern banking and treasury institutions of non-interest bearing debt.' On the same page Stuart Chase states: 'If the government borrows solely from its own central bank without interest there need be no interest burden at all. There would be amortization of the principal and the fundamental prohibition not to pump too many new dollars into the system which still stands'." So that these are authorities who are speaking that way, and I've in the past quoted other people who are holding that same view; and I think the Honourable Member for Brokenhead quoted some authorities when he spoke on this resolution at an earlier date, that at some time or other we will have to come to this conclusion and we will have to look for funds to provide for the unemployed because of automation coming in and support them in this way. I hope that this Consultative Board when it reports annually to the House, as it states in the report that they will make annual reports, that they do look into this aspect of improving the performance of our economy and in this way help the situation.

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

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

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Madam Speaker, I intended that I wouldn't have very much to say when I introduced this resolution in the House, because I thought it was quite necessary and it was the right type of a resolution to present to ask for unanimous support from the members of this House, but after the four experts on agriculture spoke from the Liberal Party, I should answer them -- also the Honourable Member from Radisson. I don't like the way he combs his hair.

In introducing this resolution, Madam Speaker, I said at the offset that I would say as far as my remarks I mean no reflection at all to those who are growing, processing and serving the public in well planned and developed eating establishments. It is only to create a greater interest in the members of this House and the people of this province the high standard of the products that are produced in the province, and I have contacted a good many people that are interested in producing these products.

I have here, Madam Speaker, several letters I had from such people as The Hotel Association, The Restaurant Association, The Retail Merchants Association and others commending me on the introduction -- when I did introduce this resolution into the House, and it is hard for me to understand why some of the members would think that this was a foolish resolution in their remarks when they were speaking.

I have been in this House quite a few years, Madam Speaker, and it is the first time I have been challenged with statements such as has been made in the House. I have introduced resolutions in this House asking for the previous government to implement some form of crop insurance, also asked them, the previous government to ask the Federal Government in Ottawa in those days, in 1954 I think it was, that they would request Ottawa to establish a system of loans on farm-stored grain. I have also asked for other, introduced other resolutions asking along -- help that the farmers needed and needed very bad. And a lot of those, almost all of those, I would say it's safe in saying all of those resolutions are in effect today. So when the learned lawyer from Selkirk who's not in his chair, now speaks the way he spoke when he was speaking to this resolution it's hard for me to understand just how a learned lawyer from the famous port of Selkirk would have the audacity or have the nerve to condemn the seaport and the fish that come out through that seaport such -- riverport -- such as Selkirk. Now he thought that this resolution wasn't necessary at all and he accused me along with some of the others of condemning the Department of Industry and Commerce and during my remarks when I introduced this resolution I never mentioned Industry and Commerce because I knew what they were doing and had the Member from Selkirk been really serious about this and watching the trend of things in his constituency he would have realized that he was way out of line making these remarks -- very much out of line. And I don't know just what the members of his constituency will think when they read Hansard -- if they do read it, I hope they do -- of his remarks in regard to this resolution.

Then we go on to the other agricultural expert from Gladstone, that insurance agent from Neepawa. Now he had a lot to say about this resolution, and one of the things that amused me was he made the suggestion if this was going to be another committee set up by

(MR. SHEWMAN cont'd.) the House and I was going to be Chairman, that he would like to go on a great big bang-up to Italy for two or three years to be able to sample their wine. Now I think that's the prize statement of this session so far. When a member that's supposed to have the interest of agriculture at heart will get up and make a statement in the House such as that I just can't understand it. And yet he hangs his shingle out for an agricultural expert. Now, Madam Speaker, these things are hard, very hard because when I introduced this resolution as I mentioned before, I had talked to a good many people that are producing the products that I mentioned in my speech and I talked to the farm organizations and they all encouraged me to do so. Now I don't know what they will think of the honourable insurance agent from Neepawa in his constituency - I'm not going to be one to go up there and tell them what he said here, I wouldn't for all the rice in China - they'll have to find out for themselves. They'll have to find out for themselves.

Now we had the Honourable Member from Emerson speak on this resolution and boy I don't know whether it's worthwhile mentioning it or not. But he is a turkey expert and he criticized this resolution. True, almost likely he got the thought from that insurance agent, the Honourable Member from Neepawa, about the Honourable Member from Emerson raising 25,000 turkeys, and I forget how many years it would take for the members sitting in this House to eat all those turkeys. But it would appear that the Honourable Member from Emerson is ashamed of his Manitoba turkeys. He wants to call them New York dressed turkeys, that's what he wants to do. Literally he's ashamed of his own product and that's another thing that I cannot understand. Madam Speaker, I think the Liberal Party here have a lot to learn as far as agricultural policies are concerned. They've a long ways to go, and I think one of the most glaring examples - and I hope the co-partners of theirs in Ottawa are not advising them because if they are I've just got an article here, I just happen to have in my hand and it takes place in Vancouver. One of the leading chain stores there have a full page of advertising in their daily paper - and this is all I was asking the members of this House to do, is to push our own Manitoba products, that's all I was asking to do in the first instance, Madam Speaker. But I hope that the Liberals in this House will write, maybe they shouldn't wait to write, maybe they should 'phone the Minister of Agriculture, the Honourable Mr. Hays in Ottawa to see if he has corrected this situation. I will just quote a line or two, and it says: "Steaks, sirloins, T-bone, round, the kind men like to eat, 49 cents a pound. On the grassy slopes of New Zealand ranges graze some of the world's prime cattle, beef that is comparable to our own mature well-finished western steers. Shop-Easy buyers select only the finest backed by our government seal of approval, 'Canada Choice'." Now that's what I'm trying to avoid in Manitoba and the learned experts in agriculture say this is a frivolous resolution that I have before the House today. And they go on to say that this is choice, prime, stamped with the word "Canada" on it. I'm appealing to the Liberal Party in this House to see if this still exists at the western coast and any time that I can be of any help to them - that is the Liberal members in this House, calling themselves agricultural experts - I'd only be too glad, Madam Speaker, to help.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SHEWMAN: I'd like Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, did you put the question yet?

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

MR. SHEWMAN: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

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

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

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Evans, Froese, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Paulley, Roblin, Schreyer, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Desjardins, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak and Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 39; Nays, 13.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

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

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Speaker, in rising to speak on our motion that has been amended I wish to thank the honourable members that took part in the debate, and while I may not agree with all the Honourable Member for Wellington said, I appreciate the amount of work he did in support of his contention. I am a little disappointed in the fact that no member of the Liberal Party saw fit to speak on what we consider an important resolution, because you must remember that since 1929 in some form or other they have been promising some form of medical insurance -- (Interjection). -- Since 1919 my colleague says.

I quoted in introducing the resolution, Madam Speaker, that the Liberals have been giving serious study as of late to the question of going to the country in June and to pushing medicare as the election issue. It's interesting to note that the Pearson administration has appointed 14 civil service committees and he set them up inside the Department of National Health and Welfare to determine the administrative feasibility of the Hall Commission Report. Perhaps the silence on the part of the party here is because the Liberals are giving more study to this all important question.

It was said that some form of medicare would not really represent a radical departure for the Pearson administration because promises of a medical care plan were included in the party's 1962 and 1963 election platforms, and among other things these plans provided for free medical services for the unemployed and children up to 16 as well as a \$25 deductible plan for the rest of the population. I don't wish to devote too much time to criticizing my honourable friends but I am a little disappointed in the fact that they didn't see fit to speak to this.

Now much has been made of the fact that the plan that we recommended was compulsory. What's so wrong with the term compulsory education, and what's so wrong about the compulsory Manitoba Hospital Services Plan? You heard the Honourable Member for Wellington talk about the feeding trough that we have provided for people today. He spoke of the people who were being trained to be sick. These are the actual words, Madam Speaker, and I quote from Page 876 of Hansard. The Honourable Member for Wellington said, "And further, when the government constructs a feeding trough and fills it with fruit extorted from the people, it creates new claimants and aggravates the problems it was supposed to solve, as I have endeavoured to show you," and continually through his speech he refers to this question of people taking advantage. Now I know, Madam Speaker, that there are people that do this sort of thing but I don't agree that they are the majority, and this is a problem no matter what sort of plan you have.

The amendment to the resolution stresses the fact that the government did make a presentation to the commission in 1962, and I wish to quote, Madam Speaker, on Page 11, No. 47. The Premier was submitting his brief and he said, "What then is the solution? It is our opinion that medical coverage should be available to all citizens of Manitoba and it is our further opinion that any such scheme must be based on three essential principles: (1) that it be universally available; (2) that it be at a stipulated premium within the range of the great majority of the citizens of Manitoba; and (3) that it be voluntary." Now we have seen voluntary plans and we mustn't forget that the Hall Commission has recommended against the voluntary plans because it claims that these plans would cost 22 percent more than the compulsory plan as they have it in Saskatchewan.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland made much about the Alberta plan the other day but I am going to loan him a comparison between Alberta's plan and the Saskatchewan plan, Madam Speaker, and I don't wish to burden the records with all this but it's very interesting to see. For example, a subscriber over the age of 65 has less protection against high premium rates than before, just when his need for assistance may be sharply increased. For most Alberta residents the plan does little but change in a minor degree the existing voluntary plans which they may or may not belong to, but for the man with two children on a gross income of only \$260 there will be no help whatever. He will be responsible for the full premium up to \$159 per year. Under the Saskatchewan plan he would pay less than \$45.00.

To illustrate just how restricted the program is, in Regina an employee could earn \$5.00 a week less than the minimum wage and still get no subsidy whatever. You must remember that Alberta's plan is a premium subsidy plan, Madam Speaker. You must also remember that in Alberta no physiotherapy is given. It's not covered whatever in the Alberta plan where it is in the Saskatchewan plan. There's a 12 month waiting period for psycho-therapy. I would certainly recommend that the honourable member in making comparison between the Alberta

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd) plan and the Saskatchewan plan should read this.

Now what about the voluntary plans. We have had MMS and I submitted on many occasions that it was not sufficient. For instance, Madam Speaker, in Manitoba, 70 percent of the people are covered by MMS in the metro area but only 40 percent of the whole population of the province is covered by the MMS. I have pointed out on more than one occasion the inadequacy of the MMS plan and I repeat again my perennial announcement about the aged lady of over 80 that pays out of her sole income of \$75 per month a premium of nearly \$15 per quarter and whose only need is for drugs, and yet she cannot acquire these under the plan as envisaged by the MMS, and yet under advertisement they claim a Manitoba first -- "comprehensive medical care available for all citizens."

Well if this is the sort of thing that this government envisages, Madam Speaker, I submit that they are away off base. I'm just as sure as I'm standing here, Madam Speaker, that within the next two or three years we are going to see the plan just as we saw the Manitoba Hospital Services Plan become a reality. I can remember at our urban association meetings when certain members of the Liberal Party took the stand then when we were trying to get the compulsory Manitoba Hospital Services Plan launched that the people in Manitoba were not ready for this sort of thing. Well we have found out that the people of Manitoba were ready and are accepting it very gratefully.

Now the Premier in making his submission also said that the government of Manitoba agreed with neither of the extreme views, that is he didn't agree with the compulsory plan and he didn't agree with the inadequate private plans that were existing at the present time. He said, "It is our conviction that compulsion is not necessary in this case, that compulsion will not create facilities; that compulsion will not provide necessary personnel. We also disagree with those who allege that the present schemes are all-encompassing and available to all." That's an important thing, Madam Speaker. The Premier did see that these schemes were not all-encompassing and he said, "It is our experience that there are many citizens of Manitoba for whom the present schemes are not available, that the present schemes are priced beyond their means, and among these we include those persons who are not and cannot be classified as indigents for whom coverage is essential."

Time after time, Madam Speaker, in this House, we have pointed out that while the government tends to boast a little over its Manitoba Social Allowances Act -- and it is a good thing -- we have to keep reminding them that it is for the indigent, and here we see the Premier admitting this on Page 11 of the submission where he says that there are many many people who do not and who are not able to pay into these private plans.

Madam Speaker, we heard a moment ago on the speech on automation that we are committed to the automated state. The Honourable Minister of Education quoted Dr. Solante as saying that we are committed to the automated state. I just wondered when I heard him say that, and I know to say anything about the welfare state in this House is rather a nasty thing, but are we not also committed to a little more of the welfare state? I don't think that it's so awful really when we hear professors talking about how we are going to train people to indulge in the arts in order to pass their spare time in the future. Is this the blessing of automation? I believe it is. I believe that we are going to have to -- I think the problem of spare time will be probably one of the bigger problems.

We heard the Honourable Member for Rhineland just say a few moments ago that he believes that such things as Unemployment Insurance and Children's Allowance -- he defined them as props of society. I believe that that's true, Madam Speaker. I think that all these things have bolstered the economy of Canada and I do not know why we have to be so afraid of a compulsory comprehensive medical scheme.

Madam Speaker, I find myself unable to support the amendment because it specifically points out that it would be based on the question of need. I think it has to be more all-encompassing than that, Madam Speaker, and therefore I intend to vote against the amendment.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, the amended motion is what we are voting on, and I would suggest that if you think the amended motion is lost, that you call for the voice vote again.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question on the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution as amended, and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. PAULLEY: On division.

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

MR. PAULLEY: I beg the indulgence, Madam Speaker, to allow this to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Springfield, and the proposed sub-amendment by the Honourable the Member for Gladstone. The Honourable the Member for La Verendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, we now have before us the amendment to the amendment which was actually replacing my original resolution asking for the use of tax-free gasoline in farm trucks. When one looks at the resolution, the amendment and the sub-amendment, I think one has to agree that it is apparent that it is not easy to come up with the real solution to the problem of allowing the farmer the amount of tax-free gasoline that he should get.

Now reading what has been said on this resolution, I am wondering whether my first resolution was really understood when I read the Honourable Member from Springfield saying, "I do not think that coloured tax-free gasoline would solve the problem of the farmers of Manitoba or anywhere probably in the world." Well certainly, Madam Speaker, I don't think that this was a United Nations resolution and was that important.

Then he says further, "I think by trying to allow coloured tax-free gasoline for the farmers would cause a great deal of confusion and discomfort to many farmers because a farmer could not always be driving around with his truck on the farm." Well this is just the point, Madam Speaker. He cannot use the truck on the farm with purple gas and then change the gas when he goes out and put amber gasoline. On the other hand, if he is allowed tax-free gasoline and he is caught with taxed gasoline, I don't think the government would object.

Now he further says, "I am interested to know what we are going to do right here in the Province of Manitoba for our own farmers." Well certainly I agree with that part of his statement because I think we are doing much less than what is being done in the west by other provinces, and this was the reason for me bringing in my resolution.

Now the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture chastizes us by saying, "My honourable friend from Emerson seems to be terribly troubled about the fact that the government benches have found a good idea, and why couldn't they have found it some time ago? Well the Liberal benches couldn't find the answer at all." Then later he says, "The only thing that I can say to the Honourable Member for Emerson is that it didn't take us as long to find out that we were on the wrong scent as it has obviously taken him and his colleagues, because I think from an administrative point of view it is a pretty neat way of giving recognition compared with trying to set up administration of a refund for farm trucks."

Well, Madam Speaker, what have they found out? When I read the resolution it says, "Therefore be it resolved that the government consider the advisability of extending such further recognition to bona fide farmers operating farm truck licenses under The Highway Traffic Act by way of a reduction in farm truck license fees." Well, Madam Speaker, I don't think my honourable friend is too serious when he suggests that exactly two months after we just added a 25 percent increase in truck licenses. I don't think this is serious, and I can't see why he is so pleased with the suggestion all of a sudden which comes only two months after there was an increase, and at the same time there was no increase in the CT or PSV trucks.

My honourable friend the Member for Gladstone suggests that we have a straight \$10.00 fee. Well at least there is something constructive, there is something concrete about this resolution which set the real amount that we are to deduct -- that we are to allow the farmers.

The Honourable Member from Souris-Lansdowne figures that if we allow purple gasoline that the farmers will take off for a trip with a couple of drums of gas in the truck. Well first I don't think they will. I don't think they'd want to mix up their luggage with drums of gasoline, and on the second part, this wouldn't be harmful to the province in the first place because once they are out of the province they wouldn't be buying Manitoba gas anyway. Furthermore, you will find that many provinces have legislation that prohibits more than a certain amount of gasoline when you enter the province. As all members know, for a long time I was a truck driver and I often had my tank checked before entering the province of Ontario for example where we were only allowed to enter the province with 40 gallons of gasoline, so this is not too serious a point.

Now as I said before, I'm not one who thinks that I have the exact solution to the problem and I don't think anybody has. If we look at what has happened in the past, I think the first method that we had of the farmers asking for a refund for that part that was used by farm trucks

(MR. VIELFAURE cont'd). . . . on the farm, for farm machinery at that time, was the best one. This government shows different, because in the words of the First Minister we were being cheated of a half a million dollars a year by the farmers of this province. I don't think this is right, but anyways that was the reason given when we introduced purple gasoline.

Now has the purple gasoline legislation solved the problem? I don't think so. In an Order for Return that I have here, in 1964 there were 53 persons convicted of an offence under Section 24 of The Gasoline Tax Act. Now these people were convicted and paid a total of \$2,425 in fines. Now of course if fifty people paid a fine there is certainly fifty that were using purple gasoline. Now there were only five inspectors to look after five Acts so I don't imagine there were too many checked, and if we have found out these many in default I am sure there were many more using the purple gas. This system in itself is far from perfect and at the same time we are not giving the exemption that I think we should give the farmers because certainly they are allowed some tax-free gasoline due to the operation that they have.

Now my honourable friends also should remember when they are suggesting that they have come out with something entirely new that nobody else has thought of, there's a few things that they have done. In the last few years -- I think the first increase was in 1960 since they have been the government. The tax was only 11 cents; it was brought up to 14 cents; and last year again to 17 cents; and on top of that the license fees were increased by 25 percent.

Now if we look at what happens in the other provinces, even if we do give a reduction of 25 percent which would just cover the last increase, this would put us back still over Saskatchewan for example, because a 6,000 pound truck - which is usually called a half-ton, and in my estimation the most trucks used are either a half-ton or a three-ton on the farm - well the 6,000 pound truck in Manitoba now pays 12.50 plus 25 percent which would be approximately \$15.00. Well in Saskatchewan he only pays 12.50, and furthermore is allowed tax-free gasoline. In Saskatchewan, the 24,000 pound three-ton truck is paying \$30.00 while in Manitoba it is 57.50 plus the 25 percent which makes it about \$72.00. Furthermore, in Manitoba the farmer pays for all his other taxes - gas taxes or the gas used in his car, 17 cents, which is three cents more than Saskatchewan and five cents more than Alberta.

So I think that my honourable friend by suggesting a straight \$10.00 fee has maybe not the exact solution, but in the matter of the three-ton truck he would save the farmer - 10 from 72 - he would save him \$62.00. On the half-ton it would be a very little saving, as a matter of fact only about \$5.00, but at least it is something concrete; it is something that you can make figures of and you can show the farmer that something is being allowed to him; and therefore I also will be glad to support this sub-amendment.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Chernicak, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright. **NAYS:** Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 19; Nays, 32.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The amendment of the Honourable Member for Springfield. Are you ready for the question?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this amendment of the Member for Springfield, I'm at a complete loss to understand the attitude of the government. The Minister of Agriculture got up the other day and supported the idea of a reduction in license fees for farmers. The Member for Springfield gets up and proposes this amendment and then he votes against it when we try to be helpful on this situation. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the amendment introduced by the Member for Springfield is absolutely meaningless and the government has no intentions of doing anything. A suggestion is put forward by this side of the House and automatically it's got to be voted down regardless of what the contents. Even if it's supporting one of their own resolutions or their own amendments, they must vote against it just on principle. So -- (Interjection) -- pardon? May not be good enough? I watch with interest to see what you do with it.

Mr. Chairman, since this session got under way, every resolution I can recall has been

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd) voted down by the government or amended. They will accept nothing from this side regardless whether we put it forward or members of the NDP, and therefore I have no other conclusion that the amendment submitted by the Member for Springfield was absolutely meaningless and they weren't sincere in their suggestion at all.

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

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

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may have permission to speak at this time.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Why certainly everyone can speak if they wish.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before you put the question on adjournment, I merely wish to say at this time that I support the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Springfield. I said so before. However, I think there is a very important question that should be asked of the honourable member and of government members generally, and that is, what scale of a reduction in license fees do they envisage here, because this whole thing could be a joke.

The proposed sub-amendment which was defeated, which was proposed by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, proposed a reduction to a \$10.00 basic minimum. Now it may well be that the government felt this was too drastic a reduction, and if they felt so you could say that they had some amount of credibility on their side. However, if the Honourable Member for Springfield when he proposed the amendment had in mind a reduction of a couple of dollars, or three or four dollars, this could well be a joke, this amendment that was proposed by the honourable member, especially, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that it was only a few months ago that this government increased the fees. Therefore, if they reduce it only marginally now, they will in effect be reducing the fee to that level which it was only scarce months ago and that would be foolish indeed.

So therefore whatever the government has in mind -- the honourable member has in mind - we don't know what they have in mind, it's rather mysterious, they haven't named any levels or figures - but I would hope for their own sake if they don't want to look ludicrous and silly, that the reduction that they propose here is more than was the increase that was established only a few months ago, otherwise this amendment is simply false labour on their part. I don't know what other term could better describe their tactical manoeuvre. So we on this side can only be hopeful that the reduction proposed by the amendment is one which takes the fee level substantially below the level of license fees before the most recent increase.

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Wellington. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, my reading of The Amusement Tax Act which deals with the censorship of moving pictures leads me to the conclusion that a moving picture theatre operator is only allowed by law to exhibit those motion pictures that have been censored by the Censor Board, and that he must indicate by sign or other notice the classification of the particular film or films that he is exhibiting. I do not think that there is any further obligation placed upon the operator of a moving picture theatre to exclude therefrom children who seek admission to see a film or a motion picture which has been described or classified as "Restricted Adult." Now I may be wrong in my reading of the Act but I don't think I am.

But the point I wish to make is this, Mr. Speaker. I have the greatest respect for the Honourable Member for Wellington. I know he's consistent and sincere in all views that he expresses in this House, but I am a little amazed that the Honourable Member for Wellington who is such a rugged individualist should suggest to the Government of Manitoba that it place itself in local parentis to every child in Manitoba, because exactly that is what this would do if this resolution were placed into effect.

Now I still am sufficiently old-fashioned to believe that the responsibility for the morals of youths, that is the primary responsibility for the morals of our youth lies with the parents,

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd) and as long as motion picture exhibitors display to the public the classification of the films or pictures that they are showing, I think the duty lies with the parents, if they're not satisfied that that is the right type of picture for their child or their children to see, to keep their children out of that theatre. I think there's far too much emphasis today being placed upon the state as an agency in bringing up children, and I think the sooner we get back to the old-fashioned idea that children are the responsibility of parents the better it'll be for society in general.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I agree fully every word almost with the argument advanced by the Honourable Member from Selkirk. All the time during the present session, on many occasions all we did was legalize, legalize, legalize. When it came to education - no money, no help nowheres--(Interjection)--I don't say general education. --(Interjection)--How much have you given on education of alcohol? I'm not speaking about education of the schools--(Interjection)--Pardon?

A MEMBER: He asked for it.

MR. PAULLEY: You had no right to answer him.

MR. GRAY: There is at least in one case now. Supposing we pass the resolution and it becomes a law. No. 1, you got to have policing of it. No. 2, you'll make liars of the children. No. 3, they cannot join their parents at any time because the parents will go to a movie that's marked "adult" and the children will go to a "general" movie. This way they could at least join their parents and go to the movies together. How can you distinguish between 16 and 17? Can you spoil a girl of 17 and not of 16? If the girl wants, or the child or the boy wants to go to a movie, he'll lie to them. He'll probably not have his birth certificate.

I think in my opinion it's absolutely wrong and just another resolution which will not work. It will not help anyone and it'll take away every bit of responsibility from the parents, and God knows we have enough of neglect of the parents in other cases. Let us at least stick with these which don't do any harm, because our own censors are examining the picture, and even if it's an adult picture they are not letting anything which is absolutely wrong be shown, so I think that we are just simply crawling on four walls. Let's defeat it and I hope the government will help us to defeat this resolution.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a word in connection with this resolution. It seems to me, if I recall correctly, when the Honourable Member for Wellington was introducing the resolution that we have before us, it seemed to me that he proposed this resolution generally based on some representations that were made to him as a private member of the Legislature; and if I recall correctly, at that particular time my honourable friend in reply to one of the questions that was directed toward him says, "well I don't know too much about it, I never go to movies so therefore I don't know too much about the motion that I'm presenting for the consideration of the House."

I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, if you will look at the resolution itself that you will come to that conclusion yourself, because the resolution says, "Therefore be it resolved that if motion picture theatres continue to make it possible, then the government should take whatever action it deems advisable and necessary." I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the resolution itself is the type of a resolution that we shouldn't really give much serious consideration to based on the preposition "if".

I would say that if there had been evidence produced by the mover of the resolution or an indication that such was a fact, then we should properly I suggest consider the contents of the resolution; and I suggest that in the terminology of the resolution that we have, it seems to me that there is a reflection made on the motion picture theatres that they may not be entitled to receive.

So I would suggest that on that basis alone I could not support the resolution that is proposed. If the situation is a definite circumstance that this is happening, then I would suggest that a resolution of that type should be forthcoming; and again if the government is aware of a situation and that the legislation does not contain certain regulations or necessary regulations or the legislation has not got sufficient elements of policing within it, then the onus then should be on the government to propose the legislation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I find that I cannot support a resolution of this type because there appears to be no substantiation at all. It does appear to me however that there is a sort of a reflection on motion pictures in the Province of Manitoba by the use of the word "if" in

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) the resolution.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. RICHARD SEABORN (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to adjourn the debate, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Selkirk and the proposed motion in amendment thereto of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, on this resolution and amendment thereto, it seemed to me that both the proposer and the Member from Wellington seemed to be a little confused in their way of thinking on this motion. Now labour is asking that this clause and subsection (3) be thrown out because it doesn't do them any good at all. When we say that, we don't want any after effects. We say it should be thrown out and that's it.

What went before was good enough and was fair enough, but right today they are hamstringing labour and giving everything to the employers in this respect, that they hold labour back seven days before they can put in an application to strike. In the meantime, the lawyer can do what he likes in that particular time with his employee.

Now I have heard it said here that the employers -- it seems the same. That may be so, but I know that if you are an employee working for a man you haven't very much to say for yourself, because if you've got a wife and kids working -- wife and kids I would say and you are working for that man, there's not much you can say. So I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this clause 21, subsection (3) should be thrown out. The subsection imposes governmental supervision over employees' decisions, and whereas the subsection imposes participation of non-union persons in union activities, and whereas the section imposes participation by employers in employee activities, and whereas participation imposed by law is used by some employers to weaken and destroy employee bargaining hours.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know for myself -- I listened to the Member for Wellington say he was a union member, he was a union member when he was 15 years old. Now I can tell him that I have gone one better than him. I was 14 years old when I was a union member and I'm proud of that, and before me my father was and my grandfather was. I can go back and say that during the time of the Chartists in the old country my people were there. They were politically minded and they knew that with the people that were there, the landed gentry, they had to do something for themselves.

First of all, where I was there was a Tory member--(Interjection)--That's bad, yes, that's bad. Then there was only two parties. Well you're between the devil and the deep blue sea, so they went ahead and said now we'll take the lesser evil, we'll go Liberal, so they went Liberal. Then they thought for themselves, well this is no good either. There's no place I can go now, what should I do? Well I'm going to go independent, so they went independent. Well that was fine, but eventually through the years the labour movement come in there and after that they never had no more of Independent, Conservative or Liberal. Ever since I've known, in my part there, there's always been Labour MPs and we've carried on that way.

Now I wouldn't say that that is going to continue that way because what industry we have there is going away from there, but we always look at it in this way, that we try to do for our people as much as we can, and here we are trying to do the same. We are not knocking the employer; we are trying to get things straightened out so that both sides can understand one another, can have mutual trust. We can't have mutual trust while this is thrust upon us, so therefore I say that we should throw this Section 21, subsection (3) out.

Now you say, what does Labour want? What does Labour want? It wants the earth and the fullness thereof. There is nothing too precious, there is nothing too lofty, too ennobling unless it is within the scope and comprehension of Labour's aspirations and wants. We want more schools and less jails. We want more books and less arsenals; more learning and less vice; more constant work and less crying; more leisure and less greed; more justice and less revenge; and in fact more of the opportunities to cultivate our better natures and to make manhood more noble and to make womanhood more beautiful and childhood more happy and bright. Thank you.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Gray, Güttermson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Evans, Froese, Hamilton, Harrison, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Seaborn, Shewman, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 19; Nays, 29.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Selkirk. Are you ready for the question?

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

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie and the proposed motion in amendment thereto of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate for the Honourable the Minister of Labour.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I felt that I should join in this debate at this time. I find on reviewing the debates I would like to be in a position where I could support the amendment and I'd like to be in a position where I could support the main resolution. I find on reviewing the amendment that we can substantially support it; and I find on reviewing the resolution that the aims and objects really of the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie are the same as our aims and objects. It seems unfortunate that he did not accept the fact that this committee was established at the request and with the consent of the parties themselves. It was not set up at the whim of the Minister. I think that as he reviews the statement that I made in an earlier debate that this point will be quite clear.

Now for the amendment, the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party has proposed several propositions if we are to establish a Labour-Management Committee by this House. He has proposed that it would report regularly; that it would be established on a continuing basis; and that actually the government would give consideration to the recommendations of the committee, the recommendations submitted to the government by labour and by management and by the public in general. Now we do this.

The resolution itself asks for a Labour-Management Committee, asking that it be provided with whatever research assistance is necessary and asking that it be supported by the University. So that, Mr. Speaker, I find myself in a quandary at this time in that to move an amendment to the amendment according to our rules would be out of order because substantially it does nothing to change the amendment.

The other proposition is that I would like to change the body of the main resolution establishing this Labour-Management Committee as a committee established by the Legislature and responsible to the government. I think that this will satisfy all of us in this House. I think possibly it is one time since this session has started where there is certainly a fair degree of unanimity, at least in the purposes that we are seeking. I can think of no better committee to do this than a committee that has been established at the request and with the consent of the parties themselves.

I'm afraid at this time if we see no way around the particular dilemma, that we will have to vote against the amendment and I will introduce an amendment to the main motion unless there is another way to get out of this particular quandary. I can't see it at the moment as I look at the rules.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Labour would permit a question at this stage.

MR. BAIZLEY: Yes, sure, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: My question would be, it seems to me, Mr. Minister, that your problem is one of the rules of order and the rules of the House and I presume that you have considered all this. You have in essence made a statement that the general principles contained within the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). amendment that I have proposed are acceptable to the government. I believe this to be correct. My question to you, Sir, is that on the basis of your statement of the acceptance of the principles of the amendment proposed by myself being withdrawn, you would be prepared to accept them and embody them in any further amendment which you might make to the main motion that then would come within the rules of the orders of procedure. Is that correct?

MR. BAIZLEY: That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HILLHOUSE: if the Honourable Minister would accede to this suggestion, then it would appear to me that you would be agreeable to a resolution similar to that introduced here provided there were certain changes made in it. Is that right?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, what I was thinking of at the present time providing I had unanimous consent of the House, in view of the statement of the Minister that he accepts the principles contained within my amendment, I would with the, and I have to have this I believe at this stage, Mr. Speaker, I would be prepared on receiving that consent to withdraw my amendment in order to facilitate the Minister accepting that and bringing it in on an amendment to the main motion.

MR. HILLHOUSE: My suggestion was going a step further and was trying to consolidate everything into one action. My suggestion would be this, with the unanimous consent of the House this resolution could stand on the Order Paper adjourned in the Minister's name, and if the parties could get together and work out a resolution which would be acceptable to us all, then the thing could be passed by the House.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask if I have the unanimous consent of the House to withdraw my amendment. I have the word -- I accept the word of the Minister of Labour that the principles enunciated by myself in my resolution will be acceptable. The barrier is unanimous consent and I ask for that now.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it agreed that the House will give unanimous consent to the withdrawal of the proposed amendment of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party?

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, before that question is put, has the government agreed to that procedure?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): I have spoken for our side of the House in saying that we agree to this being done.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shall unanimous consent to the withdrawal of this amendment of the Leader of the New Democratic Party be given by the members of this House? ---- There is unanimous consent so this proposed amendment is thereby withdrawn and we have before the House the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Public Works, that the resolution of the Member for Portage la Prairie be amended by striking out all the words following the word "foregoing" in the first line of the second paragraph thereof and substitute therefore the words "is through study and research on labour and management problems."

Insert immediately after the second paragraph thereof and before "therefore" in the third paragraph the following: "and whereas the Economic Consultative Board is composed of labour and management representatives and is developing programs for industrial development through research analysis in consultation with labour and management; And whereas the Minister of Labour has established a joint Labour-Management Review Committee composed of twelve representatives selected by labour, twelve representatives selected by management, with a Chairman from a university and a Vice-Chairman from the legal profession; And whereas such Labour-Management Review Committee has been functioning for several months and is making good progress towards developing a better understanding between labour and management and in reviewing Manitoba's labour legislation."

Then we strike out all of the resolution following the word "resolved" in the third paragraph and substitute therefor the following: "(a) that the joint Labour-Management Review Committee set up by the Minister of Labour and commonly known as the Woods Committee be approved and endorsed by this House; (b) that such committee function on a continuing basis; (c) that the government give consideration to continuing to provide this committee with such research facilities as the committee may request from time to time to enable it to carry out its functions most effectively; (d) that the committee make an annual report to the Minister of Labour as to its deliberations, and its findings to be laid before this Legislature fifteen days after the commencement of each annual session; and (e) that the government recommend

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd).....improvements in the labour legislation of the province as from time to time it deems advisable and give due consideration to the recommendations of the joint committee as well as to any other submissions which may be made by labour, management or the general public.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, could you give us a ruling as to whether or not that amendment is in order? It has changed the meaning completely.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would rule that that amendment is in order. I think it certainly has to do with the matter that the original motion has to do with and it is in order.

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

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I suggest it is 5:30.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now 5:30 and I will leave the House until 8:00 o'clock.