

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 11, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'd like to take a moment of the time of the House and introduce our student guests. We have in the gallery with us today 24 students of Grade 5 standing of the Robert H. Smith School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Sim. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. We also have 46 students of Grade 7 standing from the Gladstone Elementary school. These students are under the direction of Mr. Krahn and Miss Watt. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. There are also 40 students of Grade 11 and 12 standing of the Brandon Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Loucks. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Brandon. We also have 21 students of Grade 6 standing from the Clifton School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Avery. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wellington. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the cost of milk is a live issue today, has the government given any consideration to a publicly-owned system for the distribution of milk owned either at the provincial or the municipal level; and if it has could we hear comment from the government on this matter?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, this is obviously a question of policy in which if there were any to announce it would be made by the government in due course.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister. Can my honourable friend indicate to the House as to whether or not continuing or a resumption of representations will be made in respect of the retention of Air Canada in Manitoba or at least a curtailment of the continuing exodus of well-trained personnel to other parts of Canada.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I thank my honourable friend for raising this point because it is a very important one and I regret to say that since I spoke on this subject in the House in respect of a resolution now on the Order Paper that it seems to me that since our deliberation at that time that further measures are called for. Consequently I am hopeful that we will be able to resume our discussion on that resolution soon, because when I close the debate on it I would like to lay before the House the plans the government has in respect to pursuing the matter that has been raised.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may in all due respect to my honourable friend and his resolution that the progress the House is making at the present time dealing with resolutions, that may be some time. I want to ask, however, my honourable friend whether or not the government has under consideration the recalling or the reconstituting of the committee or delegation that travelled to Ottawa on two or three occasions to make representation in respect of this very important matter.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm a little more optimistic than my honourable friend about the time element involved. It would be our hope that we would perhaps soon be able to call this resolution to continue the discussion on it; but it is the intention of the government to take further steps. I'm not able to say at the moment whether it consists of precisely the suggestion raised by my honourable friend but something very close to it is what we have in mind.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, if I may, may I suggest to the Honourable the First Minister that he give consideration to a proposal which seemed to emanate from discussions held in Ottawa this morning where Air Canada was discussed in committee; and where I understand it was stated that in order to expand the facilities which will be needed in Dorval in the next two or three years some \$4 million will be required; and the figure was given that in order to establish similar facilities in Winnipeg to do the same work as

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) . . . . in Dorval the cost would be \$16 million and there was no indication that there would be any difference in the continuing costs thereafter, certainly no increased costs based on a Winnipeg operation.

It seems therefore that the difference between regional development and decentralization in Winnipeg as compared with Dorval is some \$12 million in capital expenditure and may I suggest that the Honourable the First Minister and the Minister of Industry and Commerce might well think about ways and means to entice the Federal Government into some sort of a cost-sharing basis for this \$12 million to see what could be done about relocation back to Winnipeg.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I thank my honourable friend for the information about the committee meeting in Ottawa which I must confess comes as news to me as I have not seen that reported as yet. But it would be our intention, among other things, to have a thorough review of the Thomson Commission report in this matter because we believe that not only are the conclusions open to challenge but the facts on which they are based have changed substantially since that report was compiled and we are prepared to go to the Government of Canada with a restatement of our views in this whole matter. Involved in that is of course the fact that at Dorval they are now going to two shifts with respect to the maintenance crew in that location, and also that it appears from the expansion programs of Air Canada that there will be plenty of room in the overhaul field for both Winnipeg and Dorval. And it is with all these points in mind that we intend to reopen this matter in the way that I have indicated, and we will of course be soliciting the support of the community for a new approach to the matter as we have done before. But at the risk of - I must confess I have my statement ready now with respect to the closing of the debate and rather than go through this detail which is not appropriate at the moment, I merely would indicate that we are taking a positive and we trust constructive approach to have this matter reviewed again with a view to obtaining a more satisfactory result than the last time.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, in all deference to my honourable friend, if my honourable friend's statement is of such importance to the economy of Manitoba, I would suggest to my honourable friend that rather than await the conclusion of the debate of his resolution which is a far-ranging proposition that my honourable friend makes his statement now in order that we know what course of action that the Province of Manitoba is going to take, or contemplates taking in respect to the retention of Air Canada facilities or the expansion thereof here in Manitoba.

MR. ROBLIN: I thank my honourable friend but I think I will seek a more suitable occasion.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Water Control and Conservation in connection with the present situation on the Red River and with particular reference to that portion thereof lying from the St. Andrews Locks north to Petersfield. Have the efforts of the government in trying to blast the ice jam been successful, or what is the present situation there?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Highways) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I think the Honourable Member for Selkirk and members of the House will be happy to know that a very short time ago the efforts were successful and the river is now moving freely. There is some concern about the backlog of water affecting people in low lying areas north; diking materials have been provided and everything is being done that can be done. While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, members might also be interested to know that the Red River is believed to be cresting now in Winnipeg.

MR. HILLHOUSE: A supplementary question. Has the government finalized its plans for controlling and protecting the lands on the west shore of Lake Winnipeg and the low lying lands north of Selkirk to the, say the Town of Winnipeg Beach? I might say that there's considerable concern among the people there and particularly in the low areas just north of Selkirk, because quite a number of these people have been flooded out and have had to leave their homes.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, no.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the Honourable Minister of Highways. Sir, you probably read in the paper that Princess Alexandria was coming to Manitoba, would be landing in Rivers on June 5th and motoring to Brandon. The people in my area have wondered if Highway 25 which is the highway that she'll motor to Brandon on will be resurfaced in time for her motoring trip to Brandon on June 5th.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I think that it's only the newness of the Honourable Member from Hamiota that would allow him to ask that question. It would be a physical impossibility to have the job completed by that time, but I think that he can rest assured that every effort will be made to have the road in good shape, with the usual manner of the operation of the Department of Highways.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. According to news reports of yesterday some probe or attempt to reopen negotiations with Ottawa over getting more money for the Pan American Games has been associated with the name of Mayor Juba. I was wondering if the Minister was aware of these probes or official or unofficial attempts or whether he was participating in them as well.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would be appropriate for me to comment on this newspaper report.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to direct a question once again to the Minister of Public Utilities. When can I expect to receive the 50 copies of that address or statement that you read into the records the other day in reply to the driving record? Remember you promised me 50 copies of a statement.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Public Utilities) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, if I look surprised it's only because I thought they had already gone forward. I'm sorry.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, in answer to a question yesterday with regard to Oak Hammock Marsh, the Department will be making a further study of the area toward the end of May. It will be an examination of the area by a team consisting of the Water Resources people, Mines and Natural Resources Lands Branch and Ducks Unlimited. This group will look over the three proposals which have been made for possible development of the area and to determine which appears to be the most practical insofar as cost and benefit are concerned and also the least disturbing to other interests.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): May I ask my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, when it may be contemplated that the survey will be made and completed.

MR. EVANS: I don't know.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): I thank the Minister for the answer he gave us to this question. I just would like to know if he is aware that three studies have already been made on this question. How many more do we really need?

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): I'd like to direct a question to the Provincial Treasurer. Could he give me any further information regarding the study he is making regarding the reducing of the royalty on muskrats in view of the depressed price?

MR. EVANS: The matter of royalties on muskrats is one on which I understand there is a large degree of interprovincial agreement. It has always been the practice to have an agreement with adjacent provinces concerning the royalty rates and consequently any change will be carried out in consultation with the other provinces. There is also the fact that we're halfway through a delivery season and it's a very difficult matter to change a royalty rate halfway through a season when some people will have delivered their pelts and paid their royalties and others have not yet made the delivery. For those reasons it may not be possible to effect a change in those rates quickly.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask a question of the Honourable the Attorney-General. Is it correct that there are no copies available of the Rule Book of the House for Members of the House?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): I have no idea, Mr. Speaker, That's a matter that falls within the purview of the Clerk of the House.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, a subsequent question: I understood that it was the intention of the government to reconvene the Committee on the Rules of the House. Can the Minister indicate when this will be done? It's my understanding that the Rule Book is not available, there are not copies, and I think it's urgent therefore that we reconvene the committee and get a proper rule book bringing up to date the information. When will this be done?

MR. LYON: The resolution will be appearing on the Order Paper anytime. When we'll get to the resolution is another question, of course.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources. The statement that you have just made regarding the Oak Hammock Marsh, was that in reference or in reply to the question asked by the Leader of the NDP respecting St. Andrews bog?

MR. EVANS: It is the information with which I was furnished in answer to the question that was asked yesterday. Now my honourable friend, my predecessor in the portfolio, tells me that they are the same marsh. -- (Interjection) -- The answer to your question is yes, it was intended to be in reply to that question.

MR. HILLHOUSE: A supplementary question then. What area does your understanding of the Oak Hammock marsh comprise? Because the St. Andrews bog is partly in my constituency and partly in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and I know that the expression "Oak Hammock marsh" is rather loosely used, and I was just wondering what area was comprised in your reference to that designation.

MR. EVANS: I'll take notice of the question.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Members of the House should be made aware of a worthwhile Centennial project. The Canada Ethnic Press Federation with the Canada Press Club and with the assistance of the Canadian Centennial Commission have invited 64 French editors, journalists and radio and TV writers, who are presently in the province. - This is an exchange program such as has been going on with the students and they are here for a few days and they are going to see the rest of western Canada.

Monsieur le Président, je crois que ces visites ont certainement de grandes importances non seulement un échange d'étudiants mais un échange de journalistes et aussi d'hommes d'affaires - auraient certainement de montrer aux gens - comme il est facile de vivre ensemble en canadiens, en unité, même si on a certains problèmes. J'espère donc que - j'aimerais à souhaiter la bienvenue à ces gens, - j'espère qu'ils auront bons voyages et qu'ils nous connaîtront un peu mieux. TRANSLATION: Mr. Speaker, I think that these visits are certainly of great importance - not only because of an exchange of students but also of business men, will certainly prove how easy it is to live together as Canadians, in unity, even though we have certain problems. I wish to welcome these people; I hope they will have a good journey and that they will get to know us a little better.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to share my concern with the Members of the House with respect to recent policy announcements by the Canadian Dairy Commission. Members no doubt are aware that we here in Manitoba have recently been deficient in our supply of dairy products after - this coming after long years of oversupply. --(Interjection)-- I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I'm told I should ask for permission for a short statement. --(Interjection)-- Right.

We have been very encouraged of late with the transition that's taken place in the dairy industry, that is the changeover from farm separated cream to the shipping of whole milk for manufacturing purposes. This has proven most advantageous to the farmers as a rule and provided for expanded manufacturing as well. The recent announcements of the Dairy Commission indicate that subsidies in the forthcoming year, that is '67-68, will be paid on the basis of quotas, these quotas being based on the individual shipments of the producers in '66-67. We find that this approach would literally freeze the present situation as it stands in Manitoba. It would work particularly to the hardship of new plants presently or nearing completion where it had been hoped for and anticipated that there would be quite a large increase in the shipment of manufacturing milk. We've been fortunate that we've had a number of these plant expansions in recent times and I would just want to share with the House my strong concern. I have been in contact with Mr. Greene and also Dr. Berry of the Canadian Dairy Commission, to point out Manitoba's position in this respect and am in the process of making arrangements to have staff go down and place our position before the Dairy Commission in the next few days. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may just say a word on the statement by the Minister. I note he says that there's been an improvement in the fact that there's less farm separated cream. This may be so in certain parts of the province but I think for many other areas that farm separation is still an essential of economics, because the whole milk operation requires a different method of handling. However, be that as it may, if there is here a special problem for Manitoba, I would hope that the Minister would get the co-operation of the various farm groups, that is the Farm Bureau, the Farmers Union, the Dairy and Poultry Co-op, to go in with him in an approach to the Federal Government and put forward our point of view. I would hope that instead of just using a staff approach, as he suggests, that it will in fact be an over-all approach from the community that's affected by this.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, and with your kind permission, I wonder if I can ask the Honourable Member from Souris-Lansdowne if he intends to, in view of the way he voted yesterday, if he intends to withdraw his motion asking the

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) . . . . government to rescind the sales tax?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, questions are addressed to the Treasury bench, not to members otherwise.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, this is a personal resolution, Mr. Speaker. I didn't know that they dictated that far; I knew they were telling the backbenchers what to do but I thought I could ask the Minister - on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): I'd like to lay on the table of the House Returns to Orders of the House Nos. 41, 43 and 51.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the House Leader. When can the members of the Committee on Statutory Orders and Regulations expect to have copies of the regulations distributed to them? Apparently they're available but they're not being distributed. We have to consider these matters before the House can concur in the resolution later on.

MR. LYON: They are available anytime the members wish to have them; the only reason the committee has not been called heretofore is because the review of the regulations undertaken by the staff has not yet been completed. We wanted to have that review complete before the committee is called together. I'll make sure that the regulations are made available for my honourable friend or anyone else on the committee who wishes to have them; provided they don't lose them because there's only one copy per member.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer. Is it his intention to direct the honourable member to withdraw his motion on the tax?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Health. I understand that it is now possible to obtain lifelong immunity from measles but that the vaccine costs in the neighbourhood of \$10.00 and I was wondering if the government would give consideration to the advisability of making the vaccine available to every person in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, letters were forwarded to the medical profession just this past week advising that measles vaccine is now on the free biological list, advising how that they can obtain it, and the people to contact in order to get further details. Those letters should be in the hands of the medical profession with -- (Interjection) -- well, I guess they are, then, because they've been forwarded already.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works. I note he's looking forward in anticipation. A very important event, and well worthwhile event took place in this Legislative Building on Saturday evening, namely a Governor's Ball. I'd like to direct three questions to my honourable friend. Was anyone prosecuted for any violation of the regulation of my honourable friend; were any complaints laid as a result of a violation of the regulation of my honourable friend or was special dispensation given for the evasion or curtailment of the curfew as suggested in Regulation 21/67 given by my honourable friend, the Minister of Public Works?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, No.

A MEMBER: All three?

MR. McLEAN: To all three of the very searching questions which the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party has directed to me.

MR. PAULLEY: A supplementary question: Has my honourable friend, in view of that very important event of last Saturday, given any further consideration to amending his Regulation 21/67 since the last time he mentioned this to the House?

MR. McLEAN: The only useful thing I could say, Mr. Speaker, is that this event has softened my attitude a great deal and I'm sure I'll be very receptive to ideas with regard to the regulation.

MR. PAULLEY: Would I be presumptuous or otherwise then, Mr. Speaker, to anticipate an early amendment of Regulation 21/67?

MR. SPEAKER: . . . been satisfactorily dealt with on both . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, it has not been satisfactorily dealt with to this date at least.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe I heard the Minister say that he would be "receptive" toward suggestions.

MR. PAULLEY: When?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I would ask, I believe with concurrence of all sides of the House this Order not be called, as this is a matter that will be discussed when the Rules Committee meets. I understand there might be some disposition on the part of honourable members to give consideration on Private Members' business this afternoon to the Bills which appear on Page 17 and 18 of the Order Paper. I merely put forward the suggestion on the understanding that that would be agreeable.

MR. MOLGAT: It's agreeable to us, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to see the Bills move forward so they can go to committee if need be.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader is thinking in terms of the adjourned debates at second reading, on Bill 51, to commence with?

MR. LYON: Fifty-one and those that follow, Mr. Speaker, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Well I feel - they're both standing in my name; I feel that I'm hardly in a position to give a ruling on those two particular items so I would ask that the matter be allowed to stand.

MR. LYON: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't notice those two. I was thinking of the general proposition of advancing the bills.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading, Bill No. 90. The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. LYON: ... Mr. Speaker, just to go on and perhaps come back when the Honourable Member for Brandon reappears, as I hope he will momentarily.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on second reading, Bill 42. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand, unless someone else wishes to speak on it at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 33. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I didn't realize this would come up so soon but I would like to make some comment in connection with Bill No. 33. This is an Act respecting the sale of water in and by the Town of Winkler to Co-op Prairie Cannery Ltd., of the Town of Winkler. When the Bill was introduced on second reading the other day there was no explanation given and I felt I should inform myself on a few things before I let it pass on second reading.

The Cannery has been in existence for a good many years now and also changed hands I think some six years ago or so when the Co-op purchased it and they have been operating it since. Prior to the water system being brought into the town the cannery used the water from its own well and that of the Canadian Pacific Railway well that was nearby and at that time did not pay. Now they will, and they have been paying now since the installation of the system. I find that there is no term in the agreement; is this going to run in perpetuity? There is no definite time stated as to the lasting of this agreement and I think there should be some terminating date in this Bill. Will it be effective if the cannery changes hands. There's also a possibility here that it might change hands, perhaps in the immediate future or perhaps sometime in the future. If there is no terminating date the rates cannot be changed except by another Bill being brought in at some future date and here I find that some of the other canneries in this province have much cheaper water at their disposal.

We find for instance Campbell Soups in Portage la Prairie, they have an agreement there which is also ratified here as a Bill, or was ratified here, in '57, under which that operation will get 400,000 gallons of water daily during the time from 7 a.m. to 5 p.m. under 50 pounds pressure per square inch. It's guaranteed to meet the requirements of the Department of Health, and the price stated here is 12-1/2 cents per 1,000 imperial gallons for the first ten million used and everything after that would be 10 cents per 100,000 gallons used. This agreement is in effect and will be in effect for 20 years, so that this cannery has a much better chance of operations and much more economical operation as a result, because of this agreement that these people got for their particular plant.

Then we take a look at the one located at Morden where we have an agreement with the Town of Morden and Canadian Cannery, which was also passed in this Legislature in 1961, and here we find that they will be able to get 370,000 gallons per 24-hour day and this may be increased to half a million or 500,000 gallons also with a 50 pound pressure. They are getting it from the lake supply there and the cost here is 16 cents per 1,000 gallons. They have a minimum charge of \$2,300 for the year and with it they also have the sole use of the lagoon which is being provided, and this is an agreement for a 10 year period and will last until 1971.

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . This is found in Chapter 79 of the 1961 Statutes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I remind the honourable gentlemen that the Honourable Member for Rhineland is making some comments on Bill No. 33 to which I have no doubt the Honourable Member for Dufferin will have to reply and by the noise I hear, I'm wondering whether or not the honourable gentleman is getting the message. I wonder if we could have a little more - if you must talk, do it in a subdued tone in order that the message will get over to the Honourable Member for Dufferin.

MR. FROESE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am interested in this principle of the subsidization of water rates for industries in rural Manitoba. I feel that if in one case the subsidy is much larger than in others that the industry in one area has a much better chance of success than in another area. This is what I would like to dwell on for the next few moments because time and again I have asked the Provincial Government to look into this matter and subsidize water rates for rural industries to a certain level, so that our rural centres would more or less have an equal opportunity of attracting industries that require water. Most rural industries do require large amounts of water. We find that the canneries do. We find that the processing plants of vegetables and potatoes and so on, that these require large amounts of water, and in order to get more industries into rural Manitoba, to locate in rural Manitoba, I think this is essential that we have some kind of policy in this matter whereby we will be assisting industries of this type in rural Manitoba.

I don't know how to be more forceful in my presentation of this matter, because I think it's of such prime and high importance for this province in order to get more industry into rural Manitoba, and therefore I feel that this cannery should be getting a much better deal than they are getting under the agreement that is proposed here. I think it should have a time limit and I think it should have a provincial subsidy. We are spending oodles of money in the Department of Industry and Commerce for one study after another, and what do these studies help us? Very, very little unless and until we take some action in this regard, whereby we will be actually assisting the industry itself in getting them established and getting more of them into this province. Therefore I felt that I could not just let this opportunity go by without speaking to this Bill.

Another principle involved here was that with agreements of this type we don't have local referendums by the local people having a say in improving such agreements. These agreements are being drawn up by the town councils and presented to the Legislature for approval, without a local vote. I wanted to make sure that the people back home were informed of the subject matter and that they would be from here on, subsidizing the water rates for that particular industry in their town from here on and there is no time limit on this, it will just go on in perpetuity. I checked with the local paper and with the local town council. Some information has been given in the press and I am sure that when the sponsor of the Bill speaks to it in closing debate, he can inform us on this matter more fully.

Then we find that on occasions such as the industry at Gimli, which involved probably larger concessions, tax concessions, that they do have referendums. Why are we not consistent? Why don't we have referendums in all cases when it involves the matter of subsidizing industries or making tax concessions? I would like to have a reply on this particular point.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are the points that I thought I should raise at this particular time and I do hope that the government will come up with some proposition whereby our rural industries will get some assistance in the way of water rates, because we have industries in Manitoba that are paying very, very high prices for water. I mentioned the Vegetable Oil industry in Altona which is paying \$2.75 per 1,000. Well this is far too high for an industry to pay on large amounts of water used and certainly here is an industry that should have some relief. How are we going to attract other industries into rural Manitoba when they face this situation and when they can get much cheaper rates elsewhere in the province? So, Mr. Speaker, I do hope the government gives us a reply on this and does something about it.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Could I ask the honourable member a question.

MR. FROESE: If I can answer it.

MR. CAMPBELL: I ask it of my honourable friend rather than of the sponsor of the Bill because the sponsor of the Bill couldn't reply until he closed the debate. I would like to ask the honourable member who has just spoken, is the Water Supply Board a party to this arrangement? Is the Water Supply Board in control of this water supply?

MR. FROESE: Yes they are and this is why I feel it is so much more a responsibility of this government, because the Water Supply Board is a Crown agency and has the authority to

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . . do something about it; so that something should be done.

MR. CAMPBELL: Could I ask the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, is the Board also involved in the Altona situation?

MR. FROESE: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Dufferin.

MR. WILLIAM HOMER HAMILTON (Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, this Bill as you know would authorize the Town of Winkler to sell water to the Co-op Cannery at a special price. It has been done in Portage la Prairie and in Morden to entice industry to come. Now we have industry already in Winkler and our objective is to keep this industry in Winkler at a subsidized rate, because this is the finest canning country in southern Manitoba. The rates seem to be adequate for the town council, they are quite in favor of it. I see the rates are here printed in the Bill. It has met with the approval of the town council and they seem to be satisfactory. I have explained it to them, they have explained it to me, the water supply for the Supply Board, and I think the situation is quite adequate for the Town of Winkler at the present time. Our objective, as I said before, is to keep industry there and I recommend the Bill to go to committee.

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

I see the Honourable Member from Brandon. I believe it was agreed that we would move back to it the moment he appeared. Second reading private bill, No. 90. The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon) presented Bill No. 90, an Act to Incorporate the Diocese of Rupert's Land Development Foundation, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Speaker, this of course is a non-profit organization. The objects of the Foundation are to provide financing for the establishment, construction and extension of parish churches and other facilities of the Anglican Church of Canada within the Diocese of Rupert's Land. The Foundation has all the powers, privileges and immunities conferred by and is subject to all the limitations and liabilities set out in the provisions of The Companies Act that are applicable thereto, including without limitation the power to borrow monies for the furtherance of its objects and the power to issue bonds, debentures or other evidence of indebtedness to secure the repayment of monies borrowed by the Foundation. The head office will be within the City of Winnipeg. The Bill sets out the method of appointment of trustees, terms, and the only thing that I believe members might consider a trifle unusual is the rule against perpetuities and the rule against accumulations does not apply to donation to the Foundation. I think otherwise they are governed by all the laws under The Companies Act and I think members will find nothing unusual in the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill) presented Bill No. 76, an Act to amend the Flin Flon Charter, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, as you recall last year this Bill was submitted to this House and then recalled on second reading because of disagreement between the Hudson Bay Mining Company and the Town. They have now come to agreement on this piece of property. The property referred to is an area in the Town of Flin Flon which is used by service companies such as oil companies, gasoline companies, and they derive all their profits from the sale of their product to the Town of Flin Flon, and in respect of this the Town of Flin Flon feel that they should be in the taxation area of that town.

This is Crown property leased to the CNR and the CNR and the companies have agreed that this property would now come within the taxation area that would be covered by the Town of Flin Flon. The property will be serviced by the Town of Flin Flon; there has been no protest from the companies that occupy the property and it is felt that this will assist the Town of Flin Flon in the figures of probably 7 to 8 thousand dollars a year in additional revenue. I hope that members of this Assembly will support me at this reading.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the wish of the House that we go back to Page 2? Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan as amended. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest here the other day when the Honourable Minister for Labour got up on his feet and talked of the labour unions and

(MR. HARRIS cont'd.) . . . . various things they could do on automation and the various names that it is called. So I would like to read a little excerpt here from what he said: "I would like to suggest here, Mr. Speaker, that the trade union movement can play a much greater role in facing up to these changes than they are doing at the present time, and the role is this: a service to their membership and an encouragement to take advantage of the measures of training and retraining that are available today. All too often they enter into contracts for immediate benefits or for benefits for today without giving the necessary consideration to the benefits that should be considered for their membership over the long term, but I am sure that some of these facts will come out."

Now I have been speaking with various union representatives for quite a while now and tried to gather some facts about Manitoba. We're always talking in the distance, some other country, United States, some other country; so I thought what about Manitoba; what about Manitoba? Is there nothing that we do here? Do we hide everything? Have we so much wheat that we can hide everything under a bushel of wheat?

So in order to develop a general method to cope with job change displacements, retraining, etc., it is necessary to have certain guidelines made available through plans, however loosely arranged, that are at present the only way in which the present problems can be met in terms of union management negotiations, or terms related thereto. It has been stated that only one out of every hundred employees in any industry takes it upon themselves to become retrained or further educated. This must be dealt with in means not related to the scope of this paper.

Following are the few union management methods already in existence: At the Selkirk Rolling Mills the management and the United Steel Workers Union, Selkirk local, in conjunction with the Federal and Provincial Governments, arrived at an agreement separate and apart from the contract (collective agreement) whereby the reduction of force made due to the installation of modern equipment could be eased. Details of the plan have not been made known to the public for approbation or otherwise because it is an experiment.

Generally, however, it works this way: A board was set up comprising three local union members, three representatives of management with a chairman who is a professor at the University of Manitoba. Federal and Provincial Governments were assisting parties. Those employees with ten or less years of seniority were most seriously affected by loss of employment within a six month or a year period of gradual implementation of automation in the plant. Government agencies assisted in retraining and in placement elsewhere of those who had to be relieved of their jobs. Many of the younger persons were able to get employment on their own. Employees over 60 who had been with the company for 20 or more years were given chances to retrain on other jobs in the complex and some were given retirement on the pension plan. A full pension plan I might tell you. Some of them were 60, 61 but they were given a full pension plan to 65 and I compliment this management for doing such a thing with the labour unions. I think this is a big step forward because I feel that the working man today, the older man today, has to go out into the world and they cut down his pension plan and so on and so forth and he's going round like the beggar with a cap in his hand. I don't feel that is right at all. So I say this is a great thing to do.

This was a very difficult area as there was great resistance to change, and in some cases inability to change. Retraining is being done with the affected employees of ten or more years of seniority. It is not known just how effective the plan is, by virtue of its newness, and the fact it is an experiment. The union has to relinquish certain rights for certain individuals. On the whole it is a mass movement plan on a gradual scale. The plan is completely a series of recommendations made by the Board which has been adopted by both management and union.

The United Steel Workers have a contractual plan in effect at the John Woods Manufacturing Plant. The union feels that this is a better plan. The Company due to new processes were in need of welders. It was first agreed that recruits would be drawn from MIT welder classes. About nine young men were taken into the company from the school. Not one of them stayed for a full year, but all left for other jobs. After this the company and the union agreed to ask MIT to accept ten of the regular work force each of whom had eight or ten years seniority with the company, and train them. This was done and has been going on since. Not one of the trainees has left the company. This was a straight union-management plan and is part of the agreement, and the Steel Workers Union is satisfied with it.

Transit Workers Union had a letter of agreement with Metro Transit Commission, due to the phasing out of trolley buses. Under this agreement, maintenance men from the Trolley

(MR. HARRIS cont'd.) . . . . Bus Department are given training in diesel engines at MIT in order to fit them into the Diesel Mechanical Department of the Transit System. This has been in effect for three years now. The poor feature of the plan is that it is voluntary and only a very small percentage of the men who can take this free training are taking advantage of it.

Moore's Business Forms Limited and The Winnipeg Printing Specialists Union (537) of the Pressmen, negotiated a clause into their 1966 agreement which called for the company and the union to negotiate wages and conditions for any equipment not covered by the agreement, and to meet ahead of proposed changes to resolve personnel problems. The entire composing room at Moore's was eliminated and a new Offset Preparatory Department put in, with only one casualty. This was a person who refused to do any but typesetting work. As there was no more such work he had to leave his employ with the company. Of 22 persons in the department, 21 were accommodated in other departments; some are now management, some are pressmen, others are in the new Preparatory Department. The only casualty is working at his old trade in a shop in B. C.

In 1962, U.S. Industries set up a body called "The American Foundation of Automation and Employment." It was created because the corporation, a manufacturer of automated equipment, felt a responsibility to the people that their machines would replace. Alongside the corporation in the Foundation is the International Association of Machinists. The Foundation is financed by dues based on the "lease" or sale price of each automated machine sold or leased by the company. The same type of Foundation is set up in Britain by the corporations, U. S. Industries Incorporated Great Britain Limited. It is a research plan to alleviate any suffering due to labour-saving cost-cutting automated machines.

Domtar Industrial Conversion Plan is for all negotiated employees in the Domtar Corporation. It is multiple union on the one side with the corporation on the other. The plan goes into effect when 90 percent of the local unions join. The Corporation put in one cent per hour for each employee and the Fund will be contributed to by the Company till it reaches five million dollars. If necessary the company will put in one years advance contribution in order to start providing benefits under the plan. The plan will be administered jointly by the union and the company. There will be individual case treatment and the approach is to be corporation wide.

Then it goes on to another one here of I. B. E. W. and Manitoba Telephone System. In this instance the company notified the union a year or so in advance of commencing system changes. A plan was worked out whereby special retraining classes were held in order to have people able to take over control of automatic Direct Distance Dialing and other systems. Those who were able to pass their exams complied with the practical aspects of the new system and when it was inaugurated took positions within the complex. Others not able to complete examinations or not mentally alert enough to comply with the new conditions, were able to be placed on lower category jobs, maintenance, etc. Fortunately there were enough jobs to take care of the present employees. Retirements have taken care of all work force reductions and though the telephone system complement of workers is now less than it was, no one has lost employment due to the new automated processes.

It is felt that the fact that management and union worked this out together without any outside aid from government or university, made the plan practical and successful. Only those fully conversant with the practical effects of the system and of changes required were used to plan and implement the program. Of paramount interest is the fact that as soon as information about change is available, even though it is of general nature, the union is notified and discussions take place between management, union, business agents, shop stewards and plans are settled upon immediately to expedite training and retraining. The I. B. E. W. New York U. S. A. Local is also a party to the plan of U. S. Industries Incorporated as outlined in section (5) of this paper.

I. B. E. W. Local 435 have in their files a master plan based on Canadian case studies of the manpower adjustment program. A paper entitled "Automation - the Promise" by Air Vice Marshall F. R. Sharp, given April 7, 1966, and a paper entitled "Automation and Manpower Policy" by Professor H. Pentland of the University of Manitoba given on March 1st 1966.

Armour and Company in agreement with the United Packinghouse Workers and Amalgamated Meat Cutters formed an automation committee on September 1st '59. The two principal unions and the company signed a two year agreement featuring the "tri-partite" committee. There are four company representatives, two from each of the unions and an impartial person appointed as chairman. A fund of \$500,000 was to be set up by accumulation through a company

(MR. HARRIS cont'd.) . . . . payment of a cent on each hundredweight of total tonnage shipped from slaughtering and meat packing plants covered by the agreement with the two unions.

The text of the section in the agreements covers mechanization and new methods; study to develop and promote employment opportunities through new methods and acquiring new knowledge; training and retraining; furthering of academic education for employees; movement of employees of a closed down plant to a new and modernized plant; in other areas. Findings on recommendations of the committee shall not be binding by either party but shall be made to the company and to the unions for further consideration.

In a speech by Ralph Helstein U. P. W. A. International President, it was stated that between 1953 and the first quarter of 1960 factory maintenance and production employment dropped by one and a half million in the U.S. Mining jobs declined by 200,000; railroads 400,000 fewer jobs. During the same period less than one million full-time jobs were created and 2.9 million part-time jobs. The 2.9 million are in low paid service industries and in government employment.

Large corporations are putting in research laboratories for the purpose of developing push button controls for operating steel mills and eventually all other steel operations. This is also being done by meat packing corporations. Mr. Helstein in his speech gave his opinion that governments should set up public boards of enquiry with regard to plant closings in all industry. He also said that in the field of education there would have to be a massive change. Education of the highest type is necessary in what he calls "the age of the robot." In 1963 despite committee findings it was said that Armour and Company had closed down at least one plant a year for five years, without providing employment for almost 3,000 employees. This from Page 3 of "The Packinghouse Worker" September, 1963.

C. U. P. E. (Clerical) have formed a committee to study the development arising from improvements in IBM systems. For the past ten years IBM systems have created many new jobs but now the trend appears to be reversing. The committee has not yet gathered any concrete information but is keeping a watchful eye on employment trends in the offices covered by C. U. P. E. agreements.

There was a time when an engineer who planned a factory or a manager who set up a new office, thought of these merely as buildings, machines and people that had to be assembled to do a particular job. Now the modern engineer or manager will think of his factory or office as a complex system of men and machines which is designed to receive certain "inputs" of information and materials, process these in specified ways and produce well defined "outputs". The habit of thinking of organizations of men and machines as systems is tremendously important, useful and productive. It is essential to understand the processes of automation. Most of us cannot think of systems in abstract terms, we have to try and find some physical reality for a basis from which to work and plan. Each one can find terms from his own sphere of activity to create analogies. We have now reached a stage of automation whereby its further evolution will affect everybody. In the foreseeable future its effect on management may be just as revolutionary and far reaching as its better known and more often discussed effects on labour.

Certain can companies have negotiated with the United Steel Workers, special holiday provisions - such as three months after five years. Another has negotiated increases in overtime rates to make overtime prohibitive and to force employment of displaced persons. He says there must be government policy in this matter and other unions and managements will have to change the climate of collective bargaining processes. Where governments have to pass emergency legislation to ward off crises it will be found that automation or technological change is at the root of the trouble. It is evident from the cases and remarks cited that Manitoba must have manpower adjustment programs based on the Federal Government plan. The Federal Government is insistent that only unionized personnel are manageable for purposes of planning, side by side with our industrial organization. Some of the provinces among which we find Manitoba, tend towards employer domination. This will only cause a completely ineffective poverty stricken, unemployment ridden situation to exist to the detriment of the citizens of the province. There is no doubt that in the immediate future persons without skills, with low scale school grades, will be helpless prey of unscrupulous employers unless a government policy which makes unions mandatory for purpose of manpower planning come into being. This is made plain by the insistence of plans such as the DOMTAR plan, that only negotiable employees shall be included.

There are no luddites or machine breakers among us, nor are there pro-luddites.

(MR. HARRIS cont'd.) . . . . . Organized labour wants an orderly planned continuing transition from unskilled to skilled, from non-programmed to programmed. Certain questions will have to be asked by management and unions and will have to be answered by both together. Questions such as: What is automation? What is new about it if anything? What about the speed of its introduction? What of the effect on production? What about the effect on employment? What about the effect on the structure of the labour force? What about the implications for manpower adjustment and for sharing the cost for such adjustment equitably? What about labour-management relations? What about the implications for education? What about the new frontier of leisure? What about the role of government? What about the underdeveloped countries?

So far we in Manitoba have merely instituted certain stop-gap measures, it seems, hopefully, with the idea that maybe it will all pass. We can be sure that it will not pass and therefore must take advantage of the plans and ideas set out earlier in this paper to put into effect at the very earliest date: (a) an objective assessment of the impending impact of technological change and automation on the organization of our society. (b) an action program jointly developed and undertaken by labour and management which should include: (1) an orderly preparation and transfer of workers to new jobs within the province, (2) the upgrading or raising of basic educational qualifications of workers who need further education to keep pace with this technological change, (3) retraining of workers for other occupations where employment opportunities exist, (4) assistance to workers who must move to jobs in other areas, possibly other provinces, (5) counselling of workers to help them understand and adapt to rapidly changing conditions.

A shorter work week is inevitable in most industries and is as low as 32 hours per week in some printing industries, notably newspaper. It might be of interest here to say that many newspaper publishers consider their pressmen's union so trustworthy and mature that the entire manning and training process is left to the union. This simplifies the problem for management and allows the introduction of huge, high production automated presses with an extremely minimal manpower problem.

Another point worth noting is the famous 25 hour week of the I. B. E. W. in New York. There is a clause in the contract which makes it obligatory for electricians to put in certain hours of every week in some sort of public service. It may be art and letters or doing community club work or furthering their education. It can be seen that man is ingenious enough to have grappled with certain localized impacts already and is succeeding in controlling them and living with them. This proves that it can be done on provincial, federal and even an international scale.

If we are to survive we must disassociate ourselves from many preconceived ideas that we once held. Work for instance will become less important while productivity becomes paramount to the maintenance of each member of society in usefulness and high standards of life. It is up to us; we can control the new society for the benefit of all, if we will.

I went around there to these various people and that is the gist of what they were trying to tell me. Now I feel myself, we are in here, we're a group of people, we're a society of people, therefore we've got to work together regardless of what we do; and if we do that, well then we'll get some place. This idea of saying that one particular group over there, they want this; this one particular group over there, they want that, and this group over there, they want that; they never get anyplace. They've got to get together. And if they get together then they can get some place. I was just reading or listening the other day as the two fellow members across the way were talking on automation and I was quite taken up with my friend from Brandon, the Member from Brandon when he spoke, and I felt he was quite sensible in his way of thinking because when we look back, we say to ourselves, by gosh, you know, this thing has come on us and has come on us in such a way that we accept things that my grandfather and even my father today, they wouldn't accept. They'd say this is witchcraft; this is out of this world; it's not so. You go into a home today for instance - years ago, what was in the home? You come in there, even in the City of Winnipeg, a cold water tap, just electric light; if you had a bit of a furnace downstairs it wasn't very much. Well, today you go in a home, you have a gas furnace down in there. The wife goes downstairs and she goes and she puts her clothes in the washer, and she just touches a few dials and washes the clothes; she puts it in the dryer, she doesn't need to go out and put it on the line any more -- no sirree, by golly, you don't need a woman in the house anymore. So I say, I agree with my friend from Brandon, the honourable member, I agree with him quite well. By golly when you look at this world today you know, and

(MR. HARRIS cont'd.) . . . . you say to yourself, well, this thing has changed completely. You know, I often think to myself when I look back and I say to myself, by gosh, you know, I'm sitting down in this easy chair, where I had to carry the ashes out, and I had to do this and I had to do that; no wonder I'm getting fat. Yeah, no wonder, I'm getting fat.

The impressive benefits which have resulted from continued improvement in productivity can be seen by looking about us. Compare the way of life of a typical citizen in any Canadian city or small town with that enjoyed by his counterpart of 100 years ago, or by his counterpart today living in any village in Africa or Asia. Those who object to and resist today's automation must logically reject yesterday's mechanization, and must then reject as undesirable the whole process of industrial development and technological improvements. They must advocate, in short, the return to the most primitive forms of society of hundreds of years ago, a society which by now, with population increases, would be choked and paralyzed by hunger, disease and poverty. Obviously none of us would wish to see that. Let us not complain then if our modern society poses some social problems which the older society did not face. Automation is just a fancy new word for progress. We have nothing to fear from progress; we have everything to fear from lack of progress up to this point. I know it would appear that I have built a strong case in favour of automation. That has not been my prime purpose. However, what I have tried to do is to establish the point that technological improvement is an essential part of a competitive free society and our very survival in an economic and military sense requires that this process will continue.

In addition to this we must be realistic in our assessment of the unemployment and worker dislocation problems in a growing industrial country, and to try and solve such matters by retarding progress would be disastrous. I am sure most of the people of Manitoba, as will our enlightened leaders, agree with this point. I want to say most emphatically at this point, however, that I do not belittle the serious problems we face. They are in many ways frustrating, perhaps even terrifying, and I know the solutions we must seek together will not be readily found. As long as there is unemployment in our midst and any Canadian is living with something less than what he has a right to expect from our way of life, then the problem must receive our honest attention. Our concern here today lies more particularly in the level and trend of unemployment and how this is being influenced by automation. What in essence are the problems we face after many years of technological improvement? Certainly there are many. Here are a few of the most obvious ones:

1. The maintenance of free society. I realize this suggests just the appropriate amount of involvement of government in our industrial activity to establish the right environment.
2. The spreading of the benefits of technological improvements to all people. This does not mean to people in this country alone but eventually to the people of all nations of the world.
3. The avoidance of hardship and injustice which may result from adjustment to new conditions arising from automation. This involves the whole broad question of unemployment.
4. The regulation in the interest of the public of certain of the activities of big business, big labour unions and big government to prevent evils which do emerge from time to time because of power and perhaps selfishness.
5. The need for a constructive program which will satisfy all levels of society as to useful application of increasing leisure hours which will be inevitable as automation advances.
6. The development of new technological improvements ahead to permit a finer life for all. This could involve better community planning, purification of air, reduction of water pollution, conservation of resources, providing adequate food for the hungry people in other countries.
7. The creation of an educational system which will enable our people to better understand this changing world and should equip them with the proper skills to play their useful part in it.

These are but a few of our problems and I know there are many more. I am convinced, however, that the solutions of these economic and social problems will be formulated after a thorough continued study. I visualize today's society as being composed of five broad groups of individuals classified by their educational levels or degrees of skill.

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the honourable gentleman, but he has five minutes left.

MR. HARRIS: First, there are those, who, because of their brains, initiative and ingenuity can accept any position and rise to its challenge. They know what jobs are available and are capable of meeting the requirements. They accept these positions and stay in them

(MR. HARRIS cont'd.) . . . . until some new challenge impels them to change.

Second, there are those almost as well endowed, who only require the paths to new employment to be pointed out to them and they can readily follow them through.

The third group are those generally who have the mental and physical capabilities required but lack sufficient education to master the skills necessary to take their place in an automated world.

The fourth is a very large group who may have neither the ability nor the education to cope with a technological process. And the fifth are the new incoming additions to the labour force who may lack the experience and possibly the required educational standards.

The first two groups should present little or no problem. The third and fifth will have the problems of education or retraining. The fourth problems of unemployment. To achieve an ever-increasing average level of education will require our society to solve complex psychological as well as economic problems. How, for instance, do we set about to instill the under 20 age group a desire to stay on for more education, particularly when at this immature and impressionable age, nothing appears to be more important than to satisfy at an early date material wants. Steps must be taken in formulating a long-range plan which will effectively increase the preparedness of the labour force in meeting the challenge of automation. Important among the steps will be the following:

1. Identify areas of work which can and will be performed best by human skill.
2. Analyze the skill requirements needed for the performance of that work.
3. Determine the best methods to be used in acquiring these skills.
4. Educate and re-educate; train and retrain to keep the present and future labour force productive under the new conditions of automation.

Finally, there are many questions for which answers will have to be found as automation advances and to assure that the resultant changes in the economic, social and even political structure will be as orderly as possible.

It might be helpful to mention just a few of the types of questions that comes to mind on this whole matter:

1. What can be done with those in the labour force who are not capable of being re-educated or retrained and for whom there are not enough unskilled jobs available? For example, can as much as 15 percent of the work force remain passively unemployed?
2. How do you maintain the effective purchasing power of the subsidized unemployed? Enforced idleness is degrading and demoralizing. Sacrifice of human values and dignity should be avoided if at all possible.
3. What about prospects of national work programs, such as parks, roads, utilities, construction of institutions, schools, hospitals, etc.?
4. Who can shoulder the load of providing for the facilities, staff and costs of the projected added educational program? To the economy capable of assuming this task would it in the long run be less costly than to pay a given percentage of the population to be contently unemployed.
5. If the next ten years exhibit as much of an increase in automation as the last ten years did over the preceding ten, will a degree of control and national planning be required which will radically change our concepts of the management of our economic and social system?
6. Will the tremendous organizational and administrative tasks involved require increased governmental participation and how much is desirable?
7. On the international scene, what about the areas of chronic underdevelopment which require foreign capital just to maintain their levels of subsistence. The capital now provided by the developed countries may have to be diverted to solving their own problems of unemployment and education.
8. What would be a practical percentage allocation of government funds to provide the needs of a continually effective education program, appropriate welfare service, etc.? I do think that our industrial society in which we fill an important part today has reached a state of maturity which enables us to pool our wisdom, experience and judgment in finding a common solution to these problems.

And in conclusion it is not a problem for one group alone, but one for our entire society who have a mutual responsibility. I have confidence in the time ahead with intelligent, tolerant and unselfish approach, we'll be able to find the light we seek. Thank you, Sir.

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

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

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, there is very little that I can add at this point to what I have already said on the introduction of the resolution on the minimum wages. I feel that there has been a considerable amount of debate in the House, probably more than on any other resolution, but I would like to make a few remarks and one is that when the Federal Government was discussing its labour code in the House of Commons and introduced the Labour Code legislation and established the minimum wage of \$1.25 for industries under the federal jurisdiction, I believe it held a conference and Labour Ministers from all the provinces were invited to attend, and I believe the Honourable Minister of Labour for Manitoba was present at that time and supported that legislation of \$1.25 minimum wages, so I hope that he will demonstrate his good intentions and support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to disagree to some of the remarks that were made by the Honourable Member for St. Vital when he took part in this debate and said that we cannot legislate for the benefit of employees without first consideration of the health of the enterprise, that really what you are doing is you are telling the small enterpriser who cannot pay standard income wages that the community does not want him. You are essentially saying that if you can only pay substandard income, you are not permitted to operate in this community. Well, I can't see anything wrong with that, because if there is any industry that cannot pay the minimum wage, I cannot see why they should be allowed to operate, because I cannot see that they are serving any purpose. Furthermore, I think that the greatest effect of the wage increases would be in the area of commercial food services, especially the restaurants and similar service industries, so this destroys much of the argument that the honourable member has raised.

I would also like to quote from what the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future found, that managerial and plant efficiency were more important factors in reducing costs than the scale of wages. The report said, "The dominant factor affecting labour costs in Manitoba industry has been productivity rather than earnings. This finding is contrary to the popular belief that earnings primarily, or even exclusively, determine labour costs." In other words, Mr. Speaker, efficient productive industry should have no trouble paying good wages.

I believe that there were some other remarks made by the honourable member and he said that we have welfare programs in the Province of Manitoba. Well the whole argument here, Mr. Speaker, is that the present minimum wage of \$1.00 is below the welfare program which has been set up by the City of Winnipeg, and this is our whole argument. The Honourable Minister of Labour is disagreeing but I would like to tell him for a family of five people, 2 adults and 3 dependents, the minimum set up by the Winnipeg Welfare Committee is \$1.09 per hour; and for a family of 7 with 5 children, it is set at \$1.32. This is the statistics that I have, so certainly these figures are much higher than the present minimum wage and our whole argument is that it is probably more advantageous for some employees to be on welfare than to receive the present minimum wage.

The honourable member has also said that the sales tax does not significantly affect a breadwinner working on the minimum wage level. Well I would certainly have to disagree with him on this point as well, because after he will be in this House for a few years and after he will have some people come to see him, when \$2.00 are very important to buy a few groceries, to buy a few loaves of bread and probably a quart of milk on a Saturday - because I have had on many occasions people call me where they were really destitute, they were really in trouble, you had to go and see the council in a certain municipality - and maybe the honourable member has not had this occasion, but I am sure that after being in this House for awhile he will experience this situation and I am sure that he will change his mind, because even if it's two or three dollars to a wage earner, this is certainly a lot of money. Our whole argument is, Mr. Speaker, that today, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figure of 40.6 hours work week, the wage earner is receiving \$40.60 a week. I cannot see how anyone can exist on \$40.60 a week, and at the same time we have certain people that have to support a family on this income and it's beyond, I would say, anyone in this House to feel that this is sufficient pay.

Now I know even \$1.25 is not that much more, but it's at least \$10.00 more a week and \$10.00 will go a long way for a grocery bill, because \$1.25 minimum would establish something in the neighborhood of \$50.75 a week for a 40-hour week. So, Mr. Speaker, there is a great difference between the \$40.00 at the present and the \$50.00 that would be under the \$1.25 if the resolution passed. I certainly hope that all the members in this House will support this

(MR. PATRICK cont'd)....resolution because I think it's a very important resolution. The cost of living has gone up considerably. I know the Premier, the First Minister of this province, last fall made a statement himself that he was greatly concerned about the minimum wages in the Province of Manitoba and that something had to be done in the very near future. Well all that has been done is we asked the Minimum Wage Board to convene and study the problem, but this is probably some six months since this statement and we have had no action at all.

Not only the minimum wage is low in this province, but if we look back it seems that we have not been able to attract industry on these low wages, so the argument is not valid that is used by some of the speakers in the House.

I would also like to mention that there is a tremendous amount of dissatisfaction in the ranks of the working people in the Province of Manitoba because, as you know, the average income of Winnipeg personal income tax payers shows that Winnipeg is in the 49th place on the list of the Canadian cities and much below the national average.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is very little that I can add to what I have said on the introduction of the resolution, but I wish to take this opportunity to thank all the members who have taken part in this debate and made their contribution on this motion, and I hope that everybody will see fit to support this resolution.

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

MR. PATRICK: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

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

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 23; Nays, 29.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost.

MR. M.E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye. Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

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

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'm impressed and agree with what's been said in support of this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave?

MR. GREEN: I didn't ask for leave.

MR. SPEAKER: I beg your pardon. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned debate for the Honourable Member from Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like honourable members to know that I'm closing debate, so in case somebody would like to debate prior to me they can do so, and I trust, Mr. Speaker, that members will know that this speech probably won't be quite as brief as the last one that I happened to make in this House. I've waited patiently, Mr. Speaker, for several weeks after introducing this resolution which I felt - and I suppose everybody feels that their particular resolution is the most important matter which is before the House - and I being no different than some of the others, I felt that this resolution was probably the most important matter that the members of this Assembly would be considering during this Session and I make no exception, it's more important in my opinion than the sales tax; it's more important than the bills on education; it's more important than any of the matters which have been introduced both as government bills and as bills from members on this side of the House.

I appreciate the fact, Mr. Speaker, that every other member can't have the same attitude towards this resolution as I do in proposing it, but nevertheless I merely wish to make

(MR. GREEN cont'd)....known to the members that I thought that this was certainly a very very important resolution. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if it were put in somewhat a different context that we would have an outcry from various members of the House who have remained silent because it has been put with regard to employees. If, for instance, it was suggested that the courts were going to order the doctors who the Member -- Mr. Dow - I can't remember the constituency - Turtle Mountain -- that if it was suggested that the court was going to order the doctors who the Member for Turtle Mountain says are going to leave the province because of Medicare, that if it were suggested that there be an injunction restraining them from leaving their work in Manitoba, that there would be a public outcry from the members of the Liberal Party, in particular from the Member from Turtle Mountain, and from the members of the government party and in particular perhaps from the Minister of Labour who seems to look at this particular resolution with such equanimity.

And if, Mr. Speaker, there was a suggestion that the courts were going to order lawyers to continue to work for their clients whether they wished to do so or not and order them to work under pain of contempt, under of pain of going to jail if they did not work, there would be a public outcry in this Legislature. You wouldn't have it coming from one party or from one individual, you would have it coming from every member of the House, that we can not permit this type of conduct because we in this province do not believe in the imposition of forced labour, the imposition of an injunction which says in effect, "You will either work or go to jail."

This is the type of injunction that this resolution seeks to avoid, seeks to declaim against, but members in the House have not seen fit, Mr. Speaker, to deal with this issue as presented, and I deal particularly, Mr. Speaker, with the speech that was made by the Minister of Labour. Perhaps he didn't take the position that I put in support of this bill very seriously. I can't force him to take it seriously; I can't get an injunction requiring him to take it seriously because the courts won't issue that type of injunction, at least against the Minister of Labour they won't. They have issued an injunction which says that a man must not react in a certain way when he sees a certain sign, but I don't think they'll give me an injunction requiring the Minister of Labour to take this matter seriously and I agree that they shouldn't, because if this matter is to be taken seriously by a Minister of Labour it'll have to be another Minister of Labour. Because of the expressions that I have in this speech to this resolution which deals with the court ordering people to work and which deals with the statement that nobody shall be in contempt of court because he doesn't go to work, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour didn't contradict one fact, not one fact that was set out in my presentation in support of this bill. He didn't say that one of the things said in there was wrong, nor - and this is more important, Mr. Speaker - he didn't contradict one principle, one statement of opinion as to what the court should do that I made in my submission.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in answering the submission that we put with regard to this resolution, he doesn't even mention that injunctions are sending people back to work. He seems to be preoccupied with ex parte injunctions. Mr. Speaker, in support of this bill I didn't -- the resolution doesn't mention ex parte injunctions. In supporting the bill I said I have nothing against ex parte injunctions. I say that ex parte injunctions - and I repeat it - are a legitimate remedy afforded to people in our society in the proper case. I said that I agree with an ex parte injunction in a proper case; in an improper case, and where it comes to an injunction which will require people to work, I not only disagree with an ex parte injunction I disagree with an interlocutory injunction and I disagree with a permanent injunction. There is no injunction which is sustainable, ex parte or otherwise, which would require people to go to work.

But the Minister of Labour knows that various people in the labour movement have complained about ex parte injunctions, and because he thinks that everything that I say here is said on behalf of a special group and he knows that the labour movement is against ex parte injunctions, he thought to himself the Member for Inkster in discussing this resolution said a lot of things but he didn't say the things that the labour people are saying but he must have meant those things because he always speaks in that way, and therefore he identified my remarks with ex parte injunctions.

What does he say? "Our colleagues here in the legal profession I am sure will debate this very fully because there are differences of opinion throughout the country of the misuse and abuse of injunctions and particularly ex parte injunctions. We are also aware" - and I'm moving down the page - "We are also aware that there is a disagreement within the trade union

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . movement itself as to how ex parte injunctions in particular should be used in labour disputes." That's the reason, Mr. Speaker, for not considering what I have said, that there is disagreement among the labour people. If the labour movement were united, then the Minister of Labour would act. This is what he is saying.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't care if the labour movement is against ex parte injunctions or they are not against ex parte injunctions when dealing with this particular resolution. There's only one question that's of any relevance. Does the Minister agree that a court can order a person to go to work? Does the Minister agree that nobody should be in contempt of court because he refuses to go to work? That's the only relevant question. It has nothing to do with ex parte injunctions, and I am sure that if the Minister will review my speech that that's what I spoke about. If he didn't hear me that time then I repeat it for him now: that is the type of injunction that this resolution seeks to deal with, and the Minister of Labour in putting the position of the government, Mr. Speaker, did not talk about whether an injunction should require people to work or not. He doesn't care; he's not interested. That was the position of the Minister of Labour.

The Liberal Party spokesman took a somewhat different position, Mr. Speaker, and as far as I'm concerned, all it amounts to is double talk, because they say this is a very important matter and they don't dare say that they agree with this type of injunction, but they say this issue is now being decided by the courts. It is and will be decided by the courts for the last 50 years and possibly the next 50 years and the courts have decided, Mr. Speaker - and I put this to the members here - that they will issue this type of injunction in certain cases or they have issued this type of injunction in certain cases and their decision on whether they will continue to do so or whether they feel that the injunction that has been complained of and which is now before the Supreme Court of Canada actually orders people to go to work or doesn't is irrelevant.

I don't want to argue that question in this Legislature because the Supreme Court may say that the injunction referred to in the case before us does not order people to go to work or it may dissolve the injunction and therefore there will be no injunction ordering people to work, although the people worked a year and a half ago when the injunction was ordered, and there will be no resolution of the matter as a result of it being before the Supreme Court, but nevertheless how does the passing of this resolution affect one way or another what the Supreme Court will do with that injunction.

If the Supreme Court says that an injunction should never have been issued it will mean that it is perfectly consistent with the views that will be affirmed by the members of this Legislature, and certainly not one member of the Legislature has disagreed with this resolution. If the Supreme Court of Canada says, on the other hand, that we will continue with this type of injunction, then there is all the more reason for passing this resolution.

So the passing of the resolution in no way affects what is going on in the courts, and the only reason for not passing the resolution is that it may be felt by some that the question of whether in a particular case a judge should be able to order somebody back to work should lie with the courts, and, Mr. Speaker, that is what is happening at the present time. The question of whether this will be done or will not be done is one that is being decided by the courts and I say that it should be decided by this Legislature, that the Legislature should make the law and let the courts implement that law.

Now the member for Selkirk spoke about the fact that this resolution is initiated by a particular case involving the Plasterers Union. Now, Mr. Speaker, in my initial address I read the words of an injunction that was granted by the court prior to the decision of the plasterers' case - that was in the intermediate proceedings - and there can be no doubt about what the judge said in this case and I'm going to repeat it. In case some members feel that I am creating an issue out of nothing, I wish to read what the judge said to see whether there is any mistake about it. "It is further ordered that the members of the Operative Plasterers and Cement Masons International Association, Local 334, Winnipeg, employed by any one of the plaintiffs who ceased work" - that was their crime - "or failed to report for work at the projects on which their respective employers were engaged in on July 21, 1964, be, and they are hereby strictly enjoined to return to their respective place of employment forthwith." That's what the judge said to the members of the Plasterers Union, and as any lawyer will tell you, failure to obey an injunction, whether you agreed with it or disagreed with it or whether it would subsequently be reversed or not, it's contemptuous. That's what people in Ontario went to jail for; that's what people in B. C. went to jail for. They said that this was a bad

(MR. GREEN cont'd)....injunction and the court said: Regardless of whether it was bad or not we issued it. You do what you're told first and then argue about whether it was bad or not.

Now I also pointed out to the members that this injunction was reversed the day after it was issued, that we went down to the court and told them that they should not make this type of injunction and the court agreed and reversed it. Four days later they issued an injunction which said that you shall not stop work - and in this I am paraphrasing, I'm not giving the words - they said that you shall not stop work, and there has been argument ever since for the past two years as to whether that type of an injunction orders people to work or doesn't order them to work.

I don't expect this Legislature to settle that argument; that's something for the people involved, the lawyers involved, and I am one of those that are included to go and argue at the Supreme Court. All I am saying is that regardless of how that argument is settled, what the Legislature should say is that no court should order a person to go to work unless the Minister of Labour does want the court to order people to go to work and he feels that this is a way out of his problem. This is like Cam McLean setting wages; this is like the Labour Board setting 60-hour weeks. He can get the courts to do what he hasn't got the guts to do. He won't pass a resolution in this House saying that people should be ordered to go to work but he'll let the courts do that without interfering with that type of injunction, and lest it be said ...

MR. HILLHOUSE: ...interrupt your train of thought, you mentioned the fact that the court did change the wording of the injunction and made it a negative injunction.

MR. GREEN: Right.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Was there any reason given by the courts? Did they recognize the doctrine of specific performance could not be enforced in a personal contract?

MR. GREEN: I hesitate to go into an argument about what happened. I can only tell you that in my opinion the second Order required people to go to work, or required them to not stop working. Now, if my learned friend wishes to be a Sophist and say that a requirement to not stop working is not a requirement to keep working, he can take that position. I have argued, and I am continuing to argue that position in the courts. All I'm suggesting is that there should be no argument insofar as we are concerned, and as far as we are concerned we should say what the Criminal Code of Canada has said, that nobody commits a criminal offence by not working, despite what else they do. If their only activity has been not working, they do not commit an offence.

Now maybe the Minister of Labour thinks - and I'm sure he does think this way - well, the Member for Inkster he gets excited, he exaggerates, he dreams things up that don't exist. Well, I can't deal with the facts of the case but I can deal with a judgment of the case which is reported in the Western Weekly Report, a judgment of Mr. Justice Freedman with regard to another case dealing with the same type of injunction which is now before the Supreme Court of Canada, but I'm only going to deal with what is on the record in the Western Weekly Report and which can be read by the press and every member of this Legislature and by every citizen of this province and therefore is not privileged.

This is what Mr. Justice Freedman - this is not the member for Inkster now - this is a learned jurist, one of the most respected jurists in Canada. I agree that there are two opinions. I am saying that in the House, unless there are two opinions on this resolution, and I think that there are, I think that the Minister wants the courts to order people to work. He just won't say so and he feels that the courts can do that job for him.

But let's hear what Mr. Justice Freedman says: "Nor in my view is the covenant that the union or the men would not participate in a strike" - the kind of expressed negative covenant that my friend the Member for Selkirk talks about - "the breach of which should give rise to an order of injunction as was here granted. Such a negative covenant arises, for example, where a person binds himself to serve the other party to the contract exclusively during its term. If in breach of his covenant he seeks to work for someone else, say a competitor of his employer, he can be restrained" - that is from working for someone else - "but the effect of the injunction in such a case may be described thus: You have agreed not to work for anyone other than your employer (a) during the period of the contract, so you must not work for (b). The important thing to note is that the injunction does not say you must continue to work for (a), for that would in effect be ordering specific performance of a contract for personal services." Now this is no longer the Member for Inkster; this is the judge of the Court of Appeal for the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Justice Samuel Freedman.

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

And let's see what he says in addition. "It would be a strange thing if this were otherwise. An injunction to restrain improper picketing is one thing; an injunction in effect to compel workmen to continue to work for a particular employer on pain of going to jail for his breach is quite another. Such an injunction is so far-reaching in its consequences that occasions for resort to it are likely to be rare indeed." Now this is Mr. Justice Freedman and he found that the injunction should be dissolved.

Now we're not going to settle whether Mr. Justice Freedman was right or whether Mr. Justice Monnin was right or whether the Supreme Court will find either one or the other of them right; we'll never settle that question. That question will always be one for the courts as to what will happen in a particular case. What I'm saying is that we can settle amongst ourselves that we agree that a court should not do this unless - and I put it that that is the likelihood - unless the Minister of Labour disagrees, and that's where he's leading his party. He's leading every one of those 30 people on that side of the House to stand up and say I'm for slavery - I'm for slavery - because an injunction to order people to work is a form of slavery and you can't escape from that position, and he as not only on his own responsibility hasn't said a word about what we propose, not only on his own responsibility but has urged and gained political party support for every one on that side of the House for no reason at all except that maybe he was going to ruffle somebody who said we need this type of order because these people are leaving work. And if he doesn't believe that this is the case, I know that now that this type of injunction has been issued, the employers are seeking it. The Member for Selkirk should know that the employer in that case told his employees, if you want to strike I'll go to court and get an injunction to stop you from striking.

Well, the whole question was whether these people leaving their work could be restrained from doing that together by an injunction. I say that the court in several cases has found that this can happen, and I'm asking this Legislature to take a stand against something which they've been against for at least -- which our society has been against for at least 100 years and in the British Isles more than that, but in America for 100 years.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Would the honourable member permit another question? I don't want to be unfair, but would it be true to say that what you are asking us to confirm is reaffirm the principle of common law.

MR. GREEN: Absolutely. I'm asking you to resolve something which you all agree with. I'm not asking for anything more. I would like to be able to tell a workman when he comes to me with an injunction of this kind in his hand - and you should see them when they come in - he's got an injunction. He didn't go through a picket line, he went to have a cup of coffee. He was served with an Order of the Court, sealed with stamps on it, and in legal language which says, "You are hereby enjoined not to strike." I want to be able to tell that man as long as you are not counselling people to stay away from work, as long as you are not persuading someone not to go to work, as long as you are not doing anything against an employer, you have a right not to go back to work and you can't be enjoined by injunction. I am not able to tell them that now because of the way in which these injunctions have been issued. This is what the plumber or the plasterer walks in with and my honourable friend may say, well he should know that that injunction doesn't chase him back to work. I'm not sure. I asked the court who issued the injunction whether I could tell the man that whatever else this injunction is doing it is not telling you that you must go to work. May I say that to them, is what I said to the Court, and they said, "Well, Mr. Green, I don't know whether you can say that." Now I as a lawyer have to, at that point, know whether I was going to be in contempt of court by telling the person one thing or another thing, because my advice to him would certainly be relevant as to whether he was in contempt or not.

That's all we're asking for here, but the Minister of Labour in dealing with this issue did not say one word about injunctions which required people to work. And again, Mr. Speaker, I thought that perhaps I missed, perhaps in my inadequacy at putting a position I was unable to explain to the Minister of Labour what I'm talking about and I thought perhaps I was unable to explain to the Members of the Liberal Party what I was talking about and I attributed it possibly to the weakness in putting the case. But, Mr. Speaker, my ego was saved again; saved not by any person in this House, not by any legislator, saved by the person who indexes Hansard. Again, he didn't index this as ex parte injunctions; he didn't index this as Matters Before the Court; he indexed this as "Work Injunctions" - Work Injunctions. That's what appears in the Index, somebody understood it. Mr. Evans understood it just as he understood the other

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . injunctions; just as he understood that it wasn't a picketing injunction, it was a free speech injunction, and that's how he indexed it. Why is it that I'm able to explain to Mr. Evans what I can't explain to any other member on the government side - with any member of the government side? But he understood it and anybody in the streets would understand it. Anybody who's handed that type of injunction would understand it. The Minister of Labour understands it because he's been told by people who want this type of an injunction, don't vote for this resolution; we want to be able to get these people back to work when they go on strike and we need this type of an injunction to get them to go back to work.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we can't solve the argument that's before the courts. I'm not asking for a solution to that argument. I'm asking for a solution to our own conscience as to whether we say, regardless of what the courts have said, do we say that this is a valid type injunction. Surely the Minister can answer that without getting a message from the Supreme Court of Canada, which is what he seems to be waiting for, but in the meantime while we are waiting, this type of jurisprudence becomes the law and it becomes easier and easier in every area, Mr. Speaker, for someone to say that we can settle economic disputes affecting employers and employees by some sort of compulsion.

It becomes easier to say, as they did in the railway strike, that you're to go to work or go to jail. It becomes easier to say, as they did in the Province of Quebec to the teachers, that you are to teach or go to jail. It becomes easier to say as they did in Saskatchewan, the Liberal Government of Saskatchewan, either operate this public service or go to jail. And it becomes easier for another judge to make the next injunction even a little stronger, and I'm asking someone, somewhere, to say that it stops here, that this Legislature says that if there's to be a solution to an economic dispute between an employer and an employee that that solution must come about with the integrity, the freedom of the individual on each side being respected, and if there is damages as a result of a breach of contract, then the solution to that damage problem is the solution to every other problem which involves damages affecting a breach of contract, and that is the issue of damages, that if a person sues somebody because he didn't continue to work for him, he can get damages.

My honourable friends - and I've heard some lawyers say this - well you can't collect damages against the trade unions; they don't have any money. On the one hand we're told that they have thousands of dollars; on the other hand, well we can't collect damages from the trade unions. Mr. Speaker, I've been practising law for 12 years or 11 years, I've been engaged in the legal profession for another four; I do not know of a single judgment against a trade union that has gone unsatisfied. Maybe the Minister of Labour knows one. I don't know of any and there have been several judgments, huge ones, against trade unions. I do not know of a single one that has gone unsatisfied. On the other hand, I know of numerous judgments against corporations that have gone unsatisfied, but does anybody suggest that because a corporation might not be able to pay that they be required to be treated differently than other people as they stand before the law.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the actions of the Minister of Labour in connection with this injunction can only suggest one thing: first of all, that he doesn't wish to assume the responsibility of ruling on this type of injunction; and secondly, Mr. Speaker, he wants to keep this type of injunction, because when he talks about industrial peace and the fact that there are few problems - he says few problems, I don't know, that's a relative term - but he keeps referring to the fact that we have no trouble. What he really means is that he has industrial conquests and that's what he's really interested in, industrial conquests, to keep these people down.

If he continues that way, Mr. Speaker, he's in for a very rude awakening because the person who is an employee has exactly the same human spirit within him as every other member in this House, and the human spirit which would prevent him from succumbing to this type of thing is going to prevent those people from succumbing to those type of things. If you're looking for labour unity, if you're looking for trouble, and if you think that this type of injunction should stay in existence, you will have trouble and you'll have labour unity. You'll have what you had with the doctors in Saskatchewan. The doctors as a group said we will not doctor in this province because we don't like its laws, and if you continue to do what you are doing with regard to labour matters, the employees of this province will say we will not continue to be employed in this province because we don't like its laws.

I wonder whether the government will then say, well we'd better look at this thing again. Or should they say it now in a relatively peaceful time when they have relative industrial peace,

(MR. GREEN cont'd)...when we have got good feelings on both sides; should they now say that we respect you as individuals, we respect your fundamental rights of freedom just as we respect our own, we recognize that an infringement of your freedom is an infringement of my freedom; should we say that now by adopting this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all members of the House to pass this resolution. There is nothing hidden in it. There is nothing dangerous about it. They are not saying anything but really stating what they believe and they are stemming what I say is a dangerous tide, a tide which suggests that it is possible to obtain industrial stability by the denial of the basic rights of freedom to one part of our population.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Those in favour please say "Aye" -- those opposed please say "Nay" --

MR. GREEN: Let's hear what it is.

MR. PAULLEY: I think we won that one, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: It seems to me that the Yeas have it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs: Campbell; Cherniack, Clement, Dawson, Dow, Doern, Fox, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak and Uskiw.

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 21; Nays, 28.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. Had I voted I would have voted against the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member of St. John's in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the House to have this matter stand, although if there is anyone else who wishes to speak they may.

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

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I have found this a most interesting debate, and as the situation now exists on the Order Paper I think it presents a most challenging situation to any of us. I suppose I should announce first of all that I am speaking entirely for myself. That will become evident in my few brief remarks because I am constrained to take a different approach to some others in this Party.

In expressing my own point of view on this matter, Mr. Speaker, I can return to what may have become through the years a sort of a special text of mine. They tell about our old friend Cato who said in Latin - that I can't repeat - that Carthage must be destroyed, and he kept repeating that at the end of every speech that he made and apparently he made a great many in the olden days. Well if I have got any special message that I would like to have associated with my name - I don't ever expect to achieve the notoriety or fame that Cato did - it would be this text: that what the people can do for themselves, they can do better than the government can do it and more cheaply, and that's the text on which I would base my stand on this resolution.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that in this particular instance that the people can, by co-operation and by community effort, do better in this work than the government would do if they entered into it, and consequently I do not intend to support the resolution. Not only do I find myself in disagreement with the amendment to the amendment, but I could say further that it seems to me that the job is already being tackled, not fully I suppose, but it is presenting I think a challenge that is being accepted by communities and by churches. It seems to me it is a useful type of work in which they should engage. I'm not denying that there is a need for this type of establishment; I'm not trying to pretend that the number of working mothers will not

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) . . . . continue to need this assistance. In fact I would be prepared to agree with some who have suggested that it will probably grow, but I do not think that it is an area that is beyond the capabilities of private enterprise and community and church effort, so I do not intend to support the original resolution or the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I am not raising a point of order and I'm not going to attempt to debate a point of order, but I would like to say in passing that I believe that the amendment to the amendment is out of order. I'm not trying to hide behind that because I have already stated my position on the amendment to the amendment, which in my opinion is exactly the same principle as the original resolution. Having stated my position on the amendment to the amendment as being in opposition to it because I believe private enterprise and community effort and co-operative effort can achieve what is needed here, yet I do in passing say that I think that the House makes a mistake, Mr. Speaker, when we allow an amendment to an amendment which simply reinstates the same principle as the original resolution.

Now I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that you have before you a precedent that was established during the time of your predecessor, but I would suggest that this is one of the matters that the Rules Committee should look at when we reconvene. Having said that, and I do not intend to argue it at any length at all, I would next say, Mr. Speaker, and with all respect to you because these are not criticisms, under the circumstances I know that the amendment has been accepted because it's before us and it's been discussed, but I would suggest that once again when the Rules Committee meets that we should take a look at this type of an amendment, because in my opinion the amendment is out of order also. I think that it could not be held that the amendment that has been moved by the First Minister is an amendment to the original resolution. I'm not an authority and I don't pretend to be, Mr. Speaker, but to the extent that I understand the fundamental rule regarding amendments, this is the quotation: "The law on the relevancy of amendments is that if they are on the same subject matter with the original motion they are admissible, but not when foreign thereto."

Mr. Speaker, I suggest when my honourable friend the First Minister seized upon a resolution that dealt with one main matter, that is a day nursery to give proper care to children, when he seized upon that resolution in order to introduce an amendment dealing with a wide-ranging investigation on the status of women, that it is foreign, completely foreign to the main resolution and is therefore not an amendment at all.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that in discussing points of order or rules of the House at this stage that I must do so with all respect to your position and I recognize the position that you are in, but let me say that having stated that I do not intend to support the amendment to the amendment, I certainly do not intend to support the amendment when we come to it, because in addition to being in my opinion out of order, it is much worse than that, in that I believe it is simply a face-saving device by the government side who didn't want to stand up and be counted on the original resolution, so a method was found to employ a diversionary tactic which provided this lengthy involved complex amendment dealing with a different subject.

The subject matter of the amendment is a study on the question of the status of women and I have counted it up roughly, Mr. Speaker, and determine that there are at least 32 different questions or places of study named in that amendment - at least 32 - and one of them, one of them deals with day nurseries. It's true that one deals with a mother's emergency help which is allied, one deals with latch-key programs and one with training programs. These are allied subjects I admit, so give them four out of 32. The rest in my opinion are not directly concerned with the subject matter that was discussed in the original resolution. The subject matter there was the provision of day nurseries for children, and the status of women study is in my opinion a diversionary tactic that should not be supported.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is all that I have to say on the amendment to the amendment and the amendment itself. I hope it will be unnecessary for me to speak again on either one of them because I appreciate your courtesy, Mr. Speaker, in allowing me to range over both of them at this time and it'll be unnecessary I suppose for me to speak on the original motion if it should be reached in that form. I'm not hiding behind the fact of my belief being that the amendment to the amendment is out of order, that the amendment is our of order, because I'm prepared to say that I do not support the main principle. I do not support the amendment either, Mr. Speaker, so perhaps the House will be relieved of the opportunity of listening to me later on, although if it should happen that I should be encouraged by something else that takes place in the meantime, I will of course be prepared to develop in a little further detail my remarks with regard to the amendment. I hope not, but it might even be to the resolution itself when that is reached.

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd)....

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the cogent arguments that have been presented and with full appreciation of the sincerity by which the mover of this resolution and those who have supported him are actuated, I find myself unable to support it.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs: Barkman, Cherniack, Clement, Dawson, Dow, Doern, Fox, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak and Uskiw.

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 20; Nays, 31.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the sub-amendment lost.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment to the main motion?

MR. HARRIS: If nobody else wishes to speak, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Wellington, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Elmwood and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Emerson in amendment thereto standing in my name. I have given the matter of this amendment careful consideration, that of the Honourable Member for Emerson, and I consider it in order. The Honourable Member for Emerson wish to proceed - or he's already spoken, I think.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order here. I am not disputing your ruling, Sir, but I just wonder if it would not be advisable to put the words, "give consideration to advisability of" in the first paragraph of the resolution part so as to keep it on all fours with our rule about money resolutions being of a certain nature. I would certainly be glad if the mover of the amendment would do that and then I think we'd be on all fours.

MR. TANCHAK: It's agreeable.

MR. ROBLIN: Perhaps then, Mr. Speaker, the Clerk could take note that the next time this order appears those words could be inserted by leave.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the Clerk has the contents of those remarks that have been made.

MR. ROBLIN: Are you addressing the Clerk, Sir, or me.

MR. SPEAKER: I wondered if the Clerk had the contents of your remarks that are to be recorded in the Order Paper the next time it appears. I wonder if he has them.

MR. ROBLIN: Thank you, Sir, I think he has. It's to insert the words, "to give consideration of the advisability of" which is inserted in an appropriate place in the first paragraph of the resolution section of the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: That is agreed to by the Honourable Member for Emerson. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I assume that the numbering of the lines would be in accordance with the Votes and Proceedings but I'm wondering if it could be clarified just what word "and" is the word -- which "and" rather is the one that is to be followed by the deletion and replacement. It's not clear to me and I'm wondering if that could be clarified.

MR. ROBLIN: If my honourable friend is referring to the point that I raised -- (Interjection)-- oh, sorry.

MR. CHERNIACK: No, I'm also wondering just where these additional words would fit in but I would understand it better once I knew where the amendment itself started.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): I would suggest that it is already there in the amendment, and the point the First Minister is referring to is at the very beginning of Mr. Doern's ...

MR. ROBLIN: I assume it's correct, but it had to be repeated in the amendment.

MR. MOLGAT: If I may on a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I agree with the First Minister because the amendment wipes out the "Therefore be it resolved" section of the original motion and so it is correct that the words "consider the advisability" are removed.

In reply to the question raised by the Honourable the Member for St. John's, I think what's happened here is that as the resolution is transported from Order Paper to Order Paper sometimes the lines are changed and in this case the "and" which appears at the end of the fourth line --(Interjection)--that's right - presumably in a previous Order Paper it appeared on the fifth line but that's the one that's referred to.

MR. DOERN: The confusion is on the fact that of counting exact lines as they're printed here rather than sentences - or at least clauses rather - if you count just straight down it looks as if you're in the middle.

MR. SPEAKER: I am told that the Orders of the Day and the Votes and Proceedings are not printed exactly the same and this is probably causing a little confusion in the minds of some of the honourable members.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if you'll go back to the Orders of the Day of Wednesday, April 5th for example, you will see there that the "and" does in fact come in the fifth line of the resolution and it was based on the Order at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder with everything said, and I'm sure the Clerk has the suggestion which has been accepted by the Honourable Member for Emerson, if we could let the matter rest there until it appears again in order that we can proceed from that point onward. Is that agreed? I'd like to thank the honourable gentlemen for their many opinions.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Burrows. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, if there's no one else who wishes to participate in the debate, I'll be closing it.

I was rather interested in hearing the comments made in this debate from the other side of the House. Two points in particular that I found particularly difficult to comprehend, one the reference made by the Honourable Member for Roblin to natural gas as being a surplus resource. Well perhaps it may well be at this particular time of this day, but I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member were to check some of the recent reports dealing in studies made on the matter of demand for natural gas he would find that within a very short while there would be demand for all the gas that we could possibly produce in the country of Canada.

I was also particularly intrigued by the statement that he made stating that the southern loop, that is through the United States, will set up a long-range energy program for Canada. This I find particularly difficult to understand. Why must we go beyond the boundaries of our own country to set up an energy program for our own use? The day that this resolution was introduced the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition made the statement that we had nothing to worry about; after all, Trans Canada Pipe Lines is 92 percent Canadian-owned and the ownership of the southern gas lines will still rest in the hands of Canadians. Well, if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would apply a little bit of arithmetical calculation he will find that our ownership in this line will be less than 50 percent because the southern route going through the United States will be jointly owned by the Trans Canada Pipe Line and an American firm, in partnership, operating under the name of Great Lakes Transmission, in which each will own a 50 percent interest. So if you take 92 percent of 50 percent you will get something less than even a 50 percent interest which will be owned by Canadians and the balance of the interest in foreign control.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition also mentioned that this matter is not really one of concern to Manitobans because we're not producers of natural gas. This is something for the people in Alberta and Saskatchewan to concern themselves about but not here in the Province of Manitoba. Well even though we may not be major producers of natural gas in Manitoba, surely, Mr. Speaker, we have an interest in this matter as consumers of natural gas, despite whatever the Honourable Member for Selkirk may have said when he attempted to enlighten me on matters of physics and mathematics when he said that it's not only the diameter of a pipeline that one must take into consideration in determining the amount of gas that will flow through it but it's also the pressure factor that one must consider. This is very true, but there is a third factor also which the honourable member had overlooked, and that is there'll likely be a tap somewhere down -- or a valve down in the vicinity of Emerson, and I think it is of concern to us as to who controls that valve that's going to regulate the flow of gas into Canadian branch pipelines or into the American pipeline. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I suggest

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . . to you that this matter is of vital concern to us in the Province of Manitoba, to us living in a province which has potential for industrial development; living in a province which the government states has potential for industrial development; living in a province to develop which the government itself has introduced resolutions to promote the northern development of natural resources and so forth.

The Honourable Member for Selkirk also mentioned that I did not give the complete story, that I did not give both sides of the picture, that I only dealt with the arguments favouring a Canadian-routed pipeline but that there were arguments against it. There are also arguments against allowing the pipeline to go beyond the boundaries of the Dominion of Canada, Mr. Speaker, and I do not feel that it's necessary to repeat them at this time. My leader dealt with them when he debated this resolution some time last week. But just in briefly summarizing, there will be an economic loss to Canada which will far exceed the saving that may come about, if any, due to the slightly cheaper gas; economic loss by virtue of the multiplier effect that is generated in any new industry; economic loss by virtue of the loss of corporate taxes, a good portion of which we would lose; an economic loss as a result of loss of personal income tax which we would lose because any labour connected with the construction of this pipeline will lie outside the boundaries of the Dominion of Canada.

Now the question of costs had been mentioned, that it'll be cheaper to build this line through the United States than through Canada. The difference in the cost, Mr. Speaker, is \$35 million roughly. The cost of the line commencing at Emerson and extending east is somewhere between 200 million and \$210 million. Building that same line for the same distance connecting the same two points in Canada through Ontario will cost about \$35 million more, which really is a pittance in comparison or in relation to the loss of close to a billion dollars in income which Canada would lose by having this line outside its boundaries.

It was also mentioned that there's a market for this gas in the United States and at the present time much of this gas - natural gas - is surplus gas which we could export, so why not build a line to the United States and sell it there. But, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that we take a long range view of our natural gas needs and surely - surely, Mr. Speaker, it would be of greater benefit to Canadians to build branch lines from a Canadian-based line to any American market than to have to build branch lines back into Canada from a gas line routed through the United States. If there are markets in the United States across the boundary line from Sault Ste. Marie, a branch line could be built there. Branch lines can be built in various points in the Province of Ontario or in the Province of Quebec to serve American markets. That I suggest, Mr. Speaker, would be a wiser method of utilization of our resource by having it transported through our country rather than a foreign country and then routing it back into our own land.

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30. Before I continue, I wonder if I might direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery. It has been brought to my attention that we have a Mr. Herbert Brook, Deputy Speaker and MLA for the constituency of Esquimaux in the B.C. Legislature. On behalf of all the honourable members, Sir, I welcome you here today.

It is now 5:30 and I'm leaving the Chair to return again at 8:00 o'clock.