

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, January 31, 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.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry) introduced Bill No. 38 An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act.

MR. M. E. MCKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne) introduced Bill No. 39 An Act to incorporate the Agricultural and Community District of Newdale.

MR. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin) introduced Bill No. 41 An Act to incorporate St. Paul's Home.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I should like to present a Return to an Order of the House No. 24 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Provincial Treasurer. Could he indicate to the House when we might expect the budget?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): Not definitely, I'm afraid.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, am I correct in that the indications were prior to the Christmas recess that the budget would be introduced within a few days of the reconvening of the House?

MR. EVANS: I think that is correct, but it has had to be delayed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. Is this any indication that the government is changing its mind with regard to its tax policy?

MR. EVANS: More to do with Ottawa not making up its.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of N. D. P.) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day may I address a question to the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer. Is it the intention of the government to float a Savings Bond issue this year?

MR. EVANS: The matter is being considered. I have not been able to make any announcement in that connection.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to lay on the table of the House, a copy of all of the regulations filed under the Regulations Act between the 7th of February '66 and the 31st of December 1966. This filed pursuant to the requirements of the Regulations Act.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Highways) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day may I reply to a question of the Honourable Member from Portage, yesterday. The work being carried out on the Flin Flon by-pass is all by contract let as a result of advertising of public tenders.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Sir, I would like to ask who will determine in each town, what properties are commercial. To give you an example of what I am asking - supposing I own two homes in one town and I am renting these for revenue. What will be the tax structure for these? Will they be 33 percent or will they be 9 percent and who will make the decision? The second part of my question is, if I have a piece of property with a business in the bottom of it and a home at the top of it, what will be the tax structure on that and who will make the decision on that?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I believe this is now with the Department of Municipal Affairs, and the Bill that will come before the House at that time will have these definitions ready for you.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I have a question that I wish to direct to the First Minister. I notice reported in last night's paper that the Federal Government proposes to make available \$800 million for housing and there was also a comment there that in the opinion of Mr. Sharp the provinces and municipalities, or at least some provinces and municipalities, have not taken the maximum advantage of this in the past. My question is, has the Government of Manitoba a plan for the maximum utilization of this fund that is being made available for housing development, particularly as this refers to, particularly for low cost housing and such?

MR. ROBLIN: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the appropriation to which my honourable friend makes reference is the money the Federal Government make available to the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation which in turn provides the basis on which they make their plans. We have never been satisfied that the rules of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation are completely satisfactory to the Province of Manitoba, and as a matter of fact, the Federal Minister will be here sometime in the month of March and we expect to be dealing with that question when he visits us.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. Baldur Kristjanson, the deputy minister of the Manitoba Development Authority was speaking in Brandon on Saturday and expressed some views that appeared consistent with those of Rene Levesque. Is this government policy?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think when Dr. Kristjanson accepted the invitation to which my honourable friend refers, he was at that time Chairman of the Economic Consultative Board and he thought it advisable for him to continue to discharge the obligation to make the speech and he therefore spoke perhaps in that capacity. But I must say that the substance of his remarks - and I have read the speech - are not inconsistent with the position taken by the Province of Manitoba in that we believe that national policies to promote regional development are a missing link in the present fiscal economic relationship between the Federal Government and the Provincial Government. The exact machinery that Dr. Kristjanson proposed in dealing with this matter is of course a matter for discussion.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, the remarks inferred that he favoured a weakening of a strong central government. Surely the Provincial Government has not indicated that before have they?

MR. ROBLIN: I think if my honourable friend takes the trouble to read the full speech, as I have, that he will not make that interpretation.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct this question to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. I was wondering whether or not the Honourable Minister had occasion to notice the article in last night's paper with regard to the new assessment in the East St. Paul area and the problem arising as a result. If I might quote a section of this clipping, this might indicate to the honourable member just what I am driving at.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member would put his question.

MR. USKIW: Is the government considering ways and means of assessing farm property, or market garden property, in relation to productivity. I think this is a problem that has arisen before.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): This morning we were talking to some of the members from the area municipalities around and we have this matter under consideration.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question - I am not sure which Minister it should go to, whether it should be the Provincial Secretary or the Attorney-General - referring to a headline that appears in the Globe and Mail of yesterday, and it says "Ombudsman for Manitoba is at least a year away". I wonder if the Minister would care to comment; if it is true that the government does not propose to proceed with that legislation at this session?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, the general outline was presented to the Members in the White Paper entitled Citizens Remedies Code. That will shortly be coming under discussion and no doubt debate by the legislature at that time. I think perhaps this matter could be discussed. I'm not familiar with the article to which the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition has made reference.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. Does the government intend to proceed at this session with the establishment of the office of the ombudsman?

MR. McLEAN: It depends a good deal, Mr. Speaker, on what takes place when we discuss the White Paper itself.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. When will he be tabling the Minimum Wage Report?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I'll table the minimum wage report when it has been completed by the minimum wage board and policy has been established by the government.

MR. PATRICK: A subsequent question. When does the Minister expect the report will be completed?

MR. BAIZLEY: I do not know.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I wonder if I could direct the attention of the Members to the gallery. On my left there are 100 Grade 8 students from Norberry School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Cummer, Mrs. Cronmiller and also Mr. Huss. This school is situated in the Constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Vital. On behalf of the Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

ORDERS FOR RETURN

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker I ask permission of the House to withdraw this Order.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave?

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information concerning the Tenders by the Manitoba Hydro, for temporary housing at Kettle Rapids.

1. (a) date the tenders advertised, (b) date of closing of tenders, (c) list of firms submitting bids, (d) amount of each bid, (e) any extension for submitting bids permitted or given and if so to what date and how given, verbally or by letter? (f) if extensions given, were all bidders given the same opportunity to retender? (g) copy of all correspondence between firms tendering, and Manitoba Hydro.
2. Was Clause 16 on page 5 of the specifications complied with by the firm awarded tender.
3. Did any unsuccessful tenderer make any complaints written or oral to any member or members of the Cabinet concerning the method by which successful tenderer was chosen and if so what replies were given and whether oral or written - giving copies of the latter.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, something that the Honourable Minister of Welfare said a few days ago, or last week, prompted me to place this Order for Return. While he was speaking he was telling us of the work that was being done in the north of this province and he made such a big thing about the fact that it would mean, what it would mean to local Manitoba contractors and especially to the labour force. I asked him a question at the time and he could not reply so I thought that we would give him a chance to do so at this time. Apparently we have here an example of what this will mean to the people of Manitoba, this great work going on in the north and the emphasis that has been placed that this is going to help our own citizens. I might say at the start, Mr. Speaker, that I do not suggest that any bids from contractors living, operating from outside the province should automatically be refused, should not be entertained, but I think that everything else being equal, we should at least give the preference to the local contractors.

Now we have a copy here of the report of the - McLeans building report, dated August 29th, tenders and construction of camp buildings in Manitoba for Kettle Falls, tenders in the following price were received: Pearson Construction Company Limited, 1019 Erin Street, Winnipeg, \$1,987,614.00. And then Atco Industries Limited, \$1,992,613.00, which is more than Pearson. Then of course the -- I think if my information is correct the date for these tenders was supposed to be August 27th and then this was extended to the 29th. And although this is perfectly legal, the contract was let out only on September 21st - or at least this is what one of the tenderers, the information that he received. Now we have a - these are the specs that usually accompany the plan, there's quite a few pages - this was tendered and I forgot to read here that on September 30th, again from the McLeans report, that specification number 416, construction of camp buildings Kettle Generating Station, Nelson River, information below not previously reported, awarded to Atco Industries Limited, 1243-48th Avenue, N.E. Calgary. This with tenders closed on August 29th.

Well we have these specs here, as I say there's lots of work in there and some of the people I think at an important cost to them went to the trouble of finding out and putting a bid. It's true that there is one point here that says - and this is number 12, that if it's the tenderers opinion improvements and performance, economy or provision for re-use of building at other sites can be affected by departure from this investigation, the tenderer is invited to offer alternatives for all or any of the buildings. In other words, throw this thing out and put your own bid. And apparently this is what was done. Now from some of the people who did put in

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)..... a bid, and they cannot prove this, this is just something that they feel with the way things have been going and information that they have received, they suspect - and as I say they're not accusing - but they certainly suspect that this Atco Company has had prior knowledge of this work to be done in Kettle Rapids.

Now, you notice, Mr. Speaker, the lowest tender was one from Manitoba, but they were not awarded the tender - the lowest bid I should say. And apparently this is what Atco decided to do, they forgot about the rest of the specifications and they just took this clause and they brought in their own. And I think that in a case like this, especially when this had been given and the price was lower that these people certainly should have had a chance to retender if there was something new.

But the very important part as far as I'm concerned - it's not only the construction firm, although I would like to see as I said - when things are equal I would like to see the local firm get the preference. They are the people that are paying the taxes and I think they should have the chance and apparently this is not the case. But - this is, referring to this statement of my honourable friend the minister of welfare - and mind you many in the other departments, who made such a big thing about the work that this is going to do for the people up north. And there is a clause here -- and I'm not a lawyer but it seems to me that this clause, at least it was the intention of the government who's been talking so much about the north and the work that it's going to provide for these people that they should have paid attention to this -- and this is clause 16, the one that I refer to: "It shall be a condition of the contract that in selecting persons other than supervisory personnel to be employed in the work, those applicants for employment who have shown that they possess a contractor's reasonable requirements as to training, experience and other qualifications for the particular work to be performed shall be given preference by the contractor as follows" - and it explains.

Now this work, this was pre-fab and all the work was done in Calgary. People that were interested in submitting sub-tenders contacted this Company and they were not even interested in talking to them. And I understand they even brought in their people from Alberta - this is what they're going to do to assemble this work because they need experts.

Now I'd like to ask my honourable friend, the Honourable Minister of Welfare, who was so interested - and rightly so if, he is interested - in the welfare and in providing work for the people of the north and I'd like to ask the members of the cabinet and the Premier who is interested in the people of Manitoba if he feels that this is fair for the contracting firm, and is this getting material bought or produced in Manitoba when everything is done right in Calgary, even the painting? And what is it doing to our labour force, to our people?

Now, I understand that some of the people who were not satisfied - and this is not just Pearson I can assure you of this, there is certainly many sub-trades. This was brought up to the attention of certain ministers; it was brought up to the attention of the Minister of Labour who never replied. This is the information as I say that I've received. It was brought up to the attention of the First Minister and the attention of the Minister of Industry and Commerce and the reply was we'll see that this doesn't happen again. Well that's not good enough, Mr. Speaker; that's not good enough. If there's an injustice, if we've forgotten the people of Manitoba in this I think that this should be corrected immediately. We have talked about priorities, we're always talking about priorities here in this House. I think they should be considered in a case such as this one. It's not just a question of money, although this was lower - the first one was lower - but it's the question of forgetting local people and the material or anything that was needed for this construction, and last but certainly not least, giving jobs to some of the people up north. I would say that this is - I'm not saying that legally there's anything wrong, I'm not suggesting this, but I think that the government should take these things into consideration and in fact even if it was a little more money -- and by some of the experts in this field I understand - and I don't know too much about that - I know that at least one of the members here probably has some experience in this -- I understand that the maintenance of these type of buildings also will be very costly. I wonder if this was taken into consideration. And also the heating and all this type of work that goes in with a building; it's not just a frame, there's heating and plumbing. Apparently the maintenance up there could be quite costly.

But the main thing that I'd like to say and the reason why I brought this up is mostly because of the chance that we lost to give employment to those people. These people that tendered, the sub-trades and the other ones, they feel - I'm saying again I'm not talking about in the legal sense, but they feel cheated. And they're not too interested in bidding again, for instance Pearson feels that that cost him in man hours and so on a few thousand dollars to get

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)..... thing ready. They feel if this is the way this is going to be done and the only answer they're going to receive by one minister is complete ignorance and two others, we'll see that this does not happen again, that the government certainly should take a little more interest in the people of Manitoba, especially when we're giving so much attraction to outsiders coming in, at least when we have our own people who are paying the taxes I think that we should give them a better deal than apparently was given in this instance, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I beg to - I was going to adjourn it but if someone else wants to speak now, well that's fine. In any case I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that debate be adjourned. However, as I said, if anyone cares to speak now, it's quite all right with me.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: seconder rather than the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I was wondering....

MR. SHOEMAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for St. John's. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: I wonder if I might have permission to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Russell, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne in amendment thereof. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, to get on with this debate I want to indicate to the movers of the original resolution, a liberal motion to increase the initial price on grains, as an appropriate motion. I think this is a timely motion in that I certainly agree that bearing in mind that the final payments of grain or on grain over the last number of years have been substantial, that there certainly is a valid reason to increase initial payments. It seems to me unreasonable that farmers must wait seventeen or eighteen months to receive one-third of their wages. Surely there must be some explanation as to why we can't have higher initial payments and I'm sure if we looked into the matter I think we would find that there is no explanation. I think that it's conceivable that we could get a higher initial payment so I lend support to the motion. I think it's a very timely motion and I'm certainly happy to concur with it.

Withholding a large portion of the price of a bushel of wheat, barley or oats or what-have-you, has the effect in fact of reducing the total price of that product. It reduces the price of that commodity by the very fact that farmers having to wait so long for the back payments are forced into paying interest for a long period of time on loans which they provide for themselves in anticipation of these payments. So in effect if farmers are in a position where they have to borrow money and they have to pay 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 percent on that money, the longer we withhold or the more money we withhold from the farmers, the more it costs them to facilitate these loans and thereby in effect it reduces the overall price in a bushel of wheat or a bushel of barley and so forth. So I think it's very important that we make this point clear that the end result is we get a lower price regardless of what the newspaper tells us as to what the price is. It's the actual reality of the situation that counts.

I feel strongly that this House should be unanimous in supporting this resolution. I note that the contribution made by the government side of the House has been in the affirmative, so in this instance I feel there shouldn't be a problem, that being we are all unanimous here in Manitoba - and I'm sure we will be all unanimous insofar as the three prairie provinces are concerned - that this should be enough pressure to bear to bring forth some results.

I was quite interested in the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, and indeed in the amendment to the motion. In his amendment he indicates the need for a higher price on the international markets. He emphasizes that we must urge government at the federal level to negotiate for a higher minimum and maximum price for wheat on the international market, through the International Wheat Agreement, and I certainly concur with that motion. It's equally as timely as the original motion to increase the initial price on grains: I think these are both timely motions and certainly I am very happy to add my support to those motions.

However, I was rather taken aback from the remarks the Honourable Member for Souris-

(MR. USKIW cont'd)..... Lansdowne made prior to presenting his amendment. He talked about a number of things regarding the problems in agriculture, in particular he made reference to the costs going up all the time, wheat prices being static over the years -- I think he made mention of the fact, and I agree, that our price today is somewhat lower than it was in 1950 -- a terrible situation I might add -- and that I certainly am pleased that the government members recognize the problem. We certainly recognize the problem; so again we have unanimity here. We all know there's a problem. But my honourable friend carries on and he states that if farmers are going to survive they must negotiate or bargain better with their implement dealers. We must cut down the price of equipment by trying to bargain better with our implement dealers. I'm rather disappointed that this is an area which he feels is that important because I'm sure that we are all doing this -- I'm sure that each and every one of us as farmers are trying to drive the best bargain that we can in the purchase of farm implements. I think we've gone up the ladder insofar as savings are concerned in this respect as much as we can and I don't think that this is a positive solution to the problems in agriculture.

My honourable friend tells us that we have less wheat farmers - as the years go by each year we have fewer farmers - and I say to him that it isn't only wheat farmers it's all farmers that are getting smaller in number. In the past 10 years there were something like 200,000 farmers that have left the farm simply because of a price problem. So it isn't only the wheat farmer. It's all farmers that are faced with this problem.

My honourable friend also states that our sons are leaving the farms, they don't want to take over the enterprise that has been established for them by their parents. It's not lucrative enough for them. I agree with him; this is so. It doesn't matter in which area in rural Manitoba one looks he'll find that the population or the farm age group is somewhere in the neighbourhood of over 50 years of age, on the average; that farm managers are 50 years of age or older, on the average. So I certainly agree this is true.

My friend also tells us that we can't afford the price of labour and I have to agree with him on that score as well. Certainly agriculture is in a position where they can't afford to pay the labour a decent price, a decent wage for their efforts. All these statements are true. But my friend tells us that before long we won't have independent farmers, that we might have corporation type farms if this trend doesn't stop. I might even agree with him there. If the trend doesn't stop that's what we will have. And I suggest that we ought to stop the trend.

Farmers with only one occupation are really in trouble my honourable friend from Souris-Lansdowne tells us. Is he suggesting to this House that it is reasonable to expect that all farmers should have three or four occupations? And I know this is the case in many areas of Manitoba. I can cite examples from one end of the province to the other where people are taking on other responsibilities apart from farming to supplement their farm income. The Honourable the First Minister indicated to us that there are something like 60 percent of our farmers with a gross income of \$5,000.00. A terrible situation. And he mentioned that he shuddered to think what their net income position was.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, may I just correct my honourable friend in case he leaves a wrong impression. The figure I was quoting was not the provincial figure in that instance, it was the national figure.

MR. USKIW: Yes, I quite agree that this was so. But regardless, I think Manitoba's position is comparable. I don't think there's much deviation; I don't think we are any better off or much better off, if we are, in the national picture. So that we all agree that there is this problem, but my honourable friend from Souris-Lansdowne makes a comment which to me is very unreasonable. He's pleading with the Federal Government to negotiate a higher price for wheat; he's crying about the problems in agriculture and then he comes out with a remark that farmers need a little extra money for curling. It's the curling season. If this is the example from that side of the House I am very disappointed -- I'm very disappointed. Farmers are not in need of money to go curling. They don't need pocket money. They need farm policies that's going to give them a decent standard of living. I say that his comments are a sham. I'm disappointed that those comments would be made in this legislature. We know how tough it is for our federal authorities, for our Canadian Wheat Board, to negotiate higher prices through the International Wheat Agreement. We may hope that they adopt our resolution and try and achieve for western farmers a higher price for their grains - in particular wheat; but we also know that the bargaining is going to be tough and we don't truly have too much in the way of hope for a substantial increase through the International Wheat Agreement.

So I say to this House that both our opposition, our Liberal Opposition and our Government

(MR. USKIW cont'd).... are falling short when they only talk about initial prices and when they only talk about someone else doing something - such as a higher price negotiated through the International Wheat Agreement. These two things I don't quarrel with but I don't think we ought to stop there. I have not heard a positive resolution from either side suggesting what we might do in the way of assisting the problems in agriculture. I have not heard resolutions to the effect that we should have perhaps a two-price system for wheat in this country of ours -- recognizing of course that we can't produce wheat and sell it to our consumers on the same level as we sell our wheat to markets under the International Wheat Agreement. I think this is a very great shortcoming on the part of members in this House if they don't recognize that we as wheat producers in Manitoba and indeed in the three prairie provinces are in fact subsidizing the consumer through low prices in wheat. I think there is a good case can be made for a two price system on wheat. The Federation of Agriculture has supported this idea; the farmers' unions have supported this idea, they have presented briefs suggesting that this be adopted -- that at least it would recognize that we do differentiate between what we receive on the international picture and what we are prepared to pay for the product which is consumed in Canada. Probably if we had a two-price system of wheat it wouldn't add more than 10 or 15 or at the most 20 cents a bushel, I don't know, but at least it would be something. It would be a step in the right direction. So I suggest that this is an area where we must give consideration. The fact that the price of wheat today is lower than it was in 1950 and the fact that the costs of operating have skyrocketed since 1950, probably two or three times over, is an indication that we have a responsibility to try and do something for farmers in Manitoba and for farmers in Canada.

So I suggest to this Assembly that the two Old Line Parties have fallen far short with their resolution. Farmers are indeed tired of slogans. They're tired of being told, "Well we're going to have a conference on agricultural policy some day." They're tired about this business of a lot of talk and no action. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we adopt a new attitude, that we come to grips with the problems in agriculture and although I support the resolution and the amendment to the resolution, I wish also to add an amendment to it. The amendment being as follows: Moved by -- or I move and seconded by the Member for Ethelbert Plains that the amendment be amended by adding the following words at the end of the resolution: and further be it resolved that this House urge the Government of Canada to institute a two-price system for wheat and that the Federal Government negotiate with the farm organizations to arrive at a price. Thank you.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the honourable member a question. I was just wondering if his party at any time has ever come up with a price that you would suggest for the -- like the wheat that is used for local, for home consumption in other words? -- three or four dollars a bushel or what figure would you suggest?

MR. USKIW: We have no figures. All I'm saying in the resolution is that the farm organizations are prepared to meet with government on this problem and that we suggest that government negotiate with the farm organizations to arrive at that solution. --(Interjection)-- Let's establish the principle of it first - that's right.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't get your seconder.

MR. USKIW: Member for Ethelbert-Plains.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. D. MORRIS McGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolutions. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, may I have this matter stand, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? The proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Leader have leave? Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. George. The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Minister, may I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand please.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member of Burrows in amendment thereto. The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, when I moved the adjournment of this debate I had it in mind to attempt to revise and to broaden the resolution somewhat from the way in which it appears on the Order Paper at the present time. However, in considering the wording of my amendment it became clear to me that it would not be appropriate to move it on this motion but rather on the main motion or the main motion as amended. I therefore will reserve the opportunity to make that motion at a more appropriate time. Suffice it to say, with respect to the amendment that I intend to support it and will hope that it will then become part of the main motion as amended and that I will then have an opportunity of making those further remarks which I had in mind.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on this resolution, drawing from some of my own experience as a high school teacher and speaking about the principle of lowering the voting age to 18.

One of the problems of being a high school teacher and talking about politics in general is that some people in the system are rather afraid of the whole idea of discussing government and discussing politics in general. For example, I remember a particular incident that stands out in my mind when about two or three years ago I worked on a series of articles called "Tips for Teenage Voters" which appeared in the Winnipeg Tribune and in some seven other newspapers across the country. The idea of this series was it was strictly an article series on government for young people and the idea was to introduce them to government; it did not offer political opinions but offered suggestions as to how to be well informed. I told my principal at that time that I was going to write this series and that I wondered whether he would be interested in mentioning it to the people in the school since the series was going to appear within a few days and I was told that, "oh, no, no this was politics". I re-explained and said very clearly that it was about politics or it was on government, - that I was not offering political opinions, I was offering suggestions as to how you should look for a good candidate. I tried to outline a short history of the political parties and so on. But I was told, no this was politics; it simply couldn't be touched and it simply couldn't be mentioned out loud. So I think a lot of people are afraid, and particularly principals that I have encountered, are afraid of politics and to a certain extent, with some reason, I'll mention that later again.

There are of course, current affairs clubs in some of the high schools and these I think are invaluable, but the thing that concerns me is the present history courses which really in terms of preparing people for public life, or preparing people for knowing something about politics and for voting intelligently, I think they fall very short here. If you look at the Canadian History course taught in Grade 11 - and I might just review briefly for the members that the only History course on Canadian History between Grades 9 and 12 is in Grade 11, the others deal with British History, American History and European -- so at the end of the year you take about six weeks of what is called Civics or government, and this is inadequate. The high school History programs at present are what you might call History Looking Back - they do not really deal with the 1960's and in many cases they don't even really get into the 20th century. I think a typical high school history teacher trying to handle the bulk of the Grade 11 Canadian History course staggers up to 1914 and the course is over. He doesn't really get into the 20th century and his students get a six week course in government and what do you know after six weeks of discussing the parliamentary system, discussing the courts, discussing all aspects of government? - not very much.

Now of course some teachers - and I put myself in this category - greatly emphasize current affairs and talk almost every day on current issues and so on; and some teachers of course assist their students' knowledge by bringing them right here into this Legislature. I think this is a very worthwhile thing to do. I myself brought classes here in the last few years. Some of the schools are now starting political clubs. I notice that the Honourable Joe Greene said that he was very much in favour of political clubs in high school and that some of them are now starting mock parliaments. Of course the University had theirs and so on.

But I personally, would like to see a step up, a terrific step up in the activities in this direction. In fact, I could even propose theoretically the kind of course I would like to see in Grade 12 which would be a little different than the kind of things we have. For instance, why couldn't we have a course that would deal with politics in the 60's, take books on our present living figures which I know would create some controversy, a study of Hansard, a study of --

(MR. DOERN cont'd).... for instance, there have been special studies, the 1957 general election was studied by some professors, the '58 election, the '62 election. Why not study current things like that? Newspapers are used and should be used in the classroom. One technique that I worked on and in a sense pioneered was using the political cartoon to interest students in current affairs. For example, I assume that by interesting students in political cartoons they would read the editorial page. I found out they couldn't understand cartoons. I found out they didn't know the figures. I found out they didn't know the issues; so I had to start with the cartoon as a thing in itself.

One point that I would like to get across very clearly - and I am ignoring some of the arguments made by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and so on - those are what I call the traditional arguments about if you are old enough to die for your country or fight for your country, you are old enough to vote. I approach it from a different viewpoint. Do I agree on that particular point? - I'll have to think about that. I agree if you are in the army, but I'm not sure if you are just 18, in general, because I would like to say to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and to other people, that the actual knowledge of the typical student in Grade 11 in our high schools, regarding politics and government is appalling. It's practically non-existent. For instance, go and talk to high school students in Grade 11, ask them what the policies of the various political parties are. --(Interjection)-- That's right the adults don't know either. Ask the typical student who the leaders of the parties are. Ask him what MLA means. Ask them anything about the parliamentary system. They don't know. Why don't they know? They have never been taught it. They are taught it first in Grade 11 at the end of the year in May. So the typical student takes Grade 11, as he gets to May he starts taking something about government, then he quits school, graduates, goes out and starts working. Three years go by and he's a voter. That's no way to prepare young people for government in terms of elective office or in terms of simply being an intelligent voter. This is a point that I stress very strongly, telling the students that unless they know, unless they rationally analyze elections and candidates they will vote on irrational bases; they will vote for or against ethnic backgrounds; they'll vote for or against something their father stands for; they will vote for their father's party because it is their father's party and so on. I don't consider those reasons. I consider them explanations of why people vote, but I don't consider them good reasons for voting. Good reasons would be you study the parties, you study the planks, you look at the leaders, you look at the men, then you decide. That takes a bit of knowledge and background.

Now if you look at current statistics in this country I believe that the last one I saw said that 50 percent of our population is under 25 years old, so there is a tremendous number of young people and this seems to be increasing. In fact it puzzles me all the time because it seems if you project this every year they are getting younger and younger, it seems like a couple of hundred years from now we'll all be one year old, because that seems to be the logical conclusion we are working towards.

And then another thing I would like to touch on briefly is the teacher discussing politics. I raised this during the last election campaign and I think

MR. SPEAKER: Would you mind taking your seat. I appreciate the honourable member is required to go far afield and I believe the Chair has been rather lenient in that respect. I wonder if he would keep to the principle of the resolution itself rather than take us into the field of education at this particular time.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I thought that I was doing that and I was going to draw parallels, but I'll be more direct if you like.

I will make my point very simply, and it is this: that the average student, the average student in high school today who is 18 years old, and if he is in Grade 11, does not really know enough to vote intelligently. That is my point. Because these people come into Grade 11 which is their only Canadian History course, their only government course in high school, and in effect they know nothing - and I speak from five years experience and I speak from a great interest in young people, so my point is this - that if we are going to talk about lowering the age to 18 let's not do it on the grounds that the adults aren't informed and neither are the young people, so let's give it to them anyway. Let's take the approach that we will prepare young people properly for this responsibility and the way to do that, is the New Democratic amendment which says, that you take this into account in the high school history program, that is the right approach; and in there you should discuss things like political parties, things like the Liberal, the Conservative, the New Democratic, the Social Credit platforms. Perhaps a discussion of prime ministers, because our students don't know anything about prime ministers.

(MR. DOERN cont'd).... They can give you two sentences on John A. Macdonald and one sentence on Wilfred Laurier. They never heard of Robert Borden; they never heard of all the other prime ministers; they simply can give you two sentences on the biggest men of all. Why? They've never been taught anything about them. We don't deal with personalities in Canadian History, we simply deal with constitutional evolution. It's not very exciting but that's what we deal with.

So my point is very simple, that the 18 year old student in high school is not properly equipped and not properly trained in our present system to vote intelligently but he can be, he is bright, he does have ability, he can be prepared if we gear up the civics and the government program. So let's start in Grade 9 and give them some there; let's give them more in Grade 10 and a lot more in Grade 11. Not the six weeks in the university entrance course. Let's give them the half year that they take in the general course, those students are well prepared for voting, but let's give them some every year so that by the time they're 18 they will be prepared, because I don't think right now that they are.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Carillon 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 Assiniboia and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Kildonan, in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, this is a perennial resolution and I don't suppose for a moment there's anything new that can be said on this subject; everything has been said. However I think for the sake of the record a few words should be expressed. These are my opinions and perhaps I can say it in a way that won't be misunderstood.

I would like to start off Mr. Speaker, by saying I agree that I would like to see an increase in wages throughout this province. I agree \$1.00 an hour is not sufficient to maintain a standard of life which I would consider reasonable. Even \$1.25 could be said the same thing. I agree completely that this province should no longer look upon this area as being a low wage area and a low cost area, because it is no longer a low cost area and therefore should not be a low wage area. This I agree. I agree that we won't encourage industry to come to this province by the old "carrot" of low wages. Industry today wants competent, efficient, skilled, well paid labour, in available requirements to meet their needs. I agree. But one must bear in mind that wages are only one factor in encouraging industry and developing industry. I would certainly like to see, the same as every other member of this House, Sir, to see wages about \$2.00, \$2.50 and ... throughout this province. It would be a wonderful thing to be able to say that in this province.

I was very interested a month or so ago to hear from a reliable source that Jimmy Hoffa, who we've heard so much about, President of the Teamsters Union, who has increased the wage earnings of members of his union very substantially over a number of years, has also at the same time - or shall we say been instrumental, partly instrumental - has increased the profits of all the companies who are employing people in that Teamsters Union. It's a two-way trade. I was also interested incidentally, Mr. Speaker, to hear that nobody in the Teamsters Union works on his birthday and nobody loses pay for not working.

The impression which is created on this minimum wage is rather confusing and in many of the speeches that we've heard in this House over the years there's only one thing wrong, is that people are not speaking of minimum wage, they're speaking of fair wages or average wages. The subject under discussion is minimum wages. And therefore it has I think given the wrong impression. So really we agree that something should be done. Probably the grounds of disagreement is the method. People have various opinions and various reasons, maybe from their own personal experiences, maybe for parties and political reasons and many other reasons. However, I am convinced that the way to attain higher wages in this province, and in fact in any other province, is not by the means of increasing the minimum wage. The reason, Mr. Speaker, that I do not believe that this is the method is firstly we're getting government into the position of setting wages for industry -- and I don't think this is the reason that I elect a government -- and also one must bear in mind that wages has a big impact throughout, this is why I believe it should continue, unless someone can think of a better way, of having the minimum wage board recommend to government.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan stated the other day that the minister and the government should be responsible. I'd like to remind him that the minimum wage board only makes

(MR. PATRICK cont'd).... recommendations. The government and the minister are responsible. They do not have to accept the recommendations anymore than a government has to accept recommendations from any other board. It is still the government's responsibility.

I believe the real solution to this problem, Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, is to increase the skills of the working man so he be worth more to his industry. If on the other hand he is an industry which is disappearing or he has not the physical ability then retrain him into another industry. And great strides as you know Sir, are being taken in this direction through vocational and trade schools.

I believe too that there is another aspect that perhaps we have not gone far enough along - and that is the right to organize. I know personally of several shops in this town here where they pay the minimum wages, the situation is interesting. Management will pay the minimum wages; the staff are not contented and in between them is a man responsible to management for seeing that quality and quantity are produced. And of course he cannot do it on the minimum wages. So, consequently management suffers. One must increase the standard of skills and at the same time see that the law is upheld so that those that wish to organize - and I'm speaking of provincial and Canadian organizations that wish to be represented through a co-operative body - may do so in order that their desires may be expressed safely and soundly and accurately to management because it is in the interests of management as well as labour. For my own business I'm not interested in how much I pay a man. I like to pay him as much as I possibly can and if I can get my customer to pay the increase I'm only too willing to do it. They way to get around that is to improve his skills, to give him more equipment to make his time more valuable so that the customer will pay the added money which he can get.

So I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the solution is not through increasing the minimum wage but through increasing the skill of our labour force, by seeing that those that wish to organize may do so freely, which is already the law, and by this means I am sure we will encourage industry to do a better job and produce a better product.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed Resolution, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that this matter be allowed to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution, the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La VERENDRYE): Could I have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? The adjourned debate and the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I rise to make just a few remarks relative to the resolution. I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker, since we're all aware - I think that the members of the House are aware - that the farm income as it stands now relative to the capital investment is not exactly in line probably with other businesses. I think that the cost of production and our capital expenditure and our net gain is the net result of what its commonly referred to as the cost-price squeeze. Undoubtedly the price of machinery is probably the largest single item in the cost of production. And therefore it is necessary that any dollar invested in the capital cost of machinery must be carefully invested in order that we may gain as much return from the dollar invested as possible. And so I have to agree with the Honourable Member from Brokenhead that all should be done possible to assist the farmers in getting as much return for their dollar, the capital cost of machinery should be carried out to whatever extent the government is in a position to do so.

I'm sure that all farm members, and indeed all members of the committee or of this House, will support any legislation which might help to stabilize and to support the economy of our basic industry, which namely of course is agriculture. However in my opinion, we must take a very careful look before we legislate to assist in the production of agriculture without having a very careful look at the net results. I think we should have a very careful look at the cost of instituting such a program as farm machinery testing in the area of research and what actual results would be gained by such a program.

The Honourable Member from Brokenhead proposes a resolution that the Government of Manitoba implement a farm machinery testing program. Now I was very interested when I read this resolution on the order paper, I felt sure that the lone member, the lone farm member from the NDP party -- I beg your pardon I wasn't aware that there was another one -- but the

(MR. WATT cont'd).... Member for Brokenhead apparently has established himself as the farm critic and I think that this is borne out in the Beausejour paper, I see an article in here where he is referred to as the farm spokesman for the New Democratic Party, where he goes on to quote the Premier on farm income and he refers to the \$5,000 farm income that was mentioned a few moments ago, and he does go on here to point out that the Roblin government have done nothing and are prepared to tolerate even incomes below the poverty line.

So I was interested, Mr. Speaker, in what the Member for Brokenhead might have to say in presenting this first resolution before this House in which the resolution states that a good farm machinery testing program had been established in the Province of Saskatchewan and that the present government had now seen fit to carry on with this testing policy. I was interested when I read the resolution on what he might say and naturally I think all members of the House would expect that he would get up and give us a complete outline on how this program had operated in the Province of Saskatchewan, what it had done for the farmers, what it had cost, to what extent they had gone into research and given us a complete outline of what we might expect if we plunged into such a program at the request of the NDP Party through this resolution without considering carefully what we might do for the farmers and to what extent the expense might run and to what extent we might relieve the machine companies of doing the research which they, in my opinion, are responsible for. But I'm sorry to say that we did not hear much about the plan in Saskatchewan anymore than the Honourable Member for Brokenhead did mention that he had received a pamphlet outlining the benefits of this program but not listing.

But he went on, Mr. Chairman, to mention his own personal experience and I gather from what he said in his speech as is quoted in Hansard that apparently this implement that he did buy and apparently was not adaptable to the type of soil on his own farm that the machine company - and I assume that it was a reputable machine company - had pretty well lived up to their guarantee -- I believe the Honourable Member said -- and had finally decided that it was not adaptable to the type of farm soil on my honourable friend's farm and said, "Here, we'll take it back." Now in effect, Mr. Speaker, this was actually saying that the machine companies were standing behind their machinery.

I could give you an example -- a personal experience again of my own -- that back in 1961 what I would say was a reputable implement company came out with a diesel tractor. It proved out after a few months that - many of these tractors were out in use - that they were faulty both in the motor and in the transmission gears. It wasn't too long before the company recognized that the defects were in this tractor for they came out and they offered a field change to all farmers that had purchased this tractor. I happen to have a tractor of this model on my farm now. They replaced the motor. They replaced the gears. There was no problem. However I am not saying, Mr. Speaker, that possibly that there are farmers who are buying machinery that have problems in other areas that some service in the area of testing might be of a benefit, but I cannot say at this moment that I could support a resolution that we simply plunge into the testing of farm machinery without knowing what we're going into; without probably finding out what had happened in the Province of Saskatchewan which I believe is the only province that has ever set up a farm testing program and which has subsequently been dropped by the Liberal Government of that province.

The second part of the honourable member's resolution, the second whereas, he goes on to say: and whereas the Liberal Government of Saskatchewan has bowed to interests by abandoning the service. I think I was more curious to find out what the Honourable Member for Brokenhead was going to say when it came to the second whereas in his resolution, because in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this really is a direct charge against a government of another province, and I was really curious to know what he was going to say, I thought that probably he would have an instance of some particular company, of some terrible capitalist and assuming that it must be some of the machine companies that had a stranglehold or had the government of the Province of Saskatchewan hamstrung to the point where were no longer able to govern for the people but were governing for a vested interest. However, he said nothing in this respect. And I must say, Mr. Speaker, that while I am not generally in the habit of getting up and supporting the Liberal Government in Saskatchewan or the Liberal Party in this province, I could not honestly stand up and vote for a resolution which in effect is saying, and with nothing to substantiate, that the government of another province is in effect a corrupt government.

So, Mr. Speaker, having looked carefully at both the whereases in this resolution, I beg

(MR. WATT cont'd)..... to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Springfield, that the resolution be amended by striking out all the words following the word "Whereas" in the first line thereof and by substituting the following: "Whereas during the last regular session of the legislature there was established a committee of the House to review price and other matters related to farm machinery; and Whereas it would be advisable to re-establish a committee of the House to review price and other matters related to farm machinery; Therefore be it resolved that a special committee of the House be established to inquire into prices of farm machinery and other matters related thereto including a farm equipment testing program."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker I'm sorry I haven't got a copy of the resolution before me - but it does appear to me that it may be the type of a resolution, Sir, that you might take under advisement to see first of all whether or not it is in order and secondly whether or not it might require a resolution from His Honour dealing with an expenditure of monies. As I say, I raise this point, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of having the amendment before me and suggest that the -- my suggestion to you of taking it under advisement has been done previously, and if you do that, Sir, we will have an opportunity then of considering the resolution as well.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party for his considered opinion and I am inclined toward his thinking, so therefore I will take this amendment under advisement and report on it in due course.

Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I request the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand but if any other honourable member would like to speak on the proposition introduced by my colleague I would be glad to hear them.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to have this matter stand.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move "Whereas it is the underlying principle of the Labour Relations Act that every employee has the right to belong to a trade union and can join with his -- oh excuse me, Mr. Speaker I beg your indulgence Mr. Speaker, I want to have this matter stand as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. We're now on the second one on that page, page 7. Second and last one.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move,

WHEREAS it is the intention of the Manitoba Legislature that, during negotiations concerning a collective agreement, there shall be no strikes or lock-outs and that the employer should not alter working conditions or rates of wages for the purpose of improving his bargaining position; and

WHEREAS this Legislature recognizes the impracticality of trying to ascertain the motive of an employer in changing working conditions;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that during negotiations pursuant to the Labour Relations Act, the employer be prohibited from altering wages or working conditions without first obtaining the approval of the employees through their bargaining agent.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I had initially intended to present one of the other resolutions that I had one the Order Paper but I later substituted my thinking and thought that this would be a more appropriate resolution to deal with at the present time. I think it's particularly appropriate that we deal with this resolution at the present time because of what the Honourable Member, Mr. Stanes, said - I'm sorry, I can't recall the constituency - the Honourable Member for St. James said with regard to the right of the employees to organize and the importance of that right with regard to the improvement of their working conditions. The Honourable Member from St. James did rather quickly indicate that the worker has that right to organize and therefore all is well and we needn't worry about the minimum wage.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the resolution that I put forward today, although it appears to be rather a directed one and to deal with a specific section of the Manitoba Labour Relations Act, is actually of great importance to the principle of collective bargaining - and as a matter of

(MR. GREEN cont'd)... fact, Mr. Speaker, in my submission it underlies that principle and as the Act now stands the principle of collective bargaining is greatly affected and is not being properly given effect to.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce my remarks with a little bit of background as to the bargaining position of employees and employers prior to the enactment of the Labour Relations Act. Prior to the enactment of the various statutes regarding labour relations a group of employees could at any time go home or go to one of the homes of one of the workers, have a meeting and decide that in order to improve their working conditions it is best that they appoint some representatives to act on their behalf and to bargain collectively rather than individually to approach their employer as a group rather than individually. Of course the employer could also engage in this type of bargaining by deciding to get together with various other employers and approach the employees of all of these people as a group. Prior to the enactment of the Labour Relations Act, Mr. Speaker, the employees last bargaining position was the withholding of their services. That is, if all negotiations broke down, they could do what any other person in our economic community is entitled to do, they could say, we won't sell our labour; we won't sell what you are wishing to purchase from us; and of course, the last economic bargaining position of the employer was to say that I won't buy your services. If that occurred we had an economics problem whereby the industry was unable to continue, that particular employer was unable to continue operations and the employees were unable to continue working until they agreed upon the price. Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is the same thing as a person buying a car, not being able to conclude the transaction because he is unwilling to pay the price or the owner of the car being unwilling to drop the price to the level that would conclude a sale. The transaction just didn't take place. And we didn't consider that this was the end of the world. We thought that it was better not to force the transaction to take place and to let the parties ultimately either come to an agreement or find another job on the one hand, or other employees on the other hand.

Now prior to the enactment of The Labour Relations Act there were various subtle manoeuvres on the part of either side in negotiating, in exercising their bargaining power. The employees would threaten they would withhold their services unless they got paid a rate which probably was beyond their real expectation. The employer, on the other hand, would try to weaken the bargaining position of his union in various ways. He would, and did, try to remove people who he felt were militantly holding the men together or he would increase wages a very small amount and thereby try to wither away the bargaining position of some of his employees. All of these practices, Mr. Speaker, were tried with relative degrees of success, but always there existed on the part of either the employee or the employer, the right to take effective steps to counteract the bargaining position of the other side. In particular, if an employer said that he was going to impair the bargaining position of his employees, either by reducing wages thereby in some way attempting to intimidate the employees or scare them out of their union, the men could say if you do this, we won't work as a group tomorrow or the moment that you do it; or he could very insignificantly raise the wages and if the employees felt that this was an attempt to weaken their position, they could say the same thing, we won't offer our services if you behave in this way. And the effective preventative to an employee bargaining in that way was the ultimate bargaining position of either the employer or the employee.

Now the enactment of The Labour Relations Act, Mr. Speaker, was, I submit, an attempt to rationalize this procedure, an attempt to bring some sort of stability into the question of labour relations so you wouldn't have employers immediately locking out their employees or employees immediately withdrawing their services before there was a real effort to engage in what we call significant collective bargaining. So The Labour Relations Act was passed which provided that the ultimate bargaining position, that is the withdrawal of services or the lock-out of a plant, would not take place until the parties had taken certain steps, and co-existent with removing the right to implement the effective bargaining position of either side, the Legislature said we must make sure that in the meantime neither side will do anything to impair the bargaining position of the other side, and to that end, Mr. Speaker, there was enacted into The Labour Relations Act - and I'm referring to Section 14 of the Revised Statutes of 1954 as it originally stood - and this said, "that where notice to commence collective bargaining has been given" - and I want to stress, Mr. Speaker, at this point, that this can only take place where the Legislature through the Manitoba Labour Board has recognized the bargaining position of the employees through a certified bargaining agent or through a bargaining agent

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . . that has bargaining rights by virtue of long standing agreement or standing agreement - "that where notice to commence collective bargaining has been given" - and then it says that the bargaining agent has to do certain things and the employers have to do certain things - then section (b) "the employer shall not, without consent by or on behalf of the employees affected, decrease rates of wages or alter any other term or condition of employment of employees in the unit for which the bargaining agent is certified."

So the Legislature, because it was taking away the right of both the employer and the employee to effectively put their strongest bargaining position, also said that you will not engage in what I would call shenanigans in the meantime. You will not do anything to upset this balance because something has been taken away from you -- taken away from the employees.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I notice that somewhere along the line between 1954 and 1966 this section was changed by adding to it, and I'll read the changed section. "The employer shall not, without the consent by or on behalf of the employees affected, decrease rates of wages or increase rates of wages for the purpose of impairing the bargaining position of a certified bargaining agent or alter any other term or condition of employment of the employees in the unit for which the bargaining agent is certified." So there has been added the words "for the purpose of impairing the bargaining position of a certified bargaining agent." Now, Mr. Speaker, we say that the section as it now reads - and it is significant that it didn't read this way in 1954 - contains two provisions which are contrary to the principles of collective bargaining, and in fact place an impediment on the effective bargaining position of the employees.

The first of those provisions is the statement that this can't be done without consent by the employees affected. Now, Mr. Speaker, prior to the enactment of The Labour Relations Act, if an employer approached his employees individually to try to decrease or increase their wages, the Union could immediately call a strike and would call a strike if this was going to effectively impair their bargaining position. As the Act now reads, the employees are prevented during this period from withdrawing their services and the employer is permitted to go around and bargain with them individually. Now we say, Mr. Speaker, that this destroys the concept of effective collective bargaining because it prevents the employees from doing it while at the same time encouraging individual bargaining on the part of the employer, because if you have prevented the employees from doing this, from withdrawing their services while at the same time giving the employer the right to approach them individually and ask for their consent, then you have done exactly what the Honourable Member from St. James said shouldn't be done, you have put them in a position where they can not, without danger and without the strength of their numbers, effectively bargain with their employer.

The second part of the provision, Mr. Speaker, which we say impairs collective bargaining is the part that says "that the employer can't do this for the purpose of impairing the bargaining position of a certified bargaining agent". Now, Mr. Speaker, no employer will ever say that he decreased wages or increased wages for that purpose. He will say either that he decreased wages because his margin of profit started to reduce or he increased wages because he felt that his employees were entitled to an increase, and it is impossible for a group of employees ever to prove that the increase or decrease was done for the purpose of impairing the bargaining position of the union. I notice, Mr. Speaker, that the 1954 Act did not contain that particular provision and I submit that the reason it didn't contain it is because it is a provision that is inconsistent with effective collective bargaining.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it may be that some people would suggest that there is nothing wrong with an employer going around bargaining individually with his employees, and indeed I would agree substantially with that provision if at the same time there wasn't a restriction against the employees taking their effective bargaining steps. In other words, if we want to go back to the position of saying that the employer can do exactly as he wants to do and the employees can do exactly as they want to do, consistent with law, then I say that there is no reason for saying that employers should not bargain with his employees individually. I think it is a bad thing for him to do, but I don't think it should be illegal unless there is a restriction on the employees which, as matters now stand, there is a restriction which prevents the employees from effectively bargaining with their employer if he takes that type of step.

The other part of it, Mr. Speaker, is that where the Legislature through its Labour Board has recognized a certified bargaining agent and says that the certified bargaining agent is the sole representative on the part of its employees, then it is not consistent with good industrial relations for the employer to approach the employees over the head of his bargaining agent. First of all, it produces bad industrial relations; and secondly, it permits the employer

(MR. GREEN cont'd)... to weed out or to find out which of his employees is being militant, which ones he feels that he can lure away from the position being taken by the union, all of which, Mr. Speaker, is not consistent with the principles of effective collective bargaining.

Now I have some words to read, Mr. Speaker, from the report of the Industrial Inquiry Commission on the Canadian National Railway runthroughs, which was of course prepared by the Honourable Mr. Justice Samuel Freedman. In that case, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian National Railways approached their employees directly, and for the first time made an offer to the employees which had never been made to the Union, and Mr. Justice Freedman says on Page 53 of his report, "What was the effect of the breach of this failure to act in accordance with the company's declared policy. Let it be remembered that the matter of securing compensation for losses on homes of men required to move as a result of the company action had been a subject of discussion for many years. The Brotherhoods wanted it but the Company had consistently said that its policy was not to provide such compensation. The issue had come before the negotiating teams at contract time and it had also been considered by conciliation boards, but the attempt to secure compensation had always failed. Now in the special case of Nakina the Company was prepared to depart from its fixed policy and to give to the men something which the leaders of the Brotherhood had long and successfully striven to obtain. In these circumstances, for the Company to go over the heads of the accredited Brotherhood representatives and to announce its decision directly to the men at a general meeting, was to diminish the stature of those representatives. It was a poor contribution to labour-management relations. It impeded rather than aided the attainment of that favourable climate or atmosphere which is so essential to the conduct of fruitful negotiations. One witness described the Company's conduct as a dangerous adventure and the commission is disposed to agree."

Mr. Speaker, those people in the legal profession also recognize the validity of this position. If my honourable friend the member from St. John's was representing a client and I were representing a client and I found my honourable friend the member from St. John's obstinate and difficult to get along with - which he never is by the way - but if I found him to be that way, --(Interjection)-- Well, maybe he should be a little bit more obstinate sometimes. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, it would be wrong and a breach of ethics for me to approach his client and say I've made an offer which I think you should accept and your lawyer isn't properly dealing with you on this matter. It would be a breach of ethics for which I could be disciplined by the Law Society and I think in the Manitoba court it was held that a contract made on that basis wasn't binding on the client.

Now all we are saying, Mr. Speaker, is once the certified bargaining agent is selected, the employer should deal with that certified bargaining agent; he should not be dealing with the employee. This is not an irrevocable position. The employees have a right to deal with their employer and they can revoke the certificate of the bargaining agent, but while the union is certified, it is - and I'll use the words of Mr. Justice Freedman - "a dangerous adventure to engage in personal and direct negotiations with the employees."

So we say, Mr. Speaker, in support of this resolution, that this concept that we are now urging on the House is one which is directly consistent with the principles of collective bargaining, to which I understand all parties in the House are wedded; it's one which would implement the objectives of The Labour Relations Act and one which would provide for good industrial relations in Manitoba. I'm aware of several cases, Mr. Speaker - again I'm not talking from the point of view merely of principle - I'm aware of several cases in which the situation between the employer and the employees broke down as a result of this type of negotiating by the employer. I'm also aware of several cases where the employees were denied their right and where in fact the bargaining position of the employees was irreparably damaged by virtue of the employer taking advantage of this particular section.

Mr. Speaker, I don't mean to spend a great deal of time discussing a point which on the face of it appears very technical. I've tried to indicate to the House how this point underlies the foundation of the entire system of collective bargaining and I don't think that anything that I have said here today would in any way damage the effectiveness of The Labour Relations Act. On the other hand, I think it would fortify it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Honourable Member for Inkster in the resolution that he has before the House. I would have liked it much better had he brought in an amendment to The Labour Relations Act rather than a resolution to change The Labour Relations Act, and I would suggest to him that unless the Honourable the Minister of Labour is prepared to bring in an amendment to The Labour Relations Act

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd). . . . restoring Section 14 to its original as it appeared in Chapter 132 of the 1954 Statutes of Manitoba, I would suggest that someone else should bring in a Bill to amend that section by deleting the words that were added to it in the 1957 amendment. I think the words that are added in the 1957 amendment destroy the main purpose and intent of free and untrammelled negotiations between a bargaining agent and an employer.

It's true, Mr. Speaker, that the law presumes that a man intends the natural consequences of his act, but sometimes it is exceedingly difficult to ascertain by satisfactory evidence what those natural intentions or consequences were. If I pick up a loaded gun, I know it's loaded and I know that it has a bullet in it and I point it at somebody and I pull the trigger, there's no doubt that with my knowledge of the lethal nature of that weapon and of the damage that that bullet would do if striking a man, that I did intend the legal consequences of my act. But in the example given by the Honourable Member for Inkster in an employer offering to this employee and that employee a little consideration, how is anyone going to prove that it was his intent to impair or affect the attitude of that individual employee towards these negotiations. I think that each and every individual who is engaged in such an arrangement, a conciliation arrangement, should meet on an equal footing, and I don't think that anyone should be allowed to do anything which would impair the position of the other.

Now I make that not only with reference to the employee or the employer but also with reference to the employee, and I think that the only way that we could reinstate that section to mean what it was really intended to mean, that there should be free and untrammelled negotiations between the parties, is to repeal the amendment to The Labour Relations Act which was passed in 1957, and if the Minister of Labour is not prepared to do that, I hope some other honourable member in this House will move or bring into the House such a Bill.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question. Would you also agree that the words in the Act which says, "shall not without consent by or on behalf of the employees affected," should be changed to "shall not without consent of the bargaining agent," because without that change he could still go ahead and get the consent of each employee.

MR. HILLHOUSE: . . . which would re-instate the individuals to the position which they were intended to occupy before this 1957 amendment was introduced.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour)(Osborne): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Provincial Treasurer, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to have this matter stand.

. . . . continued on next page

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

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take a few moments just to pass some comments on this resolution. First of all, I'd like to state that I think the Honourable Member from Logan has presented a very thoughtful resolution and it is one that I'm sure a great many members have thought about and felt about and have some personal thoughts about, such as I did myself.

In the resolution, I think if you ask the right questions you come up with the right answers. I think first of all probably you would say, are there low income families where the mothers must by virtue of economic circumstances go to work, and I think the answer is yes; and I think there are also families where the mother again has to go to work because she is the only provider in the family; so again the answer is yes, we do need some sort of nursery care if there are children in the family. I think there are also cases which may not be covered in the resolution here where just by virtue of or dint of personality of the mother and also by virtue of some training which she has had in earlier life that she is really a more satisfied person in the home picture than if she had to stay home at all times, and in that particular case I think there are a substantial number of cases where it's in the best interests of both the family and the community where the mother can go to work.

Now having asked all these questions and got all the positive answers saying yes we do need day nursery care for particularly those children that are under school age, mainly in the three year to six year age bracket, I think the next logical question is who should provide this care, and this is where the real question comes in. I think if we looked at the geographical area that these problems are most common to, we find it is the larger urban areas such as Greater Metropolitan Winnipeg area, and I think probably if you look at Winnipeg itself you may find that the biggest problem is in the downtown portion of the Winnipeg area, that is usually the older section of the city where probably the lower income family groups tend to congregate.

Now coming back to the question of who should provide for this, I think first of all the home has to be the first place that the burden falls upon - this is where it has always fallen; and secondly, I think that we have humanitarian organizations such as the churches and the service clubs and the non charitable institutions that have traditionally shown a great interest in this sort of thing and have also taken positive action. To state several cases here, we have typical charitable nursery facilities such as the Day Nursery Centre, another one is the Joan of Arc Day Nursery and St. Josephs Day Nursery, and also typical of this group would be the Happy Time Nursery School. These are all schools, one of them which dates back to its establishment in 1909, and all have provided a service primarily to the pre-school age children and they do serve on the basis of the needs of the family and it's phased for special attention to those families where the one parent is missing, and also to economic needs.

Now my real personal interest in this arose because of the fact that I had been involved in an experiment in the downtown portion of Winnipeg - although I don't live in that area I happen to attend a church in that area - and this particular church had joined forces with two other churches in its geographical area, which is in the downtown area and it's which is called the inner city area of Winnipeg, and this was essentially an ecumenical movement on behalf of these three churches. One is Crescent Fort Rouge United Church, the other is St. Lukes Anglican, the other is Augustine United, and these three churches, which are now contemplating bringing in another denomination, took it upon themselves to look at the community to try and assess what the problems were where the churches could operate, and in undertaking their problem they decided that they needed assistance that was beyond their own capability and they hired a young man by the name of Ken Murdoch who had been trained, following his graduation as a church Minister, had been trained in Chicago in the suburbs where the problems are really much more severe but where there are problems which are akin to the certain areas of Winnipeg. This young man was hired jointly by this group and this group has now been operational for less than a year in attempting to work in the downtown neighbourhoods to get a fuller assessment of the needs of the community. Now by the needs of the community, this essentially means the needs of adults and children, they're the people in the community, and if you really get down to it, it's primarily aimed at the needs of children and day nursery is only one aspect of it, that is day nursery for the pre-school age children.

Now I think that this is a particularly good move because if you look at it from a strictly, say economic or geographical point of view, you have churches that are sprinkled throughout the communities, all throughout the urban areas, and they serve as a very good centre usually for

(MR. CRAIK, cont'd) bringing people in. Now in a day nursery what you essentially want to do is bring the child in during the working hours when the mother presumably can go to work. The church again being centrally located and usually in her neighbourhood, providing she doesn't have a religious barrier come into it, can take the child with no obligation to these centres.

I think that the experiment is working out very well. This isn't the only experiment incidentally, there are a number of others proceeding. There are others that are older, there's the latch-key program which I think two different churches are operating now. The latch-key program is aimed at the young school age children where they can come for a hot bowl of soup and so on at lunch time. Well the point of it all is that - and I should state first of all that the latch-key program, going back to the existing day nursery centres, all do receive some sort of government support usually through the Winnipeg Foundation or the United Way and there is economic support going to these groups. But the prime point that I want to make is that for the government to become directly involved in a program, where you're putting a government institution into a community, may sound in theory very good, but I think it is very important that a humanitarian group can do a much better job because the government isn't necessarily a humanitarian group, and if these other people are doing this for humanitarian reasons, because they want to be their brother's keeper or whatever it may be, then the government has no business - I'll put it that way - they have no business interfering with the private or humanitarian sector of the community to do this.

What the government agency should be doing is attempting to co-operate with these groups, which they are now doing through the Social Services Department, through the Department of Welfare and through the city social service groups, and that the real role of government should not be, as this motion suggests, to go in and establish day nurseries but they should be keeping their eye to communicating with the existing ones and helping out where they can through existing facilities and not looking towards establishing another government service completely financed by government, completely impersonal, and not really aimed at the humanitarian role as much as they may be in some other aspects.

With those comments, Sir, I can't help but say I'm in sympathy with the mover's motives in this resolution, but I can't support the program by which he wants to resolve the problem.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the comments on this resolution made by the Honourable Member for St. Vital. It gladdens me to hear that he does agree that there is need for nursery schools, that he does agree with the principle that this is a need that we must give attention to, but unfortunately it is at this point that our roads part. The solution that he proposes is quite different from that proposed by our resolution; it's quite different from the thinking and the philosophy behind the formation of our resolution.

It rather disturbed me that the Honourable Member for St. Vital continued to refer to the low income area as being the area within which this is the greatest problem. I suppose he is thinking in terms of low income or he is defining low income area in terms commonly attributed to it, but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the need for nursery care extends far beyond that area. It does extend into the area wherein there are people living at an income that is commonly regarded as being quite adequate and sufficient to meet the basic needs of a family.

He then poses the question of who should provide the care, and here again I agree with him that the institution or first responsibility is the home; with this I agree. However, our conditions do change with the passage of time and situations do arise, and there are many of them wherein it is impossible, impractical, in some cases even undesirable, for the home itself to carry the full burden of this responsibility.

He makes reference to various humanitarian organizations that have provided this type of care and there have been many, and I would be the first to admit that they did do an outstanding job in this area. He reminds us of the fact that there have been humanitarian organizations offering this type of service since 1909. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this has been 58 years too long for humanitarian organizations alone to be carrying this responsibility, that it is time -- that it is high time that the community at large, that the province had taken a close look at this matter and given some consideration to ways and means of sharing this responsibility over the entire community rather than just limiting it to a few, within which group you have the recipients on the one hand and those capable of financing this type of service, and needless to say the burden on them is quite heavy.

Now this idea is nothing novel, when we're proposing that the state undertake the provision of this service. It certainly is not novel in other countries. As a matter of fact, we can come

(MR. HANUSCHAK, cont'd) . . . closer than that to home, it is not new in Manitoba. The City of Winnipeg itself has pioneered in this field. There was a time not too long ago when public legislators spoke the same way about the provision of kindergartens. Kindergarten today is a part of our public school system financed out of public funds. We're still talking against the provision of nursery schools at public expense. The City of Winnipeg has set up a pilot project in this field financed out of the taxpayer's purse and from the reports that we have to date there is every indication that this project will expand.

I had mentioned a moment ago that the situation -- that the world is changing, and now in the 20th Century we have a situation quite different from what it was some years ago or even as recently as two decades ago. An item appeared in last night's paper stating that in 1946 only 247 of every 1,000 women 14 years of age and over were in the labour force. In December of last year the number had increased to 330 out of every 1,000 were in the labour force. From a figure that at one time constituted about 25 percent of the female labour force, it has now increased to about 33 percent.

Now this is one of the facts of life, Mr. Speaker, that we have to accept; it is one of the facts of life that we have to make provision for; and we can no longer afford to continue allowing services of this type and others to go begging for an existence which they now are forced to do. I had made a similar statement in the debate on the education estimates when I made mention of the fact that at the present time students in schools are in effect forced to go out to beg to supply needs for various items that are necessary as part of the education program. This in effect is what these organizations have to do, stand on street corners and collect nickels and dimes in order to finance the operation of their nursery schools. This, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, is a disgrace that should not be found in our present day society.

There are two other factors that we ought to consider, and being legislators, being involved in and concerned with the expenditures of money, we should consider the economic aspects of this. I admit that it's going to cost dollars and cents to establish nursery schools, but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if it is economically desirable for employers to hire married women; if it is economically desirable to make use of the talents and the abilities that these married women are capable to offer our economic system; if it is economically desirable for that married woman to go out to work, then I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it becomes our responsibility and the responsibility of everyone involved, both the married woman who is working as well as the employer who is providing her with a means of earning income, to share in the payment for those services that she must be provided with to enable her to go out and perform that job for which there is a need, for which industry says there is a need, for which business says there is a need.

And coupled with that, Mr. Speaker, there is the social responsibility. I may not have any children but I'm quite happy to pay my share for the cost of education in this province because it is important to me that we do live in a literate society. It is important to me as an employer to know that I am living in a society wherein young people obtain the type of training that will enable me to hire them to work in my office, plant, factory, whatever it may be. It is of importance and concern to me to know that I am living in a society that provides the type of education that cultivates the type of community that I would enjoy being part of, that I would enjoy associating with. It is of importance to me to know that the people in this community receive the type of care that they deserve. It is of importance to me, Mr. Speaker, to know that people of all age groups are afforded the opportunity to receive the type of service in the field of care, in the field of education and instruction that they deserve and are entitled to at their particular age level.

Therefore, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and I appeal to the members of this Legislature that if we are sincere -- if we are sincere in saying that this government ought to provide the best in the way of education -- and I'm speaking of nursery schools as a part of the education program because in a sense it is just as closely related to education as it may be related to the Department of Health or the Department of Welfare, perhaps even more closely related to the Department of Education -- I say that if we are sincere in our saying that the people of Manitoba deserve the best in the field of education, then there's no logical ground for drawing a cut-off line at a certain chronological age by saying that we will offer the best in education down to a certain age level but not below that. We must say and we must accept the fact that we will offer the best in educational services for all at whatever age level there may be a need for them.

MR. DAWSON: I beg to adjourn the debate if no one else wishes to speak -- moved by myself, seconded by the Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Hamiota, seconded by --

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): If you don't mind, Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a couple of comments before you adjourn the debate. I, as many others, hadn't intended to get into this debate until I listened to the last speaker, and he gave me the impression that government was going to be dragging its feet unless it was responsible for every individual citizen from the cradle to the grave, and by golly, if people don't start looking after themselves once in awhile we are going to wear out our pockets or we can rather perhaps sew up our pockets because you won't need them any more.

I think that if we are going into this Socialist movement that we have got to consider what is going to happen. I think that we have got to look forward to the day when the babies are still going to be born, but we do provide diaper service for them? Is this a 19th Century program because you still have to buy your own diapers? -- (Interjection)-- Yes, we can go through that too if you like. But when do the parents get to see their children? You grab them away from the mother after they are born and you look after them in a nursery school; you look after them in the kindergarten; you keep them in school longer because you have to teach them politics, you have got to teach them research; you have got to see that everyone goes to university free - free - it doesn't cost them a cent; but after this middle-aged man gets out of university, then all of a sudden he has to walk into this cold world where he has to earn his own living - a terrible situation. I think we are stopping too soon. We have got to look after him for the rest of his life. After all, if you look after him for the first half, why should you not look after him for the last half because that's when he is too old to look after himself.

The member remarks on the sincerity of government - the sincerity of government - my goodness, what are we doing here? That's a good question, a very good question, because if the government are going to look after the people, 57 of us are not enough to do it. After all, there are a million people -- (Interjection)-- We only can add one. If you take away the initiative of people, then certainly we are going to end up in a world where we have to look after them from the cradle to the grave, and after we pass on, who is going to look after the next bunch? After all, the ones that follow us have been looked after from the cradle to the grave, so what happens then? --(Interjection)-- You can't.

I think that voluntary groups are good. I think that when churches band together and work together, to go out and collect money for radios, TV's, for schools, that's good; it's initiative. When they get together and have tag days and work together so that they can help those who need assistance, that's good, because if they don't start working together they'll have to pay for it anyway. --(Interjection)-- That's the last resort. We haven't got that far yet. I think it is good for voluntary groups to have something to do, for church organizations to help. I don't think this is wrong at all. I don't think it is wrong. People have learned to take care of others, they are their brother's keeper. If they can't do it then the government comes in and helps, but if you take the initiative away from people to help each other and turn it over to government, then people will finally come to the conclusion that really they are no better off because they are digging in their pockets to pay for it anyway and they aren't having the fun of doing it.

When we go too far into socialism we take the fun out, the responsibility out of helping people get along in this world. I don't think socialism is the answer to all the problems in the world today. I think you have got to have private enterprise, private initiative to help our brothers, and certainly while I am in agreement with it if it's necessary for people to go out and work and if the industrial world is moving to Canada and if there are problems that are being solved by providing nurseries in other European countries, then I think maybe we should have a look at it, but certainly I don't think we should say to the voluntary groups they aren't doing a good enough job, you have got to move on, you get out of this district and we'll take over as government and tax you. I think that we should be allowed to carry on responsible government and look after the people when they can't look after themselves, but only at that time should government be called to step in.

I would support the Honourable Member from St. Vital when he relates to those agencies which have contributed so much towards helping these mothers, these working mothers, but surely - surely we have got to give the mother her child back once in awhile to keep it warm, and I hope that some of these people get out of school long enough to earn a living and to work once in awhile while they are going to school to understand what the responsibility of handling money is, money they have earned themselves, not money that is being doled out to them until they are 25 years of age.

(MR. BEARD, cont'd)

What of the responsibility of people that went to school and worked during the time they went to university and earned money and paid back money. They are good citizens. Just because we stand up and say, my goodness I got a university training and I still owe my dad, what are we crying about? If we haven't got responsibilities to bring ourselves to earn a university education in some part, then how are we going to have the responsibility after, because you are not going to learn that at school. You are not paying your whole way when you go to university, only a small part of it, but it is a good responsibility to learn and you'll be a better citizen as far as I am concerned after you have graduated.

MR. DAWSON: Do I have to make the motion over again, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: I got you the first time.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): May I ask the Honourable Member from Churchill a question? I wondered whether he was implying that by doing everything for children, taking away all responsibility, that they would do nothing else but grow fat?

MR. BEARD: . . . growing fat, Mr. Speaker, that was because I had initiative.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I put this motion, I did notice this afternoon that there was a newspaper brought into the House. I would remind the members of the rule which is very stringent that newspapers will not be brought into the House and read.

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

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

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, let me first state that I believe I appreciate and understand the concern which motivates the Honourable Member from Logan in presenting this particular resolution and I compliment him on his sincere expression in his presentation last Friday and I must admit that I share in every respect the concerns which he brought out in his speech, but one sentence of his speech really sums up the whole question and it's found on Page 549 of Hansard of last Friday, and he says about automation: "push it ahead with vigor and exploit its benefits, while controlling its hazards".

This, Mr. Speaker, I submit is the whole key. Automation, which is only part of a larger field of technological changes, is designed to increase efficiency in the production and distribution of goods and services and these are essential for our continued economic growth. These changes are being introduced at a very increasingly rapid rate. They give rise to changes in occupational composition and to the skill requirements of the economy. Research indicates that technological change is a contributing factor to the current decline in the growth of unskilled and semi-skilled jobs and to the increase and in the demand for more educated and skilled manpower.

Technological change is becoming an increasingly important issue in collective bargaining, as attempts are made to reconcile management's desire for increased efficiency with labour's legitimate desire for security. To date, however, the issue of technological change has been significant in relatively few strike situations in our country. There is general agreement about the proper goal of labour-management relations as they touch upon the issue of technological change. This goal is to achieve a fair reconciliation between the legitimate desire of firms to improve their competitive positions by introducing technological changes which will decrease operating costs or allow the production of better goods and services, and the equally legitimate desire of labour to obtain the greatest possible measure of job and income security in the face of rapid change. Management should accept the responsibility of taking all steps it reasonably can to ensure that technological changes are not implemented without due regard to the work force. What is reasonable will vary widely depending upon such factors as the financial position of the firms involved and the kind of changes being implemented. The action of management should be guided by the principle that the benefits as well as the burdens brought on by technological change should be shared by both sides. Management must recognize the legitimate desire of workers for assurance that they will be given a meaningful voice in the decisions materially affecting their lives.

The primary responsibility of government is to create an atmosphere in which technological change can take place with minimum adverse effects. In this regard, adequate government employment and manpower policies aimed at maximizing both employment opportunities and the ability of persons to take advantage of these opportunities are of paramount importance. If the economy is expanding, the demand for labour is high and alternative employment is readily available and the adverse effects of displacement by technological change will be minimized.

(MR. STEEN, cont'd) Adequate manpower policies in the form of upgrading, re-training and mobility programs can further minimize hardship by assisting persons displaced as a result of technological change and automation, and to take advantage of available job opportunities. A wide variety of government services are already available to assist workers displaced by changes. Most important among these are the many upgrading and re-training programs, the availability of sustaining training allowances, the manpower mobility program of the Federal Government and the counselling and placement services of the National Employment Service. Moreover, the Federal Manpower Consultative Service has been established for the express purpose of providing financial and technical assistance to labour and management at the plant or industry level to assist them in devising mutually satisfactory solutions to manpower adjustment problems resulting from these changes.

The Selkirk Rolling Mill situation, in which our government played a major role, in which government services were co-ordinated and put at the disposal of labour and management by our own Department of Labour working in conjunction with the Manpower Consultative Service of the Federal Government, is a prime example locally of how these services can be effectively used and co-ordinated. Four or five months prior to the initial lay-off, a joint labour-management committee was established at the Selkirk mill. This committee was charged with the task of determining the probable impact of the contemplated technological changes taking place at the mill on the work force and recommending measures which would facilitate worker adjustment to these changes. The committee found that approximately 150 permanent employees would eventually be released by the firm and that about 125 of these employees would be moved to new jobs. Under the committee's guidance, in-plant training programs were devised for these employees who would be retained by the firm but who would have to move to other jobs within the firm. There are presently two such training programs in operation, one of which is cost-shared by our government and the employer.

The counselling and placement services of the National Employment Service have been put at the disposal of those who are to be released by the firm and a variety of training opportunities have been made available to those persons to allow them to take advantage of alternative jobs. To date, no permanent employees have been laid off, but all who are due to be released have been interviewed by the National Employment Service offices and informed of the various governmental services available to them. It is interesting to note that about 60 percent of those interviewed to date have indicated a desire to enter training when they are laid off.

In this early stage of labour-management's attack on the problem, legislation I believe would be premature and it might place unnecessary rigidities upon the parties and their efforts to deal with the problem on their own and in their devising measures geared specifically to the particular capacities and needs. The efforts of government would be best spent in presenting and encouraging and assisting joint labour-management consultations, study and advanced planning away from the pressures of the bargaining table. The real need is for committees at the plant level of the kind established in the Manitoba Rolling Mills at Selkirk to deal with the specific problems created by the technological change.

The Honourable Member for Logan has presented in his resolution the idea that we would establish a committee to look into this problem. I would submit that the Economic Council of Canada, a 27 member body headed by Dr. John J. Deutch and established by the government of our own country, has for the past two years done a marvelous job in this very field and has only recently come out with the report, which I might draw to the attention of the members of the House, they can find in today's newspapers. In that report the Economic Council has recommended certain guidelines for both management and labour that they might take into account in the negotiating of future contracts, and plan and prepare now to meet the contingencies, the various problems that automation and, for that matter, all forms of technological change presents.

I am reluctant to accept the suggestion of the Honourable Member for Logan that a committee or another committee be appointed to look into this problem because I think our main problem is getting across to both labour and management, and to all fields of our economy for that matter, the various services that are existent in our government, both federally, provincially and even locally, and that are available to meet this particular problem. An education program really is the best thing that I can see to start now the moving into the second phase of acquainting the people that are involved with what can be done with their individual problems, because it's impossible for us to lay down guidelines that are going to cover every possible situation. We should be concerned with the individual problems as they arise with the individual

(MR. STEEN, cont'd) people, because after all this is people that are being affected and not just statistics. I would suggest as a first step that we have a conference in this province, sponsored by our government, bringing together the same bodies that are mentioned in the resolution by the Honourable Member for Logan that we might discuss the changes that have taken place, the various facilities that are available for attacking this problem, and that both sides of the conference might, and all present at the conference might, share their experiences and offer suggestions for the better improvement of this problem.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fisher, that this resolution be amended by deleting the words "establish a committee" in the second line of the operative part of the resolution and that the words "convene a conference" be substituted therefor; and that the word "automation" in the fourth and sixth lines of the operative part of the resolution be deleted and the words "technological change" be substituted therefor.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may just in order that when the resolution is before the House that it be a tidy resolution, may I suggest either that the proposer of the amendment or you yourself take under advisement as to whether or not the word "automation" in the first line likewise should be under consideration, because in the preamble to the resolution in the first whereas it deals with the question of automation. It might be sort of an untidy resolution if you accept it in its present form, and this too may be a resolution proposed by the government that you might take under consideration in order that we're dealing with a proper proposition before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable gentleman for his opinion but of course this can be debated. No, I'm prepared to accept the amendment as is. Are you ready for the question?

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I would like to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Your seconder?

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker; I ask on behalf of the Honourable Member that this matter stand.

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

MR. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): I would ask leave of the House to have the matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I have material about this resolution which would take me longer than the time that is available, so I wonder if I might have the indulgence of the House to have the resolution stand.

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

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I find myself in just about the same position as my honourable friend the Minister of Health --(Interjection) -- yes, and more so, and in consideration of the time of day, I beg the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: May I have this stand, Mr. Speaker, please?

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

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): I'd make the same request please, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. PAULLEY: May we have this stand, Mr. Speaker, please?

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. McKELLAR: May I have the same consideration, Mr. Speaker, for the two resolutions under my name.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. McKELLAR: The same consideration, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, the same request as the previous one.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia -- I beg your pardon, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): I request the House to have this resolution stand, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

WHEREAS increasing urbanization is accompanied not only by high land values but also a continued desire for residence ownership, and

WHEREAS the present lease system of apartment and building occupation does not satisfy the desire of many tenants for control over their premises, and

WHEREAS in many parts of the world ownership of part of a building has long been recognized, and

WHEREAS condominium accommodation provides an equity investment for the occupier, and

WHEREAS Condominium Construction will provide flexible investment opportunity for builders, and

WHEREAS Condominium Legislation would create greater activity in the Construction Industry in the province,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that an act be passed by this Legislature to facilitate the division of buildings into separately owned units, with a certificate of title to issue for each unit, and that each unit may be transferred, leased, mortgaged or otherwise dealt with in the same manner and form as any land held under the "Real Property Act", and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that each unit in a condominium constitute a "homestead" for the purpose of the Dower Act.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce this resolution requesting the government to introduce legislation to facilitate the division of buildings into separately owned units. The idea of condominium is not recent. Its history can be turned back to 16th Century France. Indeed, Article 664 of the Code Napoleon in 1804 authorized the ownership of separate units of buildings. Condominium landholding is also prevalent in Italy, Spain, Austria, Belgium, Germany, Greece, Sweden as well as many of the states of the United States. In 1963, 80 percent of the commercial buildings in Sao Paulo and Rio de Janeiro were condominium. Closer to home, the provinces of Alberta and British Columbia only last year have enacted legislation for condominium landholdings.

The most common form of condominium is a multi-unit apartment block with each resident enjoying exclusive ownership of his individual apartment. This ownership is real because the resident does not own a share in a corporation which in turn the corporation would own the apartment block, but rather he is granted a certificate of title to his own apartment and this certificate of title is as conclusive of ownership as the present ones which are prevalent in most of the provinces of Canada under the terms of landholdings of land.

Mr. Speaker, together with title to his apartment, the resident also enjoys an undivided interest in the common amenities of the buildings. These include the land, the hallways, the heating plant and all other common facilities. Therefore, I would describe a condominium as a dual form of ownership. Firstly, there is the individual ownership of apartment space; and secondly, there is the ownership of undivided interest in the land and all other parts of the building excluding the other apartment spaces.

This half of the 20th Century in Canada has been marked by the fact that we are quickly becoming one of the most urbanized centres in the world. In 1961, 69.6 percent of Canadians lived in urban centres, and before the year 2,000, if my figures are correct, 9 out of 10 Canadians will be living in urban areas, so I feel this House should recognize and provide for this trend. Urbanization has been accompanied by high and rising land values but with little abatement in the desire on the part of individuals for private home ownership. Therefore, introduction of a condominium concept to this Legislature is timely because it coincides with an increasing awareness that for some urban residents the one family home is becoming impracticable. Still the desire, which I believe to be a healthy characteristic of our society to own one's home, is likely to persist because I feel that it's so deeply imbedded in our culture.

Mr. Speaker, you can see that in the newer residential areas of the City of Winnipeg that an increasing number of families have found apartment living to be an appealing type of shelter.

(MR. PATRICK, cont'd) There are many in our society who do not need large or extensive areas in their apartments; for the others, they may find that there is great relief from many chores and duties that they would have to do by living in apartments; and for the elderly, the infirm, and the head of the household who has to do a lot of travelling, the one family home is at times not the most suitable situation. Condominium will also allow for choice locations just outside of the downtown area and thereby afford easy access to the larger department stores, places of employment, as well as recreational and cultural activities. Many persons choose not to live in apartments because they lose too many of the benefits of home ownership. The home owner has an investment in his dwelling and of course equity that he may borrow money against in any way, shape or form that he chooses, and the value of his equity increases over the years because of our residential land scarcity and our inflationary economy.

I believe therefore that the condominium concept has a wide appeal. There is the possibility of greater facilities such as swimming pools and recreational areas, since the cost would be distributed over all the residents of the condominium. There will also be savings of many buyings such as fuel, because you can buy fuel in bulk and there has to be saving because every apartment would not be buying fuel. Units could be furnished at less cost than private homes with the result being a lightened burden on each owner of each unit. The small size of mortgage would allow participation by the general public to invest, and from the point of view of the builder, it will mean a speedy return on his investment with greater flexibility in financing because some units can be sold immediately for the return of capital and other units could be held for future appreciation.

Although condominium will be primarily used for apartment and residential accommodation, there are many good reasons for a wider application of this concept. The great advantage of condominium is its industrial and commercial use adaptability, affording the builder flexibility in meeting a demand. A shopping centre where all merchants can own their own shops may have a wide appeal. Also, lower floors of apartments could be rented or leased out as stores or shops, and in the former case could pay the expense of those people living above.

Mr. Speaker, I feel the Act must provide for easements and negative covenants to protect the rights of each unit owner. Every owner must be guaranteed in the Act the right to use the common property and the use of common walks as well as passage of gas pipes through other units. Also, the Act should require that the owners for a limited purpose will be a corporation in order to run the affairs of their condominium. Each unit owner will have voting rights. Now some statutes provide that the mortgagee should exercise his right to vote in a condominium corporation. I would feel this would be wrong because since the owner is the one that is putting out the money, I think he should have the right to exercise his right in voting in a condominium corporation. Presently, there is this differential between the legislation that is presently in British Columbia and Alberta. The corporation executive will pass by-laws and govern the affairs of the condominium, financed by levying a tax against the unit of each owner. The corporation will exercise control over the common property, and for the purpose of liability will be the occupier of the common property.

Finally, there will have to be a change in our tax structure so that units will be individually assessed and separately taxed. Any failure to tax the units separately will limit the popularity of the condominium concept. I feel there must be as many incidents as are possible of a private home ownership to ensure the success of this scheme. Mr. Speaker, the condominium concept has much more to offer than I have been able to convey to the members of this House in a few minutes today, but keeping in mind the desire on the part of the people for ownership and control of their own homes, I would strongly recommend this resolution to the members of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. LYON: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, in view of the length of the resolutions that are left, if this might be a convenient time to call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm prepared to call it now 5:30 and I'll return to the Chair tonight at 8:00 p.m.