

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, March 21, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present the second report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg leave to present the following as their second report: Your Committee has considered Bills: No. 18 - An Act to amend The Mines Act; No. 19 - An Act to amend The Mineral Taxation Act; No. 20 - An Act to amend The Mining Royalty and Tax Act; No. 45 - An Act to amend The Judgments Act; No. 46 - An Act to amend The Executions Act; No. 52 - An Act to amend The Unsatisfied Judgment Fund Act; No. 53 - An Act to amend The Land Acquisition Act; No. 58 - An Act respecting Compensation to Families of Persons Killed by Accident; No. 63 - An Act to amend The Department of Education Act; No. 88 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act 3; And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered Bills: No. 17 - An Act to Amend The Crown Lands Act; No. 44 - An Act respecting the Attachment of Debts; No. 47 - An Act to amend The Law of Property Act; No. 48 An Act to amend The Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act; And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments. All of which is respectfully submitted.

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

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

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Conservation.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Agriculture and Conservation beg leave to present the following as their first report: Your Committee met for organization and appointed Mr. Shewman as Chairman. Your Committee recommends that for the remainder of this Session the Quorum of this Committee shall consist of Seven (7) members. Your Committee has considered Bills: No. 26 - An Act to amend The Agricultural Credit Act; No. 27 - An Act to amend The Crop Insurance Test Areas Act; No. 43 - The Department of Agriculture Act. And has agreed to report the same without amendment. Your Committee has also considered Bill No. 24 - An Act respecting the Establishment of The Manitoba Water Commission; And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SHEWMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Pembina that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Before the Orders of the Day I should like to direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery on my right where we have 90 students of Grade 5 standing in the Springfield Heights School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Penner, Mrs. Scollen and Miss Silver. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. He very kindly sent to my home recently a copy of a statement on transportation made by the Premier and I appreciate this very much although I did have it in Hansard. I wonder, however, if the other speeches that we have been requesting that have not appeared in Hansard, which are I think exceedingly interesting documents, such as the one he made to the Real Estate Board and others which we have requested on other occasions, and certain ones of my honourable friend the First Minister, one by the Minister of Urban Affairs, might be sent to the members as well when the ones that we requested may arrive.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (River Heights): Mr.

(MR. SPIVAK, cont'd) . . . . Speaker, the only one I can refer to is the one referred to the Real Estate Board and that as far as I know has already been handed out to the members. If the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has not received it, that has been an error and I'll see to it that he does receive a copy of the speech.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): I didn't get mine either.

MR. MOLGAT: I wonder about the others, Mr. Speaker, if maybe . . . .

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): May I ask the honourable member which one he referred to that I . . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Yes - the one to the Housing Conference. I unfortunately had to leave before the completion of the conference and I didn't get copies. I understand they might have been available there and I wonder if the members of the House could have them as well.

MRS. FORBES: Copies were available there but if they haven't been received I would be happy to try and provide you with one.

MR. MOLGAT: Then, Mr. Speaker, I think the one I can recall without going through my notes is the one of the First Minister to a Farm Conference that was held in Winnipeg which was also very interesting.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): I make no undertaking to be as obliging as some of my honourable friends because that speech was - I'm not sure that a transcript was kept of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I wonder when I might expect a Return for an Order that I read into the records and requested on February 15th. It is now five weeks ago. It had to do with the government grants to Alcohol Education, etc. etc.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Well, Mr. Speaker, the material is being prepared. I'm surprised it is not down as yet but it will be within the week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. It was reported in yesterday's Tribune that his department has been informed of the use of recording equipment that can be attached to a tape recorder and applied to a telephone and the message picked up. Is he going to, in other words -- and this is illegal under Section 37 of The Manitoba Telephone Act -- is he going to report on his findings of these devices to this Legislature and possibly recommend a change in the Act?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, there was a press report to this effect. So far as I'm aware, staff members of the Department of the Attorney-General are in touch with the Manitoba Telephone System, who have their own solicitor, to see if there's any need for intervention by our Department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. I note that the regulation has now been promulgated by the government, making 60 hours a week a standard work week during the heavy construction season, 48 hours a week when there is no heavy construction in progress. I wonder if the Minister will tell me whether the report of the board which made this report was unanimous.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I had no indication that it was not unanimous. In other words there wasn't a minority . . . .

MR. GREEN: Could the Minister determine whether it was or was not unanimous and could the Minister also advise whether any labour members of the Board resigned from the Board or refused to sit on the Board after they had commenced sitting, and give the information to the House.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'll take those questions as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): A question to the Honourable Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker. It was recently reported by one of the radio stations in Winnipeg that a prisoner was discharged from Headingley Jail who was not properly clothed. Could the Honourable the Attorney-General advise me as to whether any provision is made by his department or any agency of the government to see that prisoners who are discharged from provincial institutions are properly clothed, having regard to the type of weather into which they were being discharged?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, such provision is made. I'm not aware of the individual instance to which reference is made by the honourable member.

MR. HILLHOUSE: A supplementary question. Is it a private agency and are the prisoners made aware of its location and where they can obtain that clothing?

MR. LYON: I'll have to get the detail to answer that but I know the clothing is made available and I'm just not sure of the sources from which it is made available.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Committee of the Whole House.

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to considering the following Bills: 31, 32, 35, 37, 49, 55 and 66.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House with the Honourable Member for Arthur in the Chair.

#### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee proceed.

Bill No. 31 was read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 32 section (1) passed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to object to Bill No. 32 being considered at this time, but I do want to once again raise the point that I have on other occasions that I think it's contrary to the rule actually, and though there's disagreement in some quarters with that point of view, if it's not contrary to the rule then it's at least contrary to the spirit of the Assembly that government bills should be considered in Committee of the Whole on Private Members' time. This is a government bill, all of the others on the list are Private Members Bills and I have no objection to those proceeding but I just want to register the principle once again that I do not think it's right that government bills should take up the time of the House on Private Members' day. However, inasmuch as this Bill, judging by the treatment it got in the committee, will likely take no time at all and probably as little as I have taken in making these few remarks then there's no point in me arguing the matter at this time, but I do still adhere to the principle that I have enunciated before.

MR. LYON: . . . to the argument, this is a matter which I think the Rules Committee might well look at when it's convenient.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): . . . suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we do adhere to the principle as enunciated by the Member for Lakeside; I agree with the Honourable the Attorney-General, we can take a look at it, but I suggest until we have had a look at it that on Private Members' day we do not proceed with third readings of government measures.

MR. LYON: . . . certain sections that we proceed now, there's only one government bill --(Interjection)-- yes, yes. It doesn't happen on Fridays any more.

Bills Nos. 32, 35, 37, 49, 55 and 66 were each read section and passed.

Mr. Chairman: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has passed the following bills, without amendment and directed me to report same: Bill No. 31, Bill No. 32, Bill No. 35, Bill No. 37, Bill No. 49, Bill No. 55, Bill No. 66.

#### IN SESSION

MR. DOUGLAS J. WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Springfield the report of the Committee be received.

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

Bills Nos. 31, 32, 35, 37, 49, 55 and 66 were each read a third time and passed.

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

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

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

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned debate for the Honourable Member from Radisson.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, we had an interesting debate on this resolution and in particular the amendment that was defeated the other day -- and of course which I am not

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) . . . . permitted to make reference to that particular vote except the fact that we did have an amendment -- and it was a most interesting debate during which time it was suggested that, because of that proposition, that we were suggesting bargaining on behalf of the workers of Manitoba in this Assembly. Such is not the case if one considers the fact that here in the Legislative Assembly it is indeed the duty and the obligation of members of this House to raise from time to time matters that might be considered grievances, or to draw to the attention of the House areas within the economy of the Province of Manitoba where we feel that individuals, be they members of management, the general public or workers, are not receiving a fair share of the economy of the province. Indeed we have, from time to time, discussed in this House as to whether or not our agricultural workers are receiving a fair share of their products. We indeed still have a resolution on the Order Paper asking that certain representations be made in respect of the maximum and minimum price on wheat. The objective of the resolution that we have before us and the previous one is simply to draw to the attention of this House that there is another area of producers, another group of producers, in the province that are not receiving a fair share.

It's all very well to say that labour generally have their organizations which work and fight for them in order that they receive fair return for their labour; but there is however a vast number of employees in the Province of Manitoba of a nature that doesn't readily allow them to become members of trade unions or trade unions to represent this particular group of individuals, and it is for that purpose that from time to time resolutions are produced in the House to see whether or not their particular lot can be improved upon.

I'm happy that the Honourable Member for Assiniboia in the last year or two has introduced a resolution such as the one under consideration at the present time. I need not remind my honourable friend, however, that at the Liberal Convention, two years past this January, a resolution calling for a minimum wage, if I recall correctly, at that time of a dollar was deferred by the convention of that political party. That really is beside the point. We have before us this afternoon a resolution calling for \$1.25 -- and I suggest that the figure of \$1.25 has been arrived at by the sponsor of the resolution based on the Federal Act in respect of those industries which are under the jurisdiction of the federal authority, namely, \$1.25. But I think one of the things that has been overlooked here in Manitoba to this date has been that more and more it appears to me at least that the economy of Manitoba, the base of the economy in Manitoba is getting more and more into the low wage scale area.

I think that we only need to take a look at the activities of the Minister of Industry and Commerce of recent days to come to the same conclusion that I am trying to enunciate at the present time because my honourable friend has made representations to Ottawa for changes in The Immigration Act to make it permissible for immigrants of lower educational standards to come into the province because of the fact that we need them more and more here because of the type of economy that is developing within our province, namely an economy based on lower wage rates. And I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce is by this method exhibiting that the economy in Manitoba has been changing into this more relatively low wage scale area and I think because of the fact of the position taken by the Minister of Industry and Commerce -- and I guess he's been aided and abetted by his friend and mine, the Minister of Labour, in this -- that it is necessary to have more workers in the Province of Manitoba who are performing the task in this relatively low wage area, so therefore it is more incumbent I suggest upon us in the Legislature to see that at least they are protected to a greater degree than they have been in the past in order that they may receive wages higher than have prevailed under our minimum wage regulations and orders in the past. And when I say to my honourable friend, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, you have given us the evidence that you are concentrating insofar as the economy is concerned on this relatively low wage scale industry, I think that it's a truism on the other end of the scale that we are losing many of the products of our high schools and our universities, who have the educational standards, the professional standards and qualifications, we are losing them outside of Manitoba, and I suggest the further that this imbalances progress, as it seems to me that it is, the more need for us here in Manitoba to raise the minimum wage levels in order that there will be a greater interchange of dollars and cents in order that the economy at least has some semblance of stability.

I'm sure the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer who has introduced the five percent sales tax should be concerned, if he's not, of the relatively low wage scale level because if the economy is heading in the direction that I say it is well then certainly my honourable friend,

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) . . . . the Minister of the Treasury, is going to receive less returns than ever for his five percent sales tax, or he may even be forced into a position, Mr. Speaker, of where he's going to have to change the exemptions so that food and clothing may be taxable because of the relatively low amount of money that's in the pocketbooks of our lower wage earner rates to pay for those things - or to buy those things that the Honourable Provincial Treasurer has insofar his list that are taxable is concerned.

Now the resolution that we have before us is of a twofold nature. It suggests that the minimum wage in Manitoba be established immediately at the figure of \$1.25 per hour and that the minimum wage be reviewed at least every two years. A very fine sentiment and one which on surface appears to be fairly reasonable, that is insofar as the reviewing every two years. I presume that the mover of the resolution suggests every two years because this is by and large the prime term period in normal wage agreements between management and labour. It used to be of course in most wage agreements the period of review was a year and not two years and is rapidly getting into the area of review every three years now.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, this is a slightly different case where the employees are represented by trade union organizations and have full bargaining rights, but such is not the case insofar as those people in the province who have to be or are under the legislation of the minimum wage. They haven't the bargaining rights except by those of us in the Legislature that from time to time raise this very important matter. And I think time is of the essence as well, Mr. Speaker; I think too that there should be some consideration given to the length of time that the government or its board can take in arriving at a decision in respect of minimum wages. I think it was on the second or third day when we met - away back last year in December - that the Honourable the Minister of Labour was asked whether or not the Minimum Wage Board had been instructed to consider and to make recommendations to the government. Well of course I can't say, Mr. Speaker, that December, 1966, was a year ago, but I can say, I can say that it's about four months now. The other day the Minister of Labour was asked if he had received a report from the Minimum Wage Board. His answer was 'no'. He was also asked whether he could indicate to the Assembly as to when we might expect a report from the Minimum Wage Board and of course there was the usual shrug of the shoulders of my honourable friend, and he's got pretty husky shoulders at that, but he said no, don't know. Well I think he should know. I think it's of importance to the people of Manitoba who have to rely on actions of the Minimum Wage Board and the acceptance thereof of the government to have changes made as rapidly as possible. I think the Honourable, the Minister of Labour should say to the Board when he makes up his mind that he wants to refer this matter to the Board, "Well gentlemen, " or "ladies and gentlemen, " as the case may be now, "I'd like a report inside of a month or two months. Let's not delay in this matter because it is of importance." But this isn't being done, Mr. Speaker. It is quite conceivable that the Board can take any length of time before it makes its recommendation to the Minister. So I say to my honourable friend that whereas last December he told us "has been set", now four months later, surely to goodness it's time for a report. And even apart, Mr. Speaker, from receipt of this report, there's nothing, absolutely nothing to prevent the Honourable Minister of Labour or the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to showing a little initiative themselves and establishing a higher minimum wage rate of \$1.00 an hour which came into effect on the 1st of December. And isn't it peculiar really, Mr. Speaker, when on about the 10th of December the Minister of Labour announced in this House that he was asking the Minimum Wage Board to consider the adequacy of the minimum wage of \$1.00 an hour and it was only on the 1st of December that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council adopted the \$1.00 an hour wage rate in the Province of Manitoba. It must indicate Mr. Speaker, that in setting their figure of the \$1.00 to take effect on the 1st of December, the Government or the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council must have known that they were wrong at the time; otherwise why did they ask the Board to start reconsideration shortly thereafter? What is the explanation of that? I'd like to hear that from my honourable friend, the Minister of Labour. How can one conceive that \$1.00 must be correct on the 1st of December and then on the second or third or some date then turn around to the very Board that's charged with the responsibility of recommending change to the Minister to review the matter immediately. It doesn't seem logical. And if my honourable friend the Minister of Labour was not satisfied with the \$1.00 an hour on the first of December, why didn't he increase the amount of the \$1.00 as is his job as laid down in the Act, The Employment Standards Act.

And what does this Act really say about minimum wages? I'm referring to The Employment

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) . . . . Standards Act, Chapter 20 of The Statutes of 1957. It states that "the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may make regulations embodying and establishing in whole or in part with such amendments, additions or deletions as the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may deem desirable the recommendations of the Minimum Wage Board." This in effect of course means, Mr. Speaker, that the recommendations of the Minimum Wage Board do not represent any binding action for the Minister to take, and that's the point that I'm trying to make at the present time as to the asking of the Board to review something that became effective a few days ahead of time which in our opinion is not sufficient.

Then again in Section 23, subsection (2): "that for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this part and the regulations according to their intent, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may make such regulations as are ancillary thereto and not inconsistent therewith as he deems necessary or expedient for that purpose." And then: "Notwithstanding The Regulations Act, a regulation made under and in accordance with the authority granted by this section shall have only effect at the expiration of one month the publication in the Manitoba Gazette but thereafter shall have force and effect as law."

So even after the adopting of a recommendation it has to be Gazetted and then a month hence takes effect again. And then the Minister in Section 22, states that "a Board upon the written authorization of the Minister may with respect to the area for which it is appointed, make recommendations in writing respecting (a) standards of minimum wages to be paid to employees, (i) of different ages, or (ii) who are learners, inexperienced, handicapped or special employees, and the maximum amount (in subsection (c)) if any, that may be deducted from the prescribed minimum wage in case where the employer furnishes to the employee, board, lodging, uniforms, laundry or other services." It's quite a lot of power that is granted to my friend the Minister of Labour under The Minimum Wage Act. I say to my friend that on a minimum wage of \$1.00 an hour there's not much left for uniforms, board, lodgings, etcetera, for the Minister to order a reduction from the actual dollars and cents amount.

But, Mr. Speaker, there's another and I think more far-reaching clause within the Employment Standards Act in respect of minimum wages that we here in this House should take cognizance of and should investigate fully, and that is contained in Section 24 of the statute, and in particular, subsection (5). Here, Mr. Speaker, I think is the section of the Act that in this year 1967 we should take a look at. The Act was passed in its present state in 1957. We were living in a slightly different type of a world at that time, slightly different economy. And what does subsection (5) say? It's a directive to the Minimum Wage Board as how it should arrive at its decisions, and it states: "A Board in settling the recommendations it makes to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council shall take into consideration" - that part's okay - nothing wrong with the Board taking into consideration what follows, but, it says that it shall take into consideration and be guided by the cost to an employee of purchasing the necessities of life. "Shall take into consideration and be guided by the provision of the necessities of life."

I ask my honourable friend the Minister of Labour, and I trust and hope that he is going to take part in this debate, and when he does, as I am sure that he will, because it is incumbent upon him to do so, I would like him to tell me and to tell the House what are the necessities of life? Are the necessities of life bread, water and a pallet of straw to rest on in the evening? Conceivable, isn't it that these are the necessities of life? And Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest that there are individuals - and I'm not attributing this to the Board, the present Board - but I am suggesting that there are individuals who might conceive that bread and water and a pallet of straw are the necessities of life. I'm sure my honourable friend the Minister of Labour has met individuals of this type, indeed as I have; so I want to know from my honourable friend - and as I say I'm sure he will give us this information when he takes part in this debate - a definition of what he means or what he thinks are the necessities of life - and not only the necessities of life, Mr. Speaker, there's another word that's very important, the necessities of life and health.

The Honourable Minister of Health has a Bill before us that we're going to consider, establishing a Medicare scheme for all the citizens of Manitoba. He's forced into it he admits, but nonetheless, we're going to adopt here in Manitoba - true we're going to have to wait some considerable period in the distance before it becomes effective - but anyway the Minister of Health is going to have introduced into this House, or has introduced into this House, a Bill calling for provision for the health of the citizens of Manitoba, with a premium attached to it. Now we don't know what the premiums are going to be, as yet, Mr. Speaker, but in the Bill

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) . . . . there are provisions for exemptions of indigents and those unable to pay the premiums. In this Bill that we're considering at the present time, however, on a meagerly dollar an hour, which we have at the present time, these people will not be exempt under the terms of the Bill that the Minister of Health has introduced, from the payment of premiums. I wonder if my honourable friend, when he takes part in this debate, will indicate to us that either the Minister of Health will exempt those only on the minimum wage from payments of premiums, or whether he will ask his colleague the Minister of Labour to give instructions to the Minimum Wage Board that in computing the amount to be paid under a minimum wage, don't take into the question of health. I'm going to provide that for them because I know that in this day and age one of the necessities of life is the provision of full and adequate health care, the provision of hospitalization, the provision of dental care, the provision of optical care. Now I ask you, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, and I ask also my friend the Minister of Labour, how, with the cost of drugs what they are, with the cost of medications, the cost of medical premiums that are forthcoming, the present cost of hospital premiums, how can anyone make provisions for this and they're only receiving the minimum wage in Manitoba?

I know my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, will say, well there's not very many people that are affected this way. He may be right. He may be right. But, Mr. Speaker, there are people that are affected by the minimum wage in Manitoba and I suggest that it's time that we change the basis upon which minimum wages are arrived at. I don't think it's any longer valid for us to make directives to the Minimum Wage Board, that wages should be established on purchasing the necessities of life and health, and that should be the guide, the directive to the Minimum Wage Board.

I know in the past, Mr. Speaker, we have had arguments in this House about this very point and I say why didn't they bring in a recommendation? I've spoken to members of Boards and previous Minimum Wage Boards: Why didn't you go beyond the amount that you stated that should be paid. We were forbidden to do so because of the directive contained within the Act. I think it's time we took it out and I make this recommendation.

And so while I say, Mr. Speaker, so far as the resolution itself is concerned, with a \$1.25, we've expressed disappointment in the amount, we've expressed our disappointment in the fact of a review being taken every two years, but we do think there's also another matter, if this is going to be the proposition to be considered by this House, we suggest that there should be another consideration made in respect of the Act as it stands at the present time.

I have tried to establish in these few moments the inadequacy of the present minimum wage; I've tried to establish that there is no real firm and proper basis on which minimum wages are arrived at; I'm happy - I think I'm going to be happy that the Minister of Labour has indicated that he may - following me or sometime during the debate, indicate to the Assembly what is meant by the necessities of life and health. I am sure all the Members of the House will be most happy to hear from my honourable friend.

I made some statements in reference to the endeavours of my friend, the Minister of Industry and Commerce who wants to, in my opinion, continue the lowering of the base of the economy in the province; maybe he can put me right if I'm wrong in that, I appreciate hearing from him too. But in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to make a proposal to the House in respect of the Minimum Wage Act itself; and that proposal is, Mr. Speaker, that a Standing Committee of this House look into the whole matter of the Minimum Wage Act, the whole basis of the Minimum Wage Act, and in particular one section.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, that the following be added to the end of the resolution, namely: "And be it further resolved that the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be instructed to review the Minimum Wage Act with the object of changing the basis upon which minimum wage rates are arrived at".

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, the debate be adjourned. Is he going to speak?

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, I thought I was going to have the opportunity of hearing from our honourable friend the Member from Inkster. However, I believe there are a couple of matters in this debate that I should try and clarify once again. I'm rather disappointed that the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party again indicated his socialistic attitude and

(MR. BAIZLEY, cont'd) . . . . said, "Tell them what to do, tell them what to do". I'm sure the people of Manitoba must be a little disturbed when you have responsible boards and find that members of this House would dictate what they should say and do.

The other thing is he made quite a point and quite an issue out of the Minister of Industry and Commerce's immigration policy. It is true my honourable friend was overseas meeting business people, looking for highly technical people and looking for unskilled people, unskilled people by the thousands to work in that low paid industry of mining somewhere between 2.55 and \$3.00 an hour, but this is where we need a couple of thousand people, and I realize that these are not the highest wages in the world but they seem to be good average wages for this particular industry.

The other industry that my friend obviously was referring to was the garment industry, the highest organized industry possibly in the province, has the highest degree of junior organization in the province, and yet these are the unskilled people and these are the people whom he suggests are bringing down the wages in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, it has never been said by myself, by my colleagues, by the Progressive Conservative Government, that the minimum wage was sufficient; but we have said that the method of arriving at a proper minimum wage through a board - and again through a balanced board - and I realize my honourable friend doesn't like that terminology, he doesn't like to think that organized labour has had the opportunity to make representation or make recommendations as to who their representatives should be on the Minimum Wage Board. Management organizations have made recommendations as to who their representative should be on the board, and these competent folk, made at the request of the government, and I am sure all honourable members in this House who have been here for a few years know that that board has been called three times in the last four years, and the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party really shouldn't get upset about a progressive attitude of a government that calls a board to session prior to the last increase in the minimum wage. We realize as he does that these are changing times, but we are not going to bring in to this House and into partisan politics as was suggested by the Leader of the Opposition. I must say I thought he made a very reasoned statement the other day when he said it was very tempting to play politics with the minimum wage. I think we all agree with that, it's very tempting. I do think too that there have been a good many reasonable contributions about the plight of the individual, of an employee who works for the minimum wage; but I think we should remember too that you are talking about the least that an employer can pay an employee; you're not talking as was suggested by my honourable friend from Kildonan that \$3,000 was the minimum - we should set that fact straight - it might be as well to try and set it straight right now that this was the base that was set for family income. I'm sure he is aware of this, but it sounds so much nicer to say that the minimum is \$3,000, but that minimum as he knows, that he was referring to, was a family minimum, was a family minimum. --(Interjection)-- The minimum wage, my friend, is set by the board as the Leader of the New Democratic Party took great pains to point out, on the determination of what is necessary to maintain a person - get this now - a person.--(Interjection) This is not the intent of the minimum wage. Talk to your Leader about that, he made it quite clear that the minimum wage was a wage that was paid to an individual to maintain and sustain an employee. --(Interjection)-- Single, that's right.

The Honourable Member from Burrows the other day talked about the minimum wage again in the United States. Here it is, "Fair Labour Standards". I go over it, I find the minimum wage in the United States as of this date, February 1, '67, \$1.00 an hour in laundry, drycleaning, certain construction industries, hospitals, nursing and almost any enterprise that hasn't a volume of business over \$500,000; so that it's quite obvious as we debate minimum wages in this House that we all have a different meaning. One will talk about a fair wage, one will talk about a negotiated wage, someone else will talk about a going wage. When we as government and talking about the minimum wage are talking about a wage that has been set by a Minimum Wage Board, the recommendations have been accepted by government as the least amount of money that an employer can pay to an employee.

The other authorities that use a similar system of course - are all the provinces in Canada that use a board method of arriving at minimum wages - but the International Labour Organization, an organization that concerns itself with all employees state that this is the fairest and most equitable way for governments to arrive realistically and indiscriminately at minimum wages. I don't suppose that there would ever be agreement in this House, regardless of how progressive we tried to be or how dictatorial the Leader of the New Democratic Party



(MR. BAIZLEY, cont'd) . . . . would like to become, that there would ever be agreement as to what would be enough wages, and there isn't any question at all that the object of providing by statute for a minimum wage is an attempt to prevent exploitation of the individual who is just entering the work force, who has no skill, no other protection. As the Leader of the New Democratic Party has suggested this is the role of employment status, to try and have standards that will act as a base or a floor and as a protection to the citizens who have to work for these wages, but there is every indication the Minimum Wage Board having been called, that through these legal procedures and with proper study as to the effects of an increase in the minimum wage -- and again I might say for the benefit of honourable members opposite, if they don't already know and I am inclined to believe that they do -- that an increase, an indiscriminate increase in minimum wages can cause businesses to close. I realize that my honourable friend from Burrows says, "Well, if they can't pay more why then they should close". This is fine, maybe they should, but then I say to my honourable friend from Burrows, if they do close what about the people whom they support, even though a low wage? It was a job, they're self-sustaining - and it has been determined that the minimum wage will sustain a person.

I'm afraid that I can't define to my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party what the necessities of life are, because necessities of life will vary with individuals and vary a good deal, and that the variance is not in accordance with the amount of money they have. But governments have seen to it and have taken upon themselves to try and protect as far as possible through insurance benefits, through compensation, through welfare, through medical and hospital and meeting needs that the individual can be maintained. I sometimes wonder if our honourable friend is not talking about guaranteeing a job to everyone. He talks about the minimum wage as though it is going to eliminate poverty and he knows as I do that there isn't a jurisdiction in the country that can eliminate poverty by raising the minimum wage. We here are hopeful that with due and proper consideration there will be recommendations from the Minimum Wage Board recommending increases in that particular wage. We will study it and accept their recommendations.

I see no point in supporting part of the resolution of the Honourable Member from Assiniboia where the Minimum Wage Board should meet every two years because it is almost a continuing operation in the light of today's economy.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend the Minister expressed the hope that he would hear from me and I wouldn't want his hope to go unsatiated. I resent, Mr. Speaker, the continuous statements by the Minister of Labour to the effect that recommendations made by this side are made because of some socialist philosophy. He calls them socialistic. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hasten to say that I don't mind being called a socialist. I call myself a socialist. I just want the Minister of Labour to find something else wrong with the recommendation other than that it's socialistically inspired. Because I've been able to stand here, and members of my Party have been able to stand here and find many things wrong with what's happening on the other side without calling them capitalists, without saying they're wrong because they're capitalists; and if that's the level of debate that my honourable friend is capable of generating then I suggest to you that if it carries on that that's the kind of conflict that you will have in the House; that that government acts for the Chamber of Commerce, that it receives its instructions from the Chamber of Commerce; that it is the servant of vested interest; that it's capitalistically inclined.

Mr. Speaker, in saying all those things I haven't said one thing about the legislation that they have proposed which I disagree with. I have chosen in this House and I think that the members of our Party have chosen to look at the legislation, accept the sincerity of the people who are proposing it, but at the same time point out its weaknesses. And we've been able to do that and I think we've been able to do that with effect without saying that they're capitalists and that they're trodding on the workers. That's not our position in this House at all and he knows it. But he can't find an argument against what we've said. He hasn't been able to propose one argument against any of the resolutions that have been put forward by this Party with respect to labour matters. His only argument is that they're socialistically inspired. I've been able to show him that he agrees with all of the propositions in the resolution. He even rose to his feet last week and said, "Philosophically I agree with my honourable friend but I have to vote against it because it's socialistically inspired." Well the Honourable the Minister may be a socialist because he agrees with all these things. And today, today he takes the position that's been put by the Leader of this Party which doesn't do anything more

(MR. GREEN, cont'd) . . . . than call for a review of the directions which the Minimum Wage Board is considering when they're arriving at their conclusions and he says that that's a socialistic resolution. And why is it a socialistic resolution? Because it directs something to the Board and we socialists, we socialists are always directing Boards to do one thing or another. Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope that when we socialists are in the position that my honourable friend is now and he said, "God forbid it," I say, 'God quicken it. - quicken it!, that we will show that we don't interfere with Boards; that it's not the socialist position to interfere with Boards. We, in making this recommendation are doing no more than what the government is now doing.

And I'm going to read you what the Act now says about the Minimum Wage Board, without a socialist government; with a capitalist government that exploits the workers. Mr. Speaker, he's asking for this and if he wants to hear whether we on this side are capable of this type of invective - and I shrink to stoop to it - but if he wants to hear whether we are capable of it I assure him that we are and I hope that we can stop it at this point. I hope that I've demonstrated that it needn't go any further than this, that we can start talking about these resolutions on the basis of their substance and not on the basis of them being socialistically inspired or capitalistically inspired or fascistically inspired or any other 'istically'.

Now let's look at what the Minimum Wage Act now says. It says, "A Board in settling the recommendations it makes to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council shall -- shall take into consideration," and my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside will realize the meaning of the word 'shall', "that they shall take into consideration and be guided by the cost to an employee of purchasing the necessities of life and health." Now I ask the Honourable Minister: is the government which enacted this legislation telling the Board what to do? And if they're not telling the Board what to do then what are they doing and why do they use the words 'shall take into consideration' - and this not be a socialistic government but by a government of which my honourable friend is a member. Well, let me say this -- my honourable friend the Minister of Health indicates that this legislation was passed by the capitalistic party on my right instead of the capitalistic party over there. They've been in power nine years. If they thought that this was a socialist measure which should be eliminated then they would have eliminated it. I say that any government which sustains this type of legislation while being philosophically opposed to it is adopting it just as if they presented it in bill form in the House and voted for it. And that's what my honourable friend has done. So let him not say, let him not say that the members of this Party are socialist in that we are directing the Board what to do.

The amendment that was put forward by the Leader of this Party is an amendment which should commend itself to the Minister. It says that they should review the criteria of setting the minimum wage. And my honourable friend agrees that there should be a minimum wage; that it should have certain effect and surely there is no -- and that he can't, he can't define necessities of life. Well if he can't define necessities of life and if it is indefinable then surely one of the things that has to be done and one of the problems that has to be solved with respect to the minimum wage is the criteria which are now set forth by this government, and I'll stick with that, by this government in determining what the minimum wage should be. Now is my honourable friend opposed to that even though he doesn't know the definition of necessities of life? Then he is proposing that there exists a statute on a very important subject, and he agrees it's an important subject, minimum wages - despite our differences as to what they should be, he agrees it's an important subject - that there exists a statute setting out criteria by which these important economic wages should be determined, that the criteria under the statutes are indefinable, but they should not be changed, because I submit if they're definable he may find that we are more in keeping with what the minimum wage should be than he is. So the amendment that's been put forward by the Leader of this Party is something which I suggest to you, the Minister of Labour, should have no possible objection to. As a matter of fact he should be in favour of it because he himself has said that the criteria as presently constituted by the Act are indefinable.

My honourable friend says that the wages which are now being used to attract people to work in the mining industry are the ones that my Honourable Leader has objected to - and he referred to them as being something like \$2.50 an hour. Am I correct? Something like that. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the indefinable subjects which my honourable friend doesn't define. \$2.50 an hour where they are now working in the mining industry obviously isn't enough to attract workers up to that industry. And I suggest that if he follows his own thinking

(MR. GREEN, cont'd) . . . . that he would tell the mining companies, "If you want workers you're going to have to increase your wages. We're not going to spend thousands of dollars travelling across the continent to subsidize wages which won't attract people to your industry." But at least he chose in that regard an industry which he could use to show a wage which at least sounds good; despite the fact that it doesn't meet the living expenses of people who are living in the mining towns, at least it sounds good, \$2.50 an hour.

But the other criteria, the famous garment industry. He wants this government to subsidize people who are working in the garment industry. The garment industry, Mr. Speaker, which I submit has produced as many millionaires as any other industry and who are now working at the minimum wage, \$1.00 an hour in many, many cases. In many, many cases they're working for \$1.00 an hour, yes, and the way in which they want to prevent those wages from increasing and the collective agreements resulting in increased wages is to have my honourable friend go across the continent and bring in people who would be willing to work for \$1.00 an hour so that they can't get an increase. But it's the garment industry which he points to as being the industry - which the Leader of this Party has mentioned that the Minister of Industry and Commerce is seeking to attract workers to a highly organized industry. It's true, it's organized. I don't know whether at the moment, and I won't challenge it, I can accept the criteria that it's highly organized, it's organized but it's the rare agreements that I've seen that contain a working wage of the minimum is in the garment industry, the very industry that he now refers to.

My honourable friend also refers to balanced boards, and I know that it's the *modus operandi* of the Minister of Labour to say that he doesn't do anything until it's referred to a board, balanced board of labour and management with a chairman at the head, and then when he gets the report of that board he proposes it to the House as having come from a bipartisan board. Mr. Speaker, he knows as well as I do that a bipartisan board has this effect in labour matters, or generally has this effect, and there are exceptions! An arbitration board which is a board composed of a labour representative, a management representative and a chairman is really, and results in, conservatively speaking, 95 percent of the cases as the chairman making decision as between the labour representative and the management representative. The labour representative votes one way, the management representative votes another way and the chairman makes a decision. Is that not correct, Mr. Minister?

In a conciliation board, it's rarely the case -- and these are not even binding, just as the Minimum Wage Board provision is not binding, that's set by the board -- in a conciliation board you have the labour representative taking one point of view, the management representative taking a second point of view and the third representative, the chairman, deciding as between them. In industrial investigation boards you have the same type of procedure, if they're bipartisan. In the boards that my honourable friend is referring to, the wages, the Heavy Construction Board, the Minimum Wage Board, you have the same type of situation. You have the labour person going one way, the management person going another way and the chairman coming in and making a decision. And in this province, and I have no objections to the individual, the person who is usually the chairman of these boards, that is the Heavy Construction Board, the Minimum Wage Board, or other boards set up to consider wages, is G. Campbell MacLean, and I suggest that the Progressive Conservative Party has delegated the subject of wages to Campbell MacLean, that he is the one who sets wages in the Province of Manitoba and that's why we never discuss them in the House. The members who have been elected by their constituents, they never discuss wages. Did we discuss this latest wage that was set up, this heavy construction wage? On Saturday they promulgated a regulation which says that people are going to have to work for 60 hours a week before they're entitled to overtime. This is between the months, and I'm . . .

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): May I be permitted to ask the honourable member a question, please, just to clear a point. Is this the same Mr. MacLean that's the President of the Conservatives?

MR. GREEN: I believe that this -- I thank my faithful friend for helping me out. Yes. He happens to be a member of my fraternity, The Law Society of Manitoba. But, Mr. Speaker, we had on Saturday, we had a regulation pronounced by the Heavy Construction Industries Board or some such euphemism for Campbell MacLean to the effect that people are going to work in the construction industry 60 hours a week - and I believe the months are between April and October. Between October and April when there is relatively no construction, then they only have to work 48 hours a week. But between the months of April and October they're

(MR. GREEN, cont'd) . . . . going to work 60 hours a week before they get any overtime. For a century people have been fighting to reduce the work week. In Manitoba we have succeeded in apparently - only apparently - reducing it to 48, and I intend to show the Minister how great a fraud and illusion that is, that we have a 48-hour work week. We have what the government can refer to as a 48-hour work week but it can be . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the honourable gentleman can assure me that he's going to come back to this matter of the minimum wage.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the setting up of bipartisan boards to figure these things out. I merely intended to show what these bipartisan - so-called bipartisan boards do.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the honourable gentleman knows what I have in my mind, and I can count on him.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll go very quickly through this. In the heavy construction industry they fought for years, labour and legislators - and I think the trade unionists fight a lot harder than the legislators - I think that the trade unions achieve a wage and then the legislators come in and enact it and say, "Look at the wages we have given you." But nevertheless, they fought for years to bring this down to 48 and they are now fighting to get it down to 40 and perhaps 36 some day. Cam MacLean, by pronouncing a regulation which won't come up for debate in this House, throws it back to 60.

Now, Mr. Speaker, five years ago a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench of the Province of Manitoba told this government that they'd made a mistake in the legislation that they had enacted so that the intended 48-hour week doesn't apply to the heavy construction industry. Five years ago he told them that they had made a mistake. He asked them, even pleaded with them in his judgment - he didn't use those words - but he indicated to them he hoped they'd correct this mistake. Five years later - and I believe that this is the first regulation since that judgment, and if I'm wrong I hope that the Minister will correct me - five years later the first regulation after that mistake was pointed out to these people by the judge, the mistake has been corrected. Instead of going back to the 48-hour week, they institute a 60-hour week. And this has been done not by this government, not by debate, not so that we could say in this House - which is the same as the minimum wage - that a 60-hour week is unfair, inequitable, and results in people struggling against each other so that they don't have any time to spend with their families, etc. We can't use any of these arguments because it's done by Cam MacLean and then by regulation, and this is the criteria that my honourable friend uses as his modus operandi in that Department of Labour. If the Woods Committee comes in with a suggestion that everybody agrees with, it will be law - it will be law.

Now I say to you frankly, Mr. Speaker, that I am not wedded to the Woods Committee, a management committee and a labour committee. Members of this House who know me know that I have on many occasions, and still do, bring in resolutions which are directly contrary to the position that the labour movement is taking on a particular question. The two resolutions that I brought on going back to work and on free speech, has the Minister seen them anywhere else? Has he seen them in any representations made by the Canadian Labour Congress? Has he seen them in any representation made by the Manitoba Federation of Labour? Has he seen them anywhere except on this Order Paper? I suggest to you that many people in the labour movement disagree with them, but I brought them in because I think they're right, and I think that that government should start doing things because they think they are right and not because they have managed to shift off the heat to what they call a bipartisan board and then come in with what they say is its recommendation which they ask us to enact into legislation without debate.

So let's remember, Mr. Speaker, that when we are discussing these matters, that we feel in this Party that we are taking a position which we feel is based on our thinking on matters, and if they are to be challenged, if our resolutions are to be challenged, they should be challenged because something in them is wrong, not because it's we who bring them and that we are socialistically inclined.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I have the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand?

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

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

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

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): May I have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker, unless somebody else wishes to speak.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this resolution.

To begin with, I don't think it asks for anything that is out of the ordinary; it just asks something that we all believe in and that is that no one be forced or compelled to go to work by an order of the court. I think that under the jurisprudence that we have evolved, too often much of our law is made by judges. The interpretation they place upon it creates the law as it has been written. It isn't necessarily the intent of what has been written, but their interpretation creates this and this is what this resolution asks us to do, that we kind of nudge the courts back into line again, into what the legislation intended.

As I say, the resolution says, "that no injunction granted by the court shall compel the performance of work by an employee for an employer; and (b) no person shall be held in contempt of court for the reason that he refuses to work or return to work." And I think this is fair. Why should someone, because a judge interprets something which the legislation didn't intend it to, be forced to go to work if he does not wish to do so.

Now the Minister of Labour spoke on this resolution and he was referring to ex parte injunction. There is nothing in this resolution that says anything about ex parte injunction. The Minister of Labour also said that it's illegal and I shall try and find the quote - "Our colleagues here in the legal profession I'm sure will debate this very fully." Well I haven't heard of them yet. This resolution has been on the Order Paper since the beginning and I haven't had one word from that side from the legal profession. I believe there are five of them - three on the front bench, two more on the backbench - and I'm sure that the Minister of Labour has a lot more legal help outside of the House as well, yet we have had nothing from the legal profession on that side.

The Minister of Labour, as was pointed out by the Honourable Member from Inkster, always infers that we are looking for a consensus of opinion. In this respect he is again referring to boards; he is referring also to the Rand Commission - I think he does mention that on Page 989; he also mentions the Wood Committee. Now I'm not interested in all these committees. We are interested in the principle of this thing, whether he and all his legal help over there are also interested in the principles, then why do they not debate it? Why do they not come out and say what they feel about a man having to go to work because the court orders him to go to work? This is something that I would like to have someone on that side explain to me. Where is the legal profession on this aspect? So far we have only heard from the Minister of Labour, and as I say, I certainly would appreciate if one of the legal profession would get up and explain to me why judges should make these kind of decisions.

In respect of this resolution, this is nothing new. The courts in England have on occasion - and this is from history and from recollections - been nudged into line when their decisions started to be at variance with what the statutes wanted to have. We've had the same thing happen in the United States. In fact I think the Wagner Act was the result of the fact that the legal profession, the judges, had been making decisions and interpreting the law not the way it was intended but in a different way.

So therefore there is nothing new in us here in this Legislature doing the same thing, and if the interpretation placed upon this type of legislation has moved out of line with what it was intended, then it should be nudged back into position and this resolution asks for that. All it does is state that the interpretation of this law should not force anyone to go to work, and I don't think anyone wanted a law created which would force people to go to work. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Did I understand the Honourable Member for Loan request the House that this -- ask leave to have this matter stand?

MR. HARRIS: I did, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GREEN: I had intended to speak, but I would now request that this matter stand.

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

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, QC (Selkirk): With leave of the House, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have this matter stand.

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

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence to have this matter stand, but if anyone else wishes to speak, we'd have no objection.

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

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against this amendment because I feel a conference will not solve the problems that we face with automation. It's my belief that usually a conference is called as a preliminary move before definite steps are taken and I believe that the definite steps have been taken and automation is here to stay, and I don't believe that automation will lessen but will increase in the future. President Kennedy, when he was elected the President of the United States, realized that automation would displace a million workers a year in the United States alone, so he recognized the problem and he did not set up a conference; he set up a committee because he felt that definite action was needed. If our labour force is to increase in this province like we hope it will do, automation will be a greater danger than what it is right now.

I guess some of us ask why - we question the fact, why automation? Well, automation has given us jet travel and changing technologies and a better way of life, and for this we must face the fact squarely that automation is here to stay. Our Federal Government, and employers as well, recognize the fact that automation is a force to be dealt with and a committee constructed as the original motion was first proposed to deal with automation would be in order, and I would strongly urge the members to defeat the amendment and to support the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Burrows, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, the idea presented in this resolution is nothing new. Community colleges or folk schools or continuing schools, or call them what you wish, have been in existence for many many years in many European countries. They've been known in England as far back as the early 1800's. They took root in countries in the European continent many many years ago and are continuing to thrive and flourish therein. Nor is the idea of that new in Canada, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps we have not referred to them as community colleges, the institution may have been known under some different name, but basically the purpose of it was the same; the purpose of it was pretty well identical to that proposed or suggested in this resolution, and that is to offer people some means whereby they could continue their education, that is, for the benefit of those who do not wish to attend university, who have a need for a type of instruction somewhat different from that offered at university, for the benefit of those to whom a university is not readily and easily accessible. We've had the frontier college in operation in remote parts of Ontario for some 50 or 60 years; we've had an adult education program operate in Nova Scotia, going away back to the turn of the century. I think perhaps it's maybe a university and which has become one of the better known adult education centres in the world. So this idea is certainly not new.

As a matter of fact, browsing through a book on adult education written by a Mr. Saunders some 40 years old - I think it was written about 1925 - he reports on the situation as it existed at that time, that adult education programs were in operation in Ontario, in Quebec, in the

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd).... Maritimes, but unfortunately in the west they had barely taken root.

And it's rather interesting, Mr. Speaker, to note that in the years that followed there were many conferences held in Canada, conferences attended by people active in and interested in the educational field who met to deal with the matter of adult education, and they passed all sorts of profound resolutions. In 1943 the National Conference on Adult Education adopted the manifesto; in 1946 it adopted the statement of purposes; in 1962 the Manitoba Conference on Adult Education met and it made certain recommendations. It recommended that a Director of Adult Education be appointed - and I mention this at this point, Mr. Speaker, because I'll be referring to this later - I feel that this office is a very vital and integral part of a continuing education program. This Manitoba conference in 1962 also recommended that committees concerned with centennial projects give consideration to establishing centres for continuing education as their centennial projects. I don't know if there have been very many such centres built in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. I doubt if there have been any apart from, if we wish to classify a museum or an art gallery or an auditorium as being of an educational nature which no doubt it is, but I think that the Manitoba Conference on Adult Education had something more in mind, something more complex, broader in scope than what has been done now.

So these were some of the resolutions passed by people concerned with this matter five years ago, Mr. Speaker. This convention was held here in Winnipeg on April 12, 1962, and in a month's time five years will have lapsed since this conference was held and since these recommendations were made, and to this date nothing has been done about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in speaking of a community college, we mean more than just the -- or we think of it in broader terms than just meaning the four walls that you have erected to constitute a building. We envisage in our community college set-up that there would be provision for travelling lecturers, more adequate use of radio, television, newspapers and various other communications media to reach the people, and again I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that this has been done in other parts of Canada where the students found it impossible to come to the school, the school came to them.

Not too long ago, visiting our sister province to the east, I noticed that a newly established university at the Lakehead operates that very type of program whereby they are able to reach the communities up in northern Ontario, Red Lake, Dryden, Sioux Lookout and such, and they do that in a variety of ways. If there's a demand for instruction in a certain course requested in that community and if the demand consists of a certain minimum number of students, they will provide a lecturer to visit that community from time to time. If the demand makes it difficult, or if the number of students demanding instruction is too low to make it worthwhile to send an instructor out there, then they allot tapes which a group of three or four could listen to. Now granted, I'd be the first to admit that a tape is not an ideal substitute for a lecturer, but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that even that form of instruction is better than none at all.

Now the community college, Mr. Speaker, as we envisage it, would offer instruction in four general areas. We see the community college as offering the junior years of instruction in the arts and science faculties of the university - well, under the old system perhaps would have been the first two years, under the present system the first year of arts and science, and perhaps even the first year of engineering could be offered at the junior college.

Now, it's not merely a question of finance that I'm concerned about. I agree that this would minimize the expense, but insofar as our thinking regarding education is concerned, we feel that provision should be made for a student to attend university at a minimum of financial hardship to him regardless of where he lives. So therefore I would discuss this issue apart from the financial issues involved. There are students who would benefit and profit from an extra year at home of parental control and supervision. I think it's a known fact that many students do find it difficult to adjust to a university life upon leaving home. The sudden change in the routine, the environment, the discipline, does produce an adverse effect on the student's performance in school, and educationists will agree that in many cases that extra year of living at home would benefit the student tremendously. The transition would then become more gradual, he would leave the high school environment, enter a university environment, but at the same time have the opportunity to live at home, and then the following year if he is living outside of Metropolitan Winnipeg or outside of the City of Brandon, he then leaves home to continue with his university education.

The second area of a community college would be something similar to what we have in the City of Winnipeg, the Adult Day School offering instruction in high school academic subjects

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd)..... for the benefit of those who are in a position to take time off during the day to complete their high school training, and there are many of them, Mr. Speaker. The figures that one could obtain from the Winnipeg School Board office indicate the tremendous interest that there is shown in both the night school programs that Winnipeg operates, and some of the other school divisions, as well as the full-time day school, and within this full-time day school department, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is need there for flexibility. There is need to enable a student to attend classes just in the morning or in the afternoon, whichever fits in with his schedule; to accommodate the mother who has children of school age; to accommodate the shift worker who has to go to work at certain hours, who may work on a split shift and that sort of thing.

The third area of a community college for which we feel that there is a local demand in different parts of Manitoba is the technical and trade school department, if you wish to call it that, and it would offer instruction of a type offered by the Manitoba Institute of Technology in its various departments, that is the technological division and the industrial division. And there is a precedent set for that, Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Institute of Technology does not operate just out of Winnipeg, it operates out of Brandon; it operates out of The Pas. This trend I suggest, Mr. Speaker, could in effect become part of the community college set-up as we see it.

The fourth -- perhaps before I go on to deal with the fourth, the courses that are offered in these various local schools could be tailored to meet the needs of the community. For example, in the Manitoba Institute of Technology as it now exists, I do not believe that there is a course of instruction in agriculture. The only course of instruction in agriculture that is presently available is the one offered by the University of Manitoba. There we have the degree course and the diploma course for the benefit of those whose intention it is to go back to the farm. But I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the agriculture course could be brought closer to home, more readily available to the young men who do intend to make a career of farming and make the availability of the course somewhat easier for them.

The fourth area of instruction in our community college would be interest courses or non-credit courses, call them what you will. They could be courses of a type -- many of them are offered here in Winnipeg -- in various hobbies, courses in various crafts, courses in music, drama, there could be current affairs -- courses in topics related to current affairs and such, perhaps even courses in literature and history, in philosophy, what-have-you, not designed to lead to a certificate or diploma or a degree, but courses which one could take just simply for his own interest and appreciation.

Now, what we are suggesting, Mr. Speaker, what we are suggesting, is really an expansion and an extension of something that has already been started. It would mean an expansion, an extension and a co-ordination of the services now provided by the Manitoba Institute of Technology, by the University of Manitoba, and in areas outside the City of Winnipeg these two services could meet and function as one unit as a community college. These two services could also join hands in the City of Winnipeg for the benefit of those who wish instruction other than for the purpose of getting a university degree, other than for the purpose of getting a trade certificate at the MIT or a certificate in one of the technologies.

To accomplish this, Mr. Speaker, we have to do more than what is presently done in the area of adult education. There is a department or sub-department of adult education at the present time but there is need to set up a department headed by a person who would be charged with the responsibility of co-ordinating all these services and to set up a college functioning along these lines. This would mean more than just simply having a department that would be charged with the responsibility of paying teaching grants to those school divisions offering adult education as we now have happening. The department would have to take more initiative in setting up the program along these lines.

Also, Mr. Speaker, for a college, for community colleges to be attractive to the people in the community, I would suggest that the Department of Education do give serious consideration or do advise the university to reconsider university entrance requirements. Community colleges thrive and flourish in those areas wherein university entrance requirements vary somewhat from ours. By that I mean this: at our university you must meet certain minimum academic qualifications to qualify for admission. Now I have no quarrel with that, Mr. Speaker, insofar as the 18, 19, 20 year old student is concerned seeking admission to university, but I question, Mr. Speaker, whether it is absolutely desirable for a 30 year old who seeks admission to university to have clear Grade 12 mathematics standing if he wishes to take an Arts



(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd).... course in philosophy, psychology, history and English.

Now there are universities in Canada who do take the age of the enrolling student into consideration. There are universities in Ontario that do have the academic entrance requirements as we have them for certain students, but for the student over - and this varies - over 25, over 30 years of age, he may be admitted to university upon passing a university entrance examination, and in some cases he may be admitted without having to write such an examination but he's admitted on trial, as it were, and if he passes his term tests at the end of the first term he is allowed to continue.

Now these, Mr. Speaker, are really part and parcel of a same problem. There is need for community colleges, and to make these community colleges function effectively, there is need for the establishment of a Directorate of - and I would refrain from using the term "adult education" because in effect it's continuing education and we have to start thinking of education as a continuing process and not something that we acquire in different stages, each entirely separate and divorced from the other - a directorate of continuing education and a re-examination by the university of its entrance requirements to allow for transfer of credits from one type of course to another which would enable the adult who may decide in his late twenties or thirties to enroll in university, to enable him to do so.

And lastly, Mr. Speaker, there are two other important reasons why a community college program should be set up. One is this, that with the passage of time there is an increasing number of people who find that they do have more time to devote to activity of this type. They find that they do have more time on their hands away from work and this would certainly give them an opportunity to devote that time to some profitable, useful activity. And lastly, we are living in a continuously shrinking world and certainly, Mr. Speaker, if there's any way that's more effective than learning how to overcome international and inter-racial differences that presently exist, I do feel that education is the most effective way, and if there is a demand for the education at the adult level and if it can be offered and people can profit from it, there is certainly no reason, Mr. Speaker, why it should not be offered.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. PAULLEY: May I have this stand once again? I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Would the honourable member have any objection if I spoke on it?

MR. PAULLEY: No, go ahead.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, this resolution was introduced into this House by the Honourable Member for Burrows on January 27th last and his remarks can be found on pages 550 to 554 of Hansard of that date. He was followed by my Leader on the same day and my Leader's remarks may be found on pages 554 and 555 of the same issue of Hansard. My Leader's remarks were much shorter and in my opinion were much more relevant and much more factual, and his remarks, as I have said, can be found in the issue of Hansard of the same date. On the 16th of February the Member for Roblin then spoke and his remarks may be found on pages 1080 to 1083 of Hansard of that date.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Roblin made an excellent presentation, not only proving that he had done considerable research, much more than the mover had done, but showing an objectivity in his approach which was refreshing. It was completely bereft of any political bias but factual to the extent of proving to the satisfaction of this House that the action of the Government of Canada which was taken, was in the national interest and for the benefit of all Canadians. I commend to the members of this House a reading of the Member for Roblin's speech on the basis of which alone I feel that the Member for Burrows should withdraw his resolution as being ill-conceived and not entirely based on fact.

I was amused when the Member for Burrows said, as reported on Page 552 of Hansard, that he agreed with the stand taken by the Honourable John Diefenbaker on this issue. I asked the Member for Burrows on which of Mr. Diefenbaker's two stands does he agree. In the first stand which followed the refusal of the Government of Canada to adopt the recommendation of the National Energy Board, Mr. Diefenbaker blamed the Government of Canada for not following that decision; and when the Government of Canada did follow the second recommendation of that Board which provided the safeguards which the Government of Canada suggested,

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd). . . . Mr. Diefenbaker then accused the Government of Canada of selling out to the United States. So I ask the Honourable Member for Burrows: which stand does he agree with? To follow Mr. Diefenbaker one would have to be not only ambidextrous but I think it would be a great help if you were amphibious, and it certainly would be a much greater help if you had learned your politics from a hula hula dancer so that you could wiggle out of impossible situations.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that this is an issue wherein the mover has been content to believe everything that was said in the House of Commons by his idols without doing any research work by way of confirmation, an attitude and approach which I am sure the honourable member would not tolerate in one of his own students.

Both my Leader and the Member for Roblin have fully dealt with the preliminaries leading up to the choosing of the route which the mover says is not in the best interests of Canada. Both have given their reasons for saying that the chosen route is in that interest, and at the expense of repetition, I wish to list the advantages to Canada of the route that was chosen. These advantages are:

(1) Lower construction costs resulting in lower gas prices in Eastern Canada. As a matter of fact, the saving will be approximately three cents per 1,000 cubic feet.

(2) Shorter construction time. The construction of this new route will be completed in one year while the construction of the original plan would have taken two years.

(3) The export of natural gas to the United States would be facilitated and such export would give to Canada much needed United States funds.

(4) Financing is much easier in the route chosen.

(5) Trans-Canada Pipe Line has committed itself to looping the northern Ontario line commencing in 1970.

(6) There would be more safety and security of service. It is obvious that the separation of the first and second lines would provide a margin of safety in the event of accident or war.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Who said that?

MR. HILLHOUSE: I'm saying it and so did the National Energy Board and so did the members in the House of Commons that spoke on it.

(7) Upon completion of the southern loop there would be additional capacity immediately available in northern Ontario by reason of a diversion through the Great Lakes line of less than 50 percent of the Trans-Canada gas destined for eastern Canada.

(8) Gas service would be provided to Sault Ste. Marie at lower cost.

(9) Southwestern Ontario customers would benefit from the direct connection to the Don storage fields.

These are only a few of the advantages but they are certainly worthy of consideration and these were the advantages which were considered by the Government of Canada when they chose this route.

Now the Member for Burrows has dealt with the main line concept stressing the fact that the Great Lakes pipe line would be larger in diameter than the existing northern Ontario line, but the agreement between Trans-Canada and the government provides that at all times a greater volume of gas for eastern Canada use will be transported in the northern Ontario line than in the Great Lakes line. And what the Honourable Member for Burrows has completely ignored is the fact that it is not the size of a pipe line which determines the volume of gas but the compression used in transmitting that gas. --(Interjection)-- Beg pardon? --(Interjection) Yes, very much true here, we don't need any proof of that statement. In fact, some people refer to this as the gas Chamber - others the rock-pile.

In conclusion, I ask all members of this House to look at this matter objectively and without partisanship and I am satisfied that if they do that the Honourable Member for Burrows should withdraw his resolution.

MR. PAULLEY: Would my honourable friend the Member for Selkirk permit a question?

MR. HILLHOUSE: If I can answer it, yes.

MR. PAULLEY: I don't know if you can answer it or not but would you permit it, irrespective of whether you could answer it or not?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Well, if I can answer it, I'll answer it. You go ahead.

MR. PAULLEY: But you would accept it?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Yes.

MR. PAULLEY: Ah, that's lovely. My honourable friend mentions the length of time in constructing either the southern route or the northern route insofar as the time element is

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd).... concerned, if I remember his statement correctly, either one year or two years one against the other. Can my honourable friend tell me if construction has commenced insofar as the southern line is concerned which would take the lesser period to construct than that of the northern line?

MR. HILLHOUSE: I couldn't answer that question.

MR. PAULLEY: You don't know whether it's started or not?

MR. SPEAKER: .... the Leader of the New Democratic Party has leave to allow this to stand? Agreed? The adjourned debate of the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN: .... May I have the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand, Mr. Speaker?

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

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I'll try to be brief. I think we should all take example - I hope I'll be brief, because time is flying. --(Interjection)-- No, depends how much you get.

Over a year ago, the Minister of Education announced in this House that there will be about ten new vocational schools built somewhere in the Province of Manitoba, and subsequently the First Premier at a speech mentioned that again, and I have a paper here in front of me: "Mr. Roblin said his government would expand vocational and technical services by constructing up to ten schools throughout the province with residential accommodation where necessary" - that was during the election when he said that. Neither the First Minister nor the Minister of Education specified when those will be built and ten new schools, vocational schools, in the Province of Manitoba is not such a major proposal. Manitoba should have had some of these schools already in existence, people could have made use of them now, and they should have - some of these schools should have been built prior to the announcement of intent to build last year only.

The citizens of Manitoba are really concerned about the lack of vocational school facilities in the Province of Manitoba and they have reason to be concerned. We know that other provinces have gone ahead and the people of this province have no one else to blame for the present situation but the present government. While the other provinces of Manitoba took advantage of the generous 75 percent capital cost grant from Ottawa, the Manitoba Government was lagging in this respect and time has been lost and money in form of grants from Ottawa have not been utilized because this government chose to wait and do nothing except announce, with the exception of the odd one like we have in the city, but I'm talking about these ten schools that have been announced. Now some people say money talks and I know that money talks, but what is of greater importance to the people of Manitoba is the fact that our residents who would have had the opportunity to train, now are several years behind due to lack of vocational facilities throughout the province, or probably by now some of these people may have lost this opportunity forever and that's what concerns the people of the Province of Manitoba. Other provinces have their trained people, vocationally trained people, those provinces have their own men man the different industries but the Province of Manitoba is short of skilled labour.

The Minister of Industry, we hear that quite often, and I said that once before, has to recruit skilled labour for different industries from other countries, and I would suggest that this would not have been necessary to as great an extent if the present government would have done its homework. It has often been referred that about 40 percent of the Manitoba students would attend such schools if facilities were available. They're waiting and what's the government doing? - marking time and talking and not too much work. The government pays lip service mostly, as usual, and more so in this case - it's just procrastination. The government dropped this question into the lap of the Boundaries Commission and that's what I mean by procrastination, instead of deciding themselves and this commission probably will take its time. I think it was the chairman of the commission who said that before the report may be expected it may even take four years, that's a long time to wait. Does that mean that the people of Manitoba will have to wait for four years to find out where the location of these vocational schools may be decided upon? Now, in the meantime the school divisions are undecided as to their own plans, because they would like their own plans in their different constituencies, they would like to integrate the two, their education as one when they're building, they would like to have some plans. Many of these divisions feel that there is a great need for vocational schools and expect such schools now, at least announcements now, and they would like to go ahead with them; but it is virtually impossible unless the government comes across and decide on the location.

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd).....

Now, we hear many different questions, the Boundary Commission may have been requested by the government to delay the building of vocational schools, that's one question that is asked. Some people think that this commission was ill composed and a lot of the people agree with that. We have heard the accusations that some members of the commission are politically biased in this House. We have heard that some of the members actually suggested discrimination against opposition held constituencies - that has been said in this House; and not was it only said in this House but we have a policy statement of the present Party during election, and this one has been referred to before. It's labelled as: "Read between the lines" - it says so in here, figure it out for yourself - and mentions government-built roads, government-built parks, government-built vocational schools, and then: "Read between the lines". "If you are sitting with the opposition on June 23rd, get with the government, get with Duff Roblin and share in Manitoba's growth." This is part of the growth, vocational schools, so that may be the policy of the government and who knows, those who were appointed could subscribe to this policy because at least one of those members had indicated that this may be true.

Can you blame the people of Manitoba for being concerned about this commission? I do not blame him for that. This commission was appointed by the present government, probably the Premier had his finger in it, and these appointments were purely political. The ministers across would like us to believe otherwise, that they were the best people available because some of them have been serving the people in this Legislature, but many of them never served in this legislature, they had nothing to brush up as the Attorney-General had said, because they had not had the experience in this House, and they had been appointed to this commission. And I would say that the members almost - I'll not say altogether - without exception are either defeated Conservative candidates or retired Conservative members, they could be their relatives, Ministers' relatives and also the top workers of the Conservative Government. I would say that this is a present day family compact, similar to the family compact of the olden days. No wonder the people haven't faith in this Boundary Commission when these things come out - and I say that they haven't. Will this commission be able to decide on the basis of the greatest need for the people of Manitoba? I would like to think so, but it doesn't seem so. The people of Manitoba do not believe so.

Evidently some decisions have already been made by this commission and probably they were made purely on political basis because we have some reference here: "Technical Vocational School Here Termed a Virtual Possibility. A delegation from the board earlier this week called on Robert Smellie, Manitoba Boundaries Commission chairman" -- and what was the feeling of this group? -- "and the feeling was obtained that Dauphin would probably get a high priority." Dauphin is represented not by an opposition member but represented by a minister of the Crown. No wonder they had high hopes, and it seems to indicate that they are biased.

Now this resolution is a very simple one and it simply says, "Be it resolved that the Government of Manitoba immediately remove from the jurisdiction of the Boundaries Commission the right to determine the location of such new vocational training schools", and if it's true about this commission that they may be biased, I believe that we should immediately remove this from their hands, because although the Honourable Minister of Education is not with my Party, I would rather place my faith in him than in this Boundary Commission.

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

MR. SHOEMAKER: I must say on the outset that I have deliberately delayed and postponed speaking on this resolution and closing the debate until the school referendum vote was over with and done with and I have not mentioned the content of the resolution since I last spoke in the House some - I forget when it was, it must be nearly a month ago now - February 3rd - February 3rd, because I didn't want anyone in this House to say that what I said might have affected the vote on March 10th - I'm sure that it didn't - and I'm sure that most of the people opposite recognize and some of them appreciate the fact that I spoke at two or three or four meetings during the campaign in my own constituency. During the campaign I went to Eden to hear my honourable friend the Minister of Public Utilities who was scheduled to be there - didn't show up - and he delegated his position to the Honourable the Attorney-General and he didn't show up either. Now -- (interjection) -- they knew I was coming and they were afraid of me, is that what my honourable friend is saying? I did show up - I did show up because I did want to ask my honourable friend some questions when they were there. They weren't there. It was a good meeting. I think there were 150 there and about 150 at Brookdale as well. They

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd). . . . were two good meetings, but no Ministers there - no Ministers there trying to sell the job - but do you know at both of those meetings, and particularly the one at Eden, this subject of technical and vocational schools - the people kept raising it all of the time and I know that they wanted to ask my honourable friend what are the hopes of getting one in our area. This is what they kept saying.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I've got a letter - I get quite a few letters like my honourable friends opposite, and like every member in the House I suppose in the last month or so, because the constituents and the electors have found many reasons to write to us fellows protesting taxes and protesting a lot of other things that the government intend to propose - but one of the letters that I received I think just yesterday from a resident of Arden - and I don't intend to read it all - I wouldn't mind reading it all but this lady says, she starts out by saying: "I was one of the many who voted against the school referendum", and goes on to say why she voted against it - and quite a long letter it is - but she points up the fact that we do not have enough technical and vocational schools in the province. That's what she says and this is one of the reasons that she voted against it, because there's not enough of them and she didn't know where they were going to be prior to the referendum, so one more reason why the people voted the single district down in 19 of the areas - one of the reasons.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have often said that when you start to speak on a resolution that was introduced five or six weeks ago, that you should really read the resolution all over again so that anyone - if there is anyone left who reads Hansard - they'd know what you are talking about, but I don't think it is absolutely necessary that I do that in this particular case and I will just simply review some of the things that I said on February 3rd last, because I think I did make a fairly strong case at that time. Even the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks who immediately followed me on February 3rd said that he thought I had made a fairly good case. He wasn't in love with the resolved part of the resolution but he thought that all of the whereas sections, the preamble was excellent, convincing, and everybody agreed with the need for more technical and vocational schools; everybody agreed that the government has promised 10 of them.

The Minister promised 10 of them, not only at election time did he promise 10 of them in the province but he promised that there would be 10 following the election. Winnipeg Free Press, Friday, September 30th, Dr. Johnson speaking to the Manitoba Association of School Trustees. "Dr. Johnson said he didn't see an immediate rush" -- he said, "he didn't see an immediate rush by division boards to construct new high schools. The Boundaries Commission was now studying possible sites for eight to ten large regional vocational schools throughout Manitoba and Boards were likely to make temporary arrangements until vocational school sites had been chosen so facilities wouldn't overlap." That's what my honourable friend said on September 30th, which sounds like good advice. Do you know what it sounds like, Mr. Speaker? It sounds to me like this - he made a statement on September 30th, shortly after the summer holidays and shortly after most of the school boards in rural Manitoba were wondering what they should do about building programs, and he said to them all, "Well don't rush to build new high schools; don't rush out and make a lot of plans; don't build additions to your high schools because we intend to announce where we are going to build eight or ten vocational schools and this could very easily mean that you would not need additional facilities." This is what he said, and he not only said it on September 30th but he said it on several other occasions. He said it at Neepawa, or inferred it at Neepawa and I'm just going to run over these briefly. On August 23, 1966, headlines in the paper: "Collegiate Prepares for Increased Enrollment." That's immediately prior to September 1st.

On October 14th, a month later, "Unknown Factors Delay the Division Building Programs. Division trustees met with Department of Education officials Tuesday in Winnipeg, and acting on their advice, decided at the regular meeting Wednesday to postpone a decision on the building program until sometime next year." On the advice of whom? On the advice of the Department of Education. They said: Hold up your plans. Don't build any because we're going to announce shortly the location of these 10 vocational schools and you maybe won't need a building program. "While Trustees" - I'm still reading, Mr. Speaker, from this Friday, October 14th Press - "While trustees can foresee swelled attendance at NACI - Neepawa Area Collegiate Institute - and at Carberry next fall, there are two complicating factors. One is the single-district division referendum to be held in all Manitoba school divisions in February, 1967; another is the recent announcement from the department that regional vocational schools to be built in the province could attract as much as 40 percent of the present high schools population. Deputy Education Minister B. Scott Bateman has been quoted as saying the proposed

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd).... vocational schools would siphon off about 40 percent of the high school population in the rural areas."

Now all of this makes sense. That's what I'm saying. It makes sense. That was dated October 14th. On October 28th - and I think I should read this one because this one points up completely and confirms completely what I have said all the time and what a lot of other areas are saying - so I intend to read this one in total and it's an editorial from the Neepawa Press, Friday, October 28th, headed "Vocational Schools. The provincial government owes the citizens of this province some clarification of its plans in the field of education. At this moment education authorities at the division and local level are in a quandary because of a lack of information from higher up.

"The Department of Education has indicated that regional vocational schools, possibly 10 in number, are to be built in this province, and spokesmen reportedly have further indicated that as much as 40 percent of the high school population might be attracted to such schools. To date there has been no commitment about the location of these schools except for Brandon, Dauphin and The Pas. To someone not involved in the intricacies of the Department of Education decision-making, Neepawa would appear to be a logical choice for another school, but one would be foolhardy to assume the department will follow such logical thinking.

"Thus the trustees of Beautiful Plains Division Board, who know full well they will be faced with expanded enrollment at Neepawa and Carberry Collegiate in the fall of 1967, collegiates which are already taxed to the limit, are unable to decide whether or not to expand facilities. Should the division go for a major building program and it was announced later that a vocational school is to be built here, we might end up with an unnecessarily large high school and not enough students to fill it.

"Another imponderable is the vote coming up in February on the single-district division plan. This vote will have a very important effect on education trends in this division. Until these two unknown factors are settled, trustees can hardly proceed with any building plans. It would be a great help if the province made known its plans for vocational schools and gave some definite indication on the number of students who may be expected to enroll in such schools. With this sort of knowledge, our division trustees could make realistic plans for the future of education in this area."

Now what more is left to be said after you read that statement. What more is there left to be said? There's really nothing. It has summed it up completely and confirms what many boards have said in the rural areas: We must do something now; the schools are bulging at the seams. We need to plan for the future and we are told by the department, "Hold up your plans because we are going to build 10 vocational schools and you may not need them" Now where do you go from here, Mr. Speaker, I ask you.

That was October 28th. November 11th: "Trustees advised to delay collegiate building programs." And all the way down the line. And so, Mr. Chairman, every one of these editorials and comments suggest that in order for the rural division boards to effectively plan for the future, they've got to know where the technical and vocational schools are going to be located. You just can't do any long-range planning until you decide.

Now I have been told on good authority that some of the school boards in the province have been told to put up temporary housing in the meantime. In fact, I'm certain that some of the school divisions in the province are presently teaching children in temporary quarters and this is a pretty costly kind of an arrangement - pretty costly kind of arrangement. Now I'm sure that the 19 divisions that turned down or elected to retain the status quo, want to know now whether or not technical schools will in fact be built at all.

Now surely, Mr. Speaker, they do not intend to go back on the promises that were made prior to the election and the promises that were made by my honourable friend the Minister in September, but the information that was sent out during the single-district school division campaign would lead one to believe that if you didn't vote for the single-district division that you would not get a technical or vocational school. --(Interjection)-- Well, I'll read what it says on this page here. My honourable friend suggests that they wouldn't surely do a thing like that - I'm not saying they would but 19 divisions are wondering where they stand in this regard - and on this nicely got-up document it says, "Now we want to change to the single-district divisions that will make possible, for instance, the co-ordination of technical courses at both the elementary and secondary levels with the new regional technical vocational schools to be built in strategic locations for inter-divisional use by many rural Manitoba children. Let's give every Manitoba child a better chance to learn."

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd).....

Now, where do we stand with 19 of the divisions turning it down? Are we going to have 10 vocational schools or are we not? And where do school boards like Neepawa, Minnedosa and all of these other places, where do they go and what do they do in regard to the bulging schools that they have now? Are they going to be allowed to build until we hold more referendums or where do we stand? These are the answers that must be given now; must be announced.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on two or three occasions - and incidentally one of the reasons that I put the resolution in to start with was that the Boundaries Commission suggested that they would be up to three or four or five years in making their report. And then where do they stand? Where do the school boards stand for their building programs for the next four or five years? In this article from the Portage paper, a recent one, and on the same page two items side by side - "Tech-Voc School here Termed a Good Possibility." And it's a logical place to have one. I'll admit that Portage la Prairie is a likely place to put a technical and vocational school, as I said when I was speaking on February 3rd. Anybody can look at a map of Manitoba and point out 10 places, strategic places, where you would likely build a technical and vocational school, just normal natural places that you'd expect them to be. But this article says that technical and vocational school termed a good possibility for Portage la Prairie, but immediately underneath it, "No action on Boundaries for at least 4 years." Well where do you go in the next four years? The same paper. All depends on where you're heading.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, some of these things have to be cleared up. Here's an article here, August 25th, an editorial on the Boundaries Commission. It suggests the same thing. They could be three or four or five years in the initial studies after which they're going to get down to business. Just three or four years in the initial studies, and then after that they intend to make some recommendations. Recommendations is the right word to use, Mr. Speaker, because I understand that the Commissioner the head commissioner, Mr. Smellie - what is his official title? He is the overall chairman, is he, of the Boundaries Commission, or what is his official title? He has said that all he can do is make recommendations; it's up to the government to decide after all where they're going to be. But I guess this is only natural of a commission. Why it was stated right here this afternoon that Campbell MacLean made all the recommendations in the field of labour. But the government decide where they'll be. That is after four or five years, I suppose, the Boundaries Commission can make the recommendations but only recommendations only.

In the Clarkleigh news of the Interlake paper, and it's difficult to pronounce it - Clarkleigh news --(Interjection)--It's a new paper they've got out here in the Interlake - Manitou Wapitimes, a new paper, a new publication. "Mr. Smellie stated the purpose in coming" - he was out there having a commission hearing - "was to get ideas on how boundaries should be arrived at, representation on Boards and the location of schools. New boundaries have yet to be established. The Boundaries Commission made it clear that they have no power to act." they can only recommend.

Well this brings me around, Mr. Speaker, to what I intended to say when I first got up, and I have been in -- I have made a case I am certain, but my honourable friend said that I had made a case. My honourable friends too have encouraged me to put my money where my mouth is - that's the phrase that my honourable friends opposite use all the time - and I guess that with all the encouragement that I've had from everybody here, I better do exactly that. I said on February 3rd, you will recall, that I had this telephone call from - what did I say - from a fellow, and my honourable friend the Minister of Education said "Name him," and someone else said "Name him," and everybody else over here said "Name the Commissioner." I said that the Commission was made up of about four or five defeated Tory candidates plus a bunch of other Poll Captains and that one of them - and that one of them had made the statement or was overheard to make the remarks that there would be no technical and vocational schools in - what yours? - Rolling River -- Turtle River School Division or in any of my constituency because of the way we voted -- or the way the people voted on June 23rd, not the way they voted on March 10th. That was an interesting election too. But I have now obtained this famous document and ...

MR. SPEAKER: May I interrupt the honourable gentleman and remind him that there are only a few minutes to the half hour. I wondered if he could wind up in that time or would he want to adjourn.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I'm confident that I can. I know that it would seem like an impossible task even to me, but I'm sure that I can wind up in that length of time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the affidavit that is sworn before a Commissioner and I guess -- I've never done this before but I guess what you do is read it and then table it because they've

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd).... asked me to do it. And this is, "Province of Manitoba, Canada, to wit:" - I expect that some lawyer will say that there's something wrong with it - "Province of Manitoba, Canada, to wit: I, Homer Gill, Neepawa, Manitoba, school teacher, make oath and say that I was present at a gathering in the City of Winnipeg in the month of August, 1966, at which Mike Posmituck of McCreary, Manitoba was present. The subject of the location of the new proposed vocational and/or technical schools was being discussed. Mr. Mike Posmituck made the statement that Neepawa could hardly expect to receive a vocational school having voted as they did in the recent June election. I commented that there was absolutely no need for politics to enter into the choice of sites for the said schools and they should be on the basis of the children's need in any particular area. Mr. Posmituck replied that apparently I was not acquainted with the facts in the political arena. I replied that the Premier of this Province would not appreciate his comments in this regard." And it is signed: "Homer Gill, Sworn before me at the Town of Neepawa, Province of Manitoba, this fourth day of February, 1967", and the Secretary-Treasurer of the School Board took the oath. So there you are.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that I still can continue to talk for a couple of minutes and I would just like to ask my honourable friends what they do intend to do about it. I have said that it appeared that this whole field of deciding where the technical and vocational schools should be built should be decided now. I am certain that 19 of the divisions that voted to remain as they are are wondering whether or not they will in fact be built, and if they are going to be built, let's announce where they're going to be built. As I said on so many occasions, you can just take a look at the map of Manitoba and you can pick out 10 points that are natural normal places that they should be built.

And I want to ask my honourable friends: who decided where the one in Winnipeg and Brandon and The Pas - who decided they were going to be built there? It wasn't the Commission. Who decided they were going to be built there? Who announced that Portage -- well probably didn't announce, but who said they were going to build one at Portage? Who said they were going to build one in Dauphin? That's where they're going to build them. Let's not kid ourselves. There's going to be one in Dauphin. My honourable friend is smiling. There's going to be one in Portage la Prairie and -- well I'm not saying there'll be one at Gimli - there may be one at Gimli - but let's establish them where they shall be on the basis of need. You knew that you needed one in Winnipeg; you knew that one should be built in Brandon; you knew that one was required at The Pas; you know one is required in Dauphin. --(Interjection)-- Well they know. You know where they're going to be. I don't think that it's necessary to have a Boundaries Commission study this whole matter for five years to decide where they're going to be if there's only going to be 10. It's not that big a chore to decide.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I know that the Free Press has suggested that there would be no confidence in the Commission - in the Boundaries Commission - in respect to this. I still say you know where you're going to build the 10 schools, you're just -- these 10 normal places. Let's announce now where they're going to be, and when the future referendums will be held in the 19 divisions that turned it down, they will be able to vote more intelligently, I suggest, if you do make this announcement. I still say that the vote would likely have been more favourable; there wouldn't likely have been 19 that turned it down if the announcement had been made last fall, if the announcement had been made in September when my honourable friend made that speech to the school trustees. If you had -- my honourable friend the Minister announced on September 30th to the Manitoba Association of School Trustees that there would in fact be 10 built. Now if he had been able to get up at that same meeting and said that - the possibilities even - that it's quite possible that these will be the 10 places, then people would have been reconciled to the idea and I don't think that it is that big a chore at all.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I feel that it is now 5:30 and I feel I should put the question.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend still has some time coming to him I think you could just leave the Chair and we'll resume this debate on the next suitable occasion.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member wish to continue?

MR. SHOEMAKER: No, I'm through speaking.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to go beyond 5:30 if the honourable member has finished his presentation in order that the vote may be taken on this resolution. I don't know if this requires unanimous consent or not, but as far as I'm concerned, I'm agreed.



March 21, 1967

1871

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Dawson, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Tanchak and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Fox, Green, Hamilton, Hanuschak, Harris, Johnson, Kawchuk, Klym, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Miller, Paulley, Petursson, Roblin, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Uskiw, Watt, Witney, and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 11; Nays, 36.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost.

MR. J. E. JEANNOTTE (Rupertsland): Mr. Speaker, I didn't vote because I was paired with the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. Had I voted I would have voted against it.

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30 and I'm leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 this evening.