

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, September 30, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly at its present Session passed several bills which, in the name of the Assembly, I present to your Honour, and for which bills I respectfully request Your Honour's consent.

DEPUTY CLERK: Bill No. 2, The Statute Law Revision and Statute Law Amendment Act, 1969;

No. 3, an Act to amend The Regulations Act;

No. 13, an Act to amend The Public Utilities Board Act;

No. 14, an Act to amend The Workmen's Compensation Act;

No. 42, an Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956 (1).

CLERK: In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions.

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

HON. AL. MACKLING (Attorney-General)(St. James): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Seventh Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg leave to present the following as their Seventh Report.

With respect to Bill No. 12, The Consumer Protection Act, briefs were submitted to your Committee by:

Mr. Stevens, on behalf of the Canadian Consumers Loan Association,

Mr. A. J. McKichian, on behalf of the Retail Council of Canada,

Mr. O. J. Ongley, on behalf of Direct Sellers Association,

Mr. A. Adams, on behalf of The Education Reference Book Publishers Association,

Mr. Evan McCormick, on behalf of The Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce,

Mr. Ed. H. Vickar, on behalf of Manitoba Motor Dealers Association,

Mr. S. Haddad, on behalf of Winnipeg Motor Dealers Association,

Mr. T. V. Dobson, on behalf of Encyclopaedia Britannica Publications Ltd.,

Mr. D. A. Thompson, Q. C., on behalf of Canadian Bankers' Association (Western sub-section),

Mr. W. Grimble, Q. C. on his own behalf,

Mr. L. H. Davis, on behalf of Credit Grantors' Association Ltd.

Mr. W. Ireland, on behalf of the Legislative Committee of the Manitoba Bar Association.

Your Committee has considered Bill No. 12, The Consumer Protection Act, and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, that the report of the Committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (River Heights): Well Mr. Speaker, before the report of the Committee is accepted and received, I would like to, if I may at this time, rise in the House and repeat, and I'll repeat it very briefly, what was said at Committee earlier today. The Act that will be presented as a result of the discussions - the finalization - in Law Amendments, is a very important and significant one for Manitoba. We were very fortunate in that we had present, counsel who adequately explained to the members of the Committee the various presentations that had been made to the committee, and not only did they explain them, they gave us a summary which indicated the sections that were subsequently amended and agreed to by the committee, and the ones that were rejected and the reasons for the rejection, and, as I pointed out in the committee, and there was some evidence afterwards in the committee's hearings dealing with other matters, the time I think has now come for this House to consider very seriously and I recommend this very strongly, recognizing as well that there are going to be rules and procedures that are going to be investigated and there may be subsequent changes that may occur, but whether they do or do not occur at the next session, the time has come that the sessions of the Law Amendments Committee and other Committees of the House

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . be recorded in Hansard, or as a Hansard, so that the members of the House can adequately deal with the presentations and representations and undertakings and commitments and discussion that has been undertaken and brought forth during the committee hearings. I think this is essential and important if we are to achieve our function of carrying out responsibly, in detail, the clause by clause consideration of the various Acts, and I strongly suggest - and I recognize that we are going to have rule changes but they may not come in by next year - I strongly suggest that at the next session that there be an undertaking or at least a commitment by the government that we will be given the opportunity of having a Hansard for the committee hearings so that we can deal effectively with the matters that are before us.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Mr. Speaker, if I may, on the matters raised by the Honourable Member for River Heights. Mr. Speaker, may I remind my honourable friend that there is a resolution before the House at the present time, that hopefully will pass, establishing the Committee on Rules and Regulations and Orders of the House. I don't know whether my honourable friend has been named as a member of that committee or not. I would suggest, however, that this could well be a matter that could be considered by that committee. As far as the Room 254 is concerned, I do agree with my honourable friend that possibly we should have a microphone system put in there for the benefit of, not only the committee, but others as well who are appearing before the committee. The question of Hansard for committee meetings is an intriguing one, I admit, Mr. Speaker. I understand that the cost of Hansard is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$2,000 a week, and I would suggest, too, that this could be given consideration. I thank my honourable friend for his suggestion. I am sure he appreciates the fact that relatively little can be done, with the possible exception of the microphone, for this session and I think that the matters that he raised can well be considered by the Committee on the Rules of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the matter that has been brought to our attention as members of this House, as was the situation in committee this morning. I feel that this is very pertinent and that this matter should be given consideration. From time to time we hear outside representation in committee on the various standing committees, verbal briefs such as we heard from the legal counsel Mr. Stevens, and I think this was a very valuable brief and contained much very worthy information to honourable members. These people are doing a lot of research work in preparing their briefs and I think we as members could make so much more use of it if we had a recording system, and that we could in this way contain these briefs in typewritten form after for consideration and perusal and also so that, in case our meetings are carried on over a period of weeks, that we have something to go back on and refresh our memories. Just a microphone system I think is not all that's needed. I think we need a recording system together with it. Naturally, a microphone system would be of good use, because then the people in the audience could hear better and could also take part to a greater extent in what's going on in committee, so I certainly would welcome the idea, and I hope that the government will give consideration to this request.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General. The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the position taken by the Official Leader of the Opposition when he first spoke on this matter in the House, and also the Member for Rhineland when he made a complaint, and I believe basically the complaint was the conduct of the chairman of the committee. As we know, any committee, Law Amendments Committee not excepted, is for the purpose to elicit information from witnesses. Sometimes this requires an exchange of points, or dialogue regarding points of view, and from time to time, I am sorry to say, the chairman of the committee saw fit to cut these dialogues short and to arbitrarily take part in the discussions, and instead of acting as an impartial chairman, from time to time he would argue points and instruct members.

I would like to also point out the fact that the rules which govern committees are the same rules that govern this House with the exception of the fact that a member can speak any number of times he wishes, and that -- there's one other exception, I just can't think of it at the time. But, during the conduct of the committee, a point of order can be raised and a point of privilege can be raised, and when they are raised the chairman, if he is doing his duty,

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . must consider the point of order or he must hear the point of privilege. On Thursday night, the chairman three times denied a member of the committee the right to speak on a point of privilege. I would like to quote the rule book on Page 13, Rule 24: "When a matter of privileges arise, it shall be taken into consideration immediately."

Further, on Thursday evening last, the chairman allowed cross-examination by two cabinet ministers of witnesses. He also allowed the same two cabinet ministers to engage in verbal exchanges with members of the committee and the witness, but he would not allow certain other members the same privilege.

Now Mr. Speaker, my reason for taking the time of the House and speaking the words that I do speak at this time, that if we allow this to happen and pass unnoticed, well then, it certainly will happen again. Probably it will be taken as a precedent for similar action to be taken in the future; and Mr. Speaker, I draw these matters to your attention. It is my understanding that you are in control of committees. As Speaker of the House, you have the right to instruct the chairman of committees and to see that the rules of the House are observed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General. Will the Honourable Minister close debate?

MR. MACKLING: I will. Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to the remarks of the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party and the remarks made by the Leader of the Official Opposition, I do so with some trepidation, I having been new to the House and new to the position as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments, but I consider that the work of this committee is very important and the committee must deal with despatch with the items that come before it. I have indicated to members of the committee the desire to be precise, to speak to the point at all times, to if possible avoid repetition, and as chairman I think it is my prerogative and my duty to, at times, bring members back to the subject matter which ought to be under consideration.

I also think, when delegations appear, that they shouldn't be subject to repetitive questioning of a nature which may be deemed to be cross-examination. At times I felt that there were questions that were being put that were purely argumentative and at times questions were being formulated in a manner which were arguments first, and I think in dealing with delegations we should be courteous and make sure that they are questions put to the delegations to elicit information that the committee does not otherwise have from the presentation that has been made. I feel that my role as chairman is to ensure good conduct of the meetings of Law Amendments Committee.

Now it may be that in some instances I have overlooked having someone speak, but I have tried to be very careful to make sure that everyone has an opportunity to speak, not once but as many times as they wish, but, particularly when delegations are present, I do not feel that they should be subject to vigorous cross-examination or rhetorical arguments. I therefore feel that my conduct has been a responsible one. There may be times when I have erred and, if I have, I have erred honestly. In respect to drawing members to order, I feel that again it's the prerogative of the chairman to try and maintain order, and that when a question of order is raised it must be properly raised, and when I have ruled that there has been no point of order, I have done so conscientiously believing that to be the case.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 60 students of Grade 11 standing, of the Miles MacDonell School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Peters and Mr. Wiebe. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here today.

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

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I enquired of the House Leader the number of bills we might expect - he replied four. I see notice of one today. Has he any idea of when we might expect notice on the other three?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, in reply to my honourable friend, there will be of course the usual two Supply bills. -- Pardon? I'm hopeful that there will be; possibly there may be one other - and I'm not sure of at the present time - in addition to the one that notice has been given on, plus the two Supply bills. That's as closely . . .

HON. SIDNEY GREEN (Minister of Health & Social Services)(Inkster): . . . a little one nationalizing all provinces.

MR. PAULLEY: That's as close as the answer I can give to my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Is the government or the Minister considering to bring the parties together in an effort to effect a settlement in the Bell Foundry strike? And I wonder if the Minister is prepared to interfere in this instance? I understand that the union have stated that they'd be bound or agree to the recommendation of an impartial conciliatory body.

MR. PAULLEY: As I have indicated on numerous occasions to questions from my honourable friend and others in respect to the dispute at Bell Foundry, our good offices are available at all times to all matters pertaining to industrial relations in the province of Manitoba.

I may inform the House, Mr. Speaker, that I have received today a telegram from the representatives of the Canadian Association of Industrial-Mechanical Allied Workers, asking me to consider the appointment of an industrial enquiry commission into the dispute. I might frankly say that I do not think that this is the type of an enquiry that should be established at this time. However, I am quite prepared to meet with the - if necessary and requested - with the disputants in this dispute, in order that they may consider resuming negotiations under the laws of the province of Manitoba.

I want to assure my honourable friend that I haven't - and I'm sure that he knows - that I have no right under Manitoba labour legislation or no authority to impose compulsory arbitration on the parties, but I want to assure my honourable friend that we are doing whatever we can in order to bring the disputants together to have a settlement reached.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. Will the government step in to stop the importing of strike breakers to work at the Foundry?

MR. PAULLEY: I'm not aware of strike breakers going in there at the present time. I will look into the matter.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a subsequent question. Is the Minister considering to bring in any legislation in respect to ex parte injunctions at this session?

MR. PAULLEY: The answer is no, Mr. Speaker. I have indicated to this House on a number of occasions that it is the intention of government to review all labour legislation, including that of the use of injunctions in industrial disputes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs)(Springfield): Mr. Speaker, on September 23rd the honourable members opposite asked me a question on beef prices, and I submitted to all MLAs last week a paper on beef prices. I have been made aware that this brief presented is not, and has not attempted to deal with the drastic reduction in producer prices and the maintenance of consumer prices in the period of June to September. I was well aware of this. The brief submitted only presented prices till April last, 1969. We are now looking in a new submission that will take in consideration the quality of the cut prices of beef. This is only to let the honourable members of this House know that our Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs are looking at this, and we've been offered the help of the Farmers Union of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I wish to file a Return to an Order of the House No. 7, dated September 17, 1969, by the Honourable Member from Roblin, and at the same time, Mr. Speaker, I wish to reply to a question posed to me a few days back by the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party, in regard to the eligibility to retroactive salary benefits of civil servants who left the service between the enactment of such salary benefit and the date of implementation of the plan itself.

The answer is divided into two parts. First, in respect to permanent employees - they are to receive such benefits dating back to the date in question.

In respect to term personnel, the answer there is to the effect that the decision rests with the department in question. It is solely their own discretion insofar as term employees

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) . . . . are concerned. Permanent employees, it is a must.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Labour. Has he any progress or report to report to this House in respect to the strike at the Society for Crippled Children and the Teamsters Union. With all due respect with his answer just a minute ago, the federal Labour Minister has been very effective in bringing parties together in settling disputes very effectively, and perhaps the Minister can do this in this case, because again I would like to say that many children are suffering in this respect. Has he got anything new to report?

MR. PAULLEY: I like the reference, Mr. Speaker, of my honourable friend to the federal Minister of Labour. I know the honourable gentleman quite well. I know that on occasion he has used his good offices, as I am using mine, in the settlement of disputes.

I want to say to my honourable friend that I'm happy to report to the House that it appears that we will very shortly achieve the bringing together of the parties in the conflict regarding the Society for Crippled Children and the Teamsters Union. I'm not at present able to disclose fully the situation or the circumstances, but I want to assure, Mr. Speaker, you and the House, that negotiations or discussions have been continuing between myself, my department and the disputants in this case to bring them together. And again I want to say to my honourable friend, that there is no rights of the Minister of Labour in Manitoba to impose compulsory arbitration on disputants in industrial disputes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I could direct a question to the Minister of Youth and Education. Can he advise the House of the progress on the composite school for Metro East, whether or not the financial negotiations are completed with the Federal Government, or if construction has got under way?

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education)(Seven Oaks): Construction has not yet started. The land has been purchased. To my knowledge, the funds are available from the Federal Government. There's been no stoppage of funds, if that's what the member means.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. JACK HARDY (St. Vital): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a supplementary question to the Minister of Youth and Education, could the Minister advise the House as to the location of the proposed school?

MR. MILLER: I'm sorry to say to the member - I think he asked me this question before - I did not get the information. I'll try and get it for him this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. With Ontario and Quebec raising their phone rates in each respective province, could this be an indication that Manitoba's rates will also be going up?

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance)(St. John's): The answer, I believe, should be no.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): . . . correct the Minister of Finance. We know what the answer should be; can he indicate what the answer will be?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member for Lakeside had heard the question, I think he would agree that the proper answer is no, because as I recall the question it was: if it is done in Quebec and Ontario, does that mean it will be done in Winnipeg? and I think the answer is no. Any decision that is made - in Manitoba, I should say, not Winnipeg - will be made on the merits, on the needs, and not on the basis of what other provinces do, unlike what some of the opposition members might think is right.

MR. ENNS: A further supplementary question, then, to make the matter perfectly clear. Will the Manitoba Telephone rates in Manitoba rise?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, that's an interesting question. The answer is in the hands of the Honourable Member for Lakeside as much as it is in my hands.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Can he indicate to the House whether or not there has been any final accounting as to the flood costs of last spring that were within the responsibility of the province? Our government at that time undertook to carry a considerable amount of flood protection works

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . throughout the rural parts of Manitoba - along the Assiniboine particularly. Has there been any final accounting figures made on those commitments?

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Brandon East): Is the honourable member referring to costs that may also accrue from the Red River Floodway Board? Well, the Board is still receiving applications for compensation and therefore there is no final accounting to my knowledge. But obviously this is a rather detailed matter and I will look into it, and if I have any further information that is of a useful nature, I will endeavour to provide it to the honourable member.

While I'm on my feet, I would like to take the opportunity of answering three questions in the nature of water control. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake asked a question about the Rock Lake Dam, the Honourable Member from Lakeside asked a question regarding the Fairford Dam and the Honourable Member from Arthur asked about the Patterson Dam. Collectively these may be referred to as the dam questions.

But seriously, with regard to the Rock Lake Dam, during the discussions on my estimates I told the Honourable Member from Rock Lake that the Water Control and Conservation Branch is studying the problem at the present time and is preparing recommendations to the government - and this is still the case. The matter is still in progress. I can assure the honourable member that my department is aware of his concern for this project and that the recommendations - one way or the other - will be presented as soon as possible.

Respecting the question on the Fairford Dam structure, the question was whether or not the Fairford Dam structure has been closed to prevent water from Lake Manitoba flowing into Lake Winnipeg. I'm informed that the dam is being operated in accordance with the rules and regulations set down for the regulation of Lake Manitoba. At the present time there is a flow of approximately 1,000 cubic feet per second being released through the dam, and this flow would have a negligible effect on the level of Lake Winnipeg. Apparently it is about one one-hundredth of a foot.

With respect to the Patterson Dam, the other day I told the Honourable Member for Arthur that the government has applied to the PFRA for the construction of the Patterson Dam under the interim agreement for community projects. I said that the proposal was presently being reviewed by the Federal Government and that we anticipated approval for the project in the near future. In turn, the honourable member then said he understood that the Federal Government had approved the project last spring and that it was up to the province to get it underway. Well, we've looked into the matter and I'm informed that what was approved last May was the interim agreement concerning construction of community projects. Under this agreement the province must submit each project separately and sign a special project statement for each. The agreement and the submission regarding the Patterson Dam have been before the Federal Government's Treasury Board, I'm informed, for some time now - it is before the Treasury Board for their approval; and I can assure the honourable member that I am as anxious to receive a reply in this matter - a favourable reply in this matter - as he is.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Well Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the Honourable the Minister for his dam answers. I'd be interested to know now what the Provincial Government will do when the agreement is signed; if it is the intention of the government to proceed with the Patterson Dam.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I have no reason to believe that it would be otherwise.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Youth and Education. Earlier on in the session I directed the same question to him, with respect to how soon or when action would be taken on the Boundaries Commission Report with respect to education in the Interlake. He assured us at that time that it would be, I believe, much faster than the action taken by the previous government. I'm just wondering whether we're now arriving at that stage, seeing as how this session is getting longer and longer; that he is in fact contemplating action.

MR. MILLER: Well, using the yardstick of measurement laid down by the former government, I still have quite a bit of time to go.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services. Some time ago I asked him a question about a Social Service audit and when he's going to implement the recommendations, and in view of his question, I

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . wonder if there's any changes planned in regard to the status of Marymound School - particularly the composition of inmates?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid I'll have to take the honourable member's question as notice, but I want to indicate that my answer with regard to the Social Service audit, despite the question that was put, remains as it was when my answer was given to the honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. Has the honourable member a supplementary question?

MR. PATRICK: I have a subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister is aware that somebody from his department just quite recently made a speech at Detroit Lakes, and stated that full recommendations of the Social Service audit will be fully implemented at the beginning of the year. Has there been a change in policy?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, even a newspaper account of that particular speech would not confirm what the honourable member has just said. The honourable member has just said that the speech said that the full recommendations of the Social Service audit would be implemented. The newspaper account that I read was that the investigations of the Social - or words to the effect, and I can't repeat them exactly - that the investigations of the Social Service audit would be implemented after the presentations made a report. I want to indicate to the honourable member that the answer that I gave him, and which appears in Hansard and also which appears in the newspaper account to which he is referring, remains the same today as it was then.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education. Some time ago, I asked the Honourable Minister if he would investigate the possibility of arriving at a mutual agreement between the Province of Manitoba and the Province of Saskatchewan regarding the education of those children living on the west side of the Assiniboine River after the completion of the Shellmouth Dam, who are now facing a problem with regard to transportation. I wonder if the Minister could advise us if any progress has been made with this proposal to the Saskatchewan Government.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I can only inform the honourable member that after his question was raised in the House the matter was referred to the Department, who are getting in touch with the authorities in Saskatchewan to see whether some arrangement might be worked out to the satisfaction of both governments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Since we've had so many dam questions today, I wonder if he's prepared to report on Pembillier Dam in the constituency of Pembina?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe I've answered similar questions on a number of occasions and I must say in all honesty and fairness I have nothing further to report at this time, unless the member has a specific detailed question on the matter.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, a subsequent question. There was going to be a meeting held between you and the federal people. Has there been any communications on this?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I did indicate during the discussion of this matter during the estimates of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, that we plan to go to Ottawa and to discuss various water control projects in the province, including this one in question, but this will have to wait until the end of the session. But I can assure the honourable member that this will be forthcoming.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RON MCBRYDE (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a two-part question to the Minister of Health and Social Services. Is the Minister aware that there is a serious housing shortage in the Town of The Pas? And if he is, is he considering any action to deal with this problem?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have been made abundantly aware by certain MLAs of the housing shortage in The Pas. I can say that with regard to this area of activity as well as with regard to certain other areas of government program that we are studying it and hope to do something about it by the next session of the Legislature.

I would also indicate to the honourable members of the House that it has been, for the

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . . most part, the policy of the government to engage in housing programs on the initiative of municipalities, because it's the municipality that has been expected to initiate the program. We are looking at this procedure to see whether there can be any stimulation in both directions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Youth and Education, and I raise it now because a new academic year is under way with all its problems for many people. Has the Minister received any representations from adult students at the Adult Education Centre in Winnipeg with respect to the need for some kind of program of financial assistance similar to that which exists in the areas of vocational and job training courses?

MR. MILLER: No, there have been no representations made. I don't doubt a problem exists in this area and it's a problem that I particularly am interested in, but I don't recollect actually being officially approached by anyone.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister, in planning his program for the coming year, apprise himself of the difficulty that adult education students in the field of academic education are having, and investigate the possibility of a program of loans or bursaries or assistance of some sort?

MR. MILLER: I am aware of the problems; it's one of the areas that will be taken into consideration for the coming year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health and Social Services. Can the Minister advise the House of the state of present plans for the construction of a hospital in the north end of Winnipeg?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I can advise the member sincerely that the matter is presently under intensive review and study.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister Without Portfolio in charge of the Centennial Corporation. Could he inform us as to the total obligations of the government in connection with the 1967 celebration, the total receipts received at that time; also the government's portion of the City of Winnipeg contract, the Centennial Concert Hall and the Arts Centre; how much of this is still owing, and the total commitments for the 1970 celebrations to date.

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be able to give answers to these questions off the cuff and immediately, but these expenditures and these receipts all took place before I came into office. I would suggest, if I may, that the honourable member submit an Order for Return and I will be happy to try to get the information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare. I wonder if he has the information in connection with the Medicare premiums and its utilization that I asked before?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I did again try to obtain the information that the honourable member requested and I was advised that as at the September - and I believe the date is the 24th - date that all of the billings had been brought up to the position that they were being paid in full. In other words, the normal period of waiting was there but the accounts would be paid in full as at that date, so I would think that that would apply - and this is just my assumption - to the last figures that were put in the Order for Return that was given on request of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, let me just understand something. Are you suggesting - well, let me ask the Minister so that I can understand this correctly, and I think this is important: Are you suggesting that the figures represent the actual payout by the Corporation, either to doctors or to patients, but that they still would have on hand the six week billing to be paid owing as of that date?

MR. GREEN: I believe the member is correct as we both understand the same thing, that payments are being made in full, all accounts are being paid, but that there is a waiting period. The member mentioned six weeks - I think that that may be correct.

MR. SPIVAK: Would it be possible, then, to obtain the information as of the end of August of how much was owing -- how much that had been recorded would still be owing at that



(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . time, in order to be able to evaluate on a three-month basis the actual cost up to that time?

MR. GREEN: I wonder if it would assist the honourable member if I just added on to the previous Order for Return as to what has occurred between the date that that Order was made up and today's date?

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, that would be acceptable. That was not the only question, though, in connection with the Medicare premium. The other question has to do . . .

MR. SPEAKER: . . . a further supplementary . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Well, again, the Honourable Minister indicated that he was answering the questions that had been asked before. That was only one question; there was another question in connection with utilization. I wonder if he has that information or not?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member will recall that he asked whether the utilization figures were as projected. I indicated that this coming back would be an opinion and different people would think in different ways. My understanding is that the figures are in line with what was projected.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I address my question to the acting First Minister. Will the province of Manitoba give assistance to the City of Winnipeg with respect to the flood water pumping costs? I believe it's in the order of \$38,000.00.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of the problem; it has not been brought to my attention.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Transportation. I understand on my trip home this weekend that they were not having too much of a problem towing the cars through on the Paint Lake Highway but they were having problems with the trucks, and I was wondering whether anything can be done about this before freezeup?

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation)(Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry to report the situation hasn't improved very much. We've had an awful lot of rain there and it doesn't matter how much work we do, how much fill we put in, the trucks keep sinking in and there really isn't anything we can do about it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. HARDY: Mr. Speaker, some time ago I requested some information from the Minister of Youth and Education, inasmuch as the number of the students attending universities in the Province of Manitoba in the neighbourhood of 1,300 who are non-residents of Canada, the approximate cost to the Province of Manitoba for this service. Is the Minister in a position to give this information to the House?

MR. MILLER: No, Mr. Speaker. I have the honourable member's question. I have been trying to get an actual figure and apparently there's some difficulty in getting it. If the member will accept a rough figure based on a per pupil cost, or per student cost generally, we could give him that figure in an awful hurry. If he wants the detailed costs based on the professions they're in, the courses, whether they're post-graduate or otherwise, then it's very difficult to get the figures.

MR. HARDY: I thank the Minister for his comments, Mr. Speaker, and certainly an approximate cost would suffice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the Honourable Member from Fort Garry enquired about the reduction in the staff of the federal government's Department of Fisheries and Forestry, and I endeavoured to look into this matter. I said I would look into it personally. As a matter of information for the House and for the general public, I endeavoured to get in touch by telephone with the Minister concerned today, early this morning. Unfortunately he's in London, England. However, I talked to an official quite close to the Minister and I expressed our concern. In addition, I have wired the Minister of Forestry and Fisheries about this so that they would have it on record. I'll read the telegram at this time: "The Government of Manitoba is extremely concerned about the reduction in Forestry laboratory staff in Winnipeg stop Newspaper reports indicate a reduction of 115 jobs here out of an announced cut of 200 full-time jobs in your entire department stop In view of the detrimental impact on the provincial economy and possible adverse effects on service to Manitoba Forestry

(MR. EVANS cont'd) . . . . operations, I strongly urge you to reconsider your decision." Now, my understanding is that the Minister will be back some time next week and I have the assurance that he will be getting in touch with us and I hope to be able to discuss this with him.

I should explain here that it's not -- the 115 positions, as I understand it, will not be eliminated from the department. Some of this is a reshuffle, but as the result of the Federal Government's decision to curtail services and because of the reshuffling and reorganization that goes along, of the 200 proposed jobs to be eliminated it so happens that 115 of these are moved out of the city of Winnipeg, and this we are quite concerned about. I can only restate what I said a minute ago, that we will continue to stay on top of the situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister for the investigations and enquiries that he's conducting. The people of Fort Garry certainly appreciate the efforts he's making. The figures that he has given the House are those that have come to my attention. The reduction in job totals would run from 125 to a figure of 10 jobs left, as I understand it, in the Fort Garry laboratory. The multiplier effect on the economy of the constituency and the province is very extreme, so I thank him for the efforts that he's making, Mr. Speaker, and urge that they be continued.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: I wonder if the Honourable Minister could indicate or determine how many of these are actually moved to Edmonton that will still service this area?

MR. EVANS: I'm not sure whether I understand the question. How many of those that are being moved to Edmonton will continue to service this area?

MR. CRAIK: No, just how many are being moved to Edmonton?

MR. EVANS: Well, I don't have the precise information. I suspect that the bulk of them are being moved to Edmonton, and that in future it seems as though the Federal Government's intention for future operations is to centre their laboratory staff at Edmonton. All that will remain here, as has been indicated by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry and by the press, a small liaison staff of 10 or 12 people, and in our opinion this is not good.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health and Social Services. Yesterday we had tabled the Annual Report of the Provincial Sanitary Control Commission and the Clean Environment Commission. Now on the first page of the report, it states: "There were no formal investigations conducted by either commission in 1968," so my question is: Are there no problems in Manitoba in connection with pollution and clean environment?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the date referred to is December 31, 1968, which is almost a year old. I can't agree that there are no problems. I indicated to the honourable members of the House some time ago that I met with the Clean Environment Commission, that we will be able to discuss the areas of problems which have to be pinpointed and will be dealing with them, but there are areas of problems.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If a citizen wishes to make a complaint or have an investigation, what course of action should he take?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, at the present time I would suggest that he get in touch with the Clean Environment Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Honourable Member for Assiniboia directed a question dealing with the proposed development known as Centre Point in the downtown core of Winnipeg. He made the statement that the development was announced in June for certain construction. I must indicate to him that we have not yet received any confirmation to the effect that the feasibility studies, which are still being carried on by the proposed companies involved in the development, have been completed and that they have indicated a decision as to the actual go ahead or not. I believe the announcement which was made was that of the developer and not that of the companies involved.

In regard to the rumour that the honourable member refers to, I might say that there has been absolutely no indication of any kind that the question of the two percent corporation tax is in any way involved in the deliberations by any of the parties, and I would be very much surprised to hear that such a rumour has any foundation of any kind.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Honourable Minister, but can he tell us specifically, is the development going ahead or . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: If the honourable member had heard the answer to my question previously, he would know the answer to this precise question now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Mines and Resources could give us the date of the telegram which he sent to the Department of Forestry.

MR. EVANS: I sent it this morning.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY - PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue my discussion of the proposed resolution of the Member from Sturgeon Creek. The resolution reads as follows:

WHEREAS the provision for adequate education for the native people of this province is one of the serious problems in our present educational system, and

WHEREAS it follows that existing methods of education of our native people are not satisfactory,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government consider the advisability of establishing experimental schools for our native children with specialized curricula and providing food service and hostel care in an attempt to meet the growing crisis.

You will no doubt recall, Mr. Speaker, that last Friday I considered in a very brief manner the history of Indian education and especially the fact that Indian children were removed to residential schools, at one time, mainly for the purpose of substituting European culture for their Indian culture, and this aspect combined with other means to disregard, disrupt or destroy the Indian culture, such means as certain laws against dances etc., placing the Indian people on reserves, under the strong hand of paternalistic control of government, this had a tendency to destroy or disrupt to a certain extent the Indian culture and to force much of it underground. This, at that time and I think still today in many cases, leaves the child in a difficult position as it pushes to put them between, gives them the choice of accepting only the European or the white culture, or the choice of only accepting his own past or traditional culture, without allowing him to build on the foundation of his old culture some sort of adjustment with present day society.

On Friday I also attempted to broaden the resolution or to expand from the term just "native," and to get away from the idea that this is only one problem group. At that time I talked about culturally different groups of many types and examined some of the problems which these culturally different students have to adjust to in our school system, which is basically white, Anglo Saxon, Protestant, and middle-class. I notice the member from River Heights looking at me. I would suggest that maybe even members from River Heights might have trouble adjusting to this strange cultural situation.

Often, in the past, we have tended to blame the parents and the children in the background for school problems. We like to think that the students failed the school rather than that the school failed the students. Basically, what I said on Friday can be summed up in the words of an elementary school principal who was in a small community of mixed population. He said to me one time when speaking about the Indian students, he said, "The first day they come here, we teach them they're stupid, and then we don't let them forget it until they leave." I think this can summarize generally the feeling that many students of culturally different groups have when they are faced with our school system.

Just before the House terminated on Friday, I started to bring up some of the possible methods of dealing with the numerous problems I outlined. One of the first suggestions I had was to eliminate the IQ test, which is a very culturally-biased instrument. Another suggestion I made was to adopt a program at the University of Manitoba in northern education. They have this type of program at the University of Saskatchewan and it seems to be working out very well. They seem to be turning out a teacher that is more able to cope with the situation he finds in the north, and the situation of Indian students. I would also suggest that within this it might be possible to incorporate some sort of sensitivity training for these teachers. In the past, I have found it very useful, in dealing with Indian people and white people together, to have more vocal Indian people meet in mixed groups for intense group discussion. This is one of the best

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd) . . . . ways I have found of helping people to see other people in a different light, the best way of overcoming certain prejudices that people have.

A third possibility I suggested was to encourage a Manitoba university to establish an institute for Canadian Indian studies, and I think the Manitoba Metis Federation and Indian Brotherhood have both made the suggestion at one time or other.

The fourth suggestion I made was to review the presentation of the history of the Indian in learning materials now in use, and establish a publication policy which would lead to the creation of a realistic picture of early Indian life and the contribution of his cultural heritage. This theme, of course, should be applied to the history of other minority groups.

Another suggestion I made was to undertake a recruiting and financial assistance campaign that will increase the number of Cree, Saulteaux, Sioux, Chippewyan and other minority language teachers, especially for the low elementary and kindergarten levels. There are some significant differences pointed out in a study by the northern education division of the University of Saskatchewan of the difference between our Canadian system and the system in Greenland. In Greenland, in the early days of their education of the Eskimos, they made a serious attempt, a successful attempt to train Eskimo teachers who now pretty well dominate the educational system for Eskimos in Greenland. This policy of recruiting people of the same cultural background appeared to work much better than our system of sending people of a completely alien culture in to teach isolated Indian and Eskimo communities.

Another suggestion I made is that we do studies on the problem of the cultural difference and develop new variations to meet these problems. Also, I suggested that we make a serious effort to involve the parents of culturally different and economically deprived students in the education system, and I think this could perhaps be the most important suggestion that I am making. Certainly in Manitoba, the Indian people, treaty or non treaty, are probably more democratically-minded than many other citizens; that is, they demand to be involved; they want to have a say in those things that affect them, because they feel they have a better understanding of the situation than an outsider would have. At one meeting we had on The Pas Reserve with students, one of the suggestions that came out from students was that they have their own school on the Reserve. Now, there are certain problems in this, but I think it reflects some of their feelings with the present system.

Another suggestion I made and I think this applies to the whole educational system, and that is to allow teachers in schools to be more experimental, to reward experimentation rather than punish experimentation as we tend to do in our present system. I also suggested that we give full credit at both the high school and the university level for any second or third language; that is, we recognize Cree, Saulteaux, Sioux, Chippewyan, and other minority languages, rather than just certain ones that we designate now as being important.

I also suggested that we hire more teacher aides who are from the same cultural group as the students. This could be at the kindergarten, elementary, even at the high school level. This could also involve bringing in more people from that community or from that cultural group into the classroom to teach specific things or talk on certain subjects.

Another point I raised was that we give greater financial rewards to teachers having special capabilities, such as certain language, or experience in teaching in cross cultural situations, which is really quite a unique type of teaching; to give greater financial rewards to teachers having special capabilities or experience in teaching in the cross cultural situation.

A MEMBER: Why?

MR. McBRYDE: Well, if we are trying to meet a certain problem, the best thing to do is bring to bear the best experts on that problem, and people who have been in the cross cultural situation — (Interjection) — because if you have a higher degree, you get a special reward. If you have special capabilities of another type, I would suggest you should get a special reward.

Finally, one of the main points I would like to bring up is that education of course isn't done in isolation. We could create the best school system or the best way of dealing with culturally different students, but if we allow those who are in the poverty group to continue to live in poor housing, to continue to live in over-crowded housing, where they can't study, where they can't concentrate, if we continue to ignore their health and dental needs so they can't concentrate on their studies, these type of things are also very important. I would especially like to suggest that in poverty groups of whatever culture there are certain problems of apathy or giving up or not caring, and it doesn't matter what we do to the educational system,

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd) . . . . if the parents of students cannot be helped to see some purpose in life, to take a meaningful part in society, then we are not going to help the students because they will soon pick up this attitude, this uncaring, this giving up attitude that dominates in a poverty area or in a poverty group.

That's pretty well in general some of the ideas that I have to put forward. This is certainly a broad topic and I am sorry if I strayed too far away from the original resolution. I would like to introduce at this time an amendment, which doesn't add that much to the proposed resolution but gives us some time and the opportunity to examine this proposal and to come up with some other policies or recommendations. I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Crescentwood, that the resolution of the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek be amended by deleting the word "native" in the first line thereof, and inserting the words "culturally different"; and further amended by deleting the second and third paragraphs and inserting the following: "Whereas the solution to these problems is not simple and requires thorough study, Therefore Be It Resolved that the Department of Youth and Education investigate the proper method whereby the problems of the culturally different students can be more directly dealt with within the framework of the existing educational system." Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, if anyone else wishes to speak on this, unless they do, I would ask the indulgence of the House to have it stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand? The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, in speaking on the motion here I will be very short. The amendment of the Honourable House Leader to the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, where it actually wipes out what is interpreted, the Resolved section to increase general holidays and which the House Leader says that he in turn, well - "continue its announced plan to review all labour legislation in Manitoba." Well I am not an expert on labour legislation and I do have a lot of sympathy for the people who are representing the labouring people and also the labouring people themselves, but I find this very unusual that this House Leader of the Government, after being an expert on labour legislation in the past - in fact, I think this resolution, if I'm not right, the resolution was proposed by the New Democratic Party, was it not? It was your own, eh? Oh, that's fine; I'm glad to know that. But on similar occasions they have adopted pretty well changes of this nature and I suspected it might have been one of those resolutions proposed by the New Democratic Party in the past but I am told it isn't. But in announcing his plan to review all labour legislation, I would hope that the government would take all the time in the world to study this legislation because I think that they always have to consider the employers of the province of Manitoba, because the employers are the people who are going to pay for any changes that are going to take place and the employers are having a tough enough fight during this period of inflation, and I would hope that, in reviewing this plan, they would consider the employers and discuss all details with the employers of the province, with the end result that the plan or changes in any legislation would meet the approval of both the employers and the employees.

That's all I have to say, Mr. Chairman. We are going to accept the amendment to this proposed resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The question has been called on the amendment.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the motion as amended? The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I'll be closing the debate. I wish to express my appreciation to the members that have taken part in debating this resolution, Mr. Speaker. I believe we had some debate on this one, not as much as the one that's still standing on the Order Paper

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . in respect to three weeks' vacation pay, but I do feel that this one here is quite simple and I don't think it would affect the business, or small employers to any extent. In introducing this resolution, as well as the other one, my concern and consideration, I did think about how it would affect many employers or small businesses. I consider myself as a small businessman and I realize that some of these people do have problems, but Mr. Speaker, I think that Manitoba has been noted for many years to be what has been called by many experts in this field, that we have been paying sweatshop wages and our fringe benefits and labour legislation have not been up to what it is in some of the other provinces. The argument is used by many people that this is the reason we want it that way, because we can attract industry but the facts are, Mr. Speaker, we have not to this extent attracted that much industry because of our low wages, and the arguments that are used against this type of arguments, I don't think washes too quickly, Mr. Speaker, because really I feel also we have had a tremendous amount of study in this field in respect to labour legislation, and as I pointed out before, your TED Committee has pointed and was very critical of the wages paid in this province. We had another study - the Manitoba Conference on Technological Change - and this pointed out the same thing. I believe in that study it was pointed out quite well that Manitoba is probably the lowest wage income area per capita next to the Province of Quebec, and even below that what's paid in areas by Quebec - 10 percent below, I understand - and it's somewhat 20 percent below the Province of Ontario.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to accept what has passed the House, that the Minister will have a study into this matter, and I hope that the legislation during the next session will be amended in respect to the Employment Standards Act, that the employee will be entitled to statutory holidays. As you know, at the present time the employee is not entitled because the legislation does not require him to get paid for any of the statutory holidays. I know that it is probably in only a very few areas and a few instances where this takes place, because in all your union contracts the employee is paid, and I would say in most probably, in many or even most businesses, is well paid for statutory holidays - pay their employees. But I think there are probably some remote areas where this does not take place, and all it would do, this legislation, is it would probably clear it and make it more clear that the employee should be entitled to regular pay for statutory holidays, and I don't think this is asking too much.

I also suggested, Mr. Speaker, that Boxing Day and the first Monday in August be classified as general holidays, which would increase it to nine statutory holidays, and that the same be paid for at the rate of regular daily pay. As you know, at the present time we do have, and celebrate the first Monday in August as a holiday, as well as Boxing Day as a holiday as well. So I cannot see why we couldn't have amended the Act at this time, but I bow to the Minister that he has undertaken this, and as a matter of fact he almost promised that legislation will be forthcoming in the next session, that on statutory holidays the employees will be entitled for regular pay for statutory holidays.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance in amendment thereto. Are you ready for the Question? The Honourable Member for River Heights?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BUD BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Well, Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate the other day, but subsequent to that I think enough has been said on the matter, so I would ask that it be allowed to go to a vote at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member for Swan River at this moment, I would ask the indulgence of the House in having the matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand? (Agreed.) The proposed resolution of the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party, and the proposed motion of the Honourable First Minister in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Stand? (Agreed.) The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Riel, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

If I may interrupt at this point, it was in the course of the debate of this resolution that a request for tabling of certain documents was made some time ago. A request was made of the Honourable Member for Logan by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, and that request I had taken under advisement at that time. And during the course of debate of this motion last Friday - this is a week ago Friday as of today - the Honourable Member for Logan quoted excerpts from news reports appearing in a Winnipeg newspaper or newspapers. The Honourable Member for Rhineland then requested him, by way of oral question, to table the documents. Chapter 142, Revised Statutes of Manitoba 1954, established the Legislative Library for the use of the members of this House. Section 10 of the said Act authorizes the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to create by order-in-council a Public Records and Archives Branch. Section 13 of the said Act sets out the objects of the said Branch, which inter alia are: (b) the discovery, collection and preservation of material, wherever obtainable, having any bearing upon the history of Manitoba. And (c) the copying and printing of important public documents relating to the legislative and general history of Manitoba.

Resolution 108 in the estimates currently before the House indicates that there was and is a Public Records and Archives Branch within the Legislative Library. Upon checking with said Branch, I find that all copies of the Free Press, at one time known as the Manitoba Free Press and more recently as the Winnipeg Free Press, are on file going back to the year 1874. All copies of the Winnipeg Tribune since 1890 are on file therein. Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms 1958, Citation 179, sub-section (1), reads in part as follows, and I quote: "Where information is given to the House, the House itself is entitled to the same information as the member who may quote the statement." In this instance, the Honourable Member for Logan quoted statements from information within his possession. The acquisition of information, the tabling of which was requested by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, is equally accessible to all members of this House from its own library within equal reach of all.

In my humble opinion, it suffices that the Honourable Member for Logan cited the name and date of publication of the newspaper. Therefore, I rule the request by the Honourable Member for Rhineland of the Honourable Member for Logan for the tabling of the copy or copies of newspapers as being out of order.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have little more to contribute to this particular issue than I did in addressing the main resolution two or three weeks ago, except to clarify one point that has arisen in debate between honourable members opposite and honourable members on this side of the House, with respect to the amount of freedom - personal freedom - that is permitted a person in declaring his allegiances, be they political, be they religious, or be they or any other personal and confidential nature.

The question has presented itself: What is the difference in this case, where we're talking about opt-in, opt-out privileges where trade unionism is concerned, what is the difference in terms of the limitations placed on the free choice and conscience of the individual, between this situation and that of a shareholder in a major corporation who has no control and no specific say in where his contributions, where his investments may eventually wind up, in a political sense. That is to say that the corporation in which he is a shareholder may be making political contributions of a kind with which he has no direct connection or control. Well, I think this is a valid point and argument, Mr. Speaker, but I think it obscures the basic issue of personal privacy in one's right to his own personal political opinions, which is the issue at the root of this particular debate where we in this party are concerned. For, if I may just try to compare the two positions, I don't see that a fair analogy is applicable, Sir, between the shareholder and the trade union member, where the political contribution is concerned,

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . . for the shareholder may be working for somebody who does not share the same political views he does, and yet his participation in the form of investment in a corporate body is his own private and personal business. I, for example, might be working for somebody whose political philosophies and allegiances and membership, in fact, were quite different from mine, and I might be the possessor of one or two shares in a major corporation or two, a major corporation whose political support in the past might seem to have been directed towards the Conservative Party, for example, or the Liberal Party. But the person for whom I work is presumably not concerned with my private and personal affairs in the field of investment, if I'm fortunate enough to have a few dollars to invest in a stock portfolio, nor do I think that it's any business of my employer as to the position I take in that area. And I don't compromise my position with him, Sir, or embarrass myself in front of him by my activity as an investor and a shareholder.

I suggest that where one has to overtly declare his political allegiance, such as is the case we're dealing with in the resolution and the amendment to the resolution before us today, such as is the situation which the resolution and the amendment strive to correct, I suggest that in that instance, Mr. Speaker, there is a vivid danger that the individual may compromise his position where his employer is concerned against the best intentions of that employer. I think there's a very fine line between intention, in many cases anyway, a very fine line between intention and action. It's a subtle line. It's hard to identify, it's hard to grasp, and at times it's very hard to apply. And where an employer, with the best intentions in the world, may feel that his employee's political allegiances and private allegiances of that nature are sacrosanct and should have no effect on his position, in his working environment, I suggest there are dangers, there are situations, not always overt, not always obvious, that can creep into the situation and make it extremely difficult for that employee, embarrass him, perhaps compromise him, and perhaps mitigate against his position in his working environment, against his opportunity for advancement, and against perhaps even some of his social connections with his fellow workers, with his co-workers. This is the hypothetical danger at any rate, Mr. Speaker, that many of us on this side of the House feel exists in a situation where a worker has to, in order to take the political position with regard to his own income that he wishes to take, where he has to overtly opt-in or opt-out and thus in a declamatory way make it known that his allegiances are with or are not with a particular political party. I think that probably a situation of difficulty might only arise in one case out of a hundred, or even in fewer cases than that, but the fact is the potential is there for difficulty, that where a man works and the people that he works with are very important to his happiness and his well-being and his future. His future advancement is integrally involved with the relationships that he has with the people with whom and under whom he works.

And there are certain rights, certain privacies accruing to the individual, in our society at any rate, that are very close to being sacrosanct, Mr. Speaker, and one of them is one's political allegiance; another, I think all too infrequently is one's religious allegiance. Unfortunately, this is one privacy that I don't feel is treated as sacredly and as sacrosanctly as it should be, and it's in this area, Sir, that I speak for myself and for some others on this side of the House, and where we feel that the resolution of the Honourable Member for Riel has merit, and indeed, if it were practically applicable, the amendment of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia would have merit. I have some difficulty in determining to my own satisfaction how the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia would be applied, and I think the Honourable Member for Logan raised that very question when he was speaking in this debate a week or two ago. I don't know how one opts out anonymously of any situation, but if it's possible or practical to work out an anonymous opt-out system, then I'm willing to be convinced. My basic commitment, however, is to the reverse position, the anonymous opt-in provision, which I think is a valuable one and a vital one and is practically applicable, and I think it is -- (Interjection) -- Well, my reading of it convinces me that it's a little easier and a little more realistic to apply it in terms of opting in than opting out. I think that anonymity can be preserved much more satisfactorily and much more fully if it's on an opt-in basis rather than an opt-out basis, but the Member for Assiniboia feels that there's no difference between the two and in any event the principle involved is one on which we're both agreed, and that is that the individual has a right to protect privately his political allegiance, and if he has to declare among his fellow-workers, his co-workers, as well as his employer, that he takes a particular political point of view, it will not in the vast majority of cases affect his future or



(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) . . . . his happiness or his position one iota, but in some cases, Mr. Speaker, it conceivably could, and to try to apply the analogy of the shareholder, I think is stretching the point beyond credibility because that is a private undertaking and a private commitment, and there is no possible danger, at least not of anywhere near a comparable degree, that the shareholder can compromise himself with his fellow-workers or his employer on the basis of the corporations of which he is a partial owner, for they need not know, and in the case of the trade unionist who has to opt in or opt-out, no such protection, no such protective measure or safeguard of his privacy is afforded, so this is the point at issue with which I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, and I rise in support of the resolution, if it's applicable, as I say. If it's not applicable, it can be made so by simply reversing the procedure from opt out to opt in.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . the honourable member a question, Mr. Speaker? Are you going to vote for the amendment or vote against it?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I think I'll listen to what my colleague the Member for Riel has to say, and I'll make up my mind in the next few minutes. The honourable member, or at least one of his colleagues, has asked me that question in the past with regard to certain resolutions. I've declared -- (Interjection) -- No, not this one, not this one, but he has asked me that question in the past. I've declared my position which I think -- when the question's been asked me in the past I've declared my position, which I think really is unnecessary until the time for the vote comes. However, since the Minister of Labour always co-operates with me so comfortably in matters in the Chamber and in Law Amendments, I don't wish to put him off on his question, and I think I can say that I shall vote for both the amendment and the original resolution.

MR. PAULLEY: I thank my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, just before I go into my comments I just wanted to re-explain a point to the Honourable Member from Fort Garry because he obviously failed to get the point that was made on this side and that was made by myself, namely, the parallel between the shareholder and the trade unionist. I'll make it very brief. It's simply this. In the case of the trade union, it's not the executive that makes the decision, it's the members; and in that sense the member of a Local has a voice into whether or not his Local should affiliate, and, should they affiliate, whether it is then on the basis of opting in or opting out. That's the point. The shareholder has no say whatsoever. His executive, his Board of Directors does it, doesn't consult him, and he has no say in it whatsoever. To me that's a very sharp distinction. If it was done in the same manner in the Local, the executive would make the decision, the money would go to the political party, and the local member of that union would have no say whatsoever. That's the difference.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment briefly on the amendment and the implications of the original motion as well. The motion started out with a suggestion from the Honourable Member for Riel that political contributions should only be made on a non-compulsory opt-in basis, and presumably one of the things that he was attempting to do in that resolution was to remove all the pressures that exist apparently, not only in our society but for that particular segment of our society, namely, the trade union movement, because obviously the implication is that there are pressures on people and they are afraid of opting out. So he's going to make it on a non-compulsory opt-in basis. But in a sense, Mr. Speaker, there is pressure there too, because if there is pressure for people to stay in, there is also pressure on people to join. When everyone is joining and you are asked, or the onus is on the individual to volunteer, people generally know who supports and who doesn't, so that by making it voluntary and non-compulsory, in a sense my friend is avoiding the very thing that he's setting out to get around apparently, and that is that he wants no pressure on people to join political parties.

But I say to him that even under his system, one could argue that there are pressures there, and the same applies with the amendment from the Honourable Member for Assiniboia because his big argument is on the anonymous provision. He wants to remove pressure from people, just in a similar vein as to the original intent of the motion, to remove pressure. Well I say in a sense that this is a worthy objective - in a sense. But in another sense it's also impossible, because even if we followed his advice, one of the whole objects of this exercise presumably is to make sure that no pressure is put on any person in regard to a political party, and it seems to me that, first of all, people will continue to do the very things that they

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . . always do, that is that they will discuss politics and from that they get a general indication sometimes of how people vote. They will sell raffle tickets that might go to a political party; they will sell dinner tickets that might go to a political party; they will talk about elections and personalities, and you can often measure or gauge the real feeling of a person from the way that they talk about certain things or the way they react; and this can never be done. We can never legislate that out. And so, how does my honourable friend propose to deal with that?

He's concerned about this enormous amount of money - this five cents a month - which is being twisted out of certain people, and he's concerned about the pressures on these people to support a political party. And I say to him, what is his remedy for the talk that goes on in the shop, for the tickets that are sold to these people, for the discussions on politics? -- (Interjection) -- I say to my honourable friend, how can he ultimately make, how can he ultimately make an opt-out provision anonymous? Is this going to be done with computer cards that are fed in? Is this going to be done by whispering in somebody's ear? -- (Interjection) -- Secret ballot. But even if it's a secret ballot, although the ballots don't have to be known, if the suggestion is that certain people have the right to opt out you'll only do it on a mass basis, will you, or will the individual who wishes to opt out, he will get his own money back? -- (Interjection) -- Well, I would like to hear the explanation, because if it's on an individual opt-out basis, ultimately somebody knows . . . That accountant, that bookkeeper in Toronto, that clerk that you give your bank cheque to when you go to the bank, somebody's going to know whether or not certain moneys are missing and the word can filter back. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the intention of both the opting-in and opting-out provisions that are proposed in these resolutions cannot work, because in both cases, in both cases there are first of all pressure to join, and secondly, whether you made it anonymous or not, there are still pressures to support in a sense that people always argue. I mean not all trade unionists will put pressure on other trade unionists to join the New Democratic Party. There are a few Liberals and there are a few Conservatives around, and these people - not very many, mind you, not very many, but there are some, and the result is that this kind of pressure is exerted whether it is from the New Democratic Party or from other parties as well. So how do you eliminate that?

It seems to me that my honourable friends are concerned that trade unionists are such a feeble group, such delicate creatures, that they are unable to get up and to say to somebody -- I'm sure not in public; I'm sure a man doesn't get up on a platform and shout "I opt out." I'm sure he goes to his Local secretary, or whatever it is, and asks, for whatever reasons he gives or no reason, to be taken off.

MR. ENNS: Would the member permit a question? . . .

MR. DOERN: Just in one second. I think these men have the courage of their convictions. I think these men are strong enough, and they certainly do it. How else can my honourable friends explain the fact that out of a million people affiliated with the CLC, about a million and a quarter affiliated, that what - about a quarter of a million are affiliated or contribute to the New Democratic Party, that about three-quarters or a greater number do not, partly on tradition. Some unions don't believe in supporting political parties; some people don't believe in affiliating, and so on. So the vast majority don't. I wonder how they explain that? I'll now answer a question if my honourable friend has one.

MR. ENNS: I wonder if the member would indicate whether or not he would carry out the same, or pursue the same line of reasoning with respect to the person declaring himself in a means test, say, for social welfare assistance, rather welfare allowances?

MR. DOERN: I'm not sure I see the parallel.

MR. ENNS: Well, in the sense of there not being anything wrong to declare himself as being in a position, in a certain category - the parallel is different but the parallel being that he has to make a statement of his views known to be in a particular position; in this case, in a position to be a recipient of state assistance. This is a situation which your party are very much against.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid I don't see the parallel. I'll have to think about that. In one case a man is asked to declare his income, and in another case he's asked to declare his political affiliation which has no reference to his income, so really, I don't quite for the moment see the parallel. Maybe it'll occur to me later.

Mr. Speaker, I guess that more or less summarizes what I intended to say, namely, that I really don't feel that the proposals made by the mover of the resolution and the person who

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . . amended the resolution are practical. In other words, I don't believe that they correct the situation that they see as some kind of an abuse or some kind of a wrong. I don't think it's feasible to adopt either plan.

Secondly, as I said, I think that they are attempting to prescribe a remedy for what they see as some sort of a disease or illness when the patient himself isn't asking for any help or any assistance. I don't see the labour unions having any problem in this regard. The odd individual may - may - make complaints, but I point out to the statistics. The statistics say that over a million men are in the CLC and a quarter roughly, as I understand it, I stand subject to correction, but about a quarter are affiliated. Well, obviously, 750,000 didn't decide to opt in at all; they decided not to affiliate, and included in that amount would be unions that didn't affiliate, would be unions that also had individuals in them who decided not to opt in, and would include individuals in there who decided to opt out. That makes up the three-quarters of a million. So it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, in short, that members of this side, and I only speak for myself here, but it seems to me that we couldn't support the amendment or the original resolution.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, would the member permit a question?

MR. DOERN: Yes.

MR. PATRICK: Is he aware that the Woods Committee has been studying this same thing that we're debating here in this House, and which Committee has undertaken some urgent matters in respect to labour-management problems, and this is one of the things that they have been giving some priority, so it must be a problem.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I want to be very brief on this resolution. However, I'd like to also be quite clear because in my way of thinking the issue is not a complicated one. I think it is necessary in our society to have organizations that are assisted financially by the system of fees or dues, and those that are compulsory are compulsory because their nature decides that they ought to be. I think that it's almost unthinkable to have a medical doctor who doesn't belong to their association. We realize that lawyers, whether they are interested or not, in order to practice and be called to the Bar, must be members of the Bar Association, and these things I think are legitimate. We are now in a situation where teachers are required to write themselves out of the organization if they don't wish to belong, and this again I think is fine because they derive from the organization an assistance in their profession that is very desirable. I can't see, however, the similarity going as far as to include a political party. In all sincerity, I cannot see how people will attempt to justify the deduction of dues -- (Interjection) -- I will in a minute. I cannot see how members of a Party would attempt to justify the deduction of dues by that system. I realize that they might say, well it's all democratic because it's a decision of their executive. However, I feel personally that there is something intrinsically wrong about it and I'm going to support the amendment and I'm also going to support the resolution.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): I would just like to ask a question of the member. Does he recall the 1962 strike of the doctors and the fund that they made themselves each pay of \$100.00? Wasn't that coercion?

MR. GIRARD: I'm sorry, I can't - would you mind repeating, please, I can't hear.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the honourable member?

MR. SPEAKER: . . . honourable member asked the . . .

MR. DOERN: I don't think he heard it. I don't think he heard the question.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . the Honourable Member for Kildonan to repeat the question.

MR. FOX: I'll repeat the question, Mr. Speaker. I asked the Member of Emerson if he recalls the 1962 strike of the doctors -- (Interjection) -- Saskatchewan - where they assessed each member \$100.00.

MR. GIRARD: No. I'm not certain of the parallel, and although I'm aware of the strike and what caused the strike, I'm not particularly aware of the details, the assessment as you call it. However, my point was that doctors ought to belong to the medical association because through that association they are getting pertinent information relative, or a necessity in their practice, which is not the case in the deduction of political party dues.

MR. FOX: Would the member also agree that each organization should be democratically run and be entitled to run its own affairs?

MR. GIRARD: Most certainly - most certainly I agree. However, I would suggest that

(MR. GIRARD cont'd.) . . . . In some cases their practices are not quite what they should be and this is one case.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the honourable member. My question is very similar to the Member for Kildonan and it concerns the same incident of the doctors in Saskatchewan. Does the honourable member believe that it is all right . . .

MR. SPEAKER: . . . honourable member that this is an argumentative question and

. . .  
MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my question and you can determine whether it is argumentative or not.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . proceeds along the same line as the . . .

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask you to judge after I have asked the question. My question - and if it is out of order then it doesn't have to be answered. My question is simply this, does the honourable member believe that it is all right for a professional association to contribute as a group to a political party?

MR. SPEAKER: I must rule that question out of order, and for the reason that I have given.

MR. DOERN: I don't see why.

. . . . continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation)(Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a couple of minutes of your time to speak on this vicious anti-union resolution. You know it really makes you wonder, Mr. Speaker, that these people have been in office for 11 years, and why in all that time they didn't realize what a terrible thing has been going on in Manitoba. I'm not going to argue at the moment that this is good or bad, but if it's bad, why didn't they do it when they were in office? I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that they didn't have the courage because it is anti-union.

I have seen the unions come into this Legislature and ask for many things, resolutions, every year. I have never heard or seen a union bring in a resolution to that government or to this government that they wanted this thing done for them. Why are you interfering in their private internal affairs? Why? There isn't one resolution that has come before this House asking, whether your side or our side, to interfere and bring in this type of legislation. You didn't do it, and I would suggest to you that there was a good reason for it, and we are not going to do it. If you are sincere when you say that you are concerned about the individual's rights, are you not aware that when you get a job with any company, any company in this country, that you have to tell them your nationality and your religion, and if you don't tell them you don't get a job. Now what's more important, taking five cents off per-month or not getting a job. If you are serious, why don't you bring in a resolution saying that employers should be compelled, or legislation should be passed stopping employers from asking or forcing a prospective employee from stating his religion and nationality. Why don't you bring a resolution like that before this House if you are really concerned about the individual's rights? The Member for Riel mentioned that one of the precious rights an individual holds - and I quote - "he holds with respect to religion or other private rights that are granted him in this country." Well that's a lot of hooley and you know it. Isn't it?

MR. CRAIK: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I'll answer that in due course, but I want to take issue with you on that right now, and that is that this is not brought in because I represent a union or any other organization but I do represent a constituency, and I do have people who are individuals in that constituency that expect me to listen to their problems and bring forth the issues that I feel should be brought forth and this is one of them.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not denying him the right to bring in resolutions, but he had these constituents for 11 years, the same ones he represented for 11 years. What happened?

MR. CRAIK: The honourable member has said this now four times and I'll inform him, for his own benefit, I was elected to the Legislature in 1966.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, whatever time you were in office you were representing constituents obviously or you wouldn't be elected to office.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister is aware that any remarks made in debate must be directed to the Chair.

MR. BOROWSKI: I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, I'm directing them to you.

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Minister referred to the fact that someone in Manitoba or people in Manitoba had to indicate their religion and nationality when asking or applying for a job. If I'm correct, we have legislation in Manitoba which prevents this.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the legislation has been changed by the Federal Government in respect of nationality. As far as religion is concerned, it is my understanding that it is still in effect, and if I am wrong I am sure there is no problem in finding this thing out, it will be on the books. The last time I was hired I know that I had to put down my religion and nationality, which was before the nationality issue was settled. If the regulation has been changed it must be very recent because I am not aware of it. And again, you people have been in office, they have been in office, Mr. Speaker, 11 years and I haven't heard anybody bring in resolutions or complain about this.

The question under discussion, Mr. Speaker, to me it seems -- or the system of check-off and opting-out is undemocratic, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, to make this thing democratic that they should take out the opt-out provision completely. And let me just for a moment go back and explain how this thing is done. First of all, the unions have national conventions. In Canada they are held once a year; in the United States twice a year. Delegates are selected from each local across the country, sent to this convention, and at this convention

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.), . . . certain resolutions are dealt with and one of them has to do of course with opting-in or opting-out. These democratically elected delegates vote on these issues - sometimes they pass them; sometimes they don't.

Now this isn't enough. They want to be more democratic, so then they go in and they have a local vote on it. The local union at the regular meeting that is properly advertised, somebody gets up and makes a resolution that we affiliate with the political party or we don't affiliate. Everybody has an opportunity to speak on this and after everybody has spoken they take a vote - should we affiliate with the political party and give this five cents or we shouldn't. The vote is taken and the majority carries. I'll just give you an example. In Thompson - I have been there 11 years since the town began - we still don't have check-off. Every time the vote would come up the members would get up and they would say we don't believe we should support a political party. And they have that right, and I might point out to you I was one of those that voted against it. Until this day they are not paying, so you can't be any more democratic than that.

But where they go too far -- and if I was drafting legislation, what I would do if I was a union man, I would say they should stop there. Why should we turn around and go through the procedure of voting to opt-in or opt-out. Let's just take the example of opting-in, and then two months later give somebody an opportunity to go to the union executive and say: I don't want to pay this five cents, therefore I opt-out. This isn't democracy, it's making a mockery of democracy when after an election has been held and a vote taken that some member, one individual member could come in and he could say: I don't care what you people voted for, I don't buy it and I want to opt-out.

The ridiculous suggestion made by that Member for Assiniboia is the type that, it's laughable. If we carried his argument into politics he would never see the inside of this House, Mr. Speaker, never, because he said we would have to have 80 percent or something like that. Well this is ridiculous. If we applied this throughout the spectrum of politics no opposition would ever get into government. It just can't work. It's not democracy, it's bloody nonsense.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, would the Speaker permit a question? I would like to ask the Minister if he would consider the Woods Committee, which had labour representatives on it as well as management, would he consider that commission a laughable item and they didn't know what they were doing, because the recommendation that I propose to this House is following along the same lines that the Woods Committee has recommended.

MR. BOROWSKI: What was the recommendation of the Woods Committee?

MR. PATRICK: Read my amendment.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, what the member is saying, because the Woods Committee said something - and I don't know what they said, I don't know what they said - but he's trying to tell us that the Woods Committee says something that it's law, it's holy. Now are we going to have the Woods Committee -- I'm not even buying the argument they've said this, I don't think they said it, knowing the Member for Assiniboia I don't think they said it.

MR. JORGENSEN: Does the Minister reject the recommendations of the Woods Committee?

MR. BOROWSKI: I haven't seen it so how can I reject it.

MR. JORGENSEN: Do you mean to tell me that in all your interests in labour you haven't read the Woods Committee report?

MR. BOROWSKI: I'm just telling you that we don't need two-bit politicians to tell a union man how they should run their business, and Mr. Speaker, this is what this resolution says, that us politicians in our wisdom are going to tell union people, intelligent properly elected officials, how they are going to run their business, and I say that's a lot of bloody nonsense.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Would the Honourable Minister entertain a question?

MR. BOROWSKI: Pardon?

MR. GIRARD: Would you accept a question? Suppose that - and I'm using this only as an example - suppose that the municipal council of the town of Thompson would decide to support my resolution, a political party. Would you accept this as an extension of democracy or a limitation of democracy?

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what the question is. When you talk of town council, of Thompson, are you talking about the union council or the town council?

MR. GIRARD: Civic council, the town council - these are elected people; so are the members of the executive of an . . .

MR. MACKLING: On a point of privilege, my honourable friend is suggesting that a criminal act be committed?

MR. GIRARD: I'm....

MR. MACKLING: Are you? Mr. Speaker, I think that you should rule that question out of order.

MR. GIRARD: No, I'm not suggesting this.

MR. MACKLING: Well he knows very well, Mr. Speaker, he knows very well that this is completely improper and would lead to a charge laid against him if such a motion were put.

MR. GIRARD: No, I am not using this -- I'm using it simply as an example. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I am using it as an example, Sir. May I clarify the analogy? The executive council of a union is elected in order to conduct the affairs of that union. In much the same way in our civic politics, a council is elected to look after the affairs of that particular town.

MR. MACKLING: The analogy is wrong, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: One of the rules of this House is that the member is entitled to make one speech. He is entitled to ask questions of a previous speaker for clarification only, but in recent times - and I'm directing this remark at all members of the House - in recent times there have been far too many questions of an argumentative nature being put forth; questions, the answers to which are debatable and which could lead to further speeches and which opens the door and the opportunity to members to make not one speech but a half dozen speeches if answers were permitted to those questions. So henceforth I would urge all honourable members to co-operate with the Chair in asking questions for clarification of points made by -- if questions must be asked, that they be limited to questions asking for clarification of points made by the previous speaker which the honourable member may not have understood or misunderstood or escaped his attention. I believe that the Honourable Member for Emerson was in the process of asking a question.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I ask you, or through you to ask the Honourable Minister to reject the statement that he just made in respect to imputing motives, that what I said in respect to the Woods Committee was not correct or untrue or false, and I ask you to ask the Honourable Minister to retract that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Unfortunately, whatever motives were imputed to anyone have escaped my mind. I must confess that I am not aware of what the honourable member is referring to.

MR. MACKLING: On that question of privilege, as I recall it, the Honourable Minister indicated that he had not read the report and that he didn't know, he didn't know whether what the honourable member was indicating was verbatim from the report or not and wasn't in a position to say that this was so or not, and that's what he said.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the Minister a question. He referred to the members on this side as two-bit politicians. Am I classified as one of those two-bit politicians?

MR. BOROWSKI: All of us.

MR. McKELLAR: Oh, your side too eh? Well I'm glad.

MR. BOROWSKI: That's right.

MR. McKELLAR: I don't consider myself a two-bit politician.

MR. SPEAKER: I suggest the honourable member has the answer to his question. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if we are back to the contents of the resolution I would like to make a few comments. First, I think the basic issue that is at stake is whether or not groups within society have the right to specify that monies received from members or shareholders within their particular community can be utilized in order to better serve the interests of that particular group or society. Much comment has been made this afternoon in connection with the Woods Report, and I would like to refer to a quotation on Page 104 as to that report which I think places in focus the main issue that we are dealing with. "Members whose political persuasions are different from those of their union may object to the expenditure of any of their dues on a party with which they do not sympathize, yet unions should have the same right as other organizations to support the party of their choice as long as that choice has the support of a majority of their members. Whatever is done should not put labour organizations at a disadvantage relative to their interest groups."

Mr. Speaker, it so happens that I am a member of the Chamber of Commerce - this may

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd.)... shock my honourable friends in the opposition ranks - and some of my dues that I paid to that organization were utilized in order to propagate a particular philosophy called "Operation Free Enterprise" two or three years ago. This was done without my permission, without the vote, the opportunity on my part to opt-out my particular area of dues, yet do I hear any comments from members of the opposition that this was undemocratic, that this was interference with my right of privacy, that the Chamber of Commerce was utilizing dues collected from people with like persuasion to perpetuate a certain philosophy? No, Mr. Speaker, they do not object to that. But now they suddenly object, after they have been in power for twelve years, to the fact that the trade union movement has indicated that they support a particular...

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, would the member permit one question at this juncture? Would he not agree that those dues that he paid as a member of the Chamber of Commerce are voluntary?

MR. PAWLEY: They were voluntary, it's true, Mr. Speaker. The point is, however, that again at the particular time in question there's still a question of privacy, a decision to be made whether you wish to disassociate yourself from the particular group that you belong, state that you will discontinue to be a member because part of your monies are being used for a particular purpose. So I suggest the issue still remains.

What the honourable friends in opposition are attempting to do, Mr. Speaker, is to place the labour movement, as such, at a disadvantage to the other interest groups, and it would appear that since the June 25th election they are particularly mindful of this problem. They recognize that the trade union movement, as such, is becoming more and more aware of the party which has best served their labour interests and proposed progressive labour legislation in the last few years, and I suggest this is the reason that my honourable friends are concerned and so alarmed at this time in respect to this particular matter. They are somewhat worried and upset that they failed to take advantage when they were in power to do the very thing that they are now asking us to do.

I might mention that I'm particularly sensitive to the fact that my honourable friends are now suggesting this is an undemocratic move on the part of the trade union movement. There's a particular local in my own constituency that has become more and more aware over the last number of years to political consciousness. Two or three years ago they felt that their main area of concern was in relation to wage bargaining and job classification and what not. Now they're more and more recognizant that their area of duty and responsibility to their membership is in the social and political arena trying to obtain the passage of laws which will best serve their particular members. There's nothing wrong with this. The Chamber of Commerce does it. The Medical Association does it. The Bar Association does it. And they are now, in a very democratic fashion, deciding within their own local whether or not they wish part of their membership dues to be used to further the interests of the political party that they are of the opinion better serve the interests of their workers. There's nothing wrong with this at all. It's a wide open debate and discussion and it's healthy to the democratic system that there be such a debate among the membership, and they will in due course make a decision whether or not to so affiliate.

So quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I just can't understand the concern of my honourable friends. I suggest the issue is whether or not my honourable friends are so determined to upset the balance in respect to the urgings and persuasions of different interest groups within society and place labour at a disadvantage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Would the Minister just permit one brief question? Would the Minister believe that I am a card-carrying, dues-paying and loyal member of a union?

MR. PAULLEY: Never, never.

MR. PAWLEY: I must say that I am indeed most shocked, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, there is something very basic here that seems to be missing from the other side, and I would like to tell the Honourable Minister that just spoke that I am new to the House and you can't point at me and say 11 years ago I should have done it, or last year. I'm very interested to know your views on this, and the fact that you don't like the Chamber of Commerce to go out and have a free enterprise program. You knew that probably before you joined the kind of organization that the Chamber of Commerce



(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.) . . . is. Now this is entirely up to you, but you were. . . .

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, my objection was quite clear that I was placing in focus the fact that part of my dues were being used to perpetuate a certain philosophy.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well fine, I'm sorry if I took the member the wrong way, Mr. Speaker - the Minister the wrong way.

You also spoke of the Woods Report, or he spoke of the Woods Report, Mr. Speaker, where he said the union should be allowed to invest their money any way they pleased. And I agree with that. But what we're talking about here, that when you join a union you automatically opt-in; there's no choice. You've got to opt-out by saying I don't want to be in. Now if you just - let's say the guts of the matter, the way our Honourable Member from St. Boniface uses it all the time, and I like his statement because it gets right down to the floor of the thing - is look, why not say when you join or become associated with a union that you are perfectly free to support any party you want. Now that's what we're saying and we get a lot of argument out of it. What could be more democratic than that? It's just as simple as that, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on this amendment to the motion. I think the most interesting aspect of this is the Achilles heel of the members of the government which has been struck here.

MR. PAWLEY: Is the honourable member closing debate?

MR. CRAIK: No, I'm speaking on the amendment. You don't have to vote yet, you've got time to see the light.

The most interesting aspect of all this first of all is the Achilles heel which has been struck across the way, and the amount of slack that has been thrown up and coming from all directions, in which we found all sorts of obtuse arguments as to why this infringement on human rights is in actual fact in the best interests of democracy and the best interests of the individual, and of course I suppose in the best interests of those that are espousing their arguments, or espousing the stand that this should be a legitimate procedure.

Now I think there is no question about the amendment, the whereas portion of it: Whereas it is the right of unions to pursue legislative goals which will complement and supplement their gains at the bargaining table. Well, it's certainly in their interests to pursue legislative goals if those legislative goals are necessary. We know that legislation does exist under which all people operate, under which businesses operate and under which unions exist, and when the member for Thompson says that two-bit politicians shouldn't be telling unions what to do, well let me suggest to him that there isn't anybody in society that has liberty without licence. And that we're saying here is that a person that belongs to a union, or the Chamber of Commerce or any other organization, or if he's walking down the street strictly as an individual and doesn't belong to anything, still have right privileges which are to some extent determined by legislative action, and to say that this Legislature has no right in this area is just absolutely ludicrous.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I did not say that. I say that this Legislature has no right to take away their rights. Now if you're going to suggest that you have the right to interfere with their rights, I say you're full of baloney.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, this just shows how badly the blinkers have wrapped themselves around the honourable member's vision, to think that we're trying to infringe on the rights of an organization. The intent of this motion is to preserve the rights of an individual, preserve the rights of an individual to keep to himself his own feelings, personal feelings, whether they be with regard to religion, to his other private matters and to his politics. To suggest that this motion is brought forward as an anti-union move, again is absolutely ludicrous. Never have you heard a suggestion - at least that I've heard in this House coming from this side and I haven't heard all the arguments - certainly haven't come from me that has anything to do with the amount of money which is collected. It may not be a large amount. That's your business; it's not the business of this resolution.

The total intent of it - and again you seem to be completely blind to the fact of what has happened in history outside of this country, blind to the fact that in ages past, in England at least, at one time dues must have been paid to a religious organization. Finally, the legislators of the day, in fact as society evolved out of the dark ages and saw the light, and this of course I think we would admit now would not be an accepted practice where in order to be the employee of a public company one had to make donations to a religious organization. But we

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.)... seem to completely - we seem to have completely on the other side be able to say, but you can't equate religion and politics. Now I'd like to know what in a person's human rights, the rights of an individual, his belief, can be more directly equated than religion and politics.

There's the old argument that religion and politics are the two items which in an argument never usually get resolved. They can be directly equated as the rights of an individual to hold in privacy.

Well, we've seen also....

MR. DOERN: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. CRAIK: Later, if you don't mind, Sir.

We've also seen progression of legislation take place in that same country I refer to, for after considerable analysis and debate they have arrived at the decision which I'm recommending that the Legislature of Manitoba takes as well. That is simply to say, not that a union or other organizations, not that they can't collect dues for political purposes, not that they can't propagate their interests politically, but simply that from the individuals that they are collecting that fee, that it can be done with that person voluntarily opting-in.

I can't believe that my honourable friends opposite have not received calls from individuals. The suggestion again was made today that this was brought in, that there was no request from a union to bring this in. I'm not interested in that. I'm asking - I'm asking friends opposite if they have not had petitions from individuals who are working -- (Interjection) -- Perhaps you don't get them then?

MR. DOERN: I've never had any.

MR. CRAIK: Maybe this is more reason why this should be, because here is the mild coercive force which to the individual member does not allow him, and maybe this is what basically you fail to see, that there is an undercurrent. There is in fact an undercurrent amongst a number, and it may not be significant, but it doesn't have to be significant.

A MEMBER: .... itself June 25th?

MR. CRAIK: It has nothing to do with it, Sir. An undercurrent that says -- and this just shows the callous disregard that this gang has for human rights. They come in here, they'll talk about a human rights commission, they'll gloss and wax about an ombudsman, and when it comes down to the point of fact, can a person hold his political rights as a matter of privacy, they laugh and scoff at it. -- (Interjection) -- Well I'm telling you that actions speak louder than words.

MR. DOERN: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CRAIK: And you have an opportunity here to show where your money is and also where your mouth is.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I don't believe that the honourable member should refer to this distinguished Assembly as a gang, but rather as an association.

MR. CRAIK: Well I know that my friends are hypersensitive because they've been smarting for days over the fact that they've been called socialists, and we've had several speeches, and one a very eloquent one last night that -- (Interjection) -- I thought it was great, it was great, but you could see the obsession that the honourable member had and his sensitivity to the fact that he'd been called a socialist. Now I would suggest that probably a gang might be more appropriate than socialist. However, I think that either one of them are still fairly mild, Mr. Speaker, compared to what is going to be, they will have to be identified as if they continue to take this particular attitude towards this very basic motion, which in fact they are trying to cloud as it being an institutional conflict rather than a spelling out of the rights of an individual within the Province of Manitoba.

Basically, the "whereas" part of the amendment which I'm speaking to is quite acceptable and I agree with it 100 percent, that every union has its right to pursue legislative goals. And we know that, everybody that has been in the Legislature has sat with the representations that are made to the Legislature every year, and nobody questions it. What we are questioning are, within a structure, how far any organization can go in infringing on the rights of an individual's privacy, and this is what is basically at stake here.

Now as far as the solution to the problem is concerned with the proposal by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, I find that it is a move and a step better than the present practice in that it would in effect bring out a provision somewhat like we have now in the case where in a closed shop an individual, if he doesn't wish to contribute to the union, can avert this via the

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.)... Rand formula, and this amendment brings in with respect to the opt-out provision something which is analogous to the Rand formula. However, I don't think we can compromise basically on the principle.

Again, the main motion asks simply that provisions for political contributions be on the opt-in basis if a person wants to do it. The Honourable Member for Elmwood suggested that what I am saying is don't apply pressure, and he's dead wrong in that suggestion, you can apply all the pressure you like. I think political activity is good and healthy and I think there should be more of it and I don't think there's any argument there. So that pressures are fine. All I'm saying is that all people aren't the same; all don't hold very firm political views; some of them wish to keep it their own business. I've had phone calls. I still hesitate to believe that members opposite haven't, and I can quote you one statement in particular. A person said -- people who feel this aren't really articulate people - may not be - and one very straightforward statement is: "What I'm trying to say, is why should I have to sign for something that I don't want?" And it's a pretty basic question: Why should I have to sign for something, particularly when it's in the field of human rights, that I don't want. And that's essentially what the present provision is forcing the individual to do.

Now I know that the argument we're getting from the government, from the members of the New Democratic Party, aren't as unanimous or as great unanimity as they are trying to portray, because you do have good solid statesmen in your party who will stand up and present even a more forceful argument than you're getting from this side to actually do what this motion recommends - and I think you know whom I'm referring to when I say that. And I suggest that if you don't, we'll arrange for you to meet him and if you can get the benefit of his wisdom, because he has spent a lot of time on this topic in the federal House, supports this resolution in its basic principle, and I would suggest that you talk to some of your own party people who can see the infringement, the encroachment on human rights that is being propagated by the present practice.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question if the honourable member would permit it. I have a specific question I'd like to pose to the honourable member in respect to his resolution. Is there not an element in the resolution as proposed by the honourable member of compulsion, in that he is compelling the union to be a collection agency for a political party that may be in fact, by decision of a majority of that particular union, not a party that has the interest of that union at heart?

MR. CRAIK: I'm not sure what word he refers to as compulsion.

MR. PAWLEY: To the contribution to a political party of his or her choice, compelling the union to collect money from the membership to any and all political parties that the member may designate on his contribution to the union.

MR. CRAIK: You know, I really must suggest here that you're trying to draw a red herring across here because there's no compulsion here at all. All the resolution is intended to do is say that it's on voluntary opt-in basis to the political party of his choice. Now I would assume that whether a union in general does it, they would make this decision at a general meeting. Certainly they're not being compelled to make donations to political parties.

MR. MACKLING: Would the honourable member yield to a question? Apparently you're alleging that there's some behind-the-scene statesman of the New Democratic Party whom we're all aware of, and I'd like the name of this person whom we should speak to about the subject. Who is it?

MR. CRAIK: Well, you come and see me and I'll make arrangements for you to visit with your own people. -- (Interjection) -- Well, if you people are basically that unfamiliar with this topic, it really means you haven't given it enough thought.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I shall be quite brief. I came in just at the end of an altercation, I suppose it was, when the Minister of Transport suggested that the Woods Committee report, or the Woods Report did not make certain recommendations. So for the edification of the Honourable Minister I'd like to quote to him in The Canadian Labour Law Reports No. 414, April 9, 1969, and on Page 20 - by the way, I will take two paragraphs and quote them. The heading is "Recommendations and Observations" 515. "Many unions take an active part in politics do so through their support of a particular political party. To this end many unions donate a portion of their members' dues to the party. The amount per worker may be small; the amount in total may be large. In any case, some workers object to any of their dues being

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.)... so allocated. Because of such objections, many unions provide that their members may opt-out of this obligation, in which event an equivalent sum sometimes is given to charity." Now that's number 515.

Part of 517, and I quote: "Dissenting members must be permitted to opt out of such a contribution. We would add two features: in order to protect the anonymity of dissenting members who may wish to avoid any possibility of retaliation, such members should be able to opt-out either by notifying the union or by stating their desire to do so in a signed letter to the Canada Labour Relations Board. The Board would, if necessary, check the authenticity of the request against the employer's personal records and inform the union of the number of members opting out. A union would then be obliged to revert these members' shares of the union's political contribution to its general fund."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not very much more to add, but I was disturbed to hear in the course of the debate two remarks that I don't think were in keeping with the Legislative Assembly in Canada. One was when one member refers to the House in general as a group of "two-bit" politicians. I don't think that is in keeping with the dignity of a Legislative Assembly in Manitoba and I don't think it should be used. I don't think it should be used.

The other remark that I heard that disturbed me was when the same gentleman said, "By what right did this House have to change or interfere in the rights of another association or union," - or something in that context. Well, I would suggest to the honourable member that the 57 members in this House are the lawmakers of the Province of Manitoba, and while there is a senior lawmaking body in Ottawa, the lawmakers of this House have jurisdiction over all matters given to them under the BNA Act, and this House has the right, if in their majority opinion they believe something should be changed within their jurisdiction, they have this right.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question? He referred to the Woods Committee. Which Woods Committee were you referring to, because there is a Woods Committee in Manitoba; there is a Woods Committee federally. I think the record should be clear as to the reference of my honourable friend.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I believe I stated at the outset The Canadian Labour Law Reports with reference to the Woods Report - the Report of the Task Force in Canadian Industrial Relations.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. The statement has now been read by the Honourable Member for Portage and I think the Honourable Minister of Transport should be man enough and decent enough to retract his statement, because he doubted my statements and said they were untrue when I spoke just a little while ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, I think that I'd like to add a few words because I feel there are only two of us really....

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, an honourable member has stood in his place and made a request through you to a member for a retraction. Now, the question now is, whether a member can stand in this House and make charges or make imputations and be allowed to continue without ever having to retract. The Member for Assiniboia has asked you, Sir, to require from the Minister of Transport a retraction for a statement he made. Now, Mr. Speaker, you may rule as you so desire, but I think it cannot be allowed to pass when a member makes a request.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the honourable member file the document that he read?

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, the document the Member for Portage la Prairie read doesn't indicate anything other than what I suggested. We'll read Hansard tomorrow and if I was incorrect I will certainly apologize, but I see no reason at the moment on the basis of what I've heard.

MR. CHERNIACK: Will the honourable member table the document?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, a clear request has been made of you. If you wish to take it under advisement this is fine, but I don't think it should be allowed to pass. Either you make a ruling or....

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair would like to know what statement the honourable member wishes retracted by the Honourable Minister.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, when I asked a question during the debate just a little while ago, the Honourable Minister of Transport was insinuating that I was not quoting or was not stating the facts as they are and that the Woods Committee did not make the recommendations that I stated it did, which I said followed along the lines of my amendment. He said, "Knowing

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.)... the Honourable Member for Assiniboia", he took it as I was not quoting correctly which I was, and I'm sure....

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, on that same point of order. You will recall that you indicated that if there was any question of the member's privilege it escaped you. I pointed out at the time that the issue that the Honourable Member for Assiniboia took with the Minister was that the Minister indicated that the wording of the resolution, he was not certain, was the exact wording of the Woods Report. He hadn't read the report and wasn't in a position to say that.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. In any case, if it was a matter of privilege it should have been undertaken at the time by the Member for Assiniboia, not the House Leader of the Liberal Party some time later.

MR. GREEN: On the same point of order. Hasn't the Minister of Transportation said that he will review what he has said in the light of the comments that were made, and if he finds that he made an incorrect charge that he'll be happy to apologize. Now all that the Minister of Transportation has requested is the opportunity to review what he said in light of the honourable member's remarks.

MR. PATRICK: That's quite acceptable to me.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, I think the only two simon-pures in this House at this time is the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and myself, and I really have doubts about him. As I say, I'd like to make sure I put on record that I have my doubts about the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, but....

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Well, make up your mind. I... withdraw these last words.

MR. BEARD: A few days ago I rose quite indignant about kick-backs and I still feel that way, and when I look at this I do wonder in a way if it isn't maybe a prepayment for anticipated privileges, because of course the NDP Party have to remember that they are no longer in opposition, they are in fact the Establishment. We say that kick-backs are something that are received for favours from industry, and we wonder maybe whether labour couldn't be accused of prepaying for anticipated favours from government. But I don't think it really goes that far. I've lived with it for a number of years in the Town of Thompson, and as the Member for Thompson has pointed out, this in fact has not been a problem in northern Manitoba as far as I can see. I think that it is becoming really a political hassle, that we could be well doing our job in debating something else than in standing here and saying these words. I realize that I too am extending this debate, so that makes us politicians all of a kind I suppose.

I don't think there is as great a problem as some people would read into this. I do feel though in debating with the Minister of Transport that it is right indeed that a group could pass a motion, but then of course this in fact binds the people that follow after who have not had the privilege of voting on that. In other words, the policy set by people who do not belong to the union at the time the policy was set. Now I don't know whether this is right or whether it is wrong, because they accept the benefits that unions have been able to negotiate for them and they just can't separate these one from another. I can't see where opting in or opting out really saves face of a man, because if he doesn't want to support a particular party then he opts out; it shows that he isn't supporting it; if he opts in it shows that he is supporting it. So really that part of it I don't think is the real part that we should be concerned about.

I would say that perhaps now that the kickback field has received its publicity then maybe this next committee that is being called to look into the whole program of funding moneys for election purposes may in fact say that the taxpayer will be responsible financially for the election of members, and if they do that in fact, then I would presume it would rule out prepayment for favours in kick-backs by industry. But not being naive enough to think that this would come about, I would say that we would have to accept the fact that this is something that we would have to face up with. Perhaps the NDP Party have the best of two sides now. They are in a position to receive kickbacks from industry and are collecting from the labour side, so maybe they'll become wealthy enough to support the Independent members when they run.

But I think that the dignity of unions should be considered. As I say, I come from a union town. I know that their past history has been one that has rather than wanting to support a particular party financially, they have felt that it is the responsibility of the person or persons who belong to the union as to what they want to do with their money as far as supporting unions are concerned - or supporting parties rather, rather than the union, and my only fear is that of course the larger unions may in some dubious way become able to effectively lobby through

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) . . . government channels - and I don't particularly say this government, but any government channel - and we must watch that just as we do watch industry. We haven't done anything about the collection of monies from unions. We haven't been able up to now to do anything about the collection of monies from unions, so we must go along under that cloud until some committee can come up with an effective way of providing the necessary funds.

I don't think that I can support one without supporting the other and voting against one without voting against the other. So I will sit down before I get too confused, Mr. Speaker, and allow the Member for Rhineland to carry on from there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, my comments will be brief indeed as well. I want to speak mainly in connection with the amendment that has been added to the motion dealing with union dues, and to me the amendment just means pussy-footing. This is exactly it. The original motion is much, much better, because with the amendment we are placing the onus on the worker and this should never be the case. The onus should not be on the worker to opt-out; rather, I feel that we should have legislation on the books that would provide or require the worker to opt-in, and this as a matter of choice of his or her desires, or whatever the person would desire. I think this should always remain a matter of choice with the individual.

Membership should definitely not be compulsory and the amendment calls for compulsory contributions in connection with this membership, because when you read the last phrase of that amendment, "on the basis of anonymous opt-out provisions, the monies of those opted out to revert to the union's general funds," this still means that even though they opt-out they will be contributing. I feel that membership in a union should be voluntary at all times. What the amendment calls for under the various acts of legislation that we have that provide for this, you must write yourselves out annually. I feel that this is also unnecessary; this should never be imposed on the individual in the first place. If he wants to become a member of a union, good and well, no objection; and if they want to contribute to the cause of the NDP, if that's their choice, good and well, we have no objection. But I think this should remain voluntary, and therefore in my opinion the original motion is much, much better than the amendment that is being attached and is before us at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, my comments will be brief. I have listened with very real interest to the comments of the honourable members, particularly on the other side of the House, and I astounded at the comments they continue to make. Obviously they haven't been listening in the House when various members, including the Honourable Member for Elmwood, participated in the debate. They are very concerned about democratic traditions and the free choice of union members to decide on which political party they will give monies or owe allegiance.

The fact is that I would assume, with the exception perhaps of the Honourable Member from Fort Garry, that very few of my honourable friends across the other side have ever held a membership in a trade union. Well I see some marked departures; that's very encouraging, there's hope yet. Well, you surely should know, you surely should know then, honourable gentleman, that the trade union movement is a democratic movement and that when a debate is held in respect to political affiliation it's a free and open debate and it's open to the press; it's open to interested people to attend at such times. These debates are vigorous, and as the Honourable Minister of Transport has indicated, oftentimes the vote is against affiliation, but no one, including the Honourable Member from Riel, has indicated that any one of the persons who has participated in any one of these debates, successfully, successfully opposing affiliation, has suffered as a result by some procedure, some devious procedure that the union officers have taken against him. Where have we had any complaints of this? But this seems to be lurking at the back of the minds of my friends across in the opposite benches that somehow this procedure, this democratic procedure as to a decision as to whether or not to affiliate or not has wrought some hardship against individual trade union members. Additional to the free and democratic right to participate in these debates as to whether to affiliate or not, the individual members, even if the majority after free and full discussion have decided to affiliate, then that individual member still has the right to opt-out.

Now this is full democratic use of his rights in society. Such rights are not accorded by my honourable friends in respect to individual shareholders in corporations and they know it. What right has an individual shareholder to say how much of the profit that has been made to the

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.)... company, which ought to be paid to him, which is his money, has been voted by a board of directors at some secret meeting to support one of the old-line parties. You don't question that. Oh no, that's not unfair. No openness, no vote, no democracy, but there's no concern of my honourable friends in respect to those aspects. -- (Interjection) -- How about people. My honourable friends are concerned about people. They like to tell us -- they like to tell us that the corporations....

MR. CRAIK: You only understand dollars.

MR. MACKLING: That's right. They like to say that the corporations in this country are controlled by individual shareholders and this is why corporations form such a wonderful substance to our society. But what right and what freedom have individual shareholders had in respect to voting funds to political parties through corporations? My honourable friend suggests that this hasn't been the case. Where did they get their election funds year in and year out then?

But the trade union movement -- (Interjection) -- That's right, but the trade union movement in open, in open, deliberate and free discussion have decided to exercise political rights, and this hurts my honourable friends. They are super-sensitive about this because here is a free and voluntary association that has decided to take political action and support a political party of their choice.

MR. CRAIK: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. MACKLING: Sure, I'll answer a question.

MR. CRAIK: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. MACKLING: Certainly.

MR. CRAIK: Was he actually suggesting in his statements that in order to prove that human rights are being treaded upon that we have to parade witnesses before him when he is asking about bringing these people in?

MR. MACKLING: My honourable friend is a strange one to be asking that question, because we asked him to name this ghost who lurked in the halls and he couldn't. He suggested he's had phone calls, he's had petitions; he's tabled none. He is concerned with the rights of some nebulous people who he has not paraded before this House in any way, shape or fashion. He suggests that.....

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It is now 5:30. Perhaps the Honourable Minister could continue when this resolution next appears on the Order Paper. It is 5:30, I am leaving the Chair to return at 8 o'clock. In the meantime, I will try to ascertain the current value.....