

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, March 8, 1974

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed this afternoon, could I draw the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 30 students of Grade 7 standing from the Queen Elizabeth School under the direction of Mrs. Beauchemin. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

And also we have 54 students of Warren Elementary School, Grades 5 and 6, under the direction of Mrs. Lillies and Miss Saquet. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

On behalf of all the honourable members I bid you welcome this afternoon.

SUPPLY - LABOUR

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Minister has five minutes.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, just before we rose I had been making some comments in respect of the contribution of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, and at that particular time I referred specifically to the garment industry.

I now want to make a few comments dealing with his remarks on the situation, dealing with the right of strike which was given to the police forces in Manitoba as a result of our last legislation. My honourable friend seems to be very perturbed over consequences as to the rights given to our police in Manitoba as the result of changes in legislation in the Police Act and also labour relations. And he said that he didn't want to be placed in a position there where there was a withdrawal of police and so on and so on, to the detriment of the citizens of Manitoba.

I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, to my honourable friend, that giving or granting the right to strike to police, or not giving them that right, really in today's labour market and the approach to labour legislation doesn't mean a heck of a lot. --(Interjection)--In Montreal, and I'm glad my honourable friend who is an Ex-RCMP, or so I understand that he was, an Ex-RCMP policeman, or I think maybe as my honourable friend the Minister of Education says, he might go back to the Northwest Mounted Police, I'm not sure now, because there is a time gap between the Mounted Police and the Northwestern Mounted Police and maybe my honourable friend goes back further than even I would attribute to him. He mentions, Mr. Chairman, the situation that prevailed in Montreal. I don't know whether he's really aware of it or not. The situation that prevailed in Montreal was that the police did not have the right to strike but they went on strike. I wonder if he really is aware of that. Then, then, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest, I would suggest to my honourable friend the Member for Swan River, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, that regardless of whether a group of employees has the right to strike or not, if they feel in their judgment that in order to achieve their desire that they do withdraw their services, the fact of legislation really doesn't mean too much, does it?

Now what happened here, what happened here is that we did - and I make no apologies for it - we did grant to the police the right of withdrawal of services under the legislation of Manitoba. We offered it to the civil servants, we offered it to our fire departments, and to the teachers if they so desired. Now then, there was no real request to continue the prohibition under the Police Act, so it was . . . But, Mr. Chairman, I have more faith, far more faith in the policemen of Manitoba than apparently my honourable friends opposite, because I have listened and read statements by the negotiators for the police in Greater Winnipeg, that they agree almost entirely with the Minister of Labour that they should have the right, but they also agree, as I agree, that having that right does not necessarily mean that they should use it.

MR. ENNS: But they are using it and they're using it today and you gave them the right to use it. They are using it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: You see, Mr. Chairman, this is why I suggest to the Honourable Member for Lakeside he should stay down raising hogs and cattle because he doesn't know, and I don't know where my honourable . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of privilege has been raised.

MR. ENNS: Let the Honourable Minister of Labour finally get it through his head that I don't raise hogs, I have nothing against anybody that does raise hogs, but I raise cattle.

SUPPLY - LABOUR

MR. PAULLEY: I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, by his recent exhibits that he bellers like his cattle does without any knowledgability of why he should beller, but I do want to say to my honourable friend, he says that they are using the strike, at the present time there is no strike. There isn't a strike. My honourable friend of the Northwest Mounted Police suggests we're using a big stick. I say, Mr. Chairman, that it doesn't matter one iota; if people are determined to establish their rights and privileges under a democracy, they will exercise that notwithstanding the law. And if, if the group of about 800 individuals who are working for the City of Winnipeg say to that municipal council, "Now look, we want to bargain with you; you get down to proper bargaining at the table," then they should have that privilege the same as everybody else has that privilege under the labour laws of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Minister's five minutes has elapsed. Resolution 74 (a)--the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I must say I am very much interested in the responses to date from the Minister on the estimates and on the remarks that were made earlier today, particularly by myself and to a certain extent by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. I want to hear more from the Minister, Mr. Chairman. I rather regret the fact that he has run out of time on this particular phase of the debate, but he'll be getting more and I want to hear more, and I want to hear him explain to us just the extent to which he feels he's in command of the situation in labour and in industrial relations in the province today, because I think that some of the things that were said earlier this morning have stung the Minister into a recognition, perhaps new and for the first time, a recognition of the fact that there are many things in the area of industrial relations that are beyond his immediate control, and beyond his immediate contact, and beyond his immediate connection and accomplishment at the present time.

I wasn't surprised, Mr. Chairman, by the response of the Minister to the remarks that I made this morning. I think it's become fairly typical of the government - not necessarily this Minister but fairly typical of Ministers in this government - that they can't stand criticism, they don't like being criticized, they don't like being questioned, and if they are questioned or criticized and if any of that criticism happens to spill over into the personal area, then they are outraged and they rise up in righteous indignation and they lash back the only way they know how, and they attempt to discredit the criticisms of the opposition on the grounds that they come from fountains of ignorance and fountains of inability and ineptness. So I wasn't surprised at all, Mr. Chairman, by the response of the Minister. I expected that he would lash back and rise up, as I say, in righteous wrath and suggest that whatever was said from this side of the House really emanated from a lack of knowledge of the situation and from an area of ignorance. It may be - and I concede, Mr. Chairman, that there might be, there are in fact areas of ignorance where the representative in our caucus in labour matters is concerned. I came into this session to try to learn from the Minister of Labour--(Interjections)--I came in to learn something. I quite candidly admit that when it comes to labour and industrial relations I should study at the knee of a man like the present Minister of Labour who has spent most of his life toiling in the vineyards of labour relations and industrial relations--in a one-sided, a one-sided area of that field, to be true, Mr. Chairman. I think the Minister of Labour has blinkers on him. You know, he sees one . . .

MR. ENNS: Bud, hold it. In a minute we may get a speech from the House Leader about how intelligent we are.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I was very encouraged by the remarks of the House Leader the other day in which he did give credit where credit was due and he did tell us on this side how intelligent we were. We tell ourselves that occasionally in caucus but it never, Sir, has had the impact that it had or the effect that it had the other day coming from the spokesman for--the House Leader and the spokesman for the New Democratic administration.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Labour said in his remarks earlier today that I don't know anything about labour relations and that, I concede, to a degree may be partially correct. I know very little about it in relation to what the Minister of Labour is supposed to know about it, but I have been attempting to study it, to absorb the intricacies of the science, to learn something from it, and I came into this Chamber to this session this year, Mr. Chairman, comitted to learning from the Minister of Labour as much as I could about how one conducts the industrial affairs of a province or any jurisdiction fairly and equitably and prosperously. And I can say this, Sir, that up to this point in time I have found nothing from the present Minister, whom I

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) like as a person and whom I respect as an Anglican.

A MEMBER: That's hitting low.

MR. SHERMAN: And that, Sir, may be hitting below the belt, and I hate to let religious prejudice creep into the debate, but I've learned--(Interjection)--if it came down to a fight over Anglicanism, Mr. Chairman, I'd be with the Minister of Labour all the way, but when it comes down to a fight over labour and labour relations I simply cannot accept the kind of position that he's taken in defence of his course of action and in retaliation to what has been said from this side of the House, Mr. Chairman.

He, for example, has referred to mediation officers and the degree to which the department has employed mediation officers to get into the points of agitation and the points of crisis before the crisis actually materializes, to solve the problem before it starts. Well, I must say, Mr. Chairman, that it's my recollection of the affairs in this Chamber up to this point, that it's been from this side of the House that the request has come time and time again in critical labour-industrial relations situations for the Minister to do something through his department, through the officers at his command, to move into these situations and attempt to take control of them and head them off before the crises do arise, and the most recent case in point was the contract dispute between the police and the City of Winnipeg. That was a case in point where we asked the Minister on frequent occasions what was he doing, what was being undertaken in the way of heading off difficulty and trouble. We received platitudes and generalizations and pontifications from the Minister which satisfied neither the opposition, which is fair game in any legislative body, but neither the opposition nor the general public in the province, Mr. Speaker.

So when the Minister talks about mediation officers being sent into the breach to solve crises and forestall strikes, I seriously question, I seriously question the initiatives that he has taken in this field. I'd be interested in hearing from him the extent to which he has carried out that kind of an exercise. The Minister said, for example, that we on this side of the House and particularly the particular spokesman for labour affairs in this caucus, being the Member for Fort Garry, myself, doesn't know anything about labour relations. Well, Mr. Chairman, the point surely is this: that one comes into any legislative body, any legislative role, any legislative responsibility, in the most part with perhaps some preconceived notions and some already formed opinions about the field in which he or she is concerned, but in all conscience most of us - and I think I can say this about myself - have come in with the open-minded attitude that at least the persons in the province, namely the ministry responsible for the area of administration in question, are going to conduct themselves and answer questions in such a way as to shed some light on what's going on in the industrial field. And I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that up to this point in time in the question period in the House and in the debate thus far on the estimates of the Minister, that there has been no light shed, no satisfactory light shed on the situations existing in the industrial field in the province at this time and that the Minister in fact has in most cases developed a kind of a verbal smokescreen which has carefully diverted the questions that have been asked him by myself and others, and carefully obscured the problems that exist in the industrial field.

I said earlier today, Mr. Speaker, that this Minister had lost touch with some of the things that were going on industrially. I think that that judgment, although harsh, that judgment is vindicated by his response to some questions that have been asked him in this House in the last few weeks and by his posture with relation to some of the industrial problems. I was interested that the Minister made the point that he felt some of the things I said this morning were somewhat out of context for me. And I may be misinterpreting him but I think I recall that he said that some of the things I said and some of the remarks I made were out of context for the Member for Fort Garry. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would love to stand up here and in a gentlemanly, statesmanlike way tell this Minister that he's doing a tremendous job and that everything is fine and that the Ministry of Labour is being run by the Minister precisely the way it should be, but I know what would happen if I did do that, Sir. In the first place I wouldn't be doing my job as a member of the opposition; in the second place I wouldn't be telling the truth from the point of view of many persons connected from one perspective or another with the industrial relations field; but in the third place, what would happen, Sir - and we've had this experience over and over and over again - is that that government, those front benches would take advantage of the remarks that I made, would turn them back upon me and upon my

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) colleagues, and would do their darndest, Sir, to make us look like idiots. It happens every time. It happens every time, Sir, every time that we stand up on this side of the House and attempt to be statesmanlike and attempt to be gentlemanly and attempt to be honourable, that that position is exploited--and there's no reason why it shouldn't be exploited. There's no reason by opportunistic political animals why it shouldn't be exploited.

But I say to the Minister, don't expect me to come with garlands and roses and lay them at his feet. I may do that, I may do that at some informal non-partisan reception that members of the Legislature go to, but I won't do that in this Chamber because I know that somewhere down the line either he or one of his colleagues will use that a month hence or two months hence or one session hence or two sessions hence, and they'll try to nail us to the wall with that because you can't be gentlemanly and honourable with the members on the front bench opposite. I have experience from the situations that many of my colleagues have found themselves in, that you can't do that with this government, so I'm not going to stand up here and sing peons of praise to this particular Minister, not that he deserves them anyway, but should I want to say, "Well, Mr. Minister, I'm going to give you a chance." I'm not going to do it because I know that it would be used to the political disadvantage of the opposition.

Sir, I criticized the Minister this morning for what I said was being out of touch with the situation, having lost his grip in terms of some of the problems existing today in the industrial field. The Minister said he's getting old. I don't accept that as an excuse. In the first place I don't believe that the Minister is getting old; he's been around in my memory since time immemorial, I'm afraid he'll be around forever, and I'm not prepared to accept that he's getting old. I do suggest that he may be getting sloppy in his job.--(Interjection)--Well, my colleague from Lakeside has suggested that he's getting senile. I'm not prepared, not perhaps prepared to pass judgment on that assessment at the moment, but he certainly is getting sloppy and he certainly is out of touch and, Mr. Chairman, I want to give you tangible evidence of exchanges in this Chamber to support that view.

Mr. Chairman, on the 25th of February, of this month, I asked for an emergency debate in this Chamber on the situation surrounding the contract dispute between the City of Winnipeg Police and the City of Winnipeg. The Minister at that time in response to my argument in favour of the emergency debate, said that the matter didn't have the emergency of debate and that certain negotiations were under way at that time that assured that all aspects of the dispute were being attended to properly and propitiously.

The quotation from Hansard of that date is to the following effect, Mr. Speaker, and I'm quoting from that exchange. This is the Minister of Labour. He says, "I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the introduction of this motion may prejudice harmonious negotiations that are going on now at the present time between the City of Winnipeg and its officials and officials of the Winnipeg Police Association."

The next day, in answer to a question of mine relating to the fact that there had been no negotiations since February 20th, the Minister said, and I accepted, that, "I did not intend to mislead the House. I did not. I gave an honest expression of what I was made aware of, and apparently unfortunately the parties did not meet."

Well, Mr. Chairman, there is one area where, in charity and kindness, I simply say the Minister was out of touch. In a second area, Mr. Speaker, in a second area, Mr. Speaker, on February 12th, which was an earlier date, I was asking the Minister of Labour about the problems in the garment industry in the province and about the need for 1,000 workers to fill 1,000, approximately crucial jobs in that industry and the Minister said to me, and I'm quoting again from Hansard of that date, page 302; "The Minister of Labour has taken as a personal crusade to meet with the leaders of the garment industry, not only in the City of Winnipeg but outside as well, to see what steps might be taken in order to employ unemployed Manitobans in the garment industry, etc."

On March 6th, when I asked the Minister to what extent his personal crusade had paid off in delivery of qualified labour for the industry and for the openings in that industry, the Minister responded in the following fashion, Sir, on Page 1108 of Hansard, and again I quote: "My crusade so-called, Mr. Speaker, had nothing to do precisely with recruitment for individuals but an assessment of the situation prevailing in the garment industry to see whether or not we may have an opportunity of employing Manitobans in the garment industry after training, etc.--(Interjection)--"

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd)

The Minister asks me, is there anything wrong with that? Well, Mr. Chairman, there's nothing wrong with that except that it indicates that the present Minister for all his services to the Province of Manitoba in the past, is completely out of touch with the situations existing in these two critical areas at the present time. That's the only thing wrong with it. If we can afford a Minister who doesn't know what's going on, who isn't close enough to the situation to be able to give answers that don't have to be modified, refined and conditionalized the next day, then everything's fine. But I suggest that in two critical areas in this province's economy and in our society, the area of the police dispute and the area of the garment industry, that that's not good enough for the Minister to be able to give an answer on one day that is, because of his erroneous impression of what's going on, is totally off the mark and then to be able to get up three or four days later and modify it and change it and alter it to meet the failings of his own assessment of the situation.

I do not suggest that the Minister misled the House; I would not suggest that, knowing this Minister, although he did apparently make a statement to the press which was delivered in the form of a denial that he had misled the House and reported in that way, but I have never accused this Minister of misleading the House. What I accuse this Minister of is being unaware of what's going on, out of touch with the situation to the point where he has misled himself. --(Interjection)--I'm sorry, I didn't hear the Minister's aside.--(Interjection)--Well I must say, Mr. Speaker, that that has been given consideration. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that that has been given consideration in the Progressive Conservative caucus; that has been given consideration in the Progressive Conservative caucus that the Minister, because of his ineptness in handling, incompetence in handling the present critical situations be replaced. I have not moved that motion to date; I have no intention of moving it this afternoon, but I suggest to the Minister of Labour that it's not - you know, it hasn't only occurred to him and he's on his mettle, he's on his mettle and he's on his responsibility, he's on his mettle to deliver in these critical areas. So, you know, I wasn't surprised as I said, Mr. Chairman, about his response to my remarks. My remarks were not intended personally, they were intended to reflect upon the performance, the performance of a Minister in his ministry, the fulfillment of his role.

A MEMBER: Despite the fact he's an Anglican.

MR. SHERMAN: I think, Mr. Chairman, that that role and the fulfillment of it and the performance of it is seriously in question at the present time, and it's incumbent upon this Minister to answer responsibly to this opposition in this Legislature and this public, as to the extent to which he keeps himself fully informed in these areas. His answers to questions in the House would indicate that there is a breakdown in communications there and that there has been a lack of devotion on his part, devotion to the details of a problem, and I think he must answer for that and tell us, not in terms and not in answers that can be modified next week, but in terms and in answers that relate to the situation today what is going on and what he's doing about it.

Mr. Chairman, moving away for a moment from the degree to which the Minister has perhaps failed to keep himself informed of industrial affairs to another subject, I would like to touch briefly in the next minute or two on the Workmen's Compensation Act and the suggestions that the Minister has made in the House and outside the House that some amendments will be coming in in that area, I would like to ask him if he has taken into consideration the whole area of industrial safety and the whole area of responsibility for follow-through in industrial health factors and industrial safety conditions. I'm told by contacts in the Workmen's Compensation Board and in the general industrial field that to a very large degree when industrial accidents and disasters occur, that there is such a fragmentation of authority in the field of safety that it's almost impossible to have an efficient kind of assessment of the problem carried out and an efficient kind of solution introduced. I'm told that there are so many agencies under the Department of Labour who have a fragmentary responsibility in the field of industrial safety, in industrial accidents, that the right hand never knows what the left hand is doing, that different agencies don't know which ones are responsible, that no one knows who has the job of following through in certain areas and, as a consequence, things are left undone that should have been done, and not only that, many things are delayed beyond a reasonable limit of time in being brought to solution. There are, for example, situations in which the Minister's office has responsibility, the Labour Department itself has responsibility, the Fire Commissioner's

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) Office, for example, has responsibility and all these areas overlap to a certain extent in the same field of industrial safety and industrial accidents. The result is that in all too many cases, Mr. Chairman, there are tendencies to wait to see what other authoritative body might be acting in the given situation and, as a consequence, the kind of action that should be taken and the kind of responsibility that should be fixed goes into limbo and the situation remains unresolved.

I would ask the Minister and commend to him the urgency of looking into a kind of a rationalization of the sense of authority and responsibility in this field. I'm told, and I believe it's true, that there's no central authority to deal with industrial accidents and industrial safety. There's no central authority to look into specific situations and deal with them. And one of the most effective services that the Minister could perform is to introduce a series of regulations that would consolidate authority and responsibility in the industrial safety and industrial accident field. Sir, an example of the degree to which authority in this field is fragmented can be easily recognized from the following information, which comes to me from unimpeachable sources and with which I'm sure the Minister is already familiar, and we're looking at ensuring safe and healthful working conditions.

When we're looking, Sir, at ensuring safe and healthful working conditions, when we're looking at the problems of industrial safety and accidents and how to deal with them, consider the following extent and degree of fragmentation of authority and responsibility in the field. The Employment Safety Act and its regulations are administered by the Workmen's Compensation Board. There has been no resolution thus far as to the degree to which the term "safety" includes health and consideration of workers' health.

The Department of Labour is involved where there are potential hazards to employees relative to elevators and lifts, boilers, gas heating units and fire hazards. The Department of Labour is involved in technical and engineering matters in areas of safety. The Department of Health has been involved in occupational health as well as public health. The City of Winnipeg Health Department functions in areas of occupational health within its own geographical boundaries. The Department of Mines and Environment has responsibility in areas of mine safety and environmental problems which appear to include the occupational environment, and the Federal Department of Labour functions in occupational areas of safety and health within its jurisdiction. Wherever provincial services are provided, they are provided under agreement. This is just a cursory run-down, Mr. Chairman, on some of the fragmentation of responsibility and authority that exists in this field, and I see the Minister is nodding his head and I know that he agrees that a consolidation of authority is long overdue in this area, so that proper safety standards can be introduced, implemented and enforced, and that in the wake of industrial accidents proper remedial action, both from the point of view of the employee and the employer, can be taken. So this is an area quite apart from the area of industrial relations to which I've devoted some time up to this point, Mr. Chairman, that I want to direct the Minister's attention to and I wish to encourage his comments on.

I would hope that in the legislative amendments he's considering in the area of the Workmen's Compensation Act, that this field of industrial safety will be one of those that is accounted for and provided for. The people who are at the receiving end of Workmen's Compensation, the people who are at the contributing end of Workmen's Compensation, and the people who work in the field of the Workmen's Compensation Board itself are all mutually and equally concerned in this field, Sir.

In closing my remarks on this particular subject, I would like to say that I think the Workmen's Compensation Act has been well and ably administered by the Workmen's Compensation Board of this province, and that the members of the board under the chairman, Mr. Johnson, deserve the congratulations and the gratitude of the Legislative Assembly for the conscientious way in which they've administered the Act within the limitations that it imposes on them. I would hope that the Minister gives them the opportunity and the equipment with which to do a better job for industry and for labour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. HARVEY PATTERSON (Crescentwood): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was just glancing over the estimates of the Labour Department and I noticed quite a few improvements in the document that we have before us, and I would just like to suggest to the honourable members opposite that this is the type of social democracy that we've been looking for for some

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PATTERSON cont'd) number of years in the labour movement and it is coming about; it is slowly coming in. We don't expect the world to change overnight because I think after a hundred years of unprogressive government of the old line parties that it's only natural that we can be somewhat impatient with the progress of labour change, but in the last five years it has certainly been changing and changing rather quickly in some areas, and we're most pleased to see that.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside, I'm glad to hear that he finally defined his position in what he does for a livelihood in society, but somewhere on his farm I'm willing to bet anybody in this House that he has a little bull. But the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, he quite realistically admits that he's a rookie in the labour field, and we can appreciate that. I'm sure that the Conservative caucus must have had considerable difficulty picking a member to be their labour critic because as I look at the benches over yonder I don't really see a labour man in their fold, and I'm sure that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry was quite honoured to accept that challenge and I'm certainly glad to hear him say that he's looking forward to learning, and it was somewhat disappointing to me to hear him say that he would not call the opposite members gentlemen.

Well, you know, I think that's rather unfortunate because, you know, I consider the people opposite, even in a political sense, to be somewhat of a gentleman type and I'm certainly--I know the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, he played left wing on our hockey team so he's maybe coming around to our way of thinking slowly but surely and I'm glad to see that. But when talking about their caucus, possibly the Member for Gladstone would have been a logical pick for a member to represent labour from their caucus because he intimated to me that he can work 17 or 16 hours a day without batting an eye and still be prepared to hot to trot, you know, so I would suggest that the Honourable Member for Gladstone be the candidate next time around.--(Interjection)--Certainly. Any time.

I just want to--I get the impression that the members of the Conservative Party--and I have to really exclude the Liberal Party here because as I listen to the Honourable Member for Assiniboia I get the impression that in this field he's on our side. We won't have any problems in that regard so I think, as I listened to the Member for Fort Garry, we're going to have some problems in the labour field with the honourable gentleman opposite but I'm sure that we'll overcome them because he has said that he is willing to learn, he's a rookie, and he's open to suggestion, and I'm sure that the Honourable Minister of Labour will suffice in that manner.

I just want to say to the honourable members opposite that even though in your seats in the House you might be considered to be reactionary, but in your groups in society, and I'm sure that many of you have been in the halls of this . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of order. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: On a point of Conservative privilege, it's quite proper for the Honourable Member for Crescentwood to consider that in his opinion he considers us all reactionaries; I would not raise a question of House privilege. But I do raise a question of privilege when he states it as a fact that we are all reactionaries.

MR. PATTERSON: I accept the honourable member's interpretation of that. It's in my opinion and . . .

MR. ENNS: That's fine. That's your opinion and I accept that.

MR. PATTERSON: . . . you know in my judgment, and only from what I see in the practice that you are taking and the positions that you take in the House. As I was just going to say, I'm sure that some of you associate yourselves, frequent the Chambers of Commerce halls in the City of Winnipeg, and in that sense you may not be so reactionary as what you show in the House here, because I'm finding that the Chamber of Commerce is changing, the people in the Chamber of Commerce are changing and their ideas are changing, their aims and drives are changing, and I'm sure that in the not too distant future that we will be working more in harmony with that particular Chamber in the field of industrial relations. And I don't think that's too far away.

I'm sure that members opposite saw the big headlines a week or so ago concerning the election in Britain and I'm rather surprised that you've been awful quiet about that particular aspect of history. It's rather surprising too that the miners' strike is settled all of a sudden. The Labour Party has come to power in Britain and within a matter of days they have settled a very serious industrial dispute. Now I'm suggesting to the members opposite that you belong

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PATTERSON cont'd) to that type of political philosophy in our society and your counterpart in Britain could not, would not, or did not wish to have anything to do with that particular settlement in Britain. He wanted to make--(Interjection)--He wanted to make the miners . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. Order please. Order please.

MR. PATTERSON: He wanted to make the miners suffer. He wanted to depress the miners, keep the workers in their place. That is the philosophy that I don't agree with. Always under--(Interjection)--Well I--No, I don't mind that; that's his privilege. Honourable Chairman, just keep track of those minutes that they take away from me because . . . The Honourable Member for Lakeside apparently doesn't like to hear a progressive type of policy coming about anywhere in the world, but the labour critic of the Conservative Party I notice he's not up on his heels because he's the more realistic person, I can see that now, and he understands those type of things.

I just want to get back on that particular settlement in Britain. All of a sudden it came about when Harold Wilson took power, and I think that it's only fair that the miners in Britain should get the type of settlement that they got, because the miners - and I don't care where they are in this world - if they aren't entitled to the highest rate of pay going then nobody is, and I don't think anybody would question that. Anybody having worked in the mines would certainly know that.

But what really got me in that particular dispute in Britain was that the Conservative Party - and I would take it that it could happen here too - that the question arose: who rules? The government or the people? That was the question that they put before the people and to me that wasn't a fair position to put before the people, because in a democracy there is only one segment of society rules and that is the people. They rule by the power of the ballot and the Conservatives have all of a sudden learned that, that in Britain the people rule. Not the unions, not the government or anybody else, but the people, and they proved it in the ballot boxes. So I would suggest to the honourable members of the Conservative Party in Manitoba that they take a lesson from their counterparts in Great Britain because that same thing could happen anywhere in the world and maybe right here.

There's been much talk about the supposedly - supposedly - there's no police strike yet in Winnipeg and I don't know if it's even contemplated by one side or the other, but there has been the overtones that all of a sudden the police are on strike. But I'm in agreement with our Honourable Minister in this regard, that we have a responsible police force in Winnipeg, one of the best in Canada if not the world, and by giving them the right to strike didn't make them any more, didn't make them any more or less responsible, and by giving them the right to strike doesn't mean to say that they will go on strike, and by having the right to strike in legislation doesn't promote or work against people going on strike because there is no law in this world that will stop people from resigning from their job, resigning in ones and twos or mass resignation, and this could become a more valid thing in the future. So just by insinuating that this government has given the police the right to strike all of a sudden puts our police force on strike, is a very wrong interpretation to take from the legislation and I would hope that the honourable members opposite would be fair in their criticism of that particular piece of legislation because it's not coming across very true at this time.

The right to strike in a free society should only be a real purpose in life; it has to be inherent in our type of society. Whether it's in legislation or not is really not that material, but by the mere fact that it is in legislation shows that we are a progressive type of society with democratic rules and democratic processes. So I would never argue with the right to strike, and it's not always used as a weapon to defeat somebody or to cause violence in society. It is the last recourse in any industrial dispute and many times the workers do not want to go on strike but, through the process of collective bargaining, they have no other choice. Management have forced--there have been many cases where management have forced a strike upon the workers. So I wouldn't quarrel too much with that and I hope the honourable members opposite would be fair in their argument on the right to strike.

Now the Honourable Member for Fort Garry made a little bit of criticism about the conscience clause in our new Labour Code. Well, it's really not a valid point to make because it's been of no consequence. The Honourable Minister of Labour has said that there were only four cases to his knowledge. The Manitoba Federation of Labour supported that particular clause

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PATTERSON cont'd) when it came before the Industrial Relations Committee, and we can't see any real criticism concerning that particular aspect of our Labour Code as it is today because the number of cases are so small that it isn't hardly even worth mentioning.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry criticized somewhat of the unemployment rate in Manitoba, 4.9 percent. Well, consistently, Manitoba over the past year or so has been below the national average, well below the national average, and sometimes we've been the lowest in Canada and the off time Saskatchewan has been slightly lower than us. But there is two provinces where social democracy is the government of the day where the trend of getting people back on the job is the job of the government, and Saskatchewan sometimes has been a little better than we have in that regard but I think that the Manitoba Government and the Honourable Minister of Labour have been very cognizant of the employment factor in Manitoba and have been leaving no stones unturned to get the people of Manitoba on the job and working, and to us in the labour movement that is most important, and if there isn't anything else that we appreciate we appreciate that because that's what it's all about.

Workmen's Compensation. The Honourable Minister of Labour is very aware of some of the deficiencies that we have in our Workmen's Compensation Act, but once again you can't bring about all the changes overnight and he's been working at it over a five year period, and in the labour movement we're hopeful and we feel rather confident that he's going to bring in some very modern and up-to-date changes this time round and, knowing the Honourable Minister of Labour, he won't disappoint us in that regard and I'm sure that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry will be standing up and complimenting him then, what he said he wouldn't do, but I think he will then. If he doesn't, well then I'll be most disappointed because when you expect something to come in and it comes in I'll expect you to be gentleman enough to get up and admit that this is what you wanted, that this is good, that this is what Labour has been looking for. So I'll be listening to those remarks very closely.

The safety legislation in Manitoba has finally been getting off the ground. It's only in the last three or four years that we've had the accident prevention department of the Workmen's Compensation Board set away from the rest of the compensation in order that they could do the job that is necessary in the labour field; and we have a long way to go in that area yet. Saskatchewan is somewhat ahead of us in that area but we are going to catch up, we are going to start doing the job in that area that the labour movement is expecting us to do, and this Minister of Labour should be able to see those things become valid before he takes the course that the honourable member has suggested, that he retire or he gets old and dilapidated or whatever, and he looks in pretty good health yet and he still sounds pretty vociferous so there's no chance of him falling down on the job in the near future. I would suggest that the Honourable Member for Lakeside could see him around for ten years or so yet.

But, you know, we have to remind the Minister of Labour that there are some shortcomings in our compensation law and he's aware of that. He's aware of that. He's sympathetic. Well I think he will; he's a very honest man. We have found him to be rather easy to get along with, but like I said, when you have to change a hundred years of work in five years it just doesn't happen that quickly. I think it was the Honourable Member for Assiniboia mentioned back pensions and this is one area that I know that our government has real concern in and we are looking for some good improvements in that area, so hopefully that is going to be the case.

The position of the Manitoba Federation of Labour coincides with the Member of Assiniboia where the ceiling should come off completely, but that is a large step to take in the compensation field and if it doesn't come off at this particular time, then we won't be complaining all that loudly because we are willing to do things in stages. But I just wonder if it did come off, if it did, what would the members opposite say then? Would they be up complaining that the ceiling came off? Would their supporters in the catacombs some place be telling them to get back into the House and don't let that Minister of Labour do what he's going to do because it's just going to break us. You know, this is what I'm scared of. This is what I'm scared of.

MR. MOUG: A by-election in Crescentwood is what you are afraid of.

MR. PATTERSON: Now, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry I hope will not--I didn't hear him, Bill, so - or Mr. Chairman - but the honourable member--Mr. Chairman, I heard that one but they'll have to forgive us; you know, we both work for the railroad and the same railroad too. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry, I hope that when we bring in those type of improvements to the Compensation Act that he'll be up there supporting, that he won't be up

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PATTERSON cont'd) there criticising. I hope he doesn't listen to the rest of the members of his caucus because I get the feeling that all of a sudden they are not so anxious to move forward as what he is. Maybe he's the most progressive one they've got in that caucus. I haven't really had the feeling yet which one is there but I'm sure that he's coming along and I understand he has some experience in Ottawa so maybe that has some influence on his progressiveness, and hopefully that will ring through in the not too distant future.

The Minister of Labour is well aware of the pensions for our widows and children and he did considerable the last time around in improving their situation, and hopefully we can look for a little more improvement in that area, if nothing else, just to keep up with the times.

There was some concern about the pre-existing conditions; some of the wording in the last Compensation Act just wasn't what the federation thought it should be. We've made the Minister aware of that and he has promised to rectify some of that particular wording in order that pre-existing conditions could be well looked after. So in the Compensation Act, I would think that we can look forward to quite a bit, quite a bit of improvement, and hopefully that you won't have to wait too long for that and I just want to emphasize that when those benefits do come in - and let's assume they are going to be vast improvements - that the members opposite will not criticize those improvements, because you cannot stand here and criticize the Minister of Labour today and tell him that he should be doing this and he should be doing that, and then a month or so later criticize him for doing exactly what you had hoped or suggested he would do and criticize him for not doing it at this time. So I hope that you don't take a turn-around like that.

I find that in my experience in life that the Conservative Party has been generally opposed to unions, because whenever we want to organize, whenever we want to get forward in our aims and desires of life, we seem to run into the Conservative Party opposing us at various stages along the way, and not only--well I don't know what's behind the scenes but the supporters of the Conservative Party always seem to be there to oppose the progressive movement of the Labour Movement, so how do we get around that particular type of thing? This is what brought the Labour Unions into progressive politics, into supporting progressive politics. Now in order to get the type of things that we wanted, we had to pick a political party that was more sympathetic to the aims and desires of labour, and we found that the Conservative Party in the main was not the party that we were looking for in that area, so we had to support the New Democratic Party in order to bring in the types of progressive legislation that we had advocated over the years.--(Interjections)--

Well whatever interpretations the opposition members want to put on that, that's their privilege, but I'm talking in the main, you'll never get 100 percent of everything so you have to take what's in the mainstream and try to do the best you can with it. And that's what we found in the Labour Movement, that you take the best of what you have and make progress from there, and we're certainly looking for more progress in the future and we're sure--our history has shown us that this is the party that will do it, not the Conservative Party.

Now, you know it's odd up to this time in history and I don't know if it will change in the future or not, but the Conservative Party never invited us to their convention; we never get credentials or applications to register to their convention, so how--(Interjections)--But I'm just pointing that out to the members and I don't think the money is the real criteria for this thing but--(Interjections)--

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order. Order please. Are the honourable members going to desist and let the honourable member who is now speaking continue, or are you going to have a confab? You sound like a gaggle of geese. The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. PATTERSON: Keep track of the time, Brother Chairman, that's all I request. They've got to have their say too and I appreciate that.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, for clarification, did he say Brother Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I think that the honourable member slipped into a union term which is quite understandable. The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, I could have used comrade too--no - because, but not in the connotation that the honourable members opposite think, because I'm sure, I'm sure that some of you must belong to the Army, Navy, Air Force . . . or legion or what have you, and in those organizations, we refer to comrades, so in that connotation comrade is not what the members opposite think it is, but I suppose they see comrade with

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PATTERSON cont'd) a red capital C or something and why they always get that-- but, well, I think the members have the message now why they find the labour movement aligning themselves--twenty minutes, brother?

I'm just looking at brother chairman. He puts up--Now I just want to say a few words about the garment industry, because the Honourable Member for Fort Garry zeroed in on this quite heavily and he accused the Honourable Minister of gambling with the garment industry in Manitoba. Well I think that is a wrong term to use, "gambling with the garment industry in Manitoba," because it seems to me that he should have been saying that the garment industry was gambling with the employees of the garment industry in Manitoba. This would be a more . . . interpretation. He indicated that we have 9,000 people working in the garment industry and he also suggested that we should bring in more workers into the garment industry. Well, when you have the type of so-called labour shortage in the garment industry that we have, you are not going to fill that vacancy by bringing in unexperienced workers from anywhere, from anywhere in the world, whether it be from Saskatchewan or whether it be from Portugal, because it takes time for the people to adapt themselves to the environment of Manitoba, it takes time for them to train. I wonder what the honourable members opposite would say if we all of a sudden decided that we had a shortage of farmers in Manitoba and we wanted to bring in a bunch of farmers. What if we brought in a bunch of farmers from China. You know, they would all come in here and set up their farms and work in competition with the farmers that we have, and that might not be so good. But bringing in garment workers into the garment industry, and I must say this just in passing, that the minimum wage in Manitoba certainly has progressed under the present government and we are looking for further progression in the minimum wage.

Now let's go back a few years. I'm just wondering if the honourable members opposite will support an increase in the minimum wage in Manitoba. I will be interested to hear them talk on that when that happens, because that is the criteria that is going to determine whether they are for labour like they are trying to pretend they're for labour. This is where we're going to see the true blood run, and the Honourable Member for Fort Garry is going to have to do some pretty fast talking when that comes into the House.

Now a few years ago the minimum wage in Manitoba was in the 60, 70 cents an hour range. Now the minimum wage has increased and you are still complaining that we shouldn't increase the minimum wage more. You know, even when the minimum wage was 60, 70 cents an hour, the honourable members in that party were saying that we have a shortage of workers in the garment industry. What are they saying today with the minimum wage where it is? They're still saying we have a shortage of workers in the garment industry, so you cannot satisfy them. The Honourable Minister of Labour, I don't care if he stands on his head and shouts to the rooftops, he will not satisfy the members opposite, so all I suggest to the Honourable Minister of Labour is, do your thing and . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The honourable member's time has expired. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you don't take offence if I just call you Mr. Chairman and not comrade or brother. I would be disposed to call you either of those terms because you are indeed my brother, fellow man, and I respect you as such, but I think I'll continue calling you Mr. Chairman, if you don't mind.

On the heels of the remarks just made by the Member from Crescentwood, and he of course highlights in his remarks probably the main criticism that the gentleman from Fort Garry has of the Minister of Labour, and highlights the one-sidedness and the total, really, inability of the present Minister of Labour to acknowledge his responsibility in this portfolio, when the Member for Crescentwood said that when we, on this side, you know, agree with certain specific labour measures, minimum wage or otherwise, that's when we will demonstrate our true concern for labour in this province. I think I was not unfair to the Honourable Member for Crescentwood in paraphrasing his remarks in this way but it does, Mr. Chairman, point out that massive gulf of ignorance and stupidity on the other side, you know, and it points out the hypocrisy of the Minister of Labour when he suggests that members on this side, like the Member for Fort Garry, have limited knowledge in discussing the question of labour. You see, they, as we've experienced before in this House, accept that if what you know constitutes everything that is to be known about a subject, that nothing else counts. So the Minister of Labour, because he happens to have a long and illustrious career in labour - not in management

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. ENNS cont'd) but in labour - and if the Member from Crescentwood has a long and illustrious career in labour, that that constitutes all there is to know about labour. And so don't have the Minister of Labour stand up here and talk to us about some sanctimonious crap, that he has any indication, any concern, any worry about bringing about harmonious labour-management agreement, because he's only talking about half of the coin. And it's because most of us on this side of the House do our own labour, as I do every morning, in my overalls and feed 500 cattle, and that if some of us have some insight as to the management side of labour, then at least give us the courtesy, Sir, at least give us the courtesy to at least acknowledge that if you had a desire and a belief that there are the two sides to bringing about a harmonious management-labour situation, that those two sides consist of management and of labour. And if you can't point out to one of us who have had 15 or 20 or 30 years of union service, who haven't come up through the ranks of union service, then don't chastise us and don't talk to us about not having any concern or any recognition about the importance of precisely the things that you, Sir, Mr. Minister, talked to us that is important about labour-management harmonious agreements.

Now the Minister, Mr. Chairman, shakes his head and acknowledges that there are, that there are those two sides of the point. I just want to, Mr. Chairman, make that point. Yes, Mr. Chairman, he can. He can look at us on this side of the House. He can look at the Member for Swan River who has worked many years as a public servant in the RCMP, who started up his business and ran a small newspaper business in the Swan River Valley; he can look at the Member for Charleswood who if need be will crawl down his own trench and fix up a cave-in or something like that as a one operator, one small man contractor; he can look at the Member from La Verendrye as a single employer hoping to employ certain people; he can look at the Member for Sturgeon Creek as a manufacturer's agent working out of his home with the help of his wife and his family to try to do business in this province; he can look at the Member for Fort Garry doing likewise; he can look at the Member from Gladstone who feeds his cattle every morning, as we do. But we have no understanding of labour. We have no understanding. We have to look to the teachers, the professors, the lawyers on that side to have some understanding about what it means to get our hands dirty and to make things tick in this country. And most of us, and most of us are not represented by capable people like the Member for Crescentwood, organized labour. We fight and work hard for our position in life and we have some right to believe that the Minister of Labour of this province should also be concerned about us. Should also be concerned about us. Not just, Sir, those union minions, those fellows that march in with their nickels and dimes and support him at a NDP convention.

SOME MEMBERS: Right. Hear, hear.

MR. ENNS: And I ask him, Sir, and I ask him, Sir, is that his concept of his responsibility in the portfolio of Labour in this province?

A MEMBER: The answer is yes.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, I make those remarks because, you know, we get a little tired, we get a little tired of this, you know--The Minister of Agriculture who is not in his seat, but it's been presented to us that we put on, we have put on a kind of a big lie approach, that if you repeat something often enough and if it's unfalse often enough, then people will believe it. Well, Sir, we have suffered, the Conservative Party has suffered, specifically, under the big lie approach that has been perpetuated by the Members of the New Democratic Party, that somehow, somehow, oblivious to the fact, to the actual representation in this Chamber, just look at the representation in this Chamber, and then I ask you, Mr. Chairman, in your objective, Sir, judgment of the matter, whether or not we do not represent as many working people, as many honest working people in this province, as they lay claim to represent. Mr. Chairman, let that be put on the record.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do have some specific remarks to direct to the Honourable Minister of Labour and I would ask him to consider these remarks. For instance, early on in his comments this morning he took great pride, took great pride in telling us that La Belle Province Quebec was about to follow the lead of His Worship the Honourable Minister of Labour in new labour legislation. Well, now, I wonder if he was aware that only this morning, Senator Lapointe from Quebec was putting forward a position that they were going to press the Federal Government to change the immigration laws to provide for people to come into this country that were willing to work in those areas where Canadians were not willing to work.

SUPPLY - LABOUR

MR. PAULLEY: That's right, where Canadians were not . . .

MR. ENNS: Right. Right. Well now, he indicates, he indicates an awareness of that fact. He should also be aware of the fact, he should also be aware of the fact that for instance when there was a little bit of a labour problem with the doctors of this province, what did his colleague the Minister of Health do? He ran off to find somebody else that would do the job. To Ontario or to bring in foreign doctors. But we can't make that same consideration for the garment industry or for anybody else.--(Interjection)--Well now, Mr. Chairman, I'm not talking about--I'm talking in broad general principles. I would like to know, I want the Minister to answer why he thinks it is quite proper for the government to go abroad, to go to Malaysia, to go to Ontario, to go elsewhere to find doctors to come and work in this province if our own doctors aren't prepared to work under certain circumstances laid down by this government, but he finds it so completely incompatible if industry asks for similar reasons. Indeed if the Province of Quebec asks for these reasons, as has been asked by the Senator Lapointe--(Interjection)--Mr. Chairman, against the good advice of my colleague, my colleague, the Member from Morris, who's always warned me not to give these fellows an inch, I will and do respect any time a Minister of the Crown stands up and wants to ask a question.

. continued on next page

SUPPLY - LABOUR

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to my honourable friend there is a great difference between the two propositions. One, if the doctors went out in strike the well-being of the people of Manitoba may be sacrificed. If there isn't an increase in the production in the garment industry because of the importation of people, private enterprise would be adversely affected but not the people of the Province of Manitoba. There's a great difference.

MR. ENNS: But, Mr. Chairman, if the railway goes out on strike, if the railway goes on strike and the income of the farmers of this province as a result, and as a result of that strike a thousand, two thousand dollars is lost to every farm family in this province, that is not of concern to the Minister of Labour, that is not of concern to labour. I'll tell you how hypocritical this Minister is, I'll tell you how hypocritical he is. The fact of the matter is the doctors happen to be the fat cats in this society. Who in hell gives a damn about the doctors? They make \$40,000 a year. So that's the question. There is no principle involved here. There is no principle involved here. You're prepared to take away three or four thousand dollars from a family that only earns \$7,000. That is the farmers who can't ship their grain as a result of rail strikes. And not once stand up as Minister of Labour and make an objection about the rail strike. But, if you're talking about doctors, if you're talking about doctors who are considered to be the fat cats in our society then the Minister of Labour takes a different position. Then the Minister . . . --(Interjection)--

Well, now, Mr. Chairman, I only want to make it clear and put it on the public record that the Minister of Labour considers a possible, not even an actual, but just a possible, you know, threat of withdrawal by the doctors of this province, as being a major threat to our society. That he considers to be paramount. An actual withdrawal of labour that has cost the farm community of this province thousands upon thousands of dollars, that he considers to be a matter to be settled in due course of negotiated bargaining agreements. Not important, not one to be considered, you know, as being paramount that government should step in and seek foreign help. --(Interjection)--

Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared, Mr. Chairman, I'm quite prepared to have that statement be left on the record. I'm prepared to go back to my farmers, to Woodlands, to W., who have been asked by the Wheat Board, by other government agencies to deliver grain but can't, and are trying to deliver grain and can't deliver grain because there are no boxcars there for them.

A MEMBER: And the elevators are plugged.

MR. ENNS: The elevators are plugged. And we know that if we can't deliver the grain now we will probably take a 50 percent drop in the price of grain by the time we finally get the grain. But that's of no concern to people like the Member for Crescentwood, you know, who have the protection of organized labour, who know they can always get their 8, 10 percent plus their inflationary rate in the economy. It's only the independent, private, those few of us who are left, that concern ourselves about these matters. And I'm suggesting, Mr. Chairman, really, that a real statesman like the Minister of Labour in this province would also concern himself about these instances, would also concern himself about these instances.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me turn to another point, and really I'm appealing to the Minister of Labour because you know there has been occasions where he has been a reasonable man. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I would have to say that in this session in general he has put forward a more reasonable position and acted in a manner of decorum that some of us veterans are surprised at. We may have been forgiven to believe, Sir, that he is maybe approaching old age and that he is mellowing in his approach.

But I now want to at least solicit from him, you know, the kind of straightforward talking that I know I've had the privilege of enjoying when I've talked to him privately and maybe we can extend that to an exchange across the House. I want him now as the Minister of Labour to tell me, with his high respect for the processes of bargaining, of you know, different groups coming together and making their arrangement without government interference, having that arrangement stand. But I want him at least to tell me, Sir, I've been searching for this question. And I represent, as do some other members particularly on this side and some on that side represent, we represent a group of workers, labourers if you want to call them that, who have agreed to a contract, we have agreed to a contract that's going to

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . last for three years. Now that's not unknown in the labour field. I know the tendency is as the Member for Crescentwood has indicated on a TV program not all that long ago, that the tendency is to shorter contracts, one year contracts, but, Sir, we in the boondocks of rural Manitoba we're a little slow in these matters. We have agreed, Sir, to a contract of three years to sell our labour at a certain price. Now as the Minister of Labour I want to appeal to you. Would you not think it proper that we knew what we sold our labour for - tell the hog producers of this province what we have agreed to sell our hogs for for the next three years? We're going to work, we're gonna work on the farms, we're feeding them, we're paying high money for the feed and the money is getting higher and higher and we don't know what the hell we're selling them for?

MR. PAULLEY: Would you like an answer now?

MR. ENNS: Yes, please. Please. Oh, I'll sit down so fast.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm so happy that my honourable friend gives me an opportunity to reply to him in his comparison between a three-year contract in the end result of a product that is produced by the application of labour to facilities that are available. Now then, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to you, and this is so indicative of the position of the Conservative party when they're talking about union contracts and when they're talking about three-year agreements. When a three-year agreement is entered into between the labour force and management it's dealing with the situation, the conditions under which the employer works for the employer and then the end result is that the disposal, the disposal of what is produced is the responsibility of management. There is the difference, Mr. Chairman, between the points --(Interjection)-- Just a minute you asked me, you gave me license to answer you and I am answering you. You don't like the answer I'm sure, but when we get into the question of a three-year agreement between management and labour insofar as working conditions are concerned, that agreement has nothing to do with the disposal of the end result of the application of labour to the --(Oh quiet)-- to the basic commodities that are involved.

Now my honourable friend is attempting in this debate --(Interjection)-- What's the selling price? The selling price of the commodity is that of management, and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, despite the lack of knowledgability of the labour movement and how the labour movement operates, how contracts are entered into between management and labour, my honourable friends opposite so lack the knowledge of the purpose of things. My honourable friend the Member for Lakeside attempted, by raising this to introduce into the Estimates of the Department of Labour something that is extraneous. A contract entered into between management say for instance in the garment industry for the sale of goods after a collective agreement has been entered into is one thing. The matter that my honourable friend has attempted to raise in this particular instance has no relationship at all. It is the responsibility, in the end result, for those who obtain or have control of the productivity to sell for the best price that they can obtain, and there is no relationship at all to a collective agreement in the normal sense. If my honourable friend cannot understand that, Mr. Chairman, I can fully understand why it is that my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry and all of his colleagues opposite don't know the first damn foundation of the principles of collective agreements. (Applause)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order. ORDER!

A MEMBER: It is now abundantly clear how stupid. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, ORDER. I know that the Honourable Member for Lakeside can speak loud but I don't want to not to be able to hear him. I can't hear him for the amount of shouting that is going on. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, never before have I realized the profound effect that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry has an influence on the Minister of Labour. Sir, from time to time the Honourable Member for Fort Garry who with his good understanding and knowledge of the English language has sometimes been able to befuddle this House with saying a great deal and with some of us not always understanding what he said. Now it's too obvious that the Minister of Labour has learned the technique from the Member for Fort Garry and he has responded to me in a manner and way in which has left us all completely baffled.

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

I have not asked him, Mr. Chairman, for instance to reveal the price of pork that is currently being sold in Japan, because after all that is a big state secret and I realize that he is not in the inner Cabinet. I realize that he is not part of the Max Hofford, Minister of Agriculture crowd that would know that. I am only asking him, I am only asking him in the course of a general discussion on the Estimates, on the Minister of Labour's salary to ask him the broader question, the broader question, because Sir, I do maintain, I do maintain that the very labour legislation that he is responsible for, that he takes great pride for, having passed this House, that there is a sister piece of legislation called the Natural Products Marketing Act passed by this Legislature, which provides the primary producers, the farmers of this province, to do much the same as organized labour; to organize into groups so that they can collectively bring about a better bargaining position for themselves. They have done this, but I'm asking him, I am asking him in his great experience as Minister of Labour, can he recall - and if he can't maybe the Member for Crescentwood can help me - can recall where and when a commodity group, or an organized labour group - and let's understand there is no differentiation there. When I say a commodity group I'm talking about a group of farmers - hog producers, broiler producers, egg producers, honey producers, turkey producers. And if you want to change that into labour terms, I'm talking about organized labour, steelworkers, railroad workers, something like that. I'm asking him whether in his memory - and, Mr. Chairman, I go a step further, in his living memory - there is a difference - in his living memory, can he recall, can he recall in his vast experience that he likes to lord over us where a situation arose where he was party to, or would have been party to, suggesting to his workmen that they accept a three-year agreement and work under that agreement, not know what they were going to get paid, but accept the blandishment of the powers to be that when the three years are over, you'll get a bonus or it will be a good deal. Will you do it? Would anybody in organized labour . . . I really now have to ignore the Minister of Labour and look at somebody that is responsible in labour, the Member for Crescentwood - the Member from Crescentwood, I ask him right now, would any organized labour man in the Province of Manitoba, indeed in this country, accept a three-year working agreement and not know what the terms contained? Now if there's any integrity - I have some respect for the Honourable Member from Crescentwood because he is a reasonably good hockey player and I hope to play hockey with him again, and up to now, aside from the kind of obvious you know, taken up enthusiasm of the NDP cause, he has by and large tried to be reasonably straightforward and truthful in this Chamber. And I want him to stand up in this House and tell me that I am wrong, that I am wrong, that he can tell me, he can stand up and represent me, that he knows of a labour organization that accepted a three-year contract and not knew what the terms contained. Now I'll sit down. I'll sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Honourable Member for Lakeside you know, he puts me in the position of where I don't know what he's talking about on the hog market contracts, but I can answer the question that he asked me, but he must not compare it with the hog marketing contract because I don't know that. I don't know that honourable member. But when he asked me the point blank question, my answer is a clear no.

MR. ENNS: I want to thank the Honourable Member for Crescentwood for one of the first straightforward answers that we have had in this House. And I will now leave this subject because it is obviously something that maybe should be taken up with the Human Rights Commission, Mr. Chairman, because he has now indicated that no organized labour man would accept that kind of contract, and I don't blame them for not accepting that kind of contract. I think it's preposterous. You know the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose took us back to the 14th, 15th century; that's just about where his Minister of Agriculture took his hog producers down to, because we now have it at least from a reputable member of organized labour that says that no organized labour man would accept that kind of contract.

Now I just want to raise this point Mr. Speaker, because I have been waiting to raise this point with the Honourable Minister of Labour, because you know, I do attempt to expand his office, I do attempt to acknowledge and to pay him the deference as the Minister of Labour of this province, and that includes a great deal more than simply being the mouthpiece for organized labour and particularly those labour unions that support the NDP party. You have a

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . . bigger responsibility, Sir, you have a responsibility to the unorganized labour in rural Manitoba, you have the responsibility of those who work in industries that are not organized. And I don't fault you, Sir, for working toward greater organization because I believe, as you believe, that the workingman's conditions can best be improved through organization and through the bargaining process. But, Sir, you cannot close your eyes to half of the Manitobans that work under unorganized conditions and not worry about their conditions that they work under. I think it's more than half. I think it's one-third. I think it's more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . direct his remarks to the chair and not engage in statements with other members.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I recognize that the Honourable Minister of Labour he feels that he has - you know I think the Member for Fort Garry put it correctly when called upon to make a correction about whether or not he ever criticized the Minister of Labour for the brevity of his remarks and he arose to correct the Honourable Minister and suggested no, that was never his intention. He did criticize him for his smugness and for his arrogance with respect to labour, and Sir, that is self-apparent. The fact of the matter that the Honourable Minister of Labour happens to be one who has carried a union card longer than most of us on this side --(Interjection)-- Yes I've had the honour. I have been a member of the United Steelworkers of America. That same union that now represents the Civil Service of this province --(Interjection)--

And Sir, - now I would not even have thought about that, but the Honourable Minister of Labour now leads me on to the other particular point that I wanted to bring to his attention, and I do so because the latitude afforded us in the debate on the Minister's Salary is such that is singular, and I ask him, I ask him now, Mr. Chairman, whether or not, whether or not he does not see it, whether or not he does not see a possible conflict that could arise should an organized labour group that represents the civil servants of this province, at the same time be a group that financially supports the government of this province?

A MEMBER: Do you want the answer?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm asking these questions, I'm sure the Minister will take mental note of these questions and will consider his reply. Mr. Chairman, you know, I would sincerely ask him whether or not he would want those two honourable gentlemen in front of him to be bound to pay to help him win the next election? Does he sincerely want that? But, Mr. Chairman, that's the honourable minister of finance, you know in his - this is the casual offhand manner in which this government shrugs away three, four hundred years of traditional parliamentary you know, civil service procedure. You know. The fact of the matter is that that is happening, and the fact of the matter that concerns me is that nobody gives a damn. That nobody seems to concern themselves about the ethics that are involved.

Well, Mr. Chairman I would like the Honourable Minister, I would like the Honourable Minister to tell me what kind of relationship he envisages, what kind of morale he envisages in the Civil Service, once every civil servant in this province has to pay his dollars and cents to his election - not to mine, not to his, but to his, because . . . that wants to represent. .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. Order please. The honourable member's time has expired, I'm sorry. The Honourable Member have leave.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, not to abuse leave, if I have but a few minutes. But, Sir, really . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the honourable member - there seemed to be some doubt in the House. Does the Honourable Member have leave?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside. Order please. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am very pleased to rise on the Minister's Estimates and his salary. I was in the caucus room about 15 or 20 minutes ago when one of my colleagues came in and he said to me, the Member from Crescentwood is standing up making very good sense on labour legislation in his speech and when I came in I must say that part of the time when I was here, Sir, that he was making very good sense, but then he kind of deviated a little bit to the point where I really couldn't, really couldn't agree with him. But I will say this, the fact that he was able to discuss labour conditions and problems in the Province of Manitoba, as I was told he was, that certainly, possibly

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . . we have the basis of a Minister of Labour who could be talked to and discussed with, with an open mind much more than we have at the present time a Minister of Labour who firmly believes that because he happened to be a member of a union and has been a member all his life, that nobody else knows anything. So maybe, Mr. Chairman, we have the basis of a much better Minister of Labour in the Member from Crescentwood and I would say that that could happen. The only one thing that I would say in the comments of the - when he corrected the Member from Lakeside, he said, don't confuse, please don't confuse labour legislation and labour with the Hog Marketing Board when we were saying would you like a three-year contract that you don't have, that nobody knows anything about, I guess I would say this. That if the Member from Crescentwood can get an answer from the Minister of Agriculture, which we haven't been able to get, and the present Minister of Labour hasn't been able to get, and the Member for Crescentwood would make it his business to find out what that agreement is, that maybe he, instead of the Minister of Labour, and instead of the Minister of Agriculture, you can get up and tell us. Maybe they'll tell you. Maybe, Mr. Chairman, they'll tell the Minister of Crescentwood, because they've told nobody else and the Minister of Labour really hasn't cared. So when the Member for Crescentwood makes the statement that "don't confuse it because I don't know anything about it," I would charge him, Mr. Chairman, to find out something about it and maybe tomorrow or the next day when we're on these estimates of labour, that he can get up and tell us what, what the Minister of Agriculture has done regarding the agreement of selling hogs in Manitoba. And if he can do that, Sir. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I know that the Minister's Salary is a point where there is tremendous latitude, but we seem to be coming back to the Hog Marketing Board and I am beginning to find out that I can't really understand what that portion has to do with the Department of Labour, so I think the honourable member should try and stick to the Department.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, the only reason I got onto it is because what the Member from Crescentwood states, that he didn't know when he was talking to the Member from Lakeside, and the only reason I thought we were really involved with the Hog Marketing Board is because we had the best statements from the Minister of Labour that we have heard in five years, and that was Oink, Oink, all the time that the Member from Lakeside was speaking.

So, Mr. Chairman, if I happen to be getting into the Hog Marketing Board it's because the Minister of Labour decided during this discussion to become a pig and yell Oink, Oink, all the time that somebody was talking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . made a remark that he should reflect upon-

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, . . . you, Sir, do you want me to repeat something

MR. CHAIRMAN: No I'm not asking you to repeat, I heard what the honourable member said and I think he should reflect upon it and perhaps consider withdrawing that remark.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . that the honourable member referred to me as a pig, then I would respectfully suggest that he should withdraw that. I don't mind being called a pig outside of the House by my honourable friend who may not have any affection for me, but I don't think that the record should go without me challenging the remark of my honourable friend from Sturgeon Creek. And if he did in effect say that, and I believe he did, I appeal to my honourable friend, or I ask my honourable friend, it's not an appeal at all, I think my honourable friend should withdraw that remark.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I'd be only too happy to withdraw the remark that I said he acted like a pig. I wouldn't like to say that he acted like a pig or sounded like a pig, I could possibly say that he sounded like a bit of a "bore", and that's all that I can say on that particular subject.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm going to ask you, Mr. Chairman, whether or not the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek is not compounding the felony by the same referral, I do suggest that during the time that the Honourable Member for Lakeside and I was having a little jovial exchange, I did say Oink, Oink, but I wasn't referring --(Interjection)-- that's right, that's right Mr. Chairman, I did, but I did not refer to my honourable friend and member of this Assembly, the Member for Lakeside as a pig or a boar and I suggest to my --(Oh you be quiet)

SUPPLY - LABOUR

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). . .-- I suggest --(Interjection)-- I bore you, you damn right, and I'm gonna bore you more before this session is over, and I'm not going to suggest to you how you're going to get bored. But anyway, Mr. Chairman, beside that point, I do not think that it is acceptable for the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek to say "well my honourable friend isn't a pig but he's a boar when he means it in the same context, and I ask him, I ask him to withdraw both statements.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Minister of Labour's remarks and I am perfectly willing to withdraw any offence that he says that I have given him, but I can only say that in his last statement when I said that - I think I made the concession that he was acting like a bit of a bore and in, in his own words he stood up and said he was going to bore the Member from Roblin many more times. So if we are going to use the statement that he is going to bore us many more times I would withdraw the fact of reference to him being a pig because he says oink, oink or he sounds like he says oink, oink, and just defer to him that he has told us that he is going to "bore" us much more in his speeches. And, Mr. Chairman, . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: No - yes. Don't you be so damned stupid, Morris.

MR. CHAIRMAN: ORDER PLEASE. Now the Honourable Minister of Labour, are you rising on a point of order?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes a point of privilege. There are two ways in the English language of using the word "bore".

A MEMBER: Take your pick Russ, you got both of them.

MR. PAULLEY: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek used it in connotation with the use of the word "pig", in this case it's spelled b-o-a-r. In the other case it was bore. Now then, if that can't penetrate the cranium of my honourable friend from Sturgeon Creek it should. And, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the record should show that the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek should withdraw the reference to me in the connotation of a pig or a boar so that the record is clear. And I don't give a continental from little Lord Diefenbaker. .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, the words that the Minister of Labour objected to, were if I heard correctly, withdrawn by the Member for Sturgeon Creek. They were withdrawn. Sir, I think that the matter should end there. The Minister of Labour of course does not want them to end there, he is making an issue where none exists. Sir, if you were to go through our rule book, Beauchesnes, I doubt very much if you will find in Beauchesnes that the word used by the Member for Sturgeon Creek is one of those that are not permitted in this Chamber. Notwithstanding that, the Member for Sturgeon Creek has withdrawn the word. I don't know what more the Minister of Labour wants other than to hear himself rant and rave, which is characteristic of the Minister. He probably wants to occupy the remainder of the time between now and 4:30, that's probably his intention. But the words have been withdrawn and I think the matter should be dropped there and the Member for Sturgeon Creek should be permitted to continue his remarks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do recognize the contribution, if one can call it that, of the Honourable Lord Diefenbaker from Morris - the Honourable Member for Morris. It would be sufficient for me to hear from the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek, who is quite knowledgeable in the spelling of the Queen's English, to have placed on the record his connotation or his reference to me as being a bore that he would use the spelling b-o-a-r or b-o-r-e. If he would define this, if he would delineate this if my honourable friend for Sturgeon Creek would say to me as Minister of Labour, my reference was in the connotation of b-o-r-e then I would accept it and I would accept his withdrawal of reference to me as a pig. And I don't need any admonitions from the honourable - I believe he comes from Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I believe that I now have a question of privilege, because I am sure, Sir, that you recognize that members in this House must be referred to in a certain manner. I have very politely referred to the Minister as the Minister of Labour without any offensive connotations. The Minister of Labour continues to refer to other members in this House otherwise and he knows better, violating a rule of this House, Sir, that is long established.

SUPPLY - LABOUR

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the point is well taken.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is well taken. I did refer to my honourable friend - apostrophe - as the Member for Morris. Now getting back to my point, my matter of personal privilege. I do, Mr. Chairman, ask the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek if he would indicate for the purpose of the records of this House whether he referred to me as a b-o-r-e or a b-o-a-r and I think we should --(Interjection)-- Yes, my honourable friend from Charleswood may not understand the Queen's English.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: This is all my request is: he withdrew the reference to me as being a pig and all I am asking is for the purpose of the records that I have from the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek a withdrawal if it's necessary in reference to me as a b-o-a-r, a boar, which is a relative of a pig and means the same thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. Perhaps the honourable member could spell the word and we can get on with the business of the House.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I want to clear this matter up very quickly for you Sir, and I do remember withdrawing references to the name which should not be used in this House, and I did that. And the reference to the word bore that I made was basically the same word and reference that the Minister used himself when he said he would "bore" the Member from Roblin. Now I was using that reference and I can only say, Sir, that I then can only return it to the Minister of Labour and place the onus on him as when he said he would bore the Member from Roblin, how does he spell it? That is as simple as that. Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable . . .

MR. PAULLEY: When I had an interchange with the Honourable Member for Russell it was following the reference of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek . . .

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege. On a point of privilege.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . to me being a bore.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. Order please. A point of privilege has been raised by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege. I have not entered into this debate and I would wish that the Minister would not refer to me in this debate if he is talking about the debate that has occurred in the last ten or fifteen minutes.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't know what that means but I do ask the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek to be definitive because - because the interchange between the Honourable Member for Roblin and myself was . . .

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, again the Minister is referring to me and I ask him not to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I have tried to be very calm about this. I've withdrawn the statements that he wanted to be withdrawn; I've accepted the fact that I'll let him use the spelling he likes, and, Mr. Chairman, if he wants me to say he's the most "boring" Minister I've ever heard in my life, fine.

Mr. Chairman, I made reference to the Member from Crescentwood as probably being much more reasonable in his remarks towards labour than the Minister of Labour and I think we had proved too in the last five minutes just why we should have maybe somebody else advising him or taking over the portfolio.

Mr. Speaker, the one thing that I get very concerned about at the Minister of Labour at the present time is he gets up and he continually talks all the time on the basis of his negotiations, his agreements, the way agreements should be formed, he talks about the involvement but then he admitted to us during this debate that he knows nothing about the marketing aspect from the point of view that it's the end consumer that pays. He has no conception whatsoever when he makes a move or when he passes legislation what effect it has on the end consumer. And we have proved in this House that the end consumer in Manitoba is the man that makes between \$6,000 a year and \$12,000 a year, because he's 62 percent of those people, that he is doing all the paying in this province. And Mr. Speaker, after coming over. . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30, the last hour of every day being Private Members' Hour, Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has directed me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Point Douglas, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is unanimous consent that we proceed with Bill 22. I believe that is correct. (Agreed)

BILL NO. 22

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 22. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's certainly not our intention to delay passage of this bill. We wanted a chance to look at it, to consider the kind of thinking that had gone into Bill 22. We have now done that and I want to say, Sir, that we are in agreement with the principle of the bill and with the kind of thinking and planning that has gone into the legislation in its present form. There well may be, Sir, some suggestions in Law Amendments that will be forthcoming from this side of the House. I daresay there might even be some representations made from interested parties appearing before Law Amendments Committee which might effect a modification or two of the legislation as it presently stands, but we're concerned at the moment of course, Sir, with principle, and I can assure you, Sir, and the House that my party supports the principle of the bill in its present form.

In closing, and it's my intention to be brief, I would just like to make the point for the record that we do feel that it is progressive legislation. The bill appoints lay people to the governing body of the legal profession and that is a laudatory development. We feel that the profession's conduct of its affairs will be strengthened and enhanced by the appointment of lay people to the governing body and in that respect it makes it a very progressive piece of legislation; perhaps, Sir, more progressive than in any other jurisdiction in Canada with the singular exception I would suggest probably of Ontario.

The legal profession itself supports the bill, Mr. Speaker. I think the leaders of the profession want it. They set up a study committee which worked for some two years, perhaps even slightly longer than that, to produce the recommendations now incorporated in the Legislation. I know the Attorney-General is anxious to act on the legislation and I thank him and his colleagues on the government side for giving us the opportunity these past few days to study it which we did earnestly desire and require. Having done so, we are in agreement with it, Sir, and it's my intention at this point, speaking on behalf of my party, to approve it through the second reading stage.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I was unable to hear the Honourable Member from Fort Garry but I'm sure his concluding sentiments are those of the Liberal Party and of me personally. I'm familiar with the bill; the bill is a very important step forward and probably makes some history of which this province can be proud in as much as it's the addition or making public that which was private before, the Law Society, a governing society bill. The admission of citizen members to the Law Society Committee and to the board itself brings the society into some further inspection by the public, something that I think we all desire, something that the McRuer Commission in Ontario of about four or five years ago recommended be done in all cases. Mr. Speaker, in giving the Liberal Party endorsement to this bill, I would only add that I hope Ministers that have responsibility for similar societies will see fit to, where it doesn't already exist, enact comparable legislation so that the mystery, the seclusion, the isolation of these kinds of governing bodies will be a thing of the past. And for that reason I have no hesitation in commending the Attorney-General for this very enlightened and easily supportive piece of legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join also the Leader of the Liberal Party and the Member from Fort Garry in commenting positively in respect to the movement by the Law Society in the direction as reflected in this bill. I think it is the direction which hopefully

BILL NO. 22

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd). . . other professional organizations will move, that for too long professional organizations have permitted themselves to be subject to the criticism that they confined their disciplinary actions, the running of their own affairs, despite the fact that those affairs affect the consumer and the public at large, to themselves in their own in camera meetings and operations. The Law Society by this bill has demonstrated to some degree anyway its preparedness to bring into the benchers of the organization, representatives of the municipal organizations and others in order to provide some public involvement. And I want to say at this point that I commend the Law Society of Manitoba in this regard because I recall just, oh three or four weeks ago, reading comments uttered by some members of another law society from another province in Canada in which they had rejected the idea of public representation on their board and they were in that society properly described as being non-progressive and in fact being dinosauric. Certainly that cannot be said for the Law Society of Manitoba in demonstrating its preparedness to be open, to involve representatives of the public, and in fact I would say that I think members will find them open to suggestions at the Committee stage as to representation.

We dealt with this at some length that section, and none of us involved in the discussions I think were rigid as to the exact make-up of public representation. We had considered at one point various occupational representatives from business, labour etc. It was very hard really to develop the type of format by which representation would be introduced from the public to the Board and it was felt in the end analysis that possibly this was the right way by bringing in representation from the Union of Manitoba Municipalities which would be representative of the rural areas and from the Manitoba Urban Association as representative of the more urban areas.

So I'm pleased to see that the Bill is moving in this direction towards committee. It's my understanding that the Law Society would be intending to forward forms to its members this coming week hopefully so that voting could take place on the basis of the intended changes within this legislation, rather than proceeding on the basis of the present Act. So I wish to thank members for assisting the expedition of the bill before us.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Move back now to Private Member's Resolutions. We are on Resolution No. 19 and it's open. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry and he'll be closing debate.

MR. SHERMAN: I'll be closing debate as you pointed out Mr. Speaker, and I certainly don't intend to do that if anyone else wishes to speak on the resolution.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll be brief in acknowledging the contributions to the debate on the resolution that were made in the House when I first had the opportunity to present it, which was on February 25th. I appreciate the comments in particular that were made by the Honourable Member for Logan speaking on behalf of the government party. I would say this, Sir, in argument with the Honourable Member for Logan that I think his estimate of the cost that would be required to print Orders-in-Council in the Manitoba Gazette, as recommended by the resolution is extravagant in the extreme; Sir, I don't believe the cost would be nearly as great as he suggests they might be for a number of reasons, one or two of which I will detail briefly at this time.

I intend to be brief, but I would just like to make the point for the record that the Member for Logan I think suggested that the cost per page of the Manitoba Gazette was something in the neighbourhood of \$17, its printing and production cost, and that to print Orders-in-Council in the number in which they are produced by this government, would require a rather extensive increase in public expenditure. He suggested in his remarks that the Orders-in-Council numbered something like 1,300-plus per year on the basis of recent experience, and that the printing of same would require an additional 7,200 pages-plus in the Gazette which would come out to an average of 5.5 pages per order and that when he takes that total and multiplies it by the cost of \$17.00 a page it comes up with an approximate increase of \$122,000 in production and printing costs on the Manitoba Gazette.

The mathematics I think are open to question, Mr. Speaker, on the grounds that as the Member for Logan pointed out, quite correctly, there are at the present time Orders-in-Council dealing with Regulations printed in the Gazette. I concede the correctness of that position. My argument was that all Orders-in-Council having to do as they do with the appointment of persons to important authoritative bodies in the province and with the spending of public funds,

RESOLUTION NO. 19

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . should be available through a medium like the Gazette to opposition and government members alike so that the job of scrutinizing government spending and administration can be properly done; but I concede that those dealing with regulations specifically already do appear in the Gazette and it was really those dealing with matters of substance and not with regulations pertaining to substance that were my concern, and if one allows for those Orders-in-Council dealing with regulations that already appear in the Gazette, as pointed out by the Member for Logan in his remarks, then the total number that you're looking at in terms of adding to the Gazette is substantially less than the total of approximately 1,300 to which he refers. In fact, it would be a fair estimate on the basis of examination of Orders-in-Council and Gazettes in recent years Sir, to suggest that the number would be probably cut by half, so we'd be talking about the additional printing of some 650 Orders-in-Council in the Gazette, not some 1,300.

So we are looking in total at perhaps an additional expenditure of some \$60,000 by the Province. I don't minimize the amount, but everything is relative and I think everyone in the House would concede that \$60,000 is substantially less than perhaps the amount that the Honourable Member for Logan suggested in his remarks. And although \$60,000 is a lot of money when one considers the importance of the role being played in this Legislature by all members in conscience, regardless of whether they are in the party in office or parties in opposition, I don't think that it becomes a critical piece of mathematics, Sir.

Further, in checking with the Queen's Printer myself I had the impression from his office that it would be possible to condense the Orders-in-Council going into the Gazette into just the specific salient features contained therein to the point where that figure could probably be reduced again by a half; and in fairness I concede that the Member for Logan suggested in his remarks that it might be suffice to meet the needs proposed in my resolution that the salient and germane parts of an Order-in-Council are all that really are necessary in terms of public dissemination and that extraneous detail could be eliminated.

That being the case, we might be talking about a sum of expenditure that is even substantially less than the \$60,000 to which I referred a moment or so ago. So we are not really in the area of extravagant expenditure, although it is all expenditure, it's all public money and taxpayers' money and I don't minimize any \$1.00 bill of it, but the results and objective I think are worthy, Mr. Speaker, and I would go so far as to suggest that perhaps \$30,000 or \$50,000 or \$60,000 has been spent by many administrations in this province, by many parties in this province for far less valuable ends than are envisioned in this resolution.

I would like to also correct an impression that perhaps may have been disseminated by one or two persons commenting on the debate on the resolution itself, in that I do not make this appeal on behalf of the Progressive-Conservative opposition or the official opposition including the Liberal Party, in this Legislature. I thought I said at the time that I presented my resolution that I was speaking for all those 57 members who sit in the House at the present time, regardless of party, and for the 57 who will sit in the next Legislature and the 57 after that and after that and after that ad infinitum, regardless of whether they are in government or in opposition; regardless of what party they belong to. I think that the resolution commends itself in a non-partisan way to everybody who runs for and hopes to serve in the Legislature of this province, in that it is aimed at better arming the individual member, the government or opposition, be he New Democrat, Conservative, Liberal, Social Credit or whatever to scrutinize the spending programs of government and to fulfill his obligations to his constituency and to the electorate insofar as responsible spending of public funds is concerned and responsible administration of the public welfare is concerned.

That, Sir, is the intention of the resolution and I thought I made that clear when I presented it, but I must say that some commentaries on the resolution and on the debate that ensued that night, left the entirely erroneous impression in the public mind that I was speaking for the Conservative Party and suggesting by implication that this government was less honest and less open in terms of divulging government affairs than previous governments were. Nothing could be further from the truth, Mr. Speaker, and I thought I went out of my way to point that out, but obviously it escaped the attention of some commentators, so I'll reiterate that I am not suggesting for one moment that this government is doing anything less in the area of publicizing its affairs and its activities than any previous government was. I'm saying all governments of

RESOLUTION NO. 19

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd). . .any stripe in this province, past present and future, have a responsibility to present and future generations to insure that government affairs are openly and effectively scrutinized in the light of public day, and one way of doing that is to make these Orders-in-Council available through a medium such as the Manitoba Gazette. Now indeed there are some funds that are necessary to pay for that printing job but as I have suggested, it's nowhere near the amount, Sir, I think in all deference to the conscientious work done on the resolution by the member for Logan, it's nowhere near the amount that he suggested and I think that if it does cost us \$50,000 as Manitobans, it might well be a far better spent \$50,000 than many other appropriations of that amount and in excess of that amount with which many of us in this Chamber are familiar. So I thank honourable members for their consideration of the resolution. I thank those who participated in the debate for so doing and I commend the resolution to them for their consideration and particularly to the government for its attention and follow through.

QUESTION put and Motion carried.

RESOLUTION NO. 1

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution No. 1. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface had 13 minutes. He's not present. We either debate it or vote it. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in respect to this resolution. I think that the substance and principle of the resolution before us is one which we would all welcome the desire and the intention to attempt to develop better forms, better techniques and methods for insuring that the will of the voting public is maximized during election campaigns with a minimum of unfair practice and procedure. Certainly the example that we have seen south of the border this past year, two years, would demonstrate the need for increasing concern in respect to the development and improvement of our own democratic rules and procedures in Canada, so that we do not make the mistakes that have occurred in the United States.

I, of course, only refer to the daily reporting of illegal contributions by large corporate interests to various election campaigns in the United States which have taken place, which are now being exposed through committee hearings; the obstruction of justice by leading and key political officials within the close circle surrounding the President of the United States and so many other examples of concerns that we must all have in respect to that. And though it has occurred there, certainly through a process of time if one did not insure that one had an open mind, a progressive mind to insuring that our election machinery and our procedures progressed in line with changing technology, we might in fact face the same type of concerns in Canada now being demonstrated in the United States.

In respect to the particular items of the resolution some I think are ones that one would want to look at with interest. The one dealing, for instance, with the permanent voters' list, we note that in the recent British election, 21-days notice; because of the existence of a permanent voters' list, it's my understanding that the election was handled with a minimum of difficulty, I would think we would want to investigate as to means by which through the use of a permanent voters' list the British election was held so effectively.

Suggestion being made that voting should be done by machine in order to eliminate the problem of spoiled ballots and necessity of judicial recounts. I want to say this, that it is my understanding that the Law Reform Commission has received a third alternative to the machine vote or the manual vote and that is the suggestion that a simple stamp be used in order to permit a voter to indicate his mark or intention on the ballot.

Well this is an area that has, let me say, intrigued the members of the Law Reform Commission, something that's novel; it may not pass careful scrutiny but on the other hand it may be an innovative twist that could be developed within the Manitoba scene.

The subsection 8 dealing with the Labour Law of Manitoba being altered or changed in order to permit the right of all Manitobans to offer themselves as candidates for public office, is in a way something which we are doing in respect to our present Civil Service Act that the Minister of Labour has introduced and applying it to Crown corporations, Crown agencies as well. So that I do think that we are moving in that direction in respect to the Legislation that is before the Session presently. I can think of one of the most - I think that is a basic guarantee that we would want to enshrine in legislation.

Insofar as increasing the levels in respect to expenses allowed to each candidate during

RESOLUTION NO. 1

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) election campaign, I would also want to retain an open mind to considering that, but there have been so many instances of abuse in this respect - and I wish that the Honourable Member for Roblin was here - because I can recall during the provincial campaign in June, like the Minister of Agriculture, campaigning in his riding, it turned out not that successfully, but we were in the Constituency of Roblin, and being confronted on the main street of Roblin with the message that a group was advertising in the local Roblin newspaper and calling itself Group for Good Government, the Roblin Group for Good Government, calling up on its readers, calling upon all its readers and its voters in the area to support logical candidates for office. And which included Schreyer in Rossmere, which included Dunlop in Dauphin, and McKenzie in Roblin.

I would suspect very much that the people who placed that ad in the paper, paid for the expense of the ad, whoever they were, knew full well that 99.8 percent of the circulation was within the Roblin Constituency and that there would not be much danger of an ad in the Roblin Review influencing the people in Rossmere to vote for Schreyer. But that was a strange type of abuse. I was never able to find out by the way, if Triple G had authorized the ad or whether they had affiliation with the group up in Roblin. I suspect that possibly they did. There must have been some consultation or involvement with the local group in Roblin prior to their inserting the ad in the Roblin Review. I don't know. I noted that the Member for Roblin has not indicated whether he represents the Progressive-Conservative party in the Legislature or the local Group for Good Government in Roblin, hasn't indicated that yet this Session. Still a question mark in that respect. I mention this as some of the problems that I can see in respect to imposing levels - in fact I think I should table this little ad so that it's part of the record of the House, so there will be no doubt as to the evidence in the future as to the ad which I'm referring to.

I think that by and large the legislation dealing with a restriction on the amount that can be spent by a candidate has been a progressive one. It's subject to these type of abuses that I've referred to but it has insured that at least insofar as the overt areas of expenditure, TV, radio, newspaper advertising, that at least they're kept to a reasonable level insuring that all candidates are kept in a reasonable relationship one to the other in disseminating election material. So that I would like to say this: The resolution before us opens up a great deal of discussion. There are positive points included within the resolution. There are other areas that I think that are open to criticism but certainly this Legislature ought not to dismiss the resolution before us, to reject it.

The Law Reform Commission has received a sizeable number of briefs and suggestions and they are presently dealing with those briefs and suggestions and I'm trusting that we will receive a report from them. They are doing this as a result of a reference by the former Attorney-General to them of the Election Act. I'm very much mindful of the suggestions that have been made that politicians themselves, members of this House, because of their practical involvement are in a better position to assess what is fair and proper election procedure from their own experience, but I would say this, that this resolution with its suggestions ought to be referred to the Law Reform Commission. The Law Reform Commission then should be requested to submit to this House their recommendations and suggestions; then upon us receiving the recommendations and suggestions from the Law Reform Commission then I think we should then determine the feasibility of establishing a committee of this Legislature so that we can deal with all the points that have been submitted to date to the Law Reform Commission. I think in that way we will have the benefit of the experience outlined in this resolution by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, we'll have the benefit of the suggestions that have been made by other members of this Legislature in debate on this resolution; we'll receive the benefit of the submissions that have been made by citizens of Manitoba to the Law Reform Commission and also their own various legal and expert advice in their considerations.

So with this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Minister of Finance that the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge be amended by deleting paragraph 11 thereof and substituting the following: That the Law Reform Commission be asked to examine the recommendations contained in the foregoing paragraphs and to prepare such recommendations as are considered appropriate on the matters referred to it.

MOTION presented. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, with deference to the honourable mover of the original

RESOLUTION NO. 1

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . . resolution, the Member for Fort Rouge, and not wishing to prolong the debate on the subject matter at this particular time, we of the Official Opposition are prepared to consider the merits of this amendment on the premise that we hear from the Member for Fort Rouge as to his feelings about the dilution, if I may say to some extent, of this resolution. I think the intent of the resolution is such that may understandably give the government some more elbow room and we appreciate that, but we're at some loss at this moment as to how to consider the bill. We know that we cannot just simply move the adjournment of the resolution because it would then fall. On the other hand, we're prepared to vote on the basic subject matter of the bill and make this recommendation to government, but I am not in the position to make that final judgment. I believe that is reserved to the author of the original resolution in the first instance, so I defer to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge for further comment.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, it's rather unfortunate that there are so few members left in the Chamber this afternoon when we're discussing such an important and interesting resolution as the one that is before us now. But those that are left I'm sure are here because they appreciate its importance and wish to give it the study that it so rightfully deserves.

I'd like to congratulate the Member for Fort Rouge in bringing forward this resolution, it's quite obvious that he has done a good deal of research and has given quite a bit of thought to the suggestions that he has put forward.

He does say I believe in the early remarks of his that he is speaking not only for himself but also for his Party and for various other individuals and I suppose that's because his Caucus has a little sensitivity about the subject following the last election. I've done a little research into the whole matter personally and like him I find it a very fascinating subject and one that gets more interesting as you get deeper into it.

I would like to quote two paragraphs that the Member for Fort Rouge said in his early remarks which I believe get down to the very basis of what we're talking about when we're discussing the Election Act and the electoral process in Manitoba. And he says on page 365 of Hansard: "I think that this, Mr. Speaker, is the basic principle and commitment that we are trying to introduce in this bill, that we must guard against the disenfranchisement of every single voter in the province; that if there is one voter for some reason of an impediment in the electoral system who is denied his right to vote, then we, the Legislature are not doing our job in properly being stewards and trustees of the democratic system of the Province of Manitoba." He reinforces that by saying roughly the same thing again, "I think that it is the basic thrust of this resolution that we would ask members to consider carefully how we can adapt and revise and change the system so that we can make it relevant to the kind of contemporary conditions we ask and to make sure that we can remove any impediment, any handicap to a voter expressing his clear right."

I'm sure that none of us would argue with that, Mr. Speaker, that we should consider what is most important and what we should strive for at all times is to try to get 100 percent of the eligible voters on the voters' list by election day and to see that none of the names on the voters' list are ineligible voters.

The Member for Fort Rouge in the second proposal that he puts forward suggests something which is really not in accord with what he is aiming for. He suggests that it will be a better thing to do to get closer to that 100 percent, that in fact he will increase the number of eligible voters by going to a permanent voters' list. And I suggest to him that this will achieve exactly the opposite situation. That far from allowing more eligible voters to cast their ballot he will in fact finish up with having less eligible voters eligible to cast their ballot.

And he quotes the system in Britain, Mr. Speaker, where they have a permanent voters' list and suggests that - at least I presume he would suggest that that is an example that we might emulate here. However, had he delved in a little more deeply into the system over there he would find that it has really very little to commend itself except a certain amount of neatness, tidyness and administrative convenience for those conducting the election. Because the way the permanent voters' list is kept up to date in Britain is that enumeration is done first of all by mail commencing around the middle of October. Letters are sent out to every resident asking them to fill in the number, the names of eligible voters and to return it. A follow-up is made later also by mail and following that a partial enumeration on those who have still not returned

RESOLUTION NO. 1

(MR. WALDING cont'd). . . their cards. This continues until the middle of December, in other words two months are taken up by this revision procedure. A further two months are allowed to elapse following this closure in the middle of December presumably for printing and distribution purposes. The list then so obtained is then in force from February 15th until the following year, February 14th. So that each year the list is in effect for 12 months; previous to that there is two months when the list is closed and the previous two months to that when the list is actually being compiled. So it can be readily seen that at the time the list comes into effectiveness it is already four months out of date. By the time that it expires it is 16 months out of date.

The Attorney-General mentioned the convenience of the short election campaign recently in Britain. The timing of it was fortunate in that the election of February 28th came only a couple of weeks after the list came effective. Had it been called a matter of three weeks before that the electoral list in use at that time would have been 16 months out of date. Now granted there is not the same turnover of voters from household to household in Britain as there is in Canada, but were that system to be transposed here it would be obvious that with our turnover rate with people moving approximately once in every five years it's obvious that in a single year a permanent voters list would exclude 20 percent of the eligible voters after one year.

He might be interested to look back in Canadian electoral history to find that Canada experimented with this system some 40 years ago when in around 1934 the Dominion Franchise Act was brought into being which set up in Canada a permanent voters' list. It was in operation for, I believe, only one election and was subsequently repealed as being certainly no better than the previous enumerative system and probably worse.

There was also the matter of cost involved. As we strive all the time to increase the number of eligible voters by putting more time and effort and money into obtaining this goal obviously we reach a stage of diminishing returns where cost does become a factor. And a report of the Special Committee of the House of Commons which looked into the situation in 1937, came up with a cost figure annually which was a little more than the three or four year cost of actually conducting an election. The figures at that time - and this is 36 years ago - found that the cost of a federal election was around \$12 million and that the annual cost of maintaining a permanent voters' list for the country was somewhere in the region of \$14 million. If we multiply this by three or four it gives some idea of the relative costs that could be expected in keeping a permanent list as against a new enumerative measure for each election.

The Member for Fort Rouge might possibly have come a little closer to home when speaking of a permanent voters' list and referred us to British Columbia's list. That is, I believe, the only province in Canada which presently has a permanent voters' list. It has the effect of between elections of becoming very much out of date. Many of the registered voters die or move and there is always a scramble at the time of a new election to get eligible voters put back onto that list. And I would like to quote him some figures by which he might judge the effectiveness of such a system. The chart that I am just looking for in the book attempts a comparison of the percentage of voting age populations to the actual number of registered voters on a list on a provincial basis. The accuracy of it is in some little doubt because the census year used was 1966, and of course there was not a provincial election in every province in that same year so there could be some discrepancy in the census figures and the list of eligible voters, but it's close enough, I believe, to give a fairly accurate picture.

In New Brunswick, which is the first example given, the voting age according to the 1966 census was 319,000 and the number of electors on a voters' list as of May, 1967, the closest election to that was 314,996. The percentage there 98.7. So it's very close to having all of the eligible voters actually on the voters' list.

The figure for Nova Scotia was 97.6; for Newfoundland 96; Saskatchewan 94.6; Alberta 93.7; Quebec 92.2; Manitoba 92.1. The figure for all of Canada 91.2, Ontario 90.9, and Prince Edward Island 89 percent. So in just about all of those cases no more than 10 percent of the eligible voters were missed off the list.

When it comes to British Columbia there we see quite a different figure. Voting age of 19, the population according to the 1966 census 1,172,000; the number of electors on the voters list as of September 1966 - so it was the same year and should be quite accurate - 873,000, and as a percentage 74.5 -- (Interjection)-- No, at that time, that was still in the dark days, I will say for the Member for Birtle-Russell, before there was an NDP Government in British

RESOLUTION NO. 1

(MR. WALDING cont'd). . .Columbia. So it should be, you, know quite obvious from these figures, Mr. Speaker, that those provinces and Canada which have a system of enumeration for listing voters, missed not more than 10 percent of the eligible voters, whereas British Columbia's method of keeping a permanent list actually disenfranchised over 25 percent of the eligible voters. Now I presume that that would not be acceptable to the Member for Fort Rouge and I would certainly not consider it acceptable.

I want to touch on just one other point that the Member for Fort Rouge made in his presentation, and that was the number of rejected ballots. I notice that he made a slight mistake in terminology calling them spoiled ballots, and I think that that has been explained to him that what he really meant was rejected ballots. I understand that the Member for Fort Rouge makes the point that there was an increase of over 1,000 spoiled ballots and that this possibly had some effect. However, we must also remember that there was an increase in the number of people who voted and the figures are borne out in this very excellent book, and here I would like to congratulate the Chief Electoral Officer, Mr. Speaker, on producing a very informative and a very helpful book of statistics on our past elections.

I would like to refer back to this figure of rejected ballots which is mentioned by the Member for Fort Rouge, and the actual percentage of rejected ballots is listed in here as .59 percent of the total which, although it maybe up from the time in actual numbers, it is still you know, half of one percent that you're speaking of as opposed to the June 25th election in 1969 when the percentage at that time was .51 percent. So on a percentage basis there's really very little to choose from. If the Member for Fort Rouge really wants to get picky, he can go back to 1966 when the organization of the election was in different hands, and find that at that time the percentage of rejected votes was .62. So percentagewise we're better off than we were at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure if I'll really have time to get into the next point that I wanted to make, I'll try. One point that the Member for Fort Rouge did not mention in his presentation that I found rather surprising, and that was the fact that we all accept the principle of one man and one vote, at least I presume we do -- one person, one vote. That satisfy the Honourable Minister?

Mr. Speaker, that phrase really only has meaning if one vote is equal in value to another vote and it was quite obvious to see the figures published in this booklet that there is a serious difference in the actual size of constituencies and how they have grown over the last four years. A few examples are perhaps in order where we find that Riel, for example, had 19,000 eligible voters. Another one that comes to mind quite close to that is Roblin with only 7,800 eligible voters. So it's obvious that the one vote in Riel is not nearly . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. WALDING: . . .not nearly the value of one vote in Roblin. Another example that I might take from one of my friends across is Charleswood, where the honourable member was returned with over 6,000 votes and the third place runner received 3,456 votes. Now he was third and he lost yet he gathered more votes than many of the winning candidates. You know obviously there is no equity in this at all.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time is up. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, dealing with the Elections Act, maybe the Speaker would like to call it 5:30 to give me a full period of time the next time it comes up.

MR. SPEAKER: I am prepared to call it 5:30. I cannot allow the honourable member to have the motion as adjourned but I will keep an eye out when he gets up the next time on this particular motion.

The hour being the adjournment hour, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.