

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 23rd, 1963

MADAM SPEAKER: Before I left the Chair at 5:30, I gave my ruling on the admissibility of the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. Anyone wishing to speak on this amendment may do so.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I'm not too clear on just how much in order I'm going to be and I want to say that I'm within your direction, but I did want to say something about the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. I normally would wait for that, except for the fact that the further amendment which has been moved by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, as it were, sort of ties in with the proposed amendment of the Member for Assiniboia, and I thought that in fairness, I ought to say my piece now, to indicate what I had in mind.

Madam Speaker, I was going to suggest to the Honourable Member for Assiniboia that he might consider withdrawing his amendment subject to what I am going to say at the moment -- right now. I point out that his amendment requests the Minister of Education to give certain instructions to school principals and teachers and athletic coaches with respect to school children and college students. Now, first of all, the Minister of Education can't give any instructions to athletic coaches and he certainly can't give any instructions to college students or instructions that affect college students, so that in that sense the Minister of Education would be unable to carry out what is requested there. In addition . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, is the Honourable Minister speaking on the question of advertising, the subject matter of the amendment to the amendment.

MR. McLEAN: I made that quite clear, Madam Speaker. I wanted to make my position clear and my only reason for speaking now is that if I let this sub-amendment go by without indicating that I have something to say about the amendment, I would appear I think a little foolish by coming back to it later on, but I'm in your hands.

MADAM SPEAKER: The sub-amendment of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks does tie in with the proposed amendment of the Honourable Member from Assiniboia. We haven't heard what the Honourable Minister of Education has to say on this, but rightfully speaking he should be speaking to the sub-amendment.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, rising on a point of order, I want to ask a question on a point of information. If a sub-amendment ties in to the amendment, a speaker may speak on one and relate his words to the other. It does seem quite logical that one could speak on the sub-amendment and refer himself to the amendment and the sub-amendment both since they are inter-related. Doesn't that seem logical?

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, you will find that this has been frequently our practice, that the two are so closely related that you cannot fully develop your subject without seeming to be touching on both of them, and I would suggest that in this instance that the Honourable Minister of Education be allowed to proceed.

MADAM SPEAKER: I would agree that the Honourable Minister could agree without reference to suggesting that the Honourable Member from Assiniboia withdraw his.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Education.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I am being advised from several directions that I can't do what I intend to do and I don't want to do anything wrong. I would think, Madam Speaker, that I should wait. I did want to ask the Honourable Member for Assiniboia to withdraw his amendment. I was prepared to indicate why I thought he should do so and I believe that it would give a little different position to the sub-amendment which has been proposed by the Member for Seven Oaks. I don't want however to transgress the rules in order to accomplish the right objective.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, with leave of the House, I would withdraw the two -- not my amendment, but just the part where the Minister of Education says he cannot give any authority to athletic coaches and college students. Well, I would withdraw just those two words and not the whole amendment.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, speaking to the point of

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd) . . . . order, I must confess I haven't that influence on my colleague that once I thought I had, because I'm quite sure that we can't deal with the amendment by withdrawing any part of it or discussing it in direct terms at the present stage, and that we probably better deal with the sub-amendment and dispose of that and then my colleague can come back. I think that what he had in mind was perfectly understandable, but I think that strict interpretation of the rules would indicate that he cannot refer to it in such direct terms as he would like to do, so I'm going to use my influence with him, Madam Speaker, if I can, to persuade him to let it go until the sub-amendment is disposed of.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, speaking on the point of order, if the Honourable Minister of Education finds himself in a position where he's in agreement with the sub-amendment, it might carry and then after it has carried a further sub-amendment respecting the amendment for the Honourable Member for Assiniboia may be introduced which might achieve the desirability of the Honourable the Minister of Education, which will still retain the phraseology of the sub-amendment at that time.

MR. GROVES: While all these Solons of the Law and experts on the rules are sorting out the amendments and the sub-amendments, it might be in order to say a few words on the general topic of smoking.

MADAM SPEAKER: The motion before the House is the sub-amendment of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks. Anyone wishing to speak on this may do so.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed amendment of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. McLEAN: In speaking now to the amendment of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, the original resolution deals with the subject of advertisements and advertising, and I leave that discussion to those more competent to discuss it.

The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia has introduced a rather different approach with respect to what he suggests should be done by the Minister of Education. I have improperly and earlier indicated that of course the Minister of Education could give no instructions to athletic coaches and would have no jurisdiction over college students. But I was going to suggest to him that he might consider withdrawing his amendment since it deals with a subject different from that of advertising for this reason, that I would give him my undertaking that I, as Minister of Education, would be prepared to give written instructions to school principals and teachers to particularly pay attention to the course of studies insofar as it affects the subject of tobacco and smoking, and that perhaps with that undertaking and because his amendment does deal with a little different aspect of the problem than advertising, which is what the Honourable the Member for Wellington is directly concerned with, that he might feel that that would satisfy the point that he wants to get at.

Now he might say, "Well, what is in the course of studies to which the Minister of Education would direct the attention of school principals and school teachers?" For Grades 4 to 6 in the general area of Health we have a text entitled "Health, Safety and Success", and this text deals with the subject of tobacco. The topics covered are History of Smoking; Harmful Contents of Tobacco, that is nicotine; Injury to the Heart, Nerves and Breathing Muscles; Advice to wait until 21 years of age before deciding whether or not to smoke; and then it goes on to amplify on that general line. Grades 7 and 8, the text is "Your Health and Safety", and this text has this to say with regard to this subject. It covers the bodily effects of tobacco and the following are discussed: Depressant to the Nervous System; Disturbs Normal Heart Beat; Irritating to the Nose and Throat; Interferes with Breathing; Dulls the Senses of Taste and Smell. Then in the text which is used in Grade 9, which is entitled "Science Indoors and Out", it devotes a considerable section of the book to this subject of tobacco education and the following is a brief summary of the topics discussed on these pages: Manufacturers' Techniques for Starting New Smokers; Cost of Smoking; Detail of Tobacco Contents; Harm to the Body, that is cancer, reduced hunger, speed heartbeat; Social Hazards, such as fire in homes, forest fires; and then some just further amplifications.

Now what I wanted to say to the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia was that it seems from this that the subject of tobacco and the effect of it is covered reasonably well in the texts which are used, and I would give him my word that instructions would go out to each principle

(Mr. McLean, cont'd) . . . . and teacher in Manitoba, particularly directing their attention to the course of studies with regard to these matters, and the subject seems to be reasonably well covered, and perhaps that would enable the debate on this particular resolution to revert back to the subject of advertising, which I believe was what the Honourable the Member for Wellington wished to deal with primarily in his resolution.

MR. CAMPBELL: On a point of order once again and to try and clarify the matter rather than confuse it, I would suggest to the Honourable the Minister of Health that the resolution of the Honourable Member for Wellington is a double-barrelled one. It doesn't deal only with advertising; it has a first operative clause that the Legislature humbly requests the Minister of Health to investigate ways and means to encourage in every possible way any positive approach designed to reduce the recruitment of children to smoking. The advertising is a second resolution, so to speak.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, this is one occasion when I find myself able to support the ideas and motives of the Honourable Member for Wellington and anyone else who sees fit to amend the original resolution. I think that if anyone wants to be taken seriously when he talks about the undesirability of the recruitment of young people to the habit, to be taken at all seriously, one should give some indication as to what tangible kind of action he is willing to endorse in order to bring about some kind of remedy of the situation.

I don't think that anyone here is so naive as to think that modern-day advertising isn't capable of exerting a terrific influence on all segments of society, particularly the young. Since 1945, the end of the last war, there have been tremendous strides and developments in the technique of advertising. Modern-day advertising has to do with motivational research, with hidden persuaders, and I'm sure members are aware of all these various aspects of the advertising industry. Well if we want to do anything, if we mean ourselves to be taken seriously with regard to the undesirable habit of smoking and its consequences so far as health is concerned, we simply have to be prepared to take concrete tangible action. Now in the past, governments, people through governments, which is their social instrument, have seen fit to have the advertising industry regulated, or restricted in one particular aspect or another, and it is not until we are prepared to do likewise insofar as the advertising of cigarettes and smoking is concerned, not until such a time will we really deserve being taken seriously in this regard.

Concomitant with the idea of regulating advertising is the matter of using our educational system to persuade our young people that it is in fact more harmful than meets the eye, therefore the amendment of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia is worthy of support. It would seem that there's a technicality involved here to the effect that the Minister of Education cannot instruct coaches, college teachers, and so on, to do anything one way or the other, but if the word "instruct" were deleted and replaced by the word "recommend", it would solve that technical problem.

Generally speaking then, Madam Speaker, I think that what is required is the kind of action envisaged in the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia to the effect that the Minister should, and his advisers should, take some positive action by recommending, by suggesting, by persuading our teachers and our coaches, to act more positively in this regard and to also keep in mind the original motion of the Honourable Member for Wellington to the effect that we should investigate ways and means of the regulation of advertising of cigarettes and so on.

Quite frankly I'm not only puzzled, I'm in despair to think that members here, while no one here got up to defend the habit, everyone here so far has seemed to think that it is desirable to put some kind of curbs on the recruitment of young people to smoking, yet for some reason just very casually voted against the previous sub-amendment, and quite frankly I fail to see the logic of the action. So I would say in conclusion, Madam Speaker, that until we are convinced personally, until we are sufficiently convinced about the undesirability to endorse a policy of regulation of advertising, we are just kidding ourselves here.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I think it's a dream that we could eradicate the evil of smoking, either by resolution, or amendment, or an amendment to the amendment. Also, controlling advertising will not help. If we stop advertising in the local papers or magazines, most of the people in the Province of Manitoba and most of the children read American

(Mr. Gray, cont'd) . . . . magazines and we cannot stop them from accepting advertising for cigarettes, and they do it more fashionably and in a more expensive way than could be done by prohibiting or regulating advertising locally in this province.

There is only one thing to do, and the same applies to liquor, is education. If it takes five years longer to educate, or ten years longer, even if we could do something constructive and prevent children from smoking and getting the habit of smoking, in 25 years we have done well. All we can do is ask the Department of Education and the Department of Health to take it seriously under consideration and do everything possible by education, by showing the harm that is done, by publicizing the opinions of the greatest medical men in the world that smoking creates cancer; that smoking is not good; it is a waste of time and a waste of money. No use telling me anything because I have the habit and I'll have to carry it through. Don't worry about me. If I live five years less it doesn't matter. It is the children that we have to start educating.

Let's forget about controlling advertising; it's impossible. If you pass the resolution, or you pass the amendment, it will be only on the journals as a record. It won't do a bit of good. There's only one thing to do. Throw out the resolution and throw out the amendments, and let's ask -- and the Honourable Minister for Education did mention that he gives his word of honour that everything possible will be done by his department to prevent if possible, and as much as possible, the habit of young children to smoke; and also the Minister of Health to advocate -- put it in the curriculum if you wish; have lecturers in the schools, and that's the only place to impress on them the harm it's going to do.

All this debate on controlling advertising, the debate on the amendment -- we should do this; we should do that -- ask the coaches, the coaches are grown-up people. You can take a horse to the trough but you can't compel him to drink. I feel that we are just wasting our time; we are just wasting our time in arguing for hours on the wording of resolutions. Take the cow by the tail and pull it and this is the only way. What's the use of having chemistry or science, how to talk to animals. Let's do it in a straight way; impress on them, and if you go to a room and it has 60 pupils or 40 pupils, if you could persuade ten, you've done a good job. It cannot be done in 24 hours. It's taken more than six days without resolutions to create the world and we cannot eradicate such a habit -- and a poor habit -- and let me tell you something else. The children that start to smoke is not because they wanted to smoke, it's a sport with them. Their friends smoke so they start, and once they start of course they get the habit. Save them before they start. Anything else is just a waste of time and a waste of debating it. I'm speaking, Madam Chairman, on behalf of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, I'm afraid I have to disagree with the Honourable Member from Inkster. He was speaking for himself and I am speaking for myself. He said the only way you can get over this smoking habit, or children starting to smoke, is through education. What is education if it isn't advertising on TV which all children watch today. They watch Juliette and she tells you "Light a Players, please"; and Bob Goulet, "Light up a Du Maurier" and what a pleasant feeling you get. If this isn't education for them to learn how to smoke, I don't know what is. I'm very sorry that I have to disagree with my honourable colleague from Inkster.

MR. GROVES: In order to make my remarks strictly in order, I think I should start off by saying that one of the ways in which we can discourage children from smoking is by setting them an example, and I would like to confine my remarks to how difficult it is sometimes to set that example.

Now I'm in favour of the principle of the resolution that we shouldn't encourage children to smoke nor should we encourage manufacturers to falsely advertise their products, whether it be tobacco or some other product. I, however, am not too qualified to get deeper involved in this debate because I am one who started to smoke at an early age -- 17 to be exact. On two occasions I quit smoking for fairly lengthy periods, the first time with the aid of pills that were on the market at that time and I must say they worked very well. On the second occasion I stopped smoking of my own free will and with the aid of my will-power. However, like most smokers who "go on the wagon", eventually I went back to the habit, although I am like most smokers convinced that I can cut down my consumption at various times and for various periods if I really make up my mind to do it.

(Mr. Groves, cont'd) . . . .

With regard to the medical aspects that were dealt with by the Honourable Member for Wellington and the Honourable Minister of Education earlier this evening, I fail to see where the people in the medical profession have too much of a degree of unanimity, nor have they set too good an example for their patients to follow. Even the Minister of Health, who swore so solemnly in this Chamber not too long ago that he was going to set us all an example and quit smoking, was caught in the hall just a few days ago sneaking a puff on one of his weeds.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, a matter of privilege, I would suggest my honourable friend read Hansard more carefully.

MR. GROVES: Well I was very interested to see in the newspapers just a short time ago a picture of a little girl smoking a cigar, and the heading under the picture is: "Don't all little girls smoke cigars?" The article goes on to say: "This appears to be the question asked by 3-year old Sonya Mae Everson of Tampa, Florida, who smokes about five cigars a day. She took a liking to tobacco when she was six months old when a cigar fell into her crib from her father's pocket and she began chewing on it. The little girl liked alternate puffs from her cigar with licks of her lollipop" -- and this is the part I'd like to emphasize, Madam Speaker -- "Her doctor says that cigars won't hurt her." Now I realize that this little news article deals with cigars and not cigarettes and we can't blame advertising for whatever example this might set to our children, but I must say that I was surprised at the comments of this little girl's doctor.

I thought that I should take seriously the advice that the Minister of Health gave us the other evening and thought that I should look around, if I was unable to quite smoking, for an alternative, or a substitute for tobacco. Now -- (Interjection) -- no, I didn't start drinking. There are people who find a substitute in candy, but we're told that candies are bad for the teeth and our dentists take a dim view of this. Some when they quit smoking they choose as their substitute eating, and we are advised by our medical advisors that even eating is bad for the health.

However, there is another alternative which I found in a tobacco store one day on which I could find no medical evidence of bad effects and this is commonly called "snoose". The Honourable Member for St. George mentioned it just a moment ago. Now the label that I saw in the tobacco store says: "Copenhagen satisfies", and then on the side of the box it says: "The tobacco chew that men like best". Well after having bought this box I consulted with some of the members of the House -- no names, no pack drill -- as to how one would go about using this stuff and I was told by these veterans -- (Interjection) -- no, this is Copenhagen. -- that the idea is that you get a pinch of this in between your fingers and you put it in your lower lip and lo and behold you get the same effect or the same satisfaction as you would if you smoked a cigarette. However, after having smelled this stuff, Madam Speaker, and after having just tasted a little wee bit on the end of my tongue, I am afraid that I didn't have the nerve to put a chew of it in my mouth.

Then I am told, or was told by these same veterans of the "snoose" box, that there was another way of taking this material. They told me that if you take your hand like this and crook your thumb you have a little hollow in here and you take a little pinch and put it into the hollow, then you sniff it up your nose. Now this looked rather challenging so three other members of this House and myself one evening after we adjourned decided that we would try this method of taking this substitute for tobacco. Madam Speaker, I can assure you that I don't recommend it to those that aren't used to it, because our reward for endeavouring to take this material in that manner was a sneezing bout for about one hour and we thought that we'd never quit sneezing. So I'm afraid that despite the fact that I took the advice of the Minister of Health seriously, that I cannot adopt this as a substitute for cigarettes, and anybody that wants to buy a box of partially used Copenhagen Snuff can have it at a very cheap price.

Now, Madam Speaker, this has been in a little lighter vein than some of the other remarks on this resolution. I don't think that does any harm, but I want to assure the Honourable Member from Wellington and the Honourable Member from Assiniboia and the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks who have resolutions and amendments on this resolution, that I really don't mean to poke fun at their resolutions. I know that they are serious about what

(Mr. Groves, cont'd) . . . . they are trying to do and I can assure them that I do support the efforts which they are making to just try and not encourage smoking amongst our children and try in some undetermined manner to have our advertisers of tobacco not direct their advertising primarily at our younger people. Thank you.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I am a non-smoker and I have never acquired the habit, so I don't know what smoking really is, and therefore if I might give some advice -- I don't know whether it would be practical or not -- it always seems to me that most people that do smoke and want to quit and can't quit, that there's just a lack of will-power and that this is the sole obstacle in the way. I am in a position where I feel that I'd support the resolution at hand, but I don't know whether it's practical or not. We can state our stand as being opposed to the use of any advertisements, but who is going to bring this into being or in effect? Has this Legislature jurisdiction in this matter or does this have to be referred to some other jurisdiction? Probably some of the members who have more experience or more knowledge in this matter could advise us to that effect.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I think this amendment is worthy of consideration because -- (Interjection) -- Oh, I can't?

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I think maybe I should say a word or two on this. I think that it has been indicated that insofar as this group is concerned, and I think maybe insofar as the whole House is concerned, that this is just a matter of personal opinion and that Party politics does not enter into a resolution of this nature. I hope this is so anyway, Madam Speaker, because I have heard from some of the remarks of my colleagues and they've been three different ways and maybe I'm going to go a fourth different way.

I wonder, Madam Speaker, whether or not we're being a little facetious in the whole matter in respect of the resolution itself and also the amendment that we have before us. Now I somewhat feel as though one who does smoke and one who periodically is enjoined by the Honourable the Minister of Health to take a deep breath to clear my lungs, possibly as the result of smoking, should properly say something in respect of this amendment that we have before us, because after all what does the amendment say? "Therefore be it resolved that this House request the Minister of Education to instruct all school principals, teachers, athletic coaches, to stress to the Manitoba school children and college students the harmful effects of smoking and that health and physical education programs should include definite reference to the harmful effects of smoking." Imagine, Madam Speaker, the principal of a school or the coach of an athletic group in the institution with a cigarette dangling out of the corner of his mouth, telling those in his charges, "Don't you smoke, look what it did to me -- cough, cough."

I don't think that we are approaching this subject realistically at all. I think it's very well, Madam Speaker, for us here in this Legislature to stand up and say don't you do what I'm doing. I think in the final analysis that unless all of us in the House show by example to the people of Manitoba what they shouldn't do by not doing it ourselves, nothing is really going to be achieved by a resolution of this nature. I for one, Madam Speaker, am not going to support either the resolution as originally suggested by the Honourable Member for Wellington or the amendment by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia because I happen to be one of the addicts of the weed. I might say that I do try to say to my children, "Now don't you do what the old man has done because you may wake up every morning barking your fool head off like the old man does." -- but at the same time, until such time as I'm prepared to stop, until such time as all of the school principals, all of the school teachers and the athletic coaches are prepared to stop smoking, I don't think that it's up to us in this Legislature to suggest that the Minister of Education stress to them that they should say to the pupils that they shouldn't do it.

The amendment that we have before us wipes out insofar as I'm concerned one of the most important parts of the original resolution, namely that of the direction in advertising to the younger people. But even in the original resolution dealing with the question of advertising, the sponsor of the original resolution was off-base because this Legislature has no jurisdiction over the question of advertising insofar as tobacco or its products are concerned. What difference does it make if we of this Legislature did oppose that portion of the original resolution which dealt with the question of advertising? There's nothing we can do about it anyway. We certainly can insofar as advertising of liquor is concerned, but we can't do it insofar as tobacco is concerned. This is solely within the jurisdiction of the federal authorities. It's well for us

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd) . . . . . to be puritans in this Legislature I suggest, Madam Speaker, but unless we can put teeth into our puritanism, I suggest resolutions of the nature of this are absolutely ridiculous.

So I say as far as I'm personally concerned, Madam Speaker, I'm going to vote against the amendment and subsequently will vote against the resolution, because while it may be desirable, while medical science has at least through its advance, through the media of X-rays been able to delve more closely and more concisely into the human body than it did 20 years ago through X-ray and the likes of that, I don't think that there has been any case established that there has been any real increase insofar as lung cancer or any other deficiency as the result of smoking today than there was 50 or 60 years ago. I think the only difference is that due to the advancement in medical science that diagnosis is far better than it was before.

I think I recall talking of athletes. If I recall correctly, there was a great Frenchman in the great Province of Quebec -- or was it New Brunswick -- by the name of Louis Fierre who could pick up about 14 tons more than any other man in the whole "countree" -- (Interjection) -- well, it is Icelandic I guess insofar as my honourable friend is concerned, but as I recall it, the history of this great man of French ancestry -- down in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia -- who was the greatest athlete insofar as weight lifting was concerned in the whole of the Dominion of Canada at that time and whose record has not been surpassed insofar as athletic prowess is concerned, could lift up about 14 ton more, as the story goes, than any other man and then sit down and smoke about two boxes of cigars in celebration of his great event.

Now I wonder very much whether it's not more the question of the chemical make-up of the body, and maybe my honourable friend the Minister of Health can instruct me on this, that is the factor which ascertains as to whether or not smoking is harmful. But I do say in all seriousness, Madam Speaker, I think it is ridiculous for us in this House to attempt to legislate by regulations, or by resolutions as we have before us today, as to whether or not we should smoke or whether our children should smoke. I think that if we're not prepared, each and every one of us in the Legislature to show by example, the better thing to do would be to wipe these resolutions off the Order Paper and get down to the real business of Manitoba.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, I would like to just say a few remarks with respect to this whole matter if I may. At the time of my estimates I took that opportunity to indicate to the House the importance being laid upon this whole subject of smoking by the official medical bodies of this Dominion and Province, and also the attitude of the Public Health people the world over. I don't think any one of us in this Chamber can dispute the very factual information which has come to light scientifically and left beyond any shadow of a doubt in the minds of the official medical bodies, as I say, and individual physicians today, the definite proof that there is a relationship between cigarette smoking and cardiac and pulmonary disease, notably cancer, which is our great enemy of middle age.

However, I guess, as the Leader of the NDP pointed out, we all have the right to die the way we choose, in the sense that if we want to follow habits which will lead us there sooner or lead us into trouble sooner, as I tried to point out in a little statement I made to the honourable members pointing out the incidence of cancer in the last few years in our own province, this is a matter of personal wisdom. It isn't up to me -- or I don't think any of us can, as the Leader of the NDP Party has said, teach an old dog new tricks, but I think we can, and it is incumbent upon us in this Legislature and in this Province in the Department of Public Health, to do what we can to bring the very latest attitudes and knowledge, as much as possible, to the attention especially of the younger people of Manitoba. I have been afraid to walk down the street without a red face with all the publicity concerning my own personal habit. I want to make it perfectly clear that in the House when asked if I had quite smoking I said, "I certainly hope to." We'll see how I make out, and I hope to reach my mark. However, I do feel that -- of course, a lot of kids started in the attic and I'd hate to think that as Minister I'll have to start sneaking up to the attic for a cigarette now at my age.

However, I might just facetiously point out to the Honourable Member from St. Vital that he was referring to the anatomical snuff box which you create by extending your thumb, called the snoose box, and "vell" known to the Icelanders and the "Svedes" in this province, and the reason we got into it was we could only get tobacco and booze for our fish for so many centuries up in those far northern wilds. But it's interesting to me when I heard today that one time in

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) . . . this Legislature there used to be a bar in the Legislative Building. Then the evils of alcohol, etc., came to light and the honourable members of the Legislature showed their concern for doing the right thing in the Province of Manitoba, so possibly this is just in the evolution of things.

However, I just want to say this categorically to the committee, as I tried to indicate previously and I won't be long, for the past year our department has been concerned as to the role which the Department of Health should play in bringing to the younger people and to the people of Manitoba the evidence with respect to the relationship of smoking and other diseases. It's long been known, for example, that heavy smokers have increased arterial spasms, and this has been evident to any practising physician, that is the vascular relationship. But the fight against cancer, of course, and the evidence presented to date linking cancer with smoking which cannot be refuted in the light of present day knowledge, we have to accept and the old fellows will have to take their chances.

However, our Director of Health and the Deputy Minister -- I have already asked them to draw up for the coming year under the Health Education Program a very positive approach and bring a program to the department as to how we can most effectively, using our audio visual aids and the resources of health education, tackle this problem. Within the City school system our present Director of Health, who was Assistant Deputy in the City, along with local specialists gave leadership in this area.

I would also point out that it is interesting that in the past month I have read most interesting and challenging articles written by local medical men, local specialists in medicine and surgery, writing in the local Manitoba journals of the problem before us and voicing their endorsement of those measures which will lead to an appreciation by the public of the cancer problem.

I think that also I can report to the committee that both at the National Hospital Advisory meeting and at the Dominion Council of Health meetings, to which the Deputy Minister has left today, these deputies have been asked to bring the whole matter up again at their Council and share possible programs with the other deputy ministers of other provinces, and we hope this will enhance our program locally. Also, for the past year this province has been planning to host the Canadian Public Health Association who are meeting here at the end of May. Outstanding speakers from all over the world will be brought here and the keynote address to be given by one of the speakers on the 27th of May here in Winnipeg at this conference where we, as I say, are the host province this year, the keynote address will be "Smoking and Lung Cancer." I would hope to distribute a summary of that meeting to the honourable members of the committee.

However, I just wanted to report these facts to the committee and I don't think that we, in light of the scientific evidence before the official body of medicine, should get into the pros and cons of it here, and I think that as long as we know the facts of the matter, it is a matter I feel of personal wisdom to older people. Certainly I am personally of the opinion that examples in the home are not always followed by the children. For instance, the children of Ministers seldom go into the ministry; the children of physicians seldom go out into the country to practise medicine. I happen to be the son of an athlete that I think was one of Manitoba's better lacrosse players, and he never smoked in front of me until I was around 25 years old, and said there was no time for an athlete to smoke. Now if you want to smoke you don't play sports. I think this is probably the opinion of the Member for Assiniboia, who is an athlete in his own right, and I think this is the attitude they take. However, the pulmonary cripples will continue, otherwise I guess we wouldn't need physicians in the Province of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I think I would be right in saying that if the Honourable Member speaks he is closing the debate.

MADAM SPEAKER: Anyone wishing to speak on the debate may do so.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hamiota, that the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.



MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member is closing the debate.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I will attempt to be very brief on this one because I know that most of the members are anxious to get into the Committee of Supply so that they'll be able to have a smoke, and I'll not try and hold them up any longer than I can.

Madam Speaker, I was indeed happy to have the Honourable Member for Gladstone on April 9th last nearly second my resolution.

A MEMBER: Gladstone? You've been smoking too much!

MR. SHOEMAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon, pardon me. Madam Speaker, it was this Copenhagen snuff I think that got the best of me here. It's powerful stuff.

Now the Honourable Member for Brandon certainly sympathizes with me and all the members of our group. He realizes that it would be very advantageous not only to us but to members of the government to have the annual reports mailed out to us well in advance of the session, in fact the resolution before us requests that within three months of the termination of the fiscal year, so that would be New Year's Day. The Honourable Member has suggested that he thinks this is quite possible in most cases and I agree with him on that one.

I have before me several of the reports and on most of the reports the front page is nothing more nor less than a letter that is directed to the minister in charge of the department and signed by the chairman. Some of them are dated; I note that some of them are not dated. The Manitoba Water Supply Board by the Chairman, Mr. Griffiths, addressed to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation just states that he has the honour of presenting the second annual report for the year ending March 31st, and that matter is dated November 30th.

I have before me The Manitoba Development Fund. They've left the date off. I think if we could get a peek at the original letter that was enclosed there would probably be a date on it, but they've left the date off of that one. The Department of Public Works. There's a date on it, that is the enclosing letter, dated December 10, 1962. The Manitoba Hydro, of which my honourable friend the Member for Brandon I believe is a Director, they're very efficient. Their enclosing letter with the annual report is dated July 25, 1962. Public Accounts -- a very important document. The enclosing letter, and it's addressed to His Honour, signed by the First Minister, Acting Provincial Treasurer: "the undersigned has the honour to present the Public Accounts for the Province of Manitoba for the year ending 31st of March, 1962, and that letter is dated November 28th. So -- (Interjection) -- that's all, that's the letter -- unless my honourable friend wanted me to read the Public Accounts, and we'll be in that next week probably.

Now, Madam Speaker, what I have attempted to do is to prove that the annual reports are ready to be presented in about November, December, some of them as early as July, so that the request certainly is not unreasonable. The Honourable Member for Brandon has suggested that he has spoken to the men in charge of most of the departments and they have assured him that they are quite willing to co-operate in this regard and see that we do get these reports, well, within three months or prior to three months before the session -- before the end of the fiscal year. In order to co-operate with my honourable friend and the government, because there's no question about it, he was speaking for the government, I, Madam Speaker, with the leave of the House, would wish now to delete the last paragraph only, because my honourable friend has suggested that he is quite prepared to go along with everything except the last paragraph, and I would like to withdraw just the last paragraph only so that we will be able to benefit every member of the House and get these reports when it would be most beneficial to us and in accordance with the request in the resolution.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege, I don't think I referred in my address anywhere to a three-month period. If I recall correctly, and I haven't Hansard at hand, was that I had the commitment from the ministers that these reports would be mailed to the members as they became available. Now that still might not coincide with the three-month period so I wouldn't like to take on that responsibility personally, because I only had the commitment from the ministers that they would mail them to members in advance of the House sitting and when they became available to the ministers. So I wouldn't want the

(Mr. Lissaman, cont'd.) . . . Member from Gladstone to feel that by deleting simply the last paragraph it would make his resolution necessarily acceptable to the government, because of course beyond the commitment that I received, I can't speak for the government, Madam Speaker.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could be clear on what the point is now. Has the honourable member attempted to move a motion that the last paragraph of the resolution be deleted? If so, I would take the ground that an honourable member can scarcely amend his own motion of which notice has already been given as appears on the Order Paper.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I asked by leave of the House to withdraw the last paragraph only -- by leave of the House to withdraw the last paragraph only so that it would be acceptable to the government.

MR. EVANS: If my honourable friend could find someone to move an amendment to his motion encompassing whatever he wishes to do -- (Interjection) -- well, that being the case, it seems constitutionally impossible to me to effect a change in the resolution that has been debated to this point, and my honourable friend is certainly closing the debate on the motion as he originally placed it in notice and as it originally came on the Order Paper.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Gladstone cannot withdraw any portion of the proposed resolution or amend his own resolution. He would have to withdraw the entire resolution. Which is his wish?

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, my suggestion is, that by leave of the House, any rule can be abridged, and what the honourable member asked was that by leave of the House leave be given to withdraw the last paragraph of his resolution. Now I am aware that the usual procedure in this House is to withdraw the resolution, but my honourable friend's point was that he had received a sufficient undertaking with regard to the first part, and gathering that the second part was objectionable to the government, that he asked the leave of the House to withdraw the last paragraph of the resolution.

MR. EVANS: . . . . . can give no undertaking that we would accept that on this side of the House, on the ground that all the other honourable members who have addressed themselves to this question have done so with that other paragraph in it. They might or might not have wished to change their stand in this House had that other paragraph been deleted. So I for one could not feel justified in going along with that suggestion.

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, I would like to make a suggestion that you take it under advisement, that the member has asked "by leave".

MADAM SPEAKER: I'd like to address your attention to the fact that I believe when he withdraws the last paragraph he is really amending his motion, and the honourable member cannot amend his own motion. I therefore think that my ruling would be that the resolution stands as is.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Yeas and Nays, please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 21; Nays, 30.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, since the Honourable Minister for Public Utilities introduced the highway safety program in his estimates the other day, I wish to have leave of the House to withdraw the resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the

(Madam Speaker, cont'd) . . . . Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks. The Honourable the Minister of Health.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, I wish to commend the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks for his continuing interest in the development of air ambulance services. He brought this matter up you will recall a few years ago. The whole question of course of ambulance and air ambulance services is being brought more and more into focus during this second half of the twentieth century by the mounting toll of highway accidents resulting from high-speed motor traffic. This is a topic which I am sure every member can find personal identification, and this government, I would like to point out in my remarks, has not been unmindful of the whole problem. I feel when one considers the question of air ambulance in Manitoba, two separate and distinct areas must be reviewed, and I refer to northern Manitoba in the Pre-cambrian Shield and to the southern settled portion of the province. I would like to deal with these separately because I feel one almost has to look at it with this division.

Firstly, regarding the north, this really came to this government's attention of course as one of our first new developments was the introduction of Northern Health Services, and I've described this program on several occasions in the House and how proud we are of the way this has functioned. This is outlined in the review of activities which I distributed in the House, indicating the kind of activities there. There is information there and of course in our annual report.

Our first assignment at that time to the new director was to visit every settlement north of 53; to review, with the people and the agencies in the area, health services and health needs. It soon became apparent that few of these smaller groups and smaller communities had any organized plan for medical emergencies, that is, sudden severe illness and accidents, and as a consequence when a medical disaster struck, valuable priceless time was being lost in getting treatment to the patient or the patient to treatment, and one by one, working with the people themselves, community plans were developed. Drug depots were developed; a roster of qualified and experienced residents was set up; and a review of communications was developed and finally transport was studied. The latter, I might add, included considerations for special weather situations, break-up, etcetera. I would point out to the committee that at that time the Indian Health Services had a health service in the north and this Northern Health Services was formed to complement that service, and they had the same attitude as that which I will point out when we discuss air ambulances.

As a result of the exercise of having a full-time team in the north, we became aware really for the first time of the amazing network of radio, radio-telephone, telephone and telegraph that have come into existence throughout the north, both in the hands of government and commercial agencies, plus the resources of the Hudson's Bay, for example, stations in the north, Indian Affairs stations and so on. When trouble strikes the north the north reacts like a family, and I would cite fascinating stories of how messages for help or guidance have been relayed along using these various resources. I mention the word "guidance" because I would like to take the honourable members to the radio base operated by the Manitoba Government Air Service at Grace Lake, The Pas, and there leaf through some of the radio traffic reports. Injury and sickness in remote points commands a considerable volume of this traffic. When the query is encountered, the Northern Health Services Director or one of the doctors in The Pas is contacted and there continues an interchange of signs and symptoms from the bush, and first aid and general medical advice in return. This kind of service is very reassuring to the residents in isolated areas and has down through the years saved many lives.

I've said we were amazed at the communication resources in the north, the complexity of them, and when we came to study air transport we were surprised again. A review for instance made late in 1961 indicated the following bases: at The Pas -- Lamb Airways with five aircraft, Manitoba Government Air Service with three aircraft and Trans-Air; Wobowden -- Airways, Trans-Air; Norway House -- Trans-Air, Manitoba Government Air Service; Ilford, Ilford Airways; Thompson -- Lamb, Trans-Air; Flin Flon, Snow Lake -- Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting; Lynn Lake -- Trans-Air, Fish Company planes; Churchill -- RCAF and Trans-Air.

I have said that in the face of medical disaster the north acts as a family, and there is no finer camaraderie of this kind than the men who fly in the bush, as we all know, our bush

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd) . . . . pilots. Time and again these men, on mercy flights, have performed miracles. For these reasons the Director of Northern Health Services, and the many citizens of the north we have polled consistently, recommend that the continued use of the planes of all operators, including Manitoba Government Air Service, is far more versatile and useful than could be provided by a centrally located air ambulance service. To quote one of the Director's reports, he says, "We are in almost constant radio communication with radio centres throughout the north and the most conveniently located plane can be despatched. In special cases we can utilize the Search and Rescue Wing of RCAF involving Winnipeg or Churchill based helicopters if circumstances warrant. We have provided our personnel with emergency equipment to be placed in planes carrying extremely ill patients who might require oxygen, etcetera." I think as Manitobans we can be proud of the arrangements in northern Manitoba and of the superb consideration and co-operation we have earned, not only from the Government Air Service but from commercial aircraft operators as well. In the light of these circumstances, we do not believe that a government ambulance service as contemplated by the honourable member in that area should supersede the facilities that are in existence and the program which is operating so successfully, utilizing the tremendous communication and transport system in the north.

Now southern Manitoba is another problem, and in considering the ambulance service time is of course the most precious ingredient. Years ago before the development of our excellent grid of all-weather, all-season roads, the delay of surface transport may have been a problem. It is really not so today. Last summer the Associated Hospitals of Manitoba raised the possibility of a government air service for Manitoba. This question came up in one of the resolutions. In November of last year I acknowledged this suggestion and frankly admitted to them that I did not possess the precise data upon the need for such a development which I thought they may have.

I suggested to them that they may undertake on my behalf through their member hospitals a study of the number and nature of cases they encounter during a year that might, in their judgment and that of their medical staffs, have benefited had an air ambulance service been available. This study has been going on now for six months and I have received an interim report upon the replies being received from the hospitals. It is already evident that there is actually very little interest in air ambulance on the part of the Manitoba hospitals, and the medical staff of many have concurred in this regard. This is interesting.

The members of the House, as pointed out by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks before, will be aware that Saskatchewan has since 1946 operated a government air ambulance service in the southern part of that province. I might point out to the honourable members that in the north they utilize much the same kind of operation as we do, and they rely on the government air service and commercial carriers just as we do here. As I have said, in '46 this may have been a good idea in Manitoba also. However, in 1963, I feel that people who should be most interested and knowledgeable actually don't show great interest. However, as the Hospital Association completes their report, it may very well be that there are several areas in the province where such an air ambulance seems to be indicated, particularly to transport their severely ill or injured cases to Winnipeg, and these situations will be carefully studied by the department in the light of full information.

I should tell honourable members that we are looking at this whole problem of surface ambulance very carefully -- the whole situation. The RCMP made a survey for the department in 1959 which showed at that time that there were few spots in southern Manitoba as I have defined it, south of 53, which were over 30 miles from a resource of an ambulance. We feel that the service requires in many cases better standards, better communications and better trained operators. Because this activity is really now so closely related to hospital activity, some months ago I asked the Hospital Commission to review all the material I had on this subject, submissions to the Royal Commissions by various groups, notably the medical profession, and all the material that I could get through the RCMP, and I of course will send on to them the results of the Associated Hospitals study.

My idea was that the Commission themselves, in talking about the whole matter of integrated hospital systems, said they were most anxious to review the material we had. Again concurrently with this, at the first meeting of the new Manitoba Health Council, I have

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd) . . . . requested that they too review all the material and information which I have been able to accumulate -- or with the department. This I think will be a good combination because on this Health Council you have lay personnel, medical men, and amongst the lay fold are municipal men. When they have both reviewed it independently I think we should bring the Commission, Associated Hospitals and Health Council together in the coming year.

As I said earlier on opening these remarks, we are not unmindful of the whole problem of ambulance service. In the north we have one situation; in the southern part of Manitoba, Swan River south, we have another. I am proud of the activity and the role which the Department of Health has played in the understanding and the development of these services in the north and the attitude they are taking towards the study and the further development of an ambulance service for the southern part of the province.

Looking at this resolution in view of this, I can't support the resolution as a multi-pronged attack to the problem. As I have indicated, I think that for the southern half of the province we should await these most interesting developments and studies by the groups involved. I really don't feel that we can divorce the development of ambulance services from the creation of hospital facilities in the province -- something that's going to have to be related in the future -- and I also feel we have considerable amount of information and background now. I don't want the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks to feel that his resolution is receiving the repudiation of ourselves. I think that in the evolution of health services in the province we are, and should in the not too distant future, come to an over-all plan of action.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): I'd like to say a few words in support of the Honourable Minister of Health in that he is so right in that our northern part of Manitoba is literally dotted with outlets of radio-telephone communications, such as you have at the Hudson Bay posts; every fishing camp has their own radio-telephone now; every prospecting camp; every trapping camp; every RCMP detachment; every Indian Agent depot; then of course all your Natural Resources people such as in the Forestry and the Games Branch. You have also on call on a 24-hour basis the RCAF Rescue Arm in Winnipeg, and you might also be very much interested that there is no less than, I think, 15 amateur radio operators in the Greater Winnipeg area who are constantly in touch with various locations in the north. An outstanding example is our own Chief of Police, Robert Taft. He has an amateur radio set in his basement and I for one have communicated with him from points like Island Lake and God's Lake on various occasions.

There is no end of this type of communication made available through the northern parts of our province, with the result that whenever anybody is in any difficulty you go on to an SOS signal, and if you are not able to get sufficient signals to go through on voice you can always go on "T", and this enables you to go through on any one of these connections. You would be amazed at the almost electric shock that exists when there is an emergency develops in any part of the north. Of course you have the RCAF; you have the various air transports who operate in the north, such as the Hudson Bay Air Transport, Trans-Air, and others that the Honourable Minister has mentioned; and you will find that an aircraft will be despatched at the earliest possible moment. If it is an emergency and the aircraft is not able to go through because of weather, then there is always the possibility of getting the doctor either at Gimli or at Lac du Bonnet or at The Pas, or at Lynn Lake, to come on the air and he will give instructions over the air to the source where the accident has taken place until they are able to remove this patient to the hospital. Consequently, I do not feel that we need to even think of establishing a similar type of air ambulance service that is in existence in Saskatchewan and with which too I am very well acquainted, having operated in the northern parts of Saskatchewan.

Now coming back to the southern parts of the province, here again we do have a very efficient unknown service in the form of two or three industrial or private aircraft enterprises who also have small aircraft, who are also tied in into a radio frequency that pretty well covers or is able to service the SOS frequency, and they too are in constant touch with any part of Manitoba and they are able to send or despatch an aircraft almost to the southern parts of the province.

Now in addition to this, the RCAF Rescue Arm has on tap two helicopters which they can call on at a moment's notice, and I think that with this type of a service they can cover any vital part of Manitoba in case of an emergency. I dare say that they can now with helicopter

(Mr. Smerchanski, cont'd) . . . . . move into an emergency system even at night because of the navigation systems that are in existence now, and with the improvements on radar, there is no problem in getting to most any part of the southern part of the province. I think that if these conditions are made available or are known by the people that may have to call on them, then I think that this type of service is very adequately covered.

I mention this because quite frankly if you are going into a prospecting area or a fishing area in the north, it is almost a "must" that you do take a radio out with you and you clear your position at least once a day, or certainly once every other day, with a base camp either in The Pas or Gimli or Lac du Bonnet, in order to give proper identification of your whereabouts and that everything is all right. It's amazing how, whether it's the Fur Department or the Game Department of the Natural Resources Arm -- they're not being paid for this, they don't have to do it, but it is a courtesy of the north; it is a courtesy that is acknowledged by anybody who has a radio-telephone in the north; and if you hear somebody trying to contact a station that appears to be dead you take it upon yourself, possibly on the hour and every hour, to go on the air yourself and try and contact the dead station just in case that there might be something wrong. I think when people who have travelled or worked or lived in the north, when they appreciate the excellent coverage that we have got with radio-telephone and the excellent coverage that we have got in case of any unforeseen emergencies, I think that it is more than adequately covered as described by the Honourable Minister.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Gladstone, that the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone: Whereas any cattle shippers to the Winnipeg Stockyards believe that their cattle undergo a period of starvation which results in excessive shrinkage with resultant loss to the shipper and cruelty to the animals, therefore be it resolved that this House recommends that scales be provided in the stockyards so that cattle may be weighed when unloaded, thereby making it possible to determine what shrinkage occurs in cattle between the time of unloading and the time of sale.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, the resolution is really self-explanatory. When farmers ship their cattle to the yards and sometimes there is a delay of several days between the unloading and the sale, farmers believe that cattle are not being fed properly and some believe that they are being mistreated. This is a constant complaint. The farmers believe that if a scale was located at the yards enabling the cattle to be weighed when they are unloaded and then weighed when they were sold, they would have an idea what shrinkage is involved between that time.

Now I am not suggesting for a moment that these animals are being starved, but I know that the farmers suspect that they are being mistreated, and it is generally felt that if a scale was set up at the yards the farmers would be in a better position to know what the situation was and they would be satisfied themselves then whether their suspicions were well founded or not.

MR. BILTON: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, that the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

. . . . . Continued on next page

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, that the ruling of Mr. Speaker of February 21st, 1961, on the question of an amendment referring the report of a special committee back to the committee for further consideration, be reversed by this House, and that this House declare that its practice shall not present a report, even if it is a final report, of either a special or a standing committee being referred back to be amended.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I have always been interested in the rules of the House and I have always taken the position that the rules should be the servant of the House rather than their masters. I have tried to avoid being technical about them, but I feel that they are for the protection of the members of the House as well as for the expediton of the business of the government, and consequently that a strict adherence to them is advisable from all points of view and that a thorough understanding of them is conducive to strict adherence to them. And when, on this occasion that's referred to in the motion, I moved that a report of a special committee be referred back to the committee for further consideration, the ruling of Mr. Speaker of that day was that this motion was not in order, the committee having ceased to exist with its first, and in that case, final report.

The situation arose in this way. We had had a special committee sitting on the -- I believe it was the one on The Election Act. My honourable friend, the present Minister of Municipal Affairs, was the Chairman. When he presented the report on the date that is mentioned and moved concurrence in it, I made this motion that I refer to. It is found on Page 92 of February 20, 1961. The motion was as follows: "Mr. Speaker, I move an amendment, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains, that the report of the committee be not now concurred in but that it be referred back with instructions that Clause C of Subsection (1) of Section 8 of The Elections Act be further considered." That was The Elections Act that the committee had been sitting on. At that time, in fact immediately, the Honourable the Attorney-General raised the question of the point of order. His remarks will be found on Page 92 of February 20, 1961 Hansard. And the Attorney-General raised this point of order saying that he thought that the reference could not be made back to the committee. I had as usual a few remarks to make on the point of order, because I had spent a little time on it before making that motion, and I particularly referred in my remarks, which you will find on the same Page 92 -- I particularly referred to our own rule 73 -- 73 that you find in our own rule book here.

I would say at this point that it is my experience from a long time in this House, that if the honourable members would try and acquaint themselves with our own rule book rather than using Beauchesne and Bourinot and May and other authorities so extensively, that we would find that a good many, at least, of these cases are covered by our own rules. The point I was trying to make then and reiterate now is that where our own rule applies, Beauchesne, Bourinot, May and any or all of the rest, have no application, because our own rules are conclusive and decisive; and it's only in cases where our own rules do not apply that we go to those other authorities. And I had been at pains on that occasion to read Rule 73 found on Page 30 of our own rule book, which is as follows -- and by the way, Madam Speaker, the heading of this section is Chapter 8, beginning on Page 28, and it's "Standing and Special Committees -- Witnesses." There are one paragraph and then a whole page and then a few rules, and 73 says: "A report from a committee shall not be amended by the House, but it may be referred back to the committee," which to me seemed to be so plain that there wasn't much argument to it. But the Honourable the First Minister, as well, gave quite a dissertation on the subject matter admitting that it was not an easy point to deal with, and his remarks also will be found beginning on Page 92 of that same Hansard. And then I again had something more to say and the Speaker quite properly took the matter under advisement.

The next day Mr. Speaker gave his ruling. It will be found on Page 145 of the Hansard of February 21, 1961, and this is Mr. Speaker's ruling: "Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution" (this is Mr. Speaker speaking) -- "Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell and amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. We had some difficulty with this the other evening and I had a look at

(Mr. Campbell cont'd) . . . . Beauchesne in respect to the advisability of accepting the amendment offered by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and I am prepared at this time to give that ruling. I would refer you to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fourth Edition, 1958, Page 236, Citation 286. " And this is the quote, although it's not in quotes in Hansard: "It is important that a motion for the appointment of a committee should state whether the committee shall report from time to time, or if it should report once. Without having been given such power it will be defunct, but may be revived. Special authority should also be given to sending for persons, papers and records. " That's the quote, I think. And then Mr. Speaker's comment is -- now this is the operative part of it and then a quote again: "A Select Special Committee ceases to exist on the moment it presents its final report to the House. The report cannot afterwards be sent back to the committee with instructions to amend it in any particular. If further proceedings are desired it is necessary to revive the committee. " I take it that's the end of the quote, although there are not quotation marks given in here. Then I think this would be the Speaker's comment: "That, I would think, substantiates the judgment that I gave the other evening, that the motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is out of order and cannot be entertained by the House. " I asked the Speaker, "Mr. Speaker, may I ask if you have considered the citations that I quoted?" because in addition to our own rule I had quoted some Beauchesne citations as well. Mr. Speaker said he did, "but I feel that this one is more applicable to the case and certainly covers it better. " I said that I had planned to appeal the ruling if it did not allow me to go on with this, but inasmuch as Mr. Speaker had made his decision I wasn't going to waste the time of the House by appealing the ruling and so I went on to move that the committee be revived and this matter be referred back to it. I haven't even taken the time and trouble to follow through to see what happened that, but I presume that it was voted down. In any case, it's immaterial to the argument that I am now examining.

Some little time elapsed -- no, not very long elapsed, just a couple of days -- and I took the occasion to write to the Honourable Roland Mitchener, then the Speaker of the House of Commons, because our rules provide that where a matter is not covered under our own rules -- I'd better state that properly, I think. Page 3, our general rule, subsection (1): Proceedings in the House and in all Committees thereof shall be conducted in accordance with the rules and with the sessional and other orders of the Assembly. Subsection (2). In all cases for which provision is not made in the rules or by sessional or other orders, the usages and customs of the House of Commons of Canada as in force at the time shall be followed so far as they are applicable to the Assembly. So I took occasion to write to Roland Mitchener, and at this time I would like to present a copy of this to my Leader, one for the Leader of the House, one for the Leader of the NDP, and one for the Leader of the Social Credit Party in this House, because I think it's important that this correspondence be before the House -- it will save me perhaps the time of reading all of it -- and I'm quite prepared to lay the original document on the table, the original of course as far as I'm concerned being the copies of my letter; but as is sometimes mentioned here, I would like to have copies made of them if they are laid on the table of the House so that I can have them back so far as the originals are concerned.

I wrote the Honourable Roland Mitchener. I'm sorry to have to take the time of the House to read all of this, but I tried to set the situation out quite fully; ask him for his comments, for his guidance. I did not try to argue the case. I said in my letter -- I said, "I am sure that Mr. Speaker Harrison will be just as interested as I in your assistance in this regard. In my opinion he is making an honest endeavour to interpret and apply the rules with fairness to all. Perhaps he has already been in touch with you, and if so I heartily agree with him for so doing. In any case I shall discuss this letter with him before I send it, because I know he will be glad to have your further advice. With kind personal regards and thanks in advance for your consideration and help, I am 'Yours truly'. "

I was as good as my word in that regard, because I took the letter that I had written to the Speaker of that day and I showed it to him, discussed it with him, told him if he would prefer that I would be quite willing for him to send the letter to Mr. Speaker Mitchener rather than I doing so; but he suggested that he would write Mr. Mitchener a letter himself, and in due course, in fact the very next day I received a copy of that letter that Mr. Speaker Harrison wrote to Mr. Mitchener. He told Mr. Mitchener that I had furnished him with a copy of the letter. That was true, but I had done more than that, I had discussed it with him before I sent it to him.



(Mr. Campbell cont'd) . . . . . And he says in the second paragraph of his letter which is contained there, "I believe Mr. Campbell has fairly set out the problem to you." Then he says that it appeared to him that the special committee died on the presentation of its report to the House as cited in Citation so and so, and he asked as I had for Mr. Mitchener's assistance in this matter. There's an acknowledgment from Mr. Mitchener to me on March 7th and a further letter to me on March 16th saying, "In further response to your letter, I enclose a letter which I have just written to Mr. Speaker Harrison and the notes which I refer to therein which I hope will be of some assistance." The copy of the letter is here to Mr. Speaker Harrison, same date, March 16th, and the letter is "Dear Mr. Speaker Harrison: The Clerk of the House of Commons, Mr. Leon Raymond, who is a good student of our procedure, has been kind enough to prepare some notes on the subject matter of the letters received from yourself and the Honourable Douglas Campbell. In answering these letters I think I cannot do better than to forward these notes which appear to me to give the correct statement of our practice." The notes by Mr. Raymond are here and they're quite extensive; I shall not read them in total. Anyone can see them. Perhaps I should read them in total to put them on Hansard, I believe I had better do that, because after all they are the key of this argument. These are the notes that Mr. Raymond enclosed:

"In the matter submitted by Mr. Speaker Harrison and by Mr. Campbell, of the Manitoba Legislature, we have to assume that the report of the Special Committee referred to was a final report or, if not, that the Motion appointing the Committee did not provide that the Committee would have power to report from time to time, in which case the first report would be tantamount to a final report. I understand also that on the motion for concurrence in such a report Mr. Campbell moved in amendment that the report be referred back to the Committee for further consideration. Mr. Speaker Harrison, basing his decision on Citation 286 of Beauchesne's 4th Edition, ruled that this amendment was not acceptable to the House, because it would refer the report back for further consideration to a Committee that was dead; and he is of the opinion that an order to reconstitute the committee should have been voted by the House before any matter could be referred to such Committee.

"Mr. Campbell seems to disagree with Mr. Speaker Harrison's decision and it is his view that Citations 321, 322, 323 and 325 of Beauchesne's 4th Edition should apply." I had mentioned that in my letter. "Citation 286 of Beauchesne's 4th Edition reads as follows: 'It is important that the motion for the appointment of the committee should state whether the committee shall report from time to time, for if it should report once without having been given such power, it will be defunct but may be revived. Special authorization should also be given to sending for persons, papers and records. A select special committee ceases to exist on the moment its final report is presented to the House. The report cannot afterwards be sent back to the committee with instruction to amend it in any particular. If further proceedings are desired it is necessary to revive the committee.'

"This Citation 286 relies for support on two references: (a) The British Journals of 1850, Volume 105. This entry appears as follows at page 201 of the said Journals: 'Ordered, That the Committee on the Tyne River Conservancy; and, Tyne Navigation Bills be revived; -- And that they have leave to sit, and proceed, upon Thursday next, at Twelve of the clock.'

"(b) May's 13th Edition, page 486. The pertinent reference is as follows: 'If a committee, at the conclusion of their inquiry, make a final report to the House, the sittings of the committee are assumed to have been closed; and if further proceedings were desired, it would be necessary to revive the committee'.

"Dealing with this question, Bourinot states as follows at pages 459 and 460 of his 4th Edition: 'The motion should . . . state whether it is necessary that the committee should report from time to time. If the committee should report once without having received the power in question, it will be defunct until revived.'

"In May's 16th Edition, at page 637, we read as follows: 'If a committee, not having power to report from time to time, makes a report to the House, the committee is dissolved, and if further proceedings were desired, it would be necessary to revive the committee.'

"The above references would lead us to believe that the ruling of Mr. Speaker Harrison was a proper one and that the amendment moved by Mr. Campbell was out of order. However, I cannot agree with that conclusion.

(Mr. Campbell cont'd) . . . . .

"Citation 326 of Beauchesne's 4th Edition, which was not invoked by Mr. Campbell, reads as follows: 'The report of a Standing Committee should be considered final only when it is adopted by the House, because, until then, the House can refer it back to the committee with instruction to amend it in any particular.'

"That Citation interprets wrongly or incompletely a decision given by Mr. Speaker Lemieux on May 30, 1928, which will be found at page 3563 of Hansard for that year, in that the Citation should not apply only to Standing Committees but also to Special Committees. I quote a few extracts from that ruling: ' . . . . . under the present circumstances the word "final" should mean that the report should be considered final only when it is adopted by the house, because the house can always refer a report back to a committee with instructions to amend it in any particular.

"A little further on, the Speaker refers to a final report which had been brought before the House on June 18, 1926, from a Special Committee and which was referred back to such Committee, and he concludes: 'So that the practice in the Canadian parliament does not prevent a report, even if it is a final report, of either a special or, better still, a standing committee, being referred back to be amended.' The above ruling by Mr. Speaker Lemieux to my knowledge has never been challenged, and I suggest it still reflects our practice.

"In the British House, as will be seen in May's 16th Edition, at page 642, the governing procedure is stated as follows: 'A motion for the recommittal of a report may be made upon the consideration of the report or as a substantive motion . . . When a report is thus recommended, the committee, with all its powers, is thereby revived.'

"Therefore, either following the Canadian practice laid down by Mr. Speaker Lemieux or the practice in the United Kingdom as stated above (page 642 of May's Edition), it is my opinion that the amendment submitted by Mr. Campbell was in order.

"In concluding, I may add that the second paragraph of Citation 286 of Beauchesne's 4th Edition, in my opinion, does not rest on a solid foundation and is in contradiction with the ruling of Mr. Speaker Lemieux and also in contradiction with the quotation taken from May's 16th Edition at page 642; and also that Citation 326 of Beauchesne's 4th Edition, which purports to be a summary or an analysis of the ruling made by Mr. Speaker Lemieux, is incomplete as it should apply to Special Committees as well as to Standing Committees."

Madam Speaker, I found it most interesting to go through these notes and to see the conclusions that Mr. Leon Raymond, the Clerk of the House of Commons at Ottawa, had arrived at, and I think the discourse that he gives indicates to us how contradictory we can find these various Citations in Beauchesne's 4th Edition, and it brings me back to the suggestion that I made some little time ago that where we can find the authority in our own rule book, that is the one that we should pay attention to. It was my contention at the time -- perhaps that is why I was so determined to follow the matter up -- that when we have a rule as definite as 73 on Page 30, dealing with the general question of Standing and Special Committees, and it says "A report from a committee shall not be amended by the House but it may be referred back to the committee" that it seemed to me there was no need for going to Beauchesne. But we find that in this case that Mr. Raymond makes it plain that some of the Citations that are given by Mr. Beauchesne are in his opinion not to be relied on as well.

Now you will have noticed that I did not attempt to gloss over the fact that Mr. Raymond mentions the fact that I did not quote the section that he found to be the controlling section in this regard. I didn't quote it for the simple reason that, as you can see by reading this, it refers, in Beauchesne, to Standing Committees, and this was a Special Committee that we were dealing with, but Mr. Raymond makes it plain in these notes that that Citation in Beauchesne incorrectly interprets the decision that the House of Commons at Ottawa is using as its guide. And so I decided that it was time that this matter was brought before the House so that if the feeling of the House agreed with the position taken by the Clerk of the House at Ottawa that we should reverse that decision in order to make it plain that our own rule in 73 is correct, and that we should be guided by it, because as Mr. Raymond concludes, on either the practice of the House of Commons of Canada or the House of Commons of the United Kingdom that this is the procedure.

So if you have noticed the wording of my resolution you will see that it is drawn exactly

(Mr. Campbell cont'd) . . . . along the lines that Mr. Raymond uses in his paragraph, I left out a few words of his. On page 4 of his letter he gives this statement, being from Mr. Lemieux's decision - "So that the practice in the Canadian parliament does not prevent a report, even if it is a final report, of either a special or, better still, a standing committee, being referred back to be amended." I haven't the motion before me at the moment but I believe that I left out the "better still," but outside of that I think I took exactly the wording that Mr. Raymond uses.

Now as I mentioned in beginning my remarks, I don't think that we gain anything by attempting to be too technical on these matters. On the other hand I think it is a mistake for us to allow rulings that we do not agree with to go unchallenged, and by that I do not mean appeal to the House because I think that the House usually backs up the conclusion of -- the decision of the Speaker. But I think that these should be followed through and I think that if anyone who will read the references that Mr. Raymond gives and also will follow through the debates in the Hansard of the Federal House of that time, they will find it quite interesting. And so in order to get the situation back to the position that I believe it should have been in before according to our own rules, let alone the other, I proposed the amendment here which I believe to be founded upon the facts and the interpretation that Mr. Raymond gives of Beauchesne and May.

MR. ALEXANDER: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Arthur, that the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, Whereas it is desirable to provide an equal educational opportunity for every child in Manitoba attending rural schools, and Whereas the departmental regulations require a minimum of 35 pupils to qualify for two teacher grants, and Whereas there are some schools in rural Manitoba with two room facilities, and Whereas teaching of 34 pupils in Grades one to eight by one teacher does not provide an equal opportunity for these children, Therefore be it resolved that the government consider the advisability of providing equal educational opportunity to the children of rural Manitoba by reducing the minimum enrolment requirements for two teacher grants.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I don't think I have to say too much on this resolution as it is quite self-explanatory. I hope I do not get a blast from the Minister as I did the last time I got up. But what really prompted me to bring this resolution in was not only the constituents in Emerson constituency, but since the session started I had a few letters from other parts of Manitoba who asked me to talk it over with my own group and bring a resolution trying to remedy this problem.

Now what I am going to say concerns only rural Manitoba and especially the elementary grades. The Public School Act provides that before a district could employ more than one teacher and qualify for more than one teacher grant, the number of pupils actually attending must exceed 34 pupils. I think I am correct in stating this. Now this creates a problem in these districts. True, the Minister, or anybody, may say that it's quite negligible, that not too many schools are affected, and I'll go along with that. But still I say, it doesn't matter how many schools are affected but it's a minority group and there are a few children who do not get an equal educational opportunity. Some schools have two-room facilities which have been closed -- some of them -- since divisions were established; in some of these schools there was grade high school teaching carried on, but when the divisions were established some of these rooms were obliged to close. So these school districts have two-room facilities but they have lost their enrolment for various reasons to a point where there are 34 or less pupils attending. Therefore, they do not qualify for more than one teacher grant.

These schools are obliged to engage one teacher to teach 34 -- or in some cases slightly less than 34 - pupils, the teacher teaching Grades one to eight. Now we all know that the school hours, the number of hours in a school day are five hours. If you divide five hours which is 300 minutes by eight, that gives only 37 1/2 minutes per grade per day. Usually there are at least six classes in every grade, so six times eight is 48, and then if you further divide it into the number of minutes you'll work it out to 6 1/4 minutes per class. Well 6 1/4 minutes is

(Mr. Tanchak cont'd) . . . . . hardly enough for an introduction to a subject. This does not provide equal opportunity for these children. It also creates a hardship on their instructor. He or she is over-worked in comparison with other teachers in graded schools, and I know that all of us will agree with that.

Now since there's a shortage of qualified teachers -- we haven't been able to overcome that yet -- the teachers can afford to be choosy. Therefore, the district finds it most difficult to engage good qualified teachers and to retain them. Some of them take a school with eight grades out in the country probably to gain a little experience. They stay a year and then they go on to greener pastures. I know of two schools about 3 1/2 miles apart; one is a one-room school with an enrolment of under 10 -- I am not just sure how many, it could be eight or nine pupils at the present time. And there's another school, a two-room school, 3 1/2 miles away, with an enrolment of just under 35, in which the teacher is giving instruction to eight grades, and the other school has only eight pupils. I do not think that one teacher teaching eight grades can give these pupils as good an education as they are entitled to. Of course, as you've all heard me before, I am a strong believer in centralization and also a strong believer in consolidation of elementary schools, and it could be argued that if this regulation was changed it would probably -- it wouldn't be too conducive to consolidation. I agree with that, because they'll say "Why consolidate? We can get two grants and split the classes into two rooms," and it would not encourage consolidation, but still I will say that until the department takes a more vigorous effort, or stand, to try and consolidate these elementary schools, these children are suffering, and I think that the Minister and Department of Education should do something to remedy this situation. --(interjection) -- Pardon? I am favouring consolidation; I always do; I think it's the best.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, when I taught school I had nine grades, one to nine inclusive, 29 students in one classroom, so that I know the problem as I am certain many other members of this House do, to which the Honourable the Member for Emerson has referred in his resolution and in his remarks, and it is certainly a problem. However, I am sure that he would not wish us to understand that his mathematical time computation is really -- that he really believes in that, because he knows from his own experience that teachers by combining the work of classes and by skilful management -- and it does require some considerable skill -- are able to see that the work is covered, and in many respects rather well covered.

Now I have had the unhappy experience that even though in 1959 when we introduced the new schedule of school grants and at that time reduced the number of students required to earn two or three or whatever the number of teacher grants at that time that that reduction took place, that even though a substantial reduction was made -- and I must confess that I was one who thought we had gone a considerable distance -- I have been disappointed by the fact that there still seemed to be just as many people one student under the number required to earn the number of teacher grants that they would like to have. And so I have come to the rather unhappy view that even though we were to reduce it very close to zero there would always be somebody just one under. You have to draw the line some place and one could make an argument with respect to any number that might be established.

I think, however, that the honourable the member has made one point which is important, and I am going to make one other as well, because he has partly answered his own resolution. He has told us -- and I believe him -- that he is a strong believer in centralization and consolidation. I am not too certain that I would be as strong a believer in centralization, although I am a believer in consolidation. But I would like to suggest to him that the adoption of the principle that's involved in his resolution here would do the greatest harm to the encouragement of consolidation. Now, he said, "Well, the Minister and the Department of Education is not doing very much to encourage consolidation," and that's a matter of argument, and I'm not particularly concerned to debate it on this occasion. All I want to say to him, however, is that were we to adopt his proposal we would thereby make it much more difficult to bring about that degree of consolidation which I am certain he believes to be worthwhile and which certainly I believe to be worthwhile under proper circumstances.

The other thing is this, that one can't tinker with the school grant system just in one particular item. If we were to, for example, consider making a change in respect to this one individual item, we would have to consider a revision of the entire grant schedule because

(Mr. McLean cont'd) . . . . this would obviously get it out of line with other groupings of students. As a matter of fact, I believe, Madam Speaker, that the problem in this regard is rather more acute in those elementary schools where they have three or four rooms teaching the eight grades, and this is a problem with which I have struggled to try and determine a new schedule that would be fair and at the same time accomplish what we would like to see done. All I want to say is that I believe sincerely that the problem referred to in this resolution is much less serious than the problem with regard to the other, and I confess that I have been unable to devise any scheme which would adequately deal with the second problem which is far more prevalent. There are actually, as the resolution indicates -- perhaps I am being unfair in saying that -- the resolution says that there are some schools in rural Manitoba with two-room facilities. Now I endeavoured to get some count of that, Madam Speaker, but was unable to do so. I would like to say to the members of the House, however, that I believe that the number of rural schools with two rooms is quite small -- small in number that is -- and I believe that in fact any suggested change such as proposed by this resolution would only encourage a number of school districts to build a second room where they now have only one, thereby making it more difficult for us to achieve the degree of consolidation which I think would be worthwhile.

The second point is that there are relatively few schools with as many -- that is few one-room schools -- with as many as even 30 students, much less 34 or 35; and indeed perhaps the more common experience is for them to have eight or nine or ten, perhaps twelve students in one-room schools. It is a fact that many of our one-room schools have quite low enrolments, therefore perhaps creating or emphasizing the importance of not tinkering with the grants schedule in this one particular.

For these reasons, Madam Speaker, and recognizing the problems that do develop, I find myself unable to support the resolution which has been proposed by the member for Emerson.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I think that the member from Emerson has made a reasonable statement in introducing his resolution. I think the Minister of Education has made an even more reasonable statement in rebuttal. And I would like to say that it would be rather nice to be able to support the member for Emerson. One is, I am sure, so tempted to look upon the one-room school with a good deal of nostalgia; you would like to be able to do something to improve the efficiency of operation of the ungraded elementary school. But I feel, like the Minister of Education, that adopting this resolution would in one way or another impede the progress in the development of elementary education in this province.

Furthermore, Madam Speaker, the member is asking here for us to draw a very fine line. He suggests that having one teacher for 34 pupils is not a very good pupil-teacher ratio. He suggests that the ratio be lowered. And of course no one can argue with that. But where would you draw the line -- at 28? It would be as a matter of degree then, somewhat better, but not so tremendously better that it warrants throwing our grant schedule out of kilter, that it warrants impeding the trend towards consolidation; and like the Minister of Education, I feel that it would be unfortunate if we were to adopt new policy here which would have the effect of impeding the trend toward consolidation in our Elementary School System. I suppose the ideal would be to have larger school areas, that is to say, to have elementary schools operating in much the same way as is the case with our secondary schools. But this remains an ideal. In the interval we look more or less towards consolidation and the effect of this resolution would be to impede that to some degree at least. So, on balance -- and this is only a matter of on balance -- on balance we do not feel in this group that we would be justified in supporting the resolution.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak now, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, that the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Madam Chairman, may I have the permission of the House to have this resolution stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? Agreed. Second reading of Bill No. 82. The Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. PETERS presented Bill No. 82, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act (2), for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, to me it is with a feeling of regret that I have to at this time bring in a bill of this nature. At the last session of the Legislature we had two very controversial bills before us. One was on the Time Sale Agreement; the other an amendment to The Labour Relations Act. They went through the respective committees that they were supposed to go through, and the one on Labour Relations, there was quite a bit of controversy on it, and the committee decided, or the government decided, that they would send it to the Court of Appeal. The other one on the Time Sale, the government said they would come into effect on the day of Proclamation. That bill has not been proclaimed, and we're dealing with it again today.

Madam Speaker, I think it is regrettable that the government saw fit to not proclaim the Time Sale Agreement. The other one went through the Court of Appeal, and I was one of the members, Madam Speaker, that sat on the Industrial Relations Committee dealing with The Labour Relations Act amendments, and in my opinion I was led to believe that as the committee rose, that when this would go to the Court of Appeal, many people that spoke to the committee would be asked to give their advice on how these amendments should be presented to the Court of Appeal, and I believe that most of the members believed that, and some of the legal people that were there thought that they were going to get an invitation from the government asking them their opinions on the way this should be presented to the Court of Appeal. Some of them were asked to give their opinions, but the Attorney-General when he wrote them said, "You can send your opinions, but I can't guarantee you that we will deal with them -- we will give them serious consideration." So what happened, Madam Speaker, is this, that the question did go to the Court of Appeal and when it did go to the Court of Appeal, the way it was put to the Court of Appeal there could only be one answer, and you didn't need to send it to the Court of Appeal to get that answer. I've talked to many legal men and asked them what their opinion was, and they told me the way the question was put to the Court of Appeal that it didn't need to go there; they could have sent it to any third-year law student and they could have given them the same answer. Because the way the question was put, it answered itself.

Now, Madam Speaker, yesterday when we were in Law Amendments Committee, by mistake there were two bills brought in front of this committee and then they were turned back to the Industrial Relations Committee. We saw there what was happening. There were two bills to be presented; the Labour Unions were on one side, the Management was on the other side, and they were both there prepared to fight each other. Now this government, Madam Speaker, has itself said that what they want most of all is co-operation between Management and Labour, and they're not going to get it by legislation, legislating against Labour unions and legislating in favour of management on the other hand. Labour Unions want co-operation, Madam Speaker, but co-operation is a two-way street; it's not a one-way street. The Honourable Member from Brandon -- he's not in his seat now -- the other day said that you can't legislate wages. No, you can't legislate wages. Neither can you legislate things that we have done. Labour unions individually fear what this legislation says. Now Madam Speaker, the question was put to the Court, and as I said before, it answers itself. The question the unions would like to know is, when does a union authorize an Act, or when does it do an Act? This is something that the Court of Appeal did not deal with, and this is a very important question to people in labour and labour unions. They want to live with Management. They want to live with everybody else, but they don't want to be the ones whose toes are always getting stepped on, and with this legislation, Madam Speaker, the legislation that I am asking to be repealed, the integrity of the unions is being questioned. Take the legal -- the taking of a strike vote conducted by the government. What does it prove? It doesn't prove a thing, Madam Speaker, It doesn't prove a thing because the government is getting into a part that I think they should not take a part in. The government has put out a press release, and I've got it here somewhere Madam Speaker -- I don't want to read it -- of how Labour and Management in the European countries are getting along and where in some countries in Europe they do not have to put up with the legislation that is being imposed on Labour here. We had a very good example, as I said the other day -- yesterday it was -- when we had the Management side on one side and the Union side on the other side, ready to battle each other, and as long as we have to live in this atmosphere, Madam Speaker, we are not going to get anywhere. Until Labour starts to trust Management and Management starts to trust Labour

(Mr. Peters cont'd) . . . . . we will not get anywhere.

When this case went to the Appeal Court, Madam Speaker, -- I don't want to go into the legal end of it because I know that I could be tied up in knots; there are too many lawyers in this House for me and I don't think I could handle all of them; I might be able to handle one at a time but not the whole works of them altogether -- but the Court of Appeal did say that they are not expected to deal on hypothetical cases, and the only way that the Unions could present their cases was on a hypothetical basis, and this is, to me, very important, Madam Speaker, because we know what has happened in other jurisdictions. We don't want it to happen here.

Madam Speaker, I could read here of the way things go on in Sweden. I don't want to read the whole part of what is going on in Sweden but I would like to just read the heading. It says, "It's Peace by Consent. Labour and Management don't Feud." This is what we want Madam Speaker, here in this province. This is what we want throughout the whole of Canada, and putting these pieces of legislation in the way of Labour, putting them in the way of Management is not going to help us any. Labour feels that they're being out-legislated; Management feels that they're not getting enough legislation in their favour, and this, if it's allowed to carry on, Madam Speaker, will never, never get us to the ultimate solution that we want, co-operation between Labour and Management. We have had many top people in Labour say that the day of the strike, that used to be one of Labour's greatest weapons, is over; that they have to sit down at the table and negotiate things. I agree with this, but as long as government passes legislation that is detrimental to Labour, then Labour is going to feel that the government is not trying to help it, that they're getting in the way, they're putting an obstacle there all the way, and this is the thing, Madam Speaker, that we have to get away from, that we all have to work towards right now. This is the critical stage in the history of the Province of Manitoba, of what is going to happen in the next ten or fifteen years.

We see the report of the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future and what they tell us and what we should do, and yet we have plants that are operating in less than 50 percent of their capacity, and it's not through legislation that this is happening; it's because -- it's a lack of understanding between the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and the Minister of Labour, that we are not getting ahead with the job; and I guess I'm getting a little off the track when I'm starting to talk; I should be talking on the Minister's salary when I start talking like this, but Madam Speaker what I've been trying to get across to the members of the Legislature is this: Labour wants to co-operate and it will co-operate. Management will co-operate as long as the government tries to help them instead of putting obstacles in their way.

Madam Speaker put the question.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, and the motion is seconded by the Minister of Welfare.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department XIII - 1. Administration.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable the First Minister can indicate where we go from here insofar as the estimates are concerned, I realize that there is the Department of Labour that we have yet to deal with, I realize that the Honourable the First Minister was pleased to announce to the House this afternoon that the Minister of Labour was down in Sao Paulo or someplace down in South America, in connection with the Pan American Games for 1967. I think that it is most important that the Minister of Labour should be in the House when we're dealing with his estimates, because this is a very important segment of the economy of the Province of Manitoba, I also realize that there are provisions in the estimates for other considerations, matters of capital, matters of public debt. I would like to know from the Honourable the First Minister whether he is going to go ahead with an Acting Minister in the Department of Labour who has no responsibilities for the conduct of the future well-being

(Mr. Paulley cont'd) . . . . . of the department in the future, or whether or not he's going to go into the provision in the estimates for public debt or whether this committee is going to have to consider a department with the Minister in absentia.

MR. ROBLIN: My friend poses me a very difficult problem here. We're almost through the estimates. The only other item that requires to be voted on besides Labour is, of course, the Civil Service salary increase, Resolution 100, and it had been my intention, I must admit, to suggest that we would continue with Labour tonight. I regret as well as he does the Minister is not here. He may not be here for a couple of days, unfortunately, and at this stage in our proceedings it's a bit awkward to hold things up. Mind you, we share a collective responsibility on this side as well as individual responsibility for departments and in view of his previous experience I hoped my colleague the Minister of Welfare could give a fairly good account of himself in going through these estimates on behalf of the Minister of Labour. I, too, would prefer the Minister of Labour to be here. I think it is salutary for Ministers to be available in debates of this kind, but his being in Brazil was coincidental unfortunately, and he's not going to be back for a couple of days as far as I know; so I would like the indulgence of the committee in proceeding with Labour if we can.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to raise objections at all. I appreciate the fact that the former Minister of Labour is in the House, and as I indicated the other day, I do feel that the former Minister of Labour should be in the House to hear of the criticisms of his administration, and I think that they are considerable; but I do think in all earnestness that it would be for the well-being of the conduct of the economy of the Province of Manitoba that the newly designated Minister of Labour should be in the House to hear of the shortcomings of the previous Minister in order that he may gain from the benefits of these shortcomings and also that, seeing as we have got a rookie in the Department of Labour with the former Honourable Member for Osborne, that he should know, without the necessity of having to read Hansard, what we thought of the operation of the Department of Labour under the former Minister and the suggestions that we are going to make on this side of the House, I hope, for the better conduct of the relationship between Management and Labour in the year that we have entered into at the present time.

Now I appreciate the predicament, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable the Leader of the House is in, and I suggest that it really is a predicament that he is in, because of the fact that his Minister of Labour has gone down to South American in connection with the Pan American Games for the year 1967 to take place here in the City of Winnipeg, and I join with my honourable friend in the statement that he made this afternoon of how we in this Legislature -- (interjection) -- Well, it doesn't matter whether I'm a day out or not. But I join with my honourable friend, the First Minister, despite the kibitz from my right, in how much we appreciate the fact that the Pan American Games are going to come here to the City of Winnipeg, and we appreciate the fact that the administration did see fit to send a representative down to Sao Paulo to aid the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg in his deliberations and persuasion to have these games here.

MR. EVANS: . . . . . Is he proposing to talk until the Minister gets back.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that I am going to talk until the Minister gets back. I would like to have that capability, and I'd like, Mr. Chairman, that the Rules of the House would permit me to talk until the Minister of Labour got back. But I would suggest that the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce has pinpointed the objectivity of my remark, and also may I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that he at least by inference is supporting me in my contention of the desirability and the necessity of the Minister of Labour being here when we are considering his estimates for the forthcoming year. And I think, Mr. Chairman, of all of the Ministers of the Crown, the one who should have raised this particular point should be the Minister of Industry and Commerce. And I say this, Mr. Chairman, because of the fact that the Minister of Industry and Commerce, of all the Ministers of the Crown, as a result of the investigation of the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future, is so concerned and the committee report is concerned, of the co-operation between Management, Labour and Government into the future of the Province of Manitoba. The committee was, I think, set up at the instigation of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and I give him credit for this. But as I mentioned the other day, throughout all of the report there is emphasis laid on the fact of the necessity of co-operation between industry, government and labour. Now we've



(Mr. Paulley cont'd) . . . . done away with the old, -- and when I say "old" I am referring to the past Minister of Labour. We've got laid before us in this House a new vision for the future well-being of the Province of Manitoba . . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is this on Item 1?

MR. PAULLEY: Just a minute, Mr. Chairman, it's not Item 1 yet. It's as to whether or not this committee should consider the Department of Labour estimates, and, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect I think this is the item, or this is the matter that's before this committee at the present time, as to where the committee should go. Now, Mr. Chairman . . . . I beg your pardon?

MR. ROBLIN: We are not on any item yet. We haven't even begun.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right. We're dealing with the question of supply. We're dealing with a motion of supply, Mr. Chairman, and I am suggesting because we have no directive from the government as to where we were going from Welfare, I am suggesting that the committee should undertake consideration of not going into the Department of Labour as you suggested -- not the committee, but you, Sir -- suggested in the absence of the Minister of Labour, because of the vital concern presumably of the government of the position of Labour, I suggest that because of the fact that the government has seen fit to change its Minister of Labour -- and I am not going to go into the reasons why, because I am not fully conversant with them but I can suspect -- but I am suggesting this Mr. Chairman, that because of the fact that the government has suggested or has announced a change in the Ministry of Labour, because of the fact the Minister of Labour is not present, because the government has pronounced . . . . its acceptance of the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future, the importance of the position of Labour in the development of the economics of Manitoba, that it is most essential that the Minister of Labour should be present for these deliberations. And I respectfully suggest to the First Minister, who is the baton waver of these committees -- and the bagpipe player . . . . and a Union member, as my honourable friend is so ready to tell us that he carries his card as a bagpipe player in the Union of Musicians here in the Province of Manitoba . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: I had to do that to prove it was a musical instrument.

MR. PAULLEY: And I might say, Mr. Chairman, that despite the statement of the Honourable the First Minister, I still doubt whether it's a musical instrument. And I say this, Mr. Chairman, with my tongue in my cheek because when I get home if my wife happens to read what I've said I know that I am going to get Lord Harry when I do get home, because she happens to be of Scottish ancestry.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Let's have a tune on your bagpipes.

MR. PAULLEY: Here I have my medical advisor on one hand, Mr. Chairman, and on the other hand here I have my undertaker friend, . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: My honourable friend has made a suggestion to me; I think I should answer it by saying that we should proceed with Item 1 on the estimates of the Department of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I raise objections. And I think that it is within my premise as a member of this committee to raise the objections that I am raising at the present time despite the injunction of my honourable friend the Minister of the Treasury and the First Minister. Because I don't think that this committee should proceed with the estimates of the Department of Labour in the absence of a new Minister of Labour, but if my honourable friend, the First Minister of the Province of Manitoba, despite the orations of my honourable friend the Minister of Industry, despite the orations of my honourable friend the First Minister, but if those two want to relegate the position of Labour in this province to the low ebb that they want to, so that these very vital estimates can be considered without the Minister in charge of the department, then I say to them, I cannot do otherwise than accept . . . .

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . their pronouncement that we should go into the consideration of the Department of Labour, but I do say to them this, that if they are sincere in their assertions that Labour is one of the three parties to the well-being of the Province of Manitoba, that we cannot consider the estimates of this department without the Minister of Labour being present during these deliberations. So I say, Mr. Chairman, that if my appeal is without avail, if the First Minister wants to relegate the situation -- the consideration of the Labour estimates -- to the position that they are suggesting, then I cannot do anything about it, and I'll have to accept it, but in accepting it I want to say to my honourable friends opposite they are only giving lip service, and they have only been giving lip service, to the position of Labour in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1, Administration.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should commence. I would like to say, however, that I thought the Premier was being most co-operative the other day because as I understood the remarks of the Leader of the NDP, he seemed to be most anxious that the former Minister of Labour should carry these estimates through in order to account for the mess in which the Department of Labour now finds itself, and I find that this co-operative spirit is not being given in return. However .....

MR. PAULLEY: ..... so he can know the error of your ways.

MR. CARROLL: It is fortunate that my honourable friend can read and he is being spared the kind of outburst that we have just seen from the Leader of the NDP. I would at this time like to say how happy I have been to have been associated with the Department of Labour, because I have counted this to be one of the very great experiences of my life to have been associated with the people in this department and with the men that have had dealings with the Department of Labour in that period of time in which I had the privilege to head the department. I would also like to pay tribute to W. Elliott Wilson, who served as Deputy Minister for a good number of years and who left the provincial service to take on responsibilities as Chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board on December 1st of last year. I will say that he has been considered one of the .....

MR. PAULLEY: If you promise to go through fast I'll sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, perhaps my friend is not speaking with the authority of his party, so perhaps I should carry on. But I would like to pay tribute to Mr. Wilson because he did serve this province well. He was recognized as a labour authority throughout Canada and was recognized even beyond the boundaries of this country. I think he was very happy to have come to join us as Deputy Minister, one who has served as a Deputy Minister of Labour, I think, longer than any other Deputy in the Dominion of Canada today. He comes from the Province of New Brunswick and has served with that department since its formation, I believe, in 1942, or some time before that. He has, and brings with him a wide experience in labour matters; he is highly recognized as an authority on labour throughout Canada, has served twice as president of the CAALL, which is the administrative organization for labour departments in Canada, and he served as well on the National Vocational Advisory Committee at Ottawa. I know there's been some criticism of the department in recent times, largely from the Leader of the NDP, and others like him who present somewhat the same views, but I don't come before the Committee here in any apologetic mood because I've worked in this department for a period of time now and I know the importance of the work that's being done in the department, the variety and complexities of the problems that are encountered, the calibre of the personnel who work in the department, and the kind of devotion and hard work that they put in and often take a great deal of abuse from those whom they are trying to serve.

I believe the Department of Labour in Manitoba is second to none in the Dominion of Canada and I don't want to recite the accomplishments because those are all before you in the Department of Labour Annual Report. They're on record for the members of the House to see. I don't want to suggest that the department is perfect because it isn't. It's made up of human beings who do, on occasion, make errors, but they do work conscientiously and those things that they do are always considered by them at the time to be in the best interests of the province when they're done. As you review the work of the department I would hope that you would judge it fairly and objectively and not let your enthusiasm for finding fault run away with you as the Leader of the NDP did the other day on the debate on The Elevator and Hoist Act.

There is a record here that is worthy of the respect and commendation of this Committee and the Annual Report contains more than the record of the achievements of the department; it also contains a forecast for the future. It points up a continuation and an intensity of the basic functions of the department in the fields of accident prevention, safety, working conditions, wages, apprenticeship training, fire prevention and all of these things which are fundamental to the well-being of the province. But this is only part of the story because the government and the department has demonstrated its awareness of the urgency of our times. It's no longer good enough to merely meet the situations as they arise. It's vital to our economic survival that we anticipate the demands of the future and take some steps to meet these. The government, we

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) . . . . recognize, can't do this job alone. We need some of that co-operative spirit that the Leader of the NDP spoke about a few minutes ago and that the Member for Elmwood spoke about. These solutions call for a variety of skills and knowledge, a pooling of resources and experience and this is the way in which we, as a department, hope to meet these challenges. This approach has been accepted by the department and is in effect at the present time. We have many joint committees at work today -- our trades training committees, our trade advisory committees in the field of gas and steam and pressure plants and electricians and elevators and all these things -- helping to modernize our statutes and meet the technological change that's taking place; setting standards that should apply in today's kinds of conditions. We're carrying on research of our own as well in the department. We know that we've got an atomic reactor coming into our province in the near future and we're aware of the implications of this event. We're aware of the benefits but we're also aware of the hazards that this may bring to the province and we've visited the site and we've had specialists already down at Chalk River to investigate the kinds of problems that may be encountered. We have a joint committee of experts in this field set up to study the kinds of problems that may be encountered when this new industry comes into the province and they're considering how we can best meet these problems before they arise. Special consideration is being given to the protection of our workers in the construction industry. The entire area of accident prevention is under investigation with the co-operation of the Workmen's Compensation Board and others will be involved in the near future.

Another example of this multi-party approach is in the investigation of our problems in the construction industry. You will recall we've known for some time that there are difficulties in this industry and we're not alone in this field because most other provinces and most other jurisdictions on the North American continent recognize problems in this particular area. The Province of Ontario has just completed a Royal Commission investigating this particular problem. There have been books written on it. We're aware -- before the law amendments committee last year, there were people that came to that committee and said that the amendments that were being proposed would do nothing for the construction industry. We recognized it at that time and said, "We have you in mind and we're going to do something about your problems." Shortly after that we had a series of strikes in Winnipeg which delayed any immediate action. However, I think it was in the month of September we started discussions by correspondence with the various construction unions and with the various employers in the building trades to see if we could devise a joint conference-type approach to a study of the problems in the construction industry. The replies were somewhat delayed; there was no delay which resulted from that election of last December, I must say, but we did have our first meeting of this committee in mid-January of this year. There were some 20 in attendance representing their various trade unions and the Builders Exchange and the House Builders Association and the Builders Exchange of Brandon. With the full agreement of this committee we decided to try to identify the problems in the construction industry and to conduct investigations and assemble the kind of research material that will enable us to recommend solutions to the problems in this industry. It was unanimously agreed that the Minister should appoint a committee from that group which had been nominated by their various organizations, and I am pleased to say that Professor Gordon Blake, who had a great deal of experience with the Gas Enquiry Commission and other commissions of that kind, who has been lecturing on labour and labour economics, who has acted as an impartial chairman of arbitration boards and conciliation boards, who has been on the advisory committee of our Labour Employment Committee of COMEF, as the Chairman of this committee. Other members of the committee are Dennis Flynn, representing the Winnipeg Building Trades Council; Otto Anderson, representing the Winnipeg and District Labour Council; R. Clayton, who represents the Winnipeg Builders Exchange; and Lou Plotkin representing the House Builders Association. This committee is charged with certain responsibilities of investigation in this field and will be reporting back regularly to the larger committee of the construction industry. We believe that this kind of joint investigation and joint recommendations by those who are vitally concerned, by those who are most aware of the problems and by those that will have to live with any proposed solution, is the right approach to make at this time. It's all under the guidance of a non-partisan objective chairman who, we believe, will do a good job, together with the other members of this committee. The Department of Labour will be providing the secretarial staff and providing such assistance as may be required by this

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd.) . . . particular committee. We think this is a very constructive approach to the work of this group.

Another new program which was announced just last week is a first for Manitoba. It's an Industrial Relations Seminar co-sponsored by the University of Manitoba and the Department of Labour. It will be a week-long seminar to be undertaken in June of this year. This sort of thing was discussed in our estimates of last year when we proposed some kind of university course for labour and management. It didn't materialize last year and was deferred because of the plans of the Trade Union movement to undertake a course for their members, so we bowed out in favour of them, and are coming forward at this time with this seminar type course. We expect that there will be 40 participants, or thereabouts, representing unions, employers, government and others. The course is designed to analyze mutual problems, to look at the national economy and bargaining trends and public labour policies, to discuss such subjects as inflation and national labour codes and to consider the European experience in labour management and government co-operation -- the kind of thing that was mentioned tonight by the Member for Elmwood. In this connection I just happen to have seen recently a statement made on this subject by William Mahoney, National Director of the United Steel Workers, the largest trade union in Canada. He was talking about the European situation, and he was doing this at the Labour Management Study Conference held in Halifax last November. He said this -- "Like us, on both union and management sides, they were united in their desire for a minimum of state interference, but unlike us, until now, they realized that the price they had to pay for their independence from the state was to jointly agree to place the public interest first and to co-operate in the public interest. You could not have both independence and irresponsibility." And then he goes on to say later, "The one big difference between the situation there" -- and he's talking about Europe -- "and the situation here is that, in all of these countries management has not merely recognized the union but has accepted unions in the fullest possible way and that both accept that neither side can advance its own legitimate interests unless the national and continental economy advances first." I think this is a very statesmanlike statement from one of the leaders of the trade union movement and this is the kind of approach that we would hope to foster through seminars of this kind. This course is designed to be held in a residential setting which will be conducive to study, where the members of the course will live and work and have any social hours they may have together. We feel that this will be a great advantage. The instruction will be provided by Professor Clarence Barbour, Economist, University of Manitoba; Professor Neil Chamberlain, Economist, Yale University -- he has an international reputation in the field of labour economics; Professor H. D. Buswoods, formerly of Manitoba, of McGill at the present time, director of their Industrial Relations Centre. He will be co-ordinator of Canada's first labour college when it commences later this year and he also helped in the labour research for COMEF report. The National Productivity Council is interested in our course. They may provide some finances for it; they will be providing a guest lecturer to take part in it. The committee that was responsible for the organization was under the chairmanship of W. Elliott Wilson; Professor T. Ryan and H. Houston of the University of Manitoba; Art Coulter from the Winnipeg and District Labour Council; John Mason of CMA and Terry Hercus, Winnipeg Personnel Association; and in the latter weeks of the work of this committee they were joined by Mr. Cochrane, the present Deputy Minister of Labour. I understand that Dr. Saunderson took an active interest in this course. It's designed first of all as a pilot project and we hope it will open the door for further joint studies to the end that better understanding will develop to the benefit of both parties and the economy of Manitoba. Mr. Chairman that's the only statement I wish to make at this time. Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN. . . . . department, that as far as possible that if we're dealing with any particular item that follows, the Administration, the Minister's salary, that we try to co-operate without getting into any particular . . . . ., I think it will help us. The member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, firstly I would like to congratulate the Honourable Minister for Welfare for his versatility of presenting two Departments in a matter of two days, in such a short time. I know it must have been some disadvantage to him because the two departments came so close together. But I think I'm probably to more disadvantage of being so new in the House and I hope that my constructive criticisms will add something to this department.

(Mr. Patrick, cont'd.) . . . .

I would also like to congratulate his personnel and his staff in the department for the good service they're giving. It seems customary that everybody congratulates the new Minister, and at this time he's not here, but I do know the Honourable Minister for Labour personally, I know he's a dedicated person and I want to wish him well in this department. I would also like to just convey my sincere congratulations for the part that he has played in the delegation in obtaining the Pan American Games. I realize the First Minister mentioned the other day that the City of Winnipeg should get the credit, but I believe that the government representative also deserves some credit in this respect. I appreciate some of the comments that Acting Minister . . . . . made in regards to this department in such things as the Joint Committee for New Industry, Accident Prevention, Research in New Construction and in Industrial Relations Seminars.

Now, I would like to ask what measures have been taken to stimulate employers to greater safety. I have in mind particularly some of the accidents that have happened in the cave-ins in the excavation work. I wonder if leadership is being offered to firms and associations to form and intensify safety activities, and has consideration been given to offering the assistance of governmental research agencies where it is evident that high rate of accidents are being encountered. Now, is there sufficient exchange of information between agencies that establish the various standards for safety required in industry?

There is another problem which faces the workers of our province, as we advance technically, that is the determination of effects and stresses and environments in their work which the human body may not naturally be fitted to withstand without damage. I'm certain that people in industry are subjected to conditions which decrease their effectiveness. For instance, what are the long-term effects of abnormal lighting; continuous or loud noises; super-sonic vibrations; and strong electro-magnetic fields on human beings? I wonder if there is an agency responsible to discovering the answers to these questions. It might be too late for many of our citizens when we find out statistically. I wonder can the Minister tell us if any work is being done to assess the effects of various industrial environments on workers? Are observations for medical records being studied with the problem in mind? I suggest that the association of safety directors from the Province of Manitoba elect a safety director to study this problem and to collect as much information as he can from Great Britain, the United States, and see that this information is correlated and distributed among different industries.

I would also like to mention a few things about the Labour laws. I think that our Labour Laws need to be tidied up. They are found in three different statutes at the present time -- The Labour Relations Act, The Employers Standard Act and The Fair Wage Act. The procedures involved are not at all too easy to follow. I think there's a case before the courts now -- it's been to the Supreme Court once and to the Manitoba Court of Appeal at least twice, and as far as I know it's not finished yet.

I suggest also that labour legislation is only as good as the procedure to carry it out. If the employee has to carry the cost of prosecution, or if he has to suffer long delays, then the law is not much help to him. The situation is not quite so bad in cases where the workman has a strong labour union to fight for him, but I think in the cases in the Province of Manitoba this is not the case. There must be remedies which is easy, speedy and effective. This means that in one way or another some government agency must handle it for him.

I would like to ask the Honourable Minister if he is aware that the present time workers applying for employment at INCO at Thompson have to get their medical examination at The Pas, Manitoba. To my knowledge there's been some hardship created on these people because when they leave home, it might be Winnipeg or Edmonton -- I know some of them have come as far as Spring Hill -- with their own knowledge that their physical is good, when they get to The Pas, they're turned down for employment at INCO. They haven't got enough money to get back home and they're stranded without any money to get back home. Now I think this could be taken up with the National Employment Service and see if they could probably get their medical in larger centres or places like Winnipeg. I know it's been brought to my attention in a few cases that there has been hardship in some of these people not being able to get back home.

I would also like to mention that -- I don't know if it's proper or not -- the Carberry case which is presently under investigation. It seems to me that all the difficulties that started

(Mr. Patrick, cont'd.) . . . . at Carberry were in the transition period from the construction to the operation of the plant. The big problem today in Carberry is, most of the -- I shouldn't say most -- but the greater percentage of the labour force in the industry in the plant is from the outside areas -- I'd say more than 50 percent. The local people are quite concerned about this, because many of them have started to build homes and tried to get settled in town, as results where they were laid off and as now there's many farm help in the plant and there's much help from different various small towns surrounding the Town of Carberry. I think that Carberry Chamber of Commerce and the Council are really quite concerned about this; they feel that they worked awfully hard to get the industry to Carberry and they're not receiving the full benefits because the people that are coming from out of town, naturally they're buying their groceries in their home town. I think that the Minister should look into this and see if anything could be done.

I'd like to read in the report on the Manitoba Trade Mission to Europe that the report noted that virtually every country visited had developed institutions where labour, management and government, working together, influenced the course of economic and social events. Now labour and management, the report stated, must meet at the national level to discuss in addition to wage negotiations, basic economic matters and objectives. The result is that mutual trust has grown with a subsequent increase in productivity. Co-operative labour management, government planning, is winning acceptance as a means of assisting in achieving economic growth. Now the report said that the members of the Manitoba Trade Mission recognized that there are certain serious gaps in government -- labour consultation and co-operation in economic and social problems in Canada. I wonder if the Honourable Minister would tell us if his department is contemplating to take any action in creating this planning between the government, labour and management. I know the report on Manitoba's Economic Future recommended that steps be taken at once to bring together responsible representatives of three sides, the industry to explore measures to be undertaken in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, I think we're going to get into a little more controversial subject. . . . I would like to make comment on the government's supervised strike vote. It seems to me in making laws it is set forth what the citizens are required to do, and it is assured that he will obey law unless information is secured to the contrary. Now I would say, for instance, making traffic laws and then putting a policeman in every car, we would not probably benefit as much as we should. Now in making rules for the conduct of strike votes by labour organizations, we have laid out rules for the conduct of strike votes and installed government supervision. We are assuming that the union officers are going to break the law, or would if they had the opportunity. We in the liberal group oppose government supervision of strike ballots, especially discriminatory treatment of organized labour. We have stated that we are in favour of secret strike votes but we are opposed to strikes being government supervised. Therefore why don't we follow the Ontario Labour Laws which say every strike vote shall be secret, but the unions are to carry them out. If the unions don't carry them out properly, then they are subject to penalties and should be penalized. It seems requirements is responsibility on all sides. We cannot foster responsibilities by treating parties if they are not to be trusted.

I have one more topic that I will touch on and that's the minimum wage. I think that is something that's certainly important to the whole committee in this House. I think a working person should receive a wage sufficient to fulfill his needs and requirements for his family. If the minimum wage is to remain at the present low level I think that our society has failed to provide for all to have such a living that would be comfortable -- that most people would like to have. I think this is quite important that we should do something about. I think that the present minimum wage is not what it should be. I have quite a few briefs -- I'm not going to go into detail on any of them, but just, for instance, let's use a figure of 70 cents an hour for eight hours, 40 hours a week. We're going to get a wage just a little more than \$100.00 a month, and I don't think that anybody can live on \$100.00 a month. I would like to say that I feel that minimum wage should be increased. I'm not in a position to say what it should be. I think that the Department of Labour probably have better ideas at this time because -- not that I wouldn't like to say, but I don't think that I have enough knowledge at the moment, or enough information to say what the minimum wage should be -- but I think that the present level is just ridiculously too low. That's all I have to say, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to thank you for bearing with me.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on the Minister's Salary and I would like to start where the Honourable Member for Assiniboia left off, on the Minimum Wage. I think it is time that this government took on its responsibility instead of shirking it off onto a Minimum Wage Board. And I can give you a good example. In Ontario where you had no minimum wage for males the government saw the responsibility and raised the minimum wage from nothing, when they had no Minimum Wage Act, to a dollar an hour. This government sits back and palms off its responsibility onto a Minimum Wage Board, and it will say that you have members of labour organizations on it. As far as I am concerned, the members that are representing Labour on the Minimum Wage Board have not been doing their job. They've been as lax as this government is. I can get it; I can stand it; I stand for a principle. When they sit back and argue over two cents an hour to get a majority report it makes me want to -- what's the parliamentary word for it? Regurgitate? But, Mr. Chairman, when we get to the Minimum Wage Board I think -- or the Minimum Wage Act -- it's time that this government woke up and took its responsibility. I am sick and tired -- this is the first year since I've sat in this house that I've not brought in a resolution asking for a minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour, because the Minimum Wage Board was sitting. And it makes me sick after I bring in a resolution to find out that the Minimum Wage Board has sat and they went all over the country and they finally decided -- and Labour members on that board -- for 66 cents an hour. What kind of rot is this? They're not being honest with us. They're not being honest with themselves.

Now getting to the Deputy Minister of Labour that the Acting Minister of Labour had mentioned, I think that this -- I don't know how to put the words. What is this doing to the people in the Province of Manitoba, that you are saying to them that you haven't got anybody in the Province of Manitoba that can administer your Act. If you had to go outside of the Province of Manitoba, if you had to go to New Brunswick, why didn't you go further and go to the European countries where they have experience, where Labour and Management are getting together. Why go to New Brunswick? Why didn't you go further east? But I still say, Mr. Chairman, that you should have got your Deputy Minister of Labour right here from Manitoba. We have the people. They are capable. And don't tell me that the Acting Minister of Labour is going to sit there and tell me that we haven't got anybody in this province that can administer the Department of Labour. Because if that's what he is going to say then he ought to be ashamed of himself and he shouldn't be sitting where he is.

Now the Minister talks about the construction industry and what they're doing. They set up this commission to look into it and everything else. Why is this government in such a rush to amend the Fair Wage Act if they have set up this commission to look into the whole construction industry? Why did they have to jump the gun? Who is pushing them? This is what Labour is afraid of, that the government is getting pushed by Management. And he can tell me that the members on these boards of the Fair Wage Board -- agreed that this was a majority report. But he will find out when he gets into the Industrial Relations Committee that it is not a unanimous report. He might have two people that agree with him. Labour has always said, and they have presented their briefs to you, to the government, that Zone B should be abolished; that there should only be one zone, one wage. We have no second class citizens in Manitoba. They are all first class citizens. And you can sit there and you can make all the excuses you want, but you have been shirking your duty. The former government shirked it also. -- (Interjection) -- Larry, you know better.

Now we get into the Labour Relations Act, Mr. Chairman. What happened? Management can violate the Labour Relations Act. If they are convicted, what happens? They get fined a few dollars and they can go on their merry way and keep on violating the Act. But what about the people that lose their jobs? They don't get their jobs back. They are the ones that suffer. Getting back to violations, let's go back; last year I read into the record and I want to read it into the record again, the violations that took place of one contractor under the Fair Wage Act -- it might be Page . . . , I'll find it if you care to wait that long -- (Interjection) -- Well that will be fine; as soon as he gets back I'll be able to deal with him much better. But anyway, Mr. Chairman, it gets down to this point that -- this is the Annual Report of 1959 and I've got them from '59, '60, '61 and '62, and it's the same company that always violates the Act. What happens? The first year they got fined \$20.00; the next time they got convicted they were put on two years' suspended sentence or something; the time after that

(Mr. Peters, cont'd.) . . . . they reconsidered and they fined them \$10.00. Failure to pay wages.

MR. CARROLL: We fixed that up last year with an amendment to The Employment Standards Act.

MR. PETERS: You haven't fixed it up because it's in the Report of 1962. Oh, I can read it though I think I should get . . . .

MR. CARROLL: What I meant to say was though, that if they failed to pay wages . . . . I'll answer later.

MR. PETERS: What I'm getting at, Mr. Chairman, is that I said earlier when I was speaking on the bill that I brought in on the Labour Relations Act, Labour does well to co-operate, and it will co-operate, but it won't and can't co-operate as long as this government sits back on its -- what's the parliamentary word? -- and does nothing about it.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm going to have to give you a dictionary . . .

MR. PETERS: One from St. Boniface in French? Fine. But anyway, Mr. Chairman, what I'm getting at is that this government has done nothing to bring on a peace between Labour and Management. This is what has got to be done. As I said earlier we are on the threshold of a great era, and if you don't do something you are going to find yourself in this position, that you won't have the co-operation of Labour, you're going to go back into the era where nobody is going to trust anybody, and the era that you are coming into now -- and you have been in the last five to ten years -- is automation. You're doing people -- automation is doing people out of jobs. The government is doing nothing to train these people or help to train them, and I'm not going to read this whole book here. It's the report of "The Toronto Star reports on Sweden, the Welfare State;" and it was a report done by Mr. Robert Nielson. I will send it over to the Minister of Labour and he can read it over at his own leisure and see what they are doing there. I will just read a few headings -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Shoemaker does all the reading. "More Jobs than Workers in Sweden." We can't say that here. "How Sweden Creates Full Employment to Avoid the Slump." And it goes on and on. I don't want to carry on and read all these reports, but this is what's going on--it's only 20 to 12, I can carry on for another 20 minutes if you like.

But the point that I was getting at, Mr. Chairman, is that this government is not the forward-looking government that it said it was. And until it gets off its -- somebody passed me a note and said "haunches" -- and do something, then we are going to be in very serious straits. I just want to take a look here and see that I -- Oh, yes, the Minister mentioned something about the meeting that they're setting up with Management and unions, and the government is looking after all this; well, this is going on in Ontario; it's going on in Saskatchewan. I've got reports from all the provinces. They're all doing it. They all realize that at last they've got to do something. And this government is almost first this time; it's about third, I think, because Ontario has already had their meeting and I think they've had them in Alberta. But I think that the the government has to give very serious consideration to all the items that I've mentioned and get off their haunches.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the Minister of Welfare who has taken on another job; the Minister of Labour, taking on his job in absentia. I have something written out here which the Minister of Labour when he was here mentioned, and I thought that that remark was out of place so I've gone ahead and thought over this thing and I brought something back to you people to think over. We are not the only ones who are looking for trouble. It seems now that we are being pushed all over the place, especially the middle-aged worker, in these various plants. I know. I've talked to people here; I've talked to people in different other places. I've gone and I've worked on this . . . . . program. We used to make an average of a dollar or two dollars a day. But now this thing has gone down. Regardless of how you go about it there has to be co-operation between Labour and Management, but if it's only one side . . . . .

Now you take for instance, we have such a plan to work. All right, we'll say we're going to go out and work. We go out and do this type of work and around the end of the week they've cut us down so far. They have the stopwatch on you. You work, you have to keep up, the older man with the young buck, and it's pretty hard to do. The old man is getting a load on his shoulder, it just feels like a sack of sand. As you get up towards the "fifties" you don't feel like going like the young fellow any more. You feel like going home at night but he feels like going out. The way it is in the plants today, it's rush, rush, rush, regardless of the



(Mr. Harris, cont'd.) . . . older worker that was there through the years and give them good employment.

Through the war years they said to the older chap, you stay on your jobs; you show these different peoples that come along, just show them what you know and look after things and see that we get production out because we need it overseas. But after the war was over -- boy, let the older guy go out. I know. I sat on various committees. I sat with my friend there in Regina one time. I come here many times. He didn't remember me but I remembered him. Through the years we've come back and forth, and I will say this, that this province to me is one that is backward. Why? I don't know. Is it because of the kind of people we have in here? What is it? You go to the east and you go to the west, and you find things are better; but right here in Manitoba, I don't know, we seem to have a stoppage in the head.

Now I think it's time we get down to facts and get going on these things. If we do that, well then we'll be able to have co-operation; we'll be able to go on, whatever we want to do here, economically. But if we don't do that, well then we are lost. We can talk all we want. You can do all you want. You can bring all the laws in you want, but you'll never push the people any further than they want to go. The reason why today we have in the various plants that have organized wages is because in the "thirties" we were here. We had no wages; we had no hours. I know for a fact -- I had a wife and two children -- what did I earn a week? I went to the factory to work. I worked two hours and I went home, and I got paid 25¢ an hour. I paid a nickel each way to go home on the street car. I took my lunch with me and I took my lunch home to eat, because there was nothing at home for me to eat, except that they'd give me that little bit of lunch to go to work.

These people were pushed up right to '39, and when this war came into being there was all kinds of work then, there was all kinds of money come in then. Where was it coming from? Then the people in the plants started to think. Then they started to organize. That was the opportunity they had. Prior to that time, the only thing in Manitoba was the railroads. If you had a job on the railroad you were a king, but if you didn't work on the railroad you worked two or three months sporadically and you saved the little you got, knowing that through the winter there was nothing for you, there was no work whatsoever. So the man had to go out and get, and save whatever he could. He went out on to the prairie and he dug a little piece and he put some seed in, hoping and praying that he would get something that would be able to sustain him through the wintertime.

As I say, the war come and changed the picture. We in Manitoba, we didn't feel the outcome of the war, not until '43 actually. But the war come and changed the picture for the working man, and we started to feel the pressure coming in from the coast, the extra work coming in from the coast right into Manitoba, the centre of the continent. Naturally they took advantage of that thing at that particular time. I know I worked in a plant where I would say, comfortably, 800 men was all you could get in there. I worked in that place. At the time of the war, there was 1400 men. There was a young chap working beside me, and I shouldn't laugh, but one day both his legs fell off -- he didn't have nothing but wooden legs. I shouldn't laugh, but it was very funny to me at the time. As long as you could wobble a finger they would find work for you to do.

Now I say if that can be done in time of war, why can't we do it in time of peace, and why can't we sit down together and work things out in the proper manner? We don't have to do any fighting. We don't have to do nothing. Nobody wants any more than anybody else. A man can only wear one suit of clothes at a time; a man can only eat one meal. So what more do you want? Why does a man want two or three million sitting in the banks doing nothing? Put it into the country and let's get going. People overseas are doing all these things, and what are we doing? We are sitting back and saying: "We're Manitobans; we're Canadians; we'll sit back on our laurels." We used to say here in Manitoba, or in the west, we have the finest hockey players in the world. But what happens today? They go overseas and what do they do to them? They show them how to play hockey. If we don't watch out, what we've got here today, what we think we've got in our hands -- we've got the wealth of the world -- it's going to be taken away from us because there are hungry people overseas waiting to come in here. It's up to us to make a market; it's up to us to put our products out; and it's up to us to show to the world that we are Canadians, we are Manitobans and we want to do what we want to do.

(Mr. Harris, cont'd.) . . . .

Now, sir, I have something here. I would wish the Minister of Labour was here. He made these few remarks. I want to put them back to him. The Honourable Minister of Labour is quite correct when he says that the members of the New Democratic Party are concerned about the wages and lives of working men in all communities. The New Democratic Party, and its predecessor the CCF, came into being and exists today to fight for the common man. It is composed mainly of such men who have found through bitter experience that they must have their own party to look after their own particular interests, which proves -- I don't care what you say -- we know we are fighting for the common man and we are the only people that I think have the interests of the common man, because we are people of that kind. I'm not saying anything about this group here, or even you there, because you have your own ways of thinking. I don't ask you to change your ways; you think as you like. I think as I like. I try to do what I think is best for everybody. If I do that, my conscience is clear.

Well, Sir, with regards to the Minister's statements in Hansard dated Wednesday April 10, 1963, Page 1099, in which he said, "The Fair Wage Board met in several communities in the province and held large public meetings to determine the situations that existed in these communities." First of all, it would be interesting to know just which communities were included in these series of meetings. I would like to know the names of all the communities in which these public meetings took place. The Minister further stated that there were large public meetings, but he does not say which segment of the public they represented, employer or employee groups. How many briefs were presented by employer groups? How many by employee groups? Could the Minister give me the names of the people representing the briefs on behalf of the employers in these communities? I cannot believe that any workers would be so naive as to cut their own throats by supporting the amendment to The Fair Wage Act.

I also am in full agreement with a strong tripartite between labour, government and management, as mentioned by the Minister in Hansard referred to before. But a tripartite means 33-1/3 representation each. In this particular case, labour's share seems to be 2%, being the two labour members of The Fair Wage Board. Outside of this, there is no employee-labour representation in these rural areas because unions are discouraged. There are therefore no spokesmen for labour outside of the City of Winnipeg. In view of this, I would urge that a full report containing the answers to my questions and a report of the Enquiry Committee into the construction industry included in The Fair Wage Act, be given to this House and taken into full consideration before this bill be given final reading and royal approval and before the amendment goes before the law of the province. Thank you, gentlemen.

..... Continued on next page

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I for one don't think that the Honourable Minister is that black. I think that he has quite a bit of experience in this department and I don't think that the government is neglecting anything by letting him take these estimates. In fact, he's in a better position to answer, either accusations or anything like this, than the poor new Minister would be in.

I think that unfortunately when we start on labour, it seems that a group here in this House feel, and today a member was doing very well who I think was very sincere, said that they were the only people interested in the common man. Well I certainly don't agree that this is so. I don't think that it is right, and I think that this is probably the downfall of the NDP Party if they feel that they can come here to represent only one part, one certain group of Canadians. And I say to them, and I know that they are sincere in this, that they will not get anywhere with this approach, this attitude. I don't think that it is well to come here and damn management, not more than it is right to take the opposite stand and just damn labour. If we want Canada to grow we need all the people in there, and there's only one way of doing this, and it is by good relations between the different groups, between management and labour. I feel that the government should come in -- this is in one department that the government should come in only if and when management and labour cannot get together, and management and labour should be told this: iron out your difficulties yourself, and if you can't, well then we'll step in and you'll have to accept this.

I know that I was told in the past that I never contributed very much to this department. About the only thing that I repeated since 1959 was that I wanted to see a better relationship -- I think the Honourable Minister remembered that in '59, '60 and '61 -- in fact, I'll read a bit of Hansard of '61 -- this is what I had to say at the time: "Mr. Chairman, unless labour and management compose their differences and make a go of collective bargaining, they may be saddled with some form of compulsory arbitration. I would say that many Canadians are losing confidence in the ability of Union leaders and the management representatives to make collective bargaining serve the public interest, and worse yet, are losing faith in the very institution of bargaining itself. It is alarming to see an increasing demand for compulsory arbitration. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the government of the province should try to foster government-labour-management conferences, preferably to start with the province here in Manitoba and eventually to try to make this a national conference." Though I do say this was the speech that I was criticized so strongly by the then Member from St. John's and the Leader of the NDP when I said -- and a lot of words were forgotten, but I said that I would wish to say here before concluding, Mr. Chairman, that I certainly do not accuse any of the labour leaders of the province of being dishonest. I think that Manitoba is fortunate in this respect but I certainly do claim that many of those big unions, national unions and international unions, need cleaning up.

Well I do say this, and I did say that I didn't feel that the management -- that their hands were lily-white either. It seems that now finally after this mission that we've had, all this report is practically this mission to Europe of the National Productivity Council, report of the labour-management government, it seems that finally we're thinking along these lines and I think this is the only way. No group will come here and accuse either the government or management and make management wrong in everything, not more than a group that come in and say that labour is always wrong. You can never make enough laws that will force what these people say that they want if there is not goodwill from both sides.

If we appreciate this and if we try to run our affairs -- there's another thing that I said that I didn't think that we needed people at the time -- that was a few years ago -- they were talking about Hoffa coming here to straighten out something and boy was I criticized for saying that, that we shouldn't have Mr. Hoffa here. Now if this is an ordinary common man, this Mr. Hoffa -- I have here a report of Hoffa's daughter marrying and I won't read it all. They said, "Amongst the more than 700 sleekly-dressed guests at the brief marriage ceremony was an ex-convict and some time teamster official, Barney Baker" and so on, but here they have, "He was overheard to say" -- this is Mr. Hoffa -- "to say during the day that all this cost him \$27,000.00." Well, you see probably tomorrow it'll be the same thing. This is not accusing labour. Labour is the man on the field, the rank and file, and these are the people that I'm interested in protecting. I'm not too interested in the others. I'm not accusing them; I'm saying there are some like this.

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd) .....

Now I was told by the Member for St. John's to mind my business, that anybody could come here and this was fine, they can exploit their people. But since then Mr. Claude Jodoin, Canada's top labour leader said Friday he thinks waterfront unionist L.B. Banks should go home to his native United States." Mr. Jodoin, President of the 1,000,000 member Canadian Labour Congress told the Norris Labour Enquiry that he erred in supporting Mr. Banks in a 1957 bid for Canadian citizenship." Now when Mr. Jodoin says that it's perfectly all right. I suggested this a few years ago -- I suggested that we try to get together; that we work together with management and labour; and it didn't make sense. I think this is the first thing.

There are some problems and we can't just say "Well, government, you have to have this, you have to have restrictive laws." We've got to have goodwill or it will never work, and I say this is the downfall of the NDP Party because they want to do away with management, because some of the members, I think the member from Elmwood the way he spoke today, well everything was wrong about management. If you do away with management, I can only see Communism and I certainly don't want Communism. -- (Interjection) -- Well, it sounded -- this is not an accusation, this is the way I understood and I think it's wrong.

I don't think that we can come here -- I know and I'm saying that there's a lot of employers that are unfair. There's no doubt about that and we've always said that. Anybody in this House do agree that we need unions, strong unions. We believe in that; we believe in all that, but you can't just come here and accuse one group. This is not right and you're just playing one group against the other and it's wrong. I think that it's wrong. I think that we need a lot more co-operation. As I said, I've advocated that for a few years and now they're talking about it, but I would like the Acting Minister of Labour to give us something on this.

I see here, and I'll read this: "Council Abandoned by the Cabinet". This is the Federal Cabinet but maybe they know something about this. "Labour and management agreed more than 18 months ago to work together as a team within the Federal Government in tackling Canada's economic problems, reliable sources say. The agreement was reached March 15, 1961, at an Ottawa Conference of Labour, management and government leaders, then promptly suppressed on orders from a high level in the Cabinet, the sources say. Most of Canada's top business and union leaders attended the Ottawa meeting at the personal invitation of Trade Minister Hees and Labour Minister Starr. They were reported to have agreed to establish a permanent council to be financed by all three groups, to foster continuing co-operation, consultation on economic problems amongst labour, management and government. They also agreed to meet again but never did." Now again this is neither an accusation and it's certainly not the fault of the Provincial Government, but at the time I was suggesting that this government pioneer and start this business, and it seemed to be something new, nobody spoke about that then, but now all of a sudden it seems that people agree.

I see that there is a group -- I think they call it the "New Group to Promote Understanding". There's a picture of three co-chairmen of the newly formed religion, business and professional council of Winnipeg. I was talking to Canon Scott a few days ago and he said that this is going very well. I hope that the Minister will tell us something about this. These are the things I'm interested in. I was supposed to get some information from Canon Scott and I've never received it.

But I think that this is the important thing. We do recognize -- everybody here recognizes about the minimum wage rates and it is a very important thing, but it's not cut and dried. If I want to help somebody and there's helping not only financially -- it might be somebody, I might not need anybody at all, any help at all, and there's some young fellow that's not too bright and could never get a job and I don't need him and he might be in the way more than anything else, and this is not far-fetched, this is done an awful lot -- you might say, all right he wants a job for his dinner. All right give him a broom. He'll push the broom, he might get 50 cents, 75 cents an hour. That might not be enough but that man is not worth it. You have to talk about the work also. You have to talk -- I mean if this is going to be welfare it's no longer a wage. Now I'm not saying that this happens every day, that you can use this as an excuse, you don't need the man. That's not what I'm trying to say. I don't want this to be exaggerated, but it is a condition.

Now there might be somebody in the general store in the country. You might have

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd) . . . . somebody coming in after school to study and they'll mind the store. Those people couldn't afford a certain amount. I think that the main thing is we've got to have charity in our hearts and we've got to see that they are living wages. That's the important thing. That is the important thing. There are people holding two jobs also. That is another thing, and they're talking about a lack of work. That's fine, they're ambitious and maybe they're not -- I know my friends to my left will probably say well they're not making enough, they have to work. That's possible. But all these things have to be considered before we come in with accusations cut and dried and either the government is wrong or the people are wrong and management are wrong. I don't doubt the sincerity of my friends in the NDP but I don't go for this business that they're the only ones that are interested in the common man. I certainly don't believe I'll ever swallow that. I don't think that that's right.

Now I think that this government has brought in some good legislation. We don't agree with them on this labour because we feel that it shouldn't be brought in piecemeal the way it's done. There's a lot of things that we agree with but it's no good, we'll have to start all over again. It's time that we maybe overhaul or at least take a good look at this; maybe call in management, labour and the government to sit in on this and make real good laws. I think that we should have a look at that but if we do it piecemeal it's not going to work. It's got to be a program that's going to be done together.

Now there is -- this is just a question. I read an article on March 29th, 1963, where the people of -- there's one country apparently in Iceland where they need all kinds of help up there, apparently they need about half a million workers. I don't know if it's true and the article from the Free Press stated that they might try to get some of the people here that couldn't find jobs. Is there anything in there? Is that a permanent thing? I think that we would be interesting knowing something about that. It seems that a country with the small population that we have -- of course they're not going to starve here -- I'm not talking about the individual, but it seems that the Federal Government maybe should do a little more than this. We can't afford to lose the people with the small population that we have in this country to go and work in Iceland.

There's not too much more I want to say. There's something that will probably bring protests from the people on my left. I see here that Mr. Justice Fauteux of the Supreme Court of Canada said today it seems to him that the rights of a member of a trade union are being infringed if money he pays in dues and membership fees is used to support a political party. He opposes it. This is something that we've been going through also -- the money for elections. We have talked about this in the past. I don't think that it's wrong for anybody to contribute for something that they believe in. I think that this is wrong. I said a while ago we believe in unions, but I don't think the union should go out and collect the money without the people having much to say -- I know they can probably write a letter but they don't like doing that, nobody likes doing that -- and they point the finger at these people and they're not in too good a condition. Don't tell me that this isn't done because there is an awful lot of this done. I don't think that that's right, that we should be able to try to get the money that way.

Now even if it was right, even if say legally or if people would get it from different companies and the shareholders are called in and so on, I don't think it's quite the same thing, but this is not conducive to help. How can you have -- how can you have in this group -- let's say like labour that's going to say all right there's only one party that . . . . . good. It's very bad business. It's bad business to do that the same as it's bad business for the NDP, and that's why they're not going anywhere. They're going to lose the only province that they have at the next election because they just try to play one group against the other. Now these are not harsh words. As I said, I think that these people are sincere but I think that they're missing the boat if they don't start to think of the things the way they really are and realize that we have to pitch in. I'm not saying that management is perfect, far from it, but I say that we have to pitch in and we have to recognize management as much as labour if we want to get anywhere, if we want to change these laws.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a few words at this time on some of the questions that have been raised. The Member for Assiniboia I think made a very worthwhile and constructive contribution toward the work of this committee. He put forward several very useful and thought-provoking ideas. He's asking what the province does to

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd) . . . . stimulate greater safety in places of employment. I would like to say that first of all we have a pretty thorough inspection system to try to prevent hazards through our inspection services, and at that time there is an educational aspect to it. We do like to lecture to make sure that people understand the values of safety. In addition to that, the Federal Government sponsor labour-management committees and they have a special program in this field. I think they're doing a very useful work and we as a province of course are lending our support to this particular program. We also take part regularly in safety award programs. I think there's one tomorrow afternoon that we've been invited to and these come off regularly, in which we like to take part to help to promote the whole idea of safety.

Now in those areas of work where there is a real health hazard, then I think the Department of Labour likes to lean on the services of the Department of Health, particularly where there's a noise hazard; where there's silica dust; where there's silicosis hazard and things of that kind; so that in these areas it's a combination of the Department of Health and the Department of Labour working together in co-operation to try to produce safe working conditions.

Another thing we do of course, we gather statistics, we analyze statistics, and we do this in co-operation with the Workmen's Compensation Board. We have a working committee now; we hope at some time in the future to be able to conduct a safety conference in which we try to involve all people who are interested in safety and who have that as a goal.

Now you were asking -- you mentioned we had three pieces of labour legislation -- I think the member is slightly misinformed. I think we have something like 25 Acts that are administered under the Department of Labour.

Cost of Prosecution borne by the worker. I would like to say that we have a special assistance officer in the department that is there to help workmen who have compensation problems, who has problems with failure to give notice, failure to pay wages, and we do things like that to help the workman who has been badly treated by his employer.

Last year in this bill to amend The Labour Relations Act, we did spell out that the government would be taking a more active interest with respect to unfair labour practices. We are aware of the problem that he mentions about Inco conducting their medicals at The Pas. There has been some discussions as I understand it with Inco. I can't think of a better place to go for a medical but it is an inconvenience for some people. We appreciate that but I must confess we aren't in a position yet to be able to push Inco around. I think we tried on one or two occasions and really haven't been too successful.

With respect to the problem in Carberry and employing people from outside of that particular community, I really think there is very little that we can do as a government to try to tell them where they should hire people and things like that. This is entirely within their sphere of jurisdiction. I doubt that there's anything that we can do.

We do agree that there is a great deal of merit in studying this European situation. We talked a great deal about Sweden but there are many other experiences that I think we should consider too. Switzerland is a very interesting one and I know that some day perhaps we'll have an opportunity to consider that one as well.

Now the question of the government strike vote. You suggest that we assume that everyone that's a trade union leader is breaking the law. I think this wasn't the point at all. I think if you'll go back and read the Hansard when this was introduced, we said that this would relieve this area of doubt. Every time there's a strike vote taken, or at least quite often, we get charges by management that it was conducted in an improper way; there was undue pressure put on people who were going to vote; possibly the vote was conducted in a place that was inconvenient to many of the workers but seemed to favor a certain group, and things like that. There were these kinds of criticisms of the actual strike vote situation and then there have been actual experiences where we of the department have felt that the votes weren't conducted properly, but altogether we felt that this would help to create a better atmosphere, and we felt that there would be some value in bringing in a secret strike vote. We agree with you that the minimum wage is presently too low, and we are still waiting for a report from the Minimum Wage Board which we hope will be coming soon.

The Member for Elmwood. I really wonder at the kind of grandstanding performance that he put on tonight. It seems to be so typical of so many people who purport to speak for

(Mr. Carroll, cont'd) . . . . the labour unions of this province to come in here and try to put on a great show to impress people that they are the true champions of labour, and I really fail to be impressed by this kind of a performance and his suggestion that the Minimum Wage Boards are not being honest with themselves in the recommendations that they bring forth. He's doing a discourtesy to every member of that Board in making statements of this kind and I think it's unworthy of a member of the House.

Now he mentions going out of the province for a Deputy Minister and I agree that frankly we should be looking within the province, but we went out of the province to get what I consider to be the best Deputy Minister of Labour in Canada, and I hope that those of you who have dealings with him over a period of time will get to know him and be able to rely on his experience, and I think you'll learn that he is that kind of man. There is one other thing, that we did have good men in the department -- I must confess that -- but I think there is no one who has developed the kind of background of experience, the all-round kind of development that would have made him fit into this senior position easy for him and for his Minister. This was the reason, I believe, why we went out of the province for that senior spot, but I do give full credit to the other senior people in the department because we believe them to be very good and capable men.

Construction industry. Why are we rushing into the amendments in The Fair Wage Act in view of the committee that has been established. I think the only reason we're doing this at this time is that we are hoping to maintain the status quo. As you will recall, a great many new communities were brought in under The Fair Wage Act last year, and because of the artificial way in which these wages in Zone B have been established, it has caused quite a dislocation within most communities. I would hope that there might be some evidence of that before our Law Amendments Committee because I know many of those people were wanting to come before the committee to speak of their particular problem, and I think that this was the real reason for the Board recommending that. They went out and met these people and they said we must do something to try to alleviate this situation on a temporary basis, only to prevent this kind of situation until such time as the construction industry committee can deal with it, and that's the reason I believe why that recommendation was made. We concurred in it and have the bill now before the House.

There was a question about employers being able to continuously violate the statutes in failing to pay wages. You will recall that last year we brought in an amendment to protect against this kind of situation. We say where an employer has been a repeated violator, or repeated offender under this section, he must file a bond or other indications of financial responsibility with the department before he can continue to employ people in the future. There have been several of these repeated violators that have filed their bonds and since that time we've had no further trouble. We hope this will solve the problem. We think it was a constructive measure and a helpful one.

He says that labour wants to co-operate but the government does nothing. Well I would like to tell him that the government does a great deal for labour, for management, particularly in labour-management relations. I know of no one that works their heart out like these men do -- long hours every night of the week on many occasions. I know that when we adjourned for Christmas holidays, when the rest of the staff were away, the conciliation staff was working on that Parkhill strike through part of the Christmas holidays. These people are dedicated people, and the kind of criticism that we got here this evening certainly must hurt those people who are giving of themselves in a dedicated way and then have this kind of lack of appreciation shown for them, this kind of abuse by people who don't understand the work. I feel that they have the responsibility to find out what kind of a job they are doing before remarks of that kind are made. You talk about labour co-operating. I would like to know how your own union co-operated just a few years ago in another labour-management negotiation that we had.

You talk about what has the government done. What's the government done? Well I have -- I don't know whether you were at the Manitoba Federation of Labour Convention two years ago -- I read the list of the statutes that this government has brought in. We brought in The Vacations with Pay Act; Tradesmen's Qualifications Act; Fair Accommodation Practices Act; amendments to The Workmen's Compensation Act. There's a whole page of them there and I could read them all if you would like.

MR. HARRIS: Pardon me, Mr. Minister. Could you tell me what years were they brought in -- vacations with pay and so on and so forth.

MR. CARROLL: They've been brought in since this government came to office. I am going back over the last four years. Winter Employment Act -- and there have been dozens of other statutes. I have mentioned our Employment Standards where we're giving protection to workmen's wages; our Construction Safety Act last year to help us to give better protection to workmen. You say we're doing nothing. Well where have you been for these four years? You've been sitting in the House here while these bills have been going through. I don't know why you persist in saying the government is doing nothing. I am not talking about the member for Logan; I am looking at the member for Elmwood here. He is the man who has been raising all the fuss in the house tonight together with his leader. What is the government doing to train people? Well I think we all know the plans that the Minister of Education has for training people together with the plan of the government at Ottawa, and I think both of them very constructive measures, the training of unemployed and the new technical training institutes that are springing up.

Then he mentioned too the Swedish experience. What he fails to recognize is that the things that we did here last year in our Labour Relations Act are just doing the things that Sweden did 20, 30 years ago. They've had legal status over there since 1915 as I recall it, and labour and management didn't come together and decide by themselves that we should get along because this is the right and proper thing to do. They got together because the government said if you don't get together we are going to step in and run your affairs. That was what happened in 1938 and that's the only reason they got together at that time. I must confess it has been a tremendously successful venture and we're trying to follow that pattern here. We're trying to encourage that kind of co-operation. I think the Member for St. Boniface last year talked about University courses. This is one step in the right direction plus all of these other things that are being done.

Some suggestion that Manitoba is way behind the east and west. I don't think the COMEF Report says that. I enquired about COMEF's report today as it applied to labour matters, and I think you'll find that they say in there that conditions in Manitoba are such as not to discriminate against labour -- our legislation is such that it doesn't discriminate against either labour or management in comparison with the adjacent provinces that were compared. I think they compared with Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan, and I am not sure, I think it was likely Alberta.

With respect to wages, as I understand it the average wage in retail trades here in Manitoba is above the national average. In the mining industry I think we are the third highest in Canada from the information I've got. In manufacturing we have been increasing at a higher level than most other provinces in recent years.

With respect to employment, I think we have an admirable record here, because for 6 months last year over 98 percent of the work force was employed. This was a real record of achievement in my opinion.

Now I think the Member for Logan also mentioned the Fair Wage Board and he wanted to know where they were meeting, etcetera. I think that it might be worthwhile if we could have the chairman of the Fair Wage Board at our meeting on Friday. I don't know whether we should invite him or whether it's proper to do so, but I could ask him to be there and then if the Industrial Relations Committee feel that they would like to draw on his advice and his experience in these little trips around the country on The Fair Wage Act -- the member for Logan was interested in this matter.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask you a question. You made a suggestion there and I think a very good one. I am on this Industrial Board, this Industrial Investigation whatever you might call it. Bring them all there; let them all answer. That's a good way to do it; that's the way to get to the bottom of everything. Thank you.

MR. CARROLL: If he isn't willing to testify, I'm prepared to get that information and have it available for the committee at that time.

Now there was one other suggestion here from the member for St. Boniface -- a permanent council. He's talking about this Ottawa situation. I really don't know why it folded or anything else, but I do know that the Minister of Industry and Commerce has legislation either before the House now or will be before the House shortly that will establish a similar kind of Board here in Manitoba that I hope will accomplish the end that he would like to see accomplished.



(Mr. Carroll, cont'd) . . . .

Now as far as the Icelanders are concerned, I've been trying to help them as best I can. I've been doing my part for the Icelandic people, not in Iceland but here in Manitoba, and I've gone about as far as I can.

MR. ROBLIN: Committee rise.

MR. PAULLEY: Before the committee rises, I want to assure the Honourable the Acting Minister of Labour that there will be a rebuttal to the remarks that he made this evening, and also of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker.

MR. ROBLIN: Perhaps the Whip might take the Chair and the Chairman might -- no, here comes the Speaker, I think. If not, the Member for St. Matthews can take the Chair.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole reports progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ruperts-land, that the report of the Committee be received.

Mr. Deputy Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: The Lieutenant-Governor transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba estimates of sums required for the service of the province for capital expenditure, and recommends these estimates for the legislature's acceptance.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the message of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor and the estimates accompanying the same be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Welfare, that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Wednesday afternoon.