



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



I N D E X

Tuesday, June 30, 1959, 2:30 P.M.

	Page
<u>Presenting Petitions</u> : Mr. Scarth, Mr. Hillhouse .....	371
<u>Committee of the Whole House</u> , Bill 26, (Mr. Johnson) .....	371
<u>Introduction of New Members</u> , Mr. Roblin .....	372
<u>Statement</u> , Birtle Celebration, Mr. Smellie .....	372
<u>Questions</u> .....	372
Mr. Schreyer (Mr. Willis), Mr. Orlikow (Mr. Roblin), Mr. Hillhouse (Mr. Willis), Mr. Prefontaine (Mr. Carroll).	
<u>Order for Returns</u> , Mr. Molgat .....	373
<u>Committee of Whole House</u> , Third Reading of Bills Nos. 21, 22 .....	373
<u>Point of Order</u> , Mr. Campbell, Mr. Roblin, Mr. Speaker .....	374
<u>Adjourned Debate</u> , re Farm Implements Tax (Mr. Ridley) and Amendment (Mr. Roberts), and amendment to amendment (Mr. Shewman): Mr. Roberts..	374
<u>Division</u> , on amendment to amendment .....	375
<u>Adjourned Debate</u> , re Minimum Wage (Mr. Harris) and amendment (Mr. Groves): Mr. Paulley .....	375
<u>Adjourned Debate</u> , re Ambulance Service, Mr. Wright .....	377
<u>Division</u> .....	378
<u>Proposed Resolution</u> , re School Construction Costs, Mr. Miller .....	378
<u>Second Reading Bill No. 66</u> , Chiropodists Act (Mr. Groves) .....	379
Mr. Corbett, Mr. Hawryluk, Mr. Gray, Mr. Johnson (Gimli) .....	380
Mr. Corbett .....	381
Mr. Gray, Mr. Campbell .....	382
Mr. Alexander, Mr. Desjardins, Mr. Roblin .....	383
Mr. Campbell, Mr. Roblin, Mr. Johnson (Gimli) Mr. Evans, Mr. Orlikow, Mr. Paulley .....	385
Mr. Lissaman, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Groves .....	386
<u>Second Reading</u> , Bills 27, 35 and 73 .....	388
<u>Royal Assent to Bills</u> , Nos. 7, 10, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 25, 28, 29, 31, 33, 34, 36, 46, 47, 48, 50, 60, 73 .....	389
<u>Committee of Supply</u>	
<u>Statement</u> , Mr. Boulic .....	390
<u>Education</u> , Administration .....	390

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, June 30th, 1959.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

MR. W.B. SCARTH, Q.C., (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Manitoba Health Service praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to Incorporate Manitoba Health Service.

MR. T.P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C., (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Mark H. Danzker and others praying for the passing of an Act to Incorporate the Red River Exhibition Greyhound Racing Association.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Select Committees.

Notice of Motion.

Introduction of Bills.

The Honourable Member for River Heights.

Mr. Scarth introduced Bill No. 78, an Act to amend The Greater Winnipeg Sanitary District Act.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

HON. GEO. JOHNSON, M.D., (Minister of Health and Public Welfare) (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution recommends same to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Health and Public Welfare Act by providing, among other matters, for the re-organization of The Public Welfare Advisory Committee and the payment from the Consolidated Fund of remuneration and out-of-pocket expenses to members of the Committee.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, I would like to give the background of this resolution to inform members that The Health and Public Welfare Act is the Act under which the Department of Health was first organized and it authorizes a setting up of a separate department; the appointment of the Minister and his deputy and other officers of the department; and it stipulates the administrative responsibilities of the department and lists the various other Acts, of which there are about twenty in number, which are administered by this department. Now this Act also provides for the establishment of a Public Welfare Advisory Committee and the Old Age Assistance and Blind Persons' Allowance Board. Now this is really supplementary to our Social Allowances Act where we now refer to this Public Welfare Advisory Committee as the appeal board, and the duties of this appeal board would be to serve as an appeal board for provincial social allowances and to be at the call of the Municipal Commissioner re municipal relief, that is, in an advisory capacity to the Municipal Commissioner; and its second duty, to set the average rates of maintenance with Children's Aid Societies, that is, what they may charge the province for neglected children committed by the Courts. Now this appeal board, as I will refer to it, replaces the Public Welfare Advisory Committee to the Minister as is in the present Act. The old appeal board consisted of the Deputy Minister of Health and five other persons appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and they were civil servants, and also it replaces the Rate Establishment Committee appointed under Section 34 of The Child Welfare Act.

This resolution makes provision to set up this new advisory committee with a permanent chairman, secretary, and 15 other members appointed by Order-in-Council, and it will take at least the chairman plus three of this committee to form a quorum to hear any particular appeal. The main purpose in this policy -- and this resolution makes provision for remuneration of that chairman and also out-of-pocket expenses or a small stipend to the members of the board for the time they spend on this committee. The idea of it is to give a review by lay people in individual cases and over all to provide a body of information on whether the government's

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) . . . policy of meeting need is being carried forward. We feel that this committee will serve a very useful function and a very necessary function in the administration of our new social allowances act when it is presented.

MR. M.A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, will this bill delay the other health bill?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): I didn't hear that question, Sir.

MR. GRAY: Will this bill delay the other health bill that you have? In other words, you have a health bill already before the House. The introduction of the new bill, will it delay the other one?

A MEMBER: . . . . . Social Allowances Act.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): No, no, it's coming up any time now.

MR. R. PAULLEY (Leader of the C.C.F. Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, can the Minister give us any further information as to the selection of the 15 members of this advisory committee? Will they be within the civil service or will they all be outside of the civil service, and will they be more or less representative of the various spheres in our life?

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, in answer to the Honourable Leader of the C.C.F. Party's question, it is hoped to appoint these 15 members by Order-in-Council and the policy would be to appoint them on a regional basis and we could visualize possibly the chairman visiting a northern area of the province and being able to sit down with a quorum instead of travelling all over. And we haven't actually -- this will have to be left to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council as to who these should be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution be adopted? The Committee rise and report.  
Call in the Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has adopted a certain resolution and directed me to report the same, and ask leave to sit again.

MR. W.G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

Mr. Johnson (Gimli) introduced Bill No. 26, An Act to amend The Health and Public Welfare Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day there are two new members in the House that I would wish to have the opportunity of introducing.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to you Joseph E. Jeanotte, Esq., Member for the Electoral Division of Rupertsland, who has taken the Oath, signed the Roll and now claims the right to take his seat.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member may now take his seat.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to you John E. Ingebrigtson, Esq., Member for the Electoral Division of Churchill, who has taken the Oath, signed the Roll, and claims the right to take his seat.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the honourable member take his seat. Orders of the Day.

MR. R.G. SMELLIE (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to call the attention of this House to the fact that Birtle is celebrating its 75th anniversary of incorporation this week. The celebration will take place over the period of the next five days, commencing tomorrow. They have many plans for this celebration and I am assured by the good people of Birtle that if any of the honourable members of this House can attend those celebrations they would be welcomed with open arms. The celebrations are taking many different forms, there being a different program for each day -- tomorrow is sports day, having a baseball tournament and a fastball tournament; they have pioneer's day on Thursday; a junior sports day on Friday; a monster parade and farmer's day on Saturday; and there will be a Canadian Legion sponsored Church service on Sunday, and a Band Concert in the afternoon. I'm requested by the people of the Town of Birtle and that district to invite all of the honourable members of this House to attend. Thank you.

MR. E.R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture if he has any statement to make to us with regards to the Federal Government announcement of this morning respecting crop insurance.

HON. ERRICK F. WILLIS, Q.C. (Minister of Agriculture and Immigration) (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, in regard to the announcement this morning, we welcome it here. As far as the announcement is concerned, I've not yet had an opportunity of seeing the actual details in regard to it, but with what I've read in the paper I am very pleased and it will probably enable us to proceed with crop insurance in this province during this session.

MR. DAVID ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. In view of what appear to be major disagreements between representatives of the City of Winnipeg and the suburban municipalities as to how the whole area is to be reorganized to better serve the needs of Greater Winnipeg, and since it is obvious that the municipalities amongst themselves may not resolve these problems, is the government giving consideration to convening, at an early date, hearings under Provincial Government auspices of all Greater Winnipeg municipal governments in order to determine the best type of government for the entire area, with a view to eliminating the section on parochial disagreements which seem to exist? It is a long question I know, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for allowing me to have a look at his question before he asked it, otherwise I am sure I wouldn't have been able to grasp such a complex question. But I think I can say to him perhaps this reply would better be given by my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, but seeing it is addressed to me I will undertake to answer it to this effect, that the problem posed by the report of the Royal Commission on Metropolitan Winnipeg is still under study by the government - very intensive study, I might say -- but I feel certain that we will, in due course, be consulting with the municipalities in respect of it. I think that is as much as I can say at the moment.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture? Has the Honourable Minister received a copy of the new Federal Farm Credit Act, or Bill?

MR. WILLIS: I have not.

MR. E. PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Utilities and ask him whether he would be kind enough to let me have, or table a copy of his letter with respect to the French language T. V. Station in St. Boniface; the letter that he said he wrote and sent to the Government at Ottawa.

HON. J.B. CARROLL (Minister of Public Utilities) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I would be very pleased to show a copy of the letter to the Member from Carillon.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. G. MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that an order of the House do issue for a Return standing in my name. (1) The total actual payment received from the Federal Government under the Tax Rentals Agreement for the fiscal years ending 31 March, 1959, and for each of the ten preceding years; (2) The breakdown of these figures between the basic tax rental payment and the equalization payment for each of these years; (3) The latest estimate of the payment to be received for the present fiscal year; (4) The guaranteed minimum payment to the Province of Manitoba under the Tax Rental Agreement for each of the fiscal years ending 31 March, 1960, 31 March, 1959, 31 March, 1958, 31 March, 1957.)

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

#### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

Bill No. 21 - Sec. 1 to Sec. 20, preamble, title, was read and passed.

Bill No. 22 - Sec. 1 to Sec. 4, was read and passed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would give us a copy of the schedule and the other amendments that were made?

HON. J. THOMPSON (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Virden): I would be glad to do that, Mr. Chairman.

Bill No. 22 - Sec. 5, preamble, title, was read and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House has considered

(Mr. Chairman, cont'd.) . . . certain bills with amendments, and others without amendments, and have directed me to report the same, and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for River Heights, that the report of the Committee be received.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and following a voice vote declared the motion carried. Bills Nos. 21 and 22 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. J. COWAN (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the C.C.F. Party and the proposed motion and amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. D.L. CAMPBELL (Leader of the Opposition) (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, may I raise the point of order before this debate is entered into that I raised a few days ago? I notice that nothing has been done to remove the imperfections of this resolution as it stands -- rather the amendment. I thought I had suggested to Your Honour that you should perhaps take it under consideration and, with the consent of the mover, make such alterations as are necessary to bring it into conformity with our practice and with good sense, because I think all anyone needs to do, Mr. Speaker, is to read the resolution as it would stand if amended to see how poor the construction is. If it were amended as suggested, I suggest that it would read "Whereas each year finds an increase in the number of motor vehicles on our highways, and whereas each year finds an increase in the number of motor vehicles on our highways, etc." Now, surely it is not intended that we deal with a resolution and an amendment in that form. I had thought, Mr. Speaker, when I raised this matter the other day and suggested that you would take it under advisement that you could make use of the powers that you have in your position to effect an amendment without it necessarily coming back to the House. As far as we are concerned, we would be prepared to agree to any change that is made to bring it into conformity with the evident intention of the amendment, but I think we should not continue the debate on it in the present form until it is agreed that something is going to be done to perfect its shape.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I agree with my honourable friend that it does appear to be redundant to have that second phrase in and if the House would be willing, I'm sure I can speak for this side and say that we would be willing to have you change that, Sir, so that that unnecessary verbiage in there is removed and it is brought into a little better form. I don't think it alters the meaning or the import in any way, but it certainly would read in a more literary style than it does at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER: I will take it down to advisement. I'm sorry, I intended to do this and it slipped my memory for the time being. But the order would stand?

MR. CAMPBELL: I don't raise it for the purpose of asking it to stand because I'm sure, as the Honourable the First Minister has said, that it's just an oversight and if the honourable member who has it adjourned prefers to continue we would be . . . . .

MR. ORLIKOW: I prefer that this matter be permitted to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Adjourned debate on the Proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for Pembina and the Proposed Motion and amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, and the Proposed Motion that the Resolution as amended be further amended by striking out in the amendment the following words: "That the Proposed Amendment be amended by deleting the word "primarily" in the fourth line thereof; and by deleting all the words after the word "purposes" in the fifth line thereof." Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. S. ROBERTS (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to speak very briefly on this amendment. First of all I would like to draw the attention of the House to the wording of this resolution; firstly, the wording as proposed by the Honourable Member for Pembina where he asks in his resolution that we recommend to the Government of Canada that machinery and equipment accessories be exempt from excise and sales tax when used for clearing snow from roads within the municipality where the farmer resides. This is the original motion from the Honourable Member from Pembina. The amendment in my name simply increases the

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) . . . coverage of the original motion. In other words, increases the exemptions, increases the worthwhileness of this resolution, and my intention there, as I said a couple of days ago, was simply to include any and all other equipment which might be attached to tractors which were purchased primarily for agricultural purposes but might occasionally and incidentally be used for secondary purposes; and this includes, of course, snowplowing.

And now we have the amendment to the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Morris which makes the whole thing ridiculous. Now surely he didn't give this matter a great deal of thought because -- then he takes this amendment and wishes to delete the words "primarily" and the last line starting with "notwithstanding", to make the resolution read as follows if this is passed: "That any farm implement or tractor including any and all equipment or accessories, hydraulic or otherwise, purchased and used for agricultural purposes". In other words, the original intent is lost entirely if the equipment is used for snowplowing then it must be taxed -- the excise and sales tax must be applied to these things as they have in the past. The hydraulics, even if they were allowed to be purchased tax free in the first place, would be taxed if they were used for moving dirt or for plowing or any other purpose other than directly connected with farming operations.

Now these are the few words I wish to say, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to point out the ridiculousness of the amendment as proposed because it destroys the whole purpose for which the Member for Pembina and myself intended this resolution.

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

A MEMBER: "Yeas" and "Nays".

MR. SPEAKER: Those wishing "Yeas" and "Nays" please stand. Call in the members.

The question before the House is the amendment to the amendment moved by the Honourable Member for Morris that the Proposed Amendment be amended by deleting the word "primarily" in the fourth line thereof and deleting all of the words after the word "purposes" in the fifth line thereof.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Boulic, Carroll, Christianson, Cobb, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Ridley, Roblin, Scarth, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Thompson, Weir, Witney.

NAYS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hawryluk, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Miller, Molgat, Orlikow, Paulley, Prefontaine, Roberts, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Wagner, Wright.

MR. CLERK: Yeas - 32. Nays - 19.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. The motion before the House now is the amendment to the main motion as amended. Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the Proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan and the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Member for St. Vital in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I regret to inform the House that my colleague, the Honourable Member for Elmwood, is in hospital at the present time. He took ill on Friday and couldn't be with us Friday evening or for the Friday afternoon session. We don't know at the present time how long he will be there. He's undergoing tests at the present time. In his absence I would like, if I may, Mr. Speaker, to say a word or two in connection with this amendment and then the debate will carry on from there or be adjourned, if that's O.K.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave of the House?

MR. PAULLEY: My remarks in this connection, Mr. Speaker, will be very brief. We can see nothing wrong particularly with the amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, and after having said that, Sir, neither can we find anything to get excited about at all. We are fully aware of the fact that the Chairman has been now appointed for the Minimum Wage Board. We certainly did not need that information by way of an amendment to a resolution. The representatives of labour have been for many months past urging this

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) . . . government and indeed the previous government to get out of the doldrums and take under review the minimum wages of the Province of Manitoba. In this field, as in many others, the government has failed to do its duty for too long without review — we have had this minimum wage -- without its doing its job of reviewing minimum wages in Manitoba. We have had this board — for too long in Manitoba we have had one of the lowest minimum wage rates in the Dominion of Canada. I think it is a tragedy that our minimum wage rate of 60¢ for men and 58¢ for women has been allowed to be the base for so long. And, of course, we agree that the present Board, in fact we made the request of the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that action be taken immediately in respect of minimum wages.

The government opposite had ample time since its election as a minority government last June to take action. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that action could have been taken providing — or had the government opposite been anxious, under the previous Chairman, Mr. Williams. We can see no reason why it was not done. It's unfortunate, of course, that that gentleman had to retire from his duties in connection with this Board by reasons of ill health, for we feel that it could have been done before that happened; and we certainly suggest and hope that there will be no undue delay under the present Chairmanship of Mr. Ken McLean. I don't know whether the government opposite really realize what they are doing in perpetuating this miserable low minimum wage rate which we have in the province. And, Sir, what does the amendment actually say? "Whereas the Minimum Wage Board has been convened and a Chairman appointed; Resolved that this House urge that the present minimum wage rates be reviewed without delay to meet present day conditions in the Province of Manitoba". I would suggest that there could have been or should have been in the amendment -- and while I'm not proposing at the present time an amendment to it -- but there should have been a general directive or at least a suggestion to the new Minimum Wage Board that not only should they review the situation but that there should be some proposition of increases in the rates themselves. And while we appreciate the fact that the Board is charged with the responsibility of recommendations and setting the rates themselves, I think that it would have been far better had the mover of this amendment suggested definitely that the wage rates should have been increased as well as simply reviewed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we introduced the original motion we suggested that this House should, in co-operation with the Federal Government and the other provincial governments, take under consideration and advisement the setting of a national minimum wage rate; and we made the suggestion of \$1.25. We did that for a purpose. We have heard arguments galore in this House over the past years of the various rates that are set in the different provinces throughout Canada; and many of the arguments that have been raised by the Government in the past have been that we here in Manitoba cannot have a minimum wage rate that is higher to any great degree than some of the rest of the provinces because, as the government in the past has suggested, it would adversely affect us in competition with other provinces. The argument has been in the past, so said the government, it would adversely affect industry coming to the province. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think that type of argument is ridiculous because the general group of employees who are affected by the minimum wage, I feel sure, is not the type of employee or the wage rates that are paid to them would either attract or detract industry from coming into our province.

The general basis of a minimum wage rate is to assure to employees who are not covered by wage agreements of a general nature that they will receive a bare minimum. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, when we read our Minimum Wage Act, when we read the directives to our Wage Board, the general directive is simply, give them nothing more than a miserly bare existence, and we had hoped in our original proposal to this House to attempt to establish a reasonable minimum wage uniform throughout Manitoba. And while, as I said in my opening remarks, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing too wrong with the amendment, it doesn't really mean anything because the Committee has been set up; the Board has been set up; the Chairman has been named and they will be doing, if they do their duty, just exactly what the resolution has suggested. So in essence, the amendment to the main motion means absolutely nothing as far as this House is concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. A.E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fisher, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, when I submitted this resolution it was with the intention of throwing some light on a matter of interest to me, and I was not surprised that the Honourable Member from Minnedosa and the Honourable Member for St. Boniface rose to speak against this or to give their reasons for thinking that we shouldn't ask the government to consider the advisability of a government-owned ambulance service. This is a familiar pattern to us because for many years we have become interested or accustomed in seeing the "Old Line" parties oppose these new ideas. What does surprise me, Mr. Speaker, that these are young men and they are engaged in an occupation which makes it necessary for them to see much human misery. I used the expression in a former speech that "familiarity breeds contempt" and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this is not true of the two honourable members.

Is there anyone here who would say that we should not have looked into such things as old age pensions, unemployment insurance, hospital insurance, things like that? Is there anyone here who would say that we have reached perfection? We should be thankful for what we have and not worry about the future? I believe we should be far more appreciative for the things that we have inherited, for then we would be able to see more clearly some of the struggles that have made today's blessings possible. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa doesn't agree that we are centralizing our hospital or our medical facilities today. I only have to show you the clippings in the Winnipeg Free Press of Thursday, June 25th which has a large article on "a rapid action on a medical centre". What interested me mostly was at the bottom when it's talking about all the projects that are being planned, and these are over the next 25 years, but it's talking about research centres, air ambulance facilities and the like, so that certainly our men of science and our medical men are considering the future and such things as air ambulance, helicopter service and such like.

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa was quick and rightly so in defending the local hospitals, and at no time in my speech did I say that these hospitals were not doing a fine job, in fact I paid my respects to the R.C.M.P. and all these people who so unselfishly give of themselves in this mercy rescue work. I did not criticize and therefore I do not see that it was necessary to defend. There is a saying that when anyone attacks one of our prejudices, it makes us angry; when we are tackled on the things that we have a knowledge, we welcome an opportunity to explain. The statement was made that most Manitoba towns have good ambulance service. Well, if the honourable member was referring to the type of people who are engaged in this work, I would agree with him. I think that these people so engaged would be the last to agree that they have reached the ultimate and that the service could not be improved. I was speaking to a young fellow who tells me that before he was 17 years of age, he had the job of driving an ambulance -- before he could get a chauffeur's license, and that he had to attend on one occasion a rush call to hospital with himself the only attendant. Now I'm not suggesting that we haven't made progress in the last three or four years, Mr. Speaker, but these things have happened.

I'm checking now to find out just what nursing units scattered throughout the province have adequate ambulance service, and I'm startled to find that the Whitemouth nursing unit has no ambulance although there are two at Beausejour; the Town of Selkirk only has one ambulance; the City of Winnipeg with its large population only ten; so I say again that this service, this private ambulance service, is certainly giving the best that it can but I say again that it's not adequate and I think that should the government see fit to investigate this, that this will be easily proven.

But the Honourable Member for Minnedosa also said that he takes issue with the statements of Major-General Worthington, and I say that I don't know of any better authority because this is not the statement of a new convert to a cause; this is the considered judgment of a man who I think, we must admit, has had considerable experience in this business of human suffering. And when he says that quite obviously an effective ambulance rescue service must be controlled and co-ordinated by the provincial governments and that this will cost money, but it will be just as beneficial to the nation as the money spent on disease prevention and medical research. He goes on to suggest, too, that it's logical to assume that the Department of Health and Welfare

(Mr. Wright, cont'd.) . . . would be quite willing to give considerably to the establishment of such service.

Now there's something that both the Honourable Member for Minnedosa and the Honourable Member for St. Boniface agree on, and speaking against this resolution they both agree that the government should pay the cost of ambulance service when it's requested by responsible people; that the private ambulance companies, in other words, should be paid on attending a scene of accidents. Now I think that we would readily agree with that, but the question of making sure that private ambulance companies are paid is not facing up to the fact that, as Major-General Worthington put it, "Surely the time has come to do something constructive about the death and destruction on our highways for our ambulance service in Canada is appallingly inadequate". Now the Government of Saskatchewan, as I mentioned the other night, appropriates \$206,000 per year for air ambulance service, and last year they made a total of 893 flights. Taking off the amount that the patient is obliged to pay which is around \$25.00, I figure that it costs per flight \$200.00 roughly, and that is less than it takes to educate one child for one year in the City of Winnipeg. Surely that is money well spent. Now what is the solution? I think that we should have a Commission. We've had a commission investigating everything from education to natural gas. Surely this is a serious enough matter to justify the government appointing competent people to look into this matter. Is not the saving of a life as important as the price of gas? As deserving of study? Quite obviously an effective ambulance service, a rescue service must be controlled and co-ordinated by the provincial government.

Now in looking at the clipping from the Tribune, as I haven't had time to read Hansard, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa refers to the numerous trips made in the polio epidemic in '53 and as I said before, we all realize what wonderful work was done, but I submit that an investigation into ambulance service in the Province of Manitoba will reveal that many of our vehicles are not equipped as adequately as they should be. Sedans, station-wagons can be converted into emergency ambulances and Major-General Worthington mentions that -- he says that roughly for a cost of \$205.00 these can be converted -- but someone will have to co-ordinate and organize this auxiliary ambulance service. After all, when someone is bleeding to death, Mr. Speaker, you can't wait to find out who has a station-wagon and what you can do on the spur of the moment.

There is a saying, Mr. Speaker, that "there is no argument so violent as that which takes place between people who will accept something today and those who will accept it tomorrow". Mr. Speaker, I know it's inevitable that improvements will be made in regard to ambulance service in our province and I sincerely ask this government to give serious and early consideration to this resolution before us today.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks - "Whereas modern mechanical blessings such as the automobile, the tractor and the outboard . . . ." Are you ready for the question?

YEAS: Gray, Harris, Hawryluk, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Orlikow, Paulley, Roberts, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Wagner, Wright.

NAYS: Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Boulic, Campbell, Carroll, Christianson, Cobb, Corbett, Cowan, Desjardins, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Miller, Molgat, Prefontaine, Ridley, Roblin, Scarth, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Thompson, Weir, Willis, Witney.

MR. CLERK: Yeas - 13, Nays - 39.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. Proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. W. C. MILLER (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon "Resolved that this House request the Government of the Province of Manitoba to consider the advisability of rescinding the present secondary school construction grant formula, and replacing it by one that will provide from the consolidated revenues of the Province of Manitoba 75% of construction costs of all secondary schools.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, this resolution is similar to one which was proposed by our group at the last Session of the Legislature and which died on the Order Paper. There is one significant difference though and that is that included in this resolution is the provision for the same construction grants of all secondary schools which include those schools which are operating or about to operate in those proposed divisions that voted no. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this change is one which should merit wholehearted support of this House because the avowed purpose of the change in all grants is to provide equal opportunity for all our children and as much as possible equality of burden. Now the sliding scale formula which as I recall, ranges from 40% to 80% benefits firstly the automatic divisions which by reason of their density of population and their high assessment will be able to construct schools of a size meriting the maximum grants. It will also benefit those other divisions, the non-automatic, who have density of population but it mitigates against those divisions and areas who by reason of the boundaries of the division cannot centralize or do not want to centralize and so I suggest that in order to be fair and just that we make this an over all percentage grant of 75% and thus relieve those areas who by the very nature of their constitutions cannot benefit through centralization and thus relieve the local people to some extent at least of the increased burden of taxation. I might mention too that I'm hopeful that the Minister will support this resolution, as indeed all members of the House should, in view of the fact that the other grants on a sliding scale have provided some trouble if one can believe the papers, and so I urge this House to support this resolution and provide real equality of opportunity and real equality of burden.

MR. J. G. COBB (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.  
Order Stand.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . . we could let the order stand the Honourable Member isn't here presumably he was unable to. . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Let the order stand. Second reading of Bill No. 66 - an Act to amend the Chiropodists Act. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. F. GROVES (St. Vital): I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member from St. Matthews that Bill No. 66 - an Act to amend the Chiropodists Act be now read a second time.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews that Bill No. 66 - an Act to amend the Chiropodists Act be now read a second time. Are you ready for the question?

MR. GROVES: This Act Mr. Speaker, deals mostly with the change in the name throughout the Act; they are intending to change the word "chiropody" to "podiatric" and the words as they appear "chiropodist" to "podiatrist". Now I looked up the meaning in the dictionary of the word "chiropody" and it means - originally the art of treating diseases of the hands and feet, as now restricted, the treatment of ailments of the feet, especially minor ailments. The definition of the word "podiatry" in the dictionary in the library is "the study and treatment of disorders of the foot", so it appears that this change in name is meant to bring the name more into line with the actual work that these people are doing.

You'll note in the Act that the definition of podiatry is enlarged somewhat from the dictionary meaning that I just gave. You find that in Section 3 (c) podiatry means that specialty of the healing art which treats ailments or diseased conditions or deformities or injuries of the human foot, includes examining or diagnosing or prescribing for or treating such foot disabilities and massage or adjusting in connection therewith. That definition is quite a bit wider than the definition in the dictionary, and that might be gone into in committee when representatives of this Association would be there to explain what they mean.

Another point that was raised by the Association when I discussed this with them - they feel that the use of the word "podiatry" will eliminate the confusion which sometimes exists between the words "chiropody" and the word "chiropractic" as used in Chapter 37 of the revised statutes.

MR. A. E. CORBETT (Swan River): Would the member permit a question? When was this word "podiatry" - when did it get into the English, British Literature, Webster's

(Mr. Corbett, cont'd).....dictionary? Is it a new word or is it another of these fads?

MR. GROVES: In answer to the Honourable Member's question, Mr. Speaker. I'm not too familiar with the history of the word but I think it has been in the dictionary for a long time and that is the word that is used in various statutes throughout Canada and the United States that this particular Association has. Saskatchewan, I believe, has recently amended their Act to use the word "podiatry" instead of "chiroprody". Does that answer your question?

Section 33 of the present Act says that the Association shall not pass any rule or regulation or bylaw restricting, or advertising or fixing prices. It is proposed in this new Act to delete this section. Insofar as restricting the advertising is concerned it is felt that most professional associations have this power and that any misuse of this power would be covered under federal legislation, that is, as far as the fixing of prices is concerned. This section, I might point out, was put in by the Legislature when the bill was originally passed and I am informed that no other similar act of ours contains such a section. The Association has had a number of complaints from the public about some of their members in connection with overcharging and with misleading advertising, and they don't feel that they can deal with these members properly, to discipline them properly, with this section of the Act as it is. They assure me that they have no intention of trying to fix the prices charged by their members but they wish this section deleted in order that they may discipline their own members that should get out of line in respect of unethical advertising practices.

The wording of Section 34 of the present Act is quite ambiguous and briefly interpreted means that this Act does not prohibit any person from selling or recommending shoes or foot or hand appliances or foot remedies provided that the person selling, recommending or advertising such appliances shall not be permitted to give treatments of the foot. The new section proposed to replace this section says the same thing but in much more readable language. It puts into laymen's language rather than in legalistic terms what in the present Act is quite complicated terminology.

I might point out that the restriction of the old Act remains in that podiatric still would not be allowed to amputate or use anaesthetic other than local anaesthetic. They would not be allowed to treat systematic diseases of the bone, muscles or ligaments or to use x-ray equipment for purposes other than diagnosis.

Section 15 of the Act presently provides that examination fees be paid to the Registrar of the University of Manitoba. The University of Manitoba has indicated that it does not wish to handle the examination fees which is the practice at the present time. Such fees are paid to the Registrar of the Association. Accordingly it is proposed that the change in the Act give recognition to the practice which is now in effect.

I think that pretty well outlines Mr. Speaker the main changes that are proposed in this Bill.

MR. J. M. HAWRYLUK (Burrows): I'm a little curious about this change in the letter "e" to the letter "o". I believe that a man that goes to medical college becomes a practitioner in any aspect and I believe they are practitioners who are in the pediatrics. Now I'm just wondering whether by changing the "e" to the "o" - I haven't heard a valid reason given - I say it's going to create quite a bit of confusion to the general public because I treat the chiropodist for it is in the same category as I would in the case of the chiropractor, in the sense that their particular profession is a special profession in itself, but I think the fact is that a doctor who is qualified to teach or heal in the pediatric class certainly is in a different category entirely, and I'm just wondering whether the public will get confused by the fact they change it from a chiropodist to that of podiatrics and I'd like a further clarification, probably from the Minister of Health and Education or Minister of Health.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, I don't think the "o" and the "e" means anything to the public who wants to remove a corn. The question is this, now first the change of the name I understand is the correct dictionary so I'll not say anything about that. I would like to know what additional professional rights are given to these people who have no medical training and by the way I have no intention of proposing second reading.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise and speak as a private member representing the good constituency of Gimli. I stand directly opposed to the principle of this Bill. The principle of this Bill is by the definition of the word podiatry, means that specialty

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd).....of the healing arts which treats ailments or diseased conditions or deformities or injuries of the human foot including examination or diagnosing or prescribing for, or treating such disabilities and massage or adjustment in connection therewith, but does not include amputation, anaesthetic other than local. Up until now the definition of the word chiropody said "Every person who practices or advertises or holds himself out in any way is practicing chiropody and massage in connection therewith but the practice of chiropody shall not include amputation or treatment of injuries to or infection of the foot, or toes or hand or fingers or manicuring the nails or use of anaesthetic except as a spray, or the use of drugs or medication other than local antiseptics."

The principle of this bill is wrong in my opinion. The principle is wrong - the principle says that the word podiatry means the treatment of infection. It means nothing else that the chiropodists now wish to treat infection. I submit that this is going back many years. When Dr. John Kerr formed the Manitoba Medical College and he called his colleagues together to form the first course in 1882, one of the first things he said was that the Senate of this University shall give the degree - we will teach but the University shall examine. Section 18 of this Chiropody Act is not repealed and I would draw your attention to the fact that Section 18 of the former Act points out where the chiropodist in their words, "be so limited in their scope as to cover only the minimum requirements for chiropody education and shall not be construed to require of the applicant a medical or surgical education but shall include at least the matriculation qualification of the University of Manitoba." This body say for their own registration purposes they must have matriculation, beyond that their training, although they spell out so many words, I would submit to the House that this means nothing. They do not -- it's up to the examining body of our University to underline this - this is policed by themselves.

Now when we talk of infection. This is going back before Ignace Semmelweiss, who discovered the causes of childbed fever. By observation before Lister. John Kerr, our first dean here, brought Lister's teachings to Manitoba and started this college off on the right foot. In 1897 Gordon Bell became our provincial Bacteriologist. Gordon Bell lost a leg with typhoid fever. How can you lose a leg with typhoid fever, an intestinal disease? Because typhoid fever is characterized by a systemic bacteremia - bacteria in the blood stream which come and settle in the walls of vessels and arteries and there set up the equivalent of clots and occlude the blood supply thereof and therefore cause gangrene of the extremity. I would point out to the honourable members as they peruse that bill, it points out that they do in no way intend to treat systemic diseases of bones, muscles or ligaments but I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that in order for our bones, muscles and ligaments to tingle we must have a blood supply thereto and the blood supply comes through the arteries and veins through that part, and I would submit therefore that they are getting into the realm of systemic infection and disease. Later Gordon Bell died from streptococcal sore throat .....

(Recording failure, approximately 1 min. 40 seconds)..

....causes the whole field of pharmacopoeia, the whole field of therapeutics materia medica is opened up. This is dangerous ground. Let's not take a step back into the darkness of Semmelweiss when we've had men like Bell and -- in our own province -- and Cadham and the rest of them light the way in this province, to make this medical school one of the finest on the continent. I say this not because I'm a doctor. Lord knows, there're many more medical men who could speak more authoritatively and better on this subject than I, but I say that we might as well call every young boy in Manitoba "doctor" and let's quit this business. I think the Legislature should look seriously at this whole problem and let's have the University and senate of this University, the highest academic body in this province, underline this treatment of disease and infection. I have no objections. People can go where they want to go. This is a democracy, but let's not us in this Legislature be saying 'who can do this type of treatment'. That's all I want to say, gentlemen, but that's the way I see this bill until proven otherwise.

MR. CORBETT: Mr. Speaker, I am much indebted to the Honourable Member for Gimli, not the Minister of Health and Public Welfare, for explaining the differences in this matter between podiatry and chiropody - I haven't got them right, but it's somewhere near there - the whole thing in my mind is we're getting to be a nation of fadists, and all these fancy names do not mean a thing. I have no objection to a man calling himself a chiropodist and dealing with diseases of the foot which I always understood, but why is it necessary to change the name and why

(Mr. Corbett, cont'd) . . . . is it necessary to have all the licensing that is necessary? It's getting to be like a religion. Now, we've got a 101 different religions and there's new fads come up day by day and they give them a different name. Well, there's no reason why the podiatrists can't come along next year and change the name to something else. I'm speaking entirely as an ignorant layman. The doctor explained the scientific end of the deal very well and I'm quite in sympathy with him but I've no sympathy with this trying to set up a new technical or medical organization by giving it a fancy name and I don't think there's any great need, in my opinion, for this Act ever having been passed in the first place. Thank you.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I usually as a democrat, I like to see, not second reading, to go things to committee. In committee I would naturally oppose it but I now, in view of the explanation of the Honourable Minister of Education -- or the Honourable Member from Gimli, I changed my opinion. I'll vote against it going through committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I think this is quite a serious question that we have here to decide this afternoon. It's not just a case of our personal opinions with regard to this particular bill, but it brings up the whole question on which the Honourable Member for Gimli, as he prefers to be known by that designation during the time of this debate, has spoken. And that's a serious and important question. Now, perhaps it's almost impossible to agree with the positions taken by both the sponsor of the bill and the Honourable Member for Gimli, and yet I rather find myself in that position. Because I agree with a good bit of what the Honourable the Member for Gimli has said and I recognize the responsibility under which he labours under these circumstances. On the other hand, I have never liked to take the position in this chamber that we should prevent one of these healing arts, so-called healing arts, whether we think it to be such or not, from being considered in the committee stage. And I think that in spite of the very excellent remarks that the Honourable the Member for Gimli has just given now, and I compliment him on them because I think it's only right that those considerations should be placed before us, I think it's his duty in his other capacity to place them before us, but in spite of that I'm of the opinion that the bill still should go to Committee. Because, after all, we have an Act on the Statute books now and if there's something wrong with that Act, if there are any dangers in it, the one that presently exists, we should take a look at it as well. And I think that we should allow the bill to go to Committee and then at Committee we should ask the, not only the Honourable Member for Gimli to be there, but other members of that profession, and to let us hear a well-informed argument on this particular question. Because I'm certainly in thorough agreement with the Honourable Member for Gimli that we should not encourage any of these healing arts to go beyond the things that they can do. I agree with him completely on that. And we laymen will, I think, perforce have to accept the informed judgment of people such as my Honourable Friend the Member for Gimli and colleagues of his profession, in deciding how far we should allow these so-called healing arts and professions to go. Now, I agree with him completely on that. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I think that even though agreeing with that premise completely, that we have to still take the other position that we should not prevent the various organizations and associations and professions of healing arts, we should not prevent them from doing those jobs that they have shown they can do well. And I believe that in most of these - I have no experience with chiropractors; I have none of my family or friends reported on them, so I speak not of them, but of some of the others - some of my family and friends have had experience and have spoken rather well of them and I think that we should not prevent them from doing those things that they can do. But at the same time I'm a hundred percent in favour of the argument of the Honourable Member for Gimli that we should try and carefully delineate the distance that they can go. Because I believe that while I would not apply the same terminology as my Honourable Friend, the Member for Swan River has just done by calling them sadists, I believe there is the tendency in all of them, and it's a human tendency, it's a tendency that's in most of us, to become rather enthusiastic about our own accomplishments and I think one of the great dangers is that the most of these organizations have been inclined in the past to press their endeavours into fields for which they are not qualified, based usually I think, on having made some contribution in their own particular field. So I would say that in spite of the excellent lecture that the Honourable Member for Gimli has just given us, and with the most of it I agree whole-heartedly and I certainly recognize him as being an authority

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd). . . . on these matters in a way that I could not attempt to give information, but in spite of that I would think we should allow the bill to go to Committee and then count upon people of that profession to see that we are given information as to the distance we should allow this particular organization to go and as to changes that should be made in this Act. Seems to me that the changing of the name is not important unless, as some honourable members have mentioned, there might be confusion developed because of it. It seems to me, however, that one instance of the associations of this kind being inclined to go a little further than their accomplishments up-to-date would recommend, is given them the section 12 dealing with nothing prohibiting the fitting or sale of corrective shoes, etc., because it seems to me that "no representative of any such dealer, jobber or manufacturer shall diagnose, etc., unless registered under this Act and licensed to practice a profession of podiatry in Manitoba". I would think that that would exclude a medical doctor, if a representative of one of the shoe companies, etc., I would think that would be going too far. I would doubt that the Association themselves have that in mind, but I do agree that we need to exercise our best judgment as to just how far we should go, so that my principle is simply this, let's give all of these folks an opportunity to do the things that they can do well, if we can agree that they do them well, but let's not encourage them to push out into fields for which they are unqualified.

MR. K. ALEXANDER (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid I have to disagree pretty near completely with the Honourable Member for Lakeside, because from what I feel or what I know of the procedure of this House that by . . . . this here that we are agreeing in principle with this bill, and I am like the Honourable Member from Gimli, I disagree quite violently with the principle here. Because we are now opening up by this bill a field to these people who I know have done a good job, I've gone to them myself and my family has gone to them, but we're opening up a new field now, as the member pointed out, of infection, opening up the field of anaesthetics to them with no increase and with no change in the requirements or in their qualifications or in their training, and I think that is wrong. I myself as a layman would hate to say what could be classified as an infection of the foot. It could have a far-reaching influence. And yet according to this bill we could have men diagnosing that and treating it and giving anaesthetic for the treatment of it who have only a matriculation and still calling themselves doctors, podiatrics or whatever name they want to use. And I feel that is quite wrong because it opens up a whole new field and I think if they want to open that field up, that we should have changes in their qualifications. We should have them pass at least a degree course in University, possibly have them take two years of medical training at the University. Take a two-year course in bacteriology; extra training before they can open up this new field. I disagree very violently with this idea of people setting themselves up as being able to treat things when they haven't had the training and because of the fact that they can use the word "Doctor" they are misleading the public to that extent. I am very much opposed to the principle of this bill.

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): I think that the words of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition have been misunderstood. I don't think that he meant for one minute to agree with them even in principle. In fact, he went a little further by saying that even the existing Act might give them too much power and it might be a good occasion to listen to medical men in committee and maybe rectify what might be wrong at the moment. Maybe going a little further just by the enlightening words that we heard today from the Honourable Member from Gimli. So, I think that by letting it go in Committee definitely does not mean that it's approved in principle or means that it's a high time that we study this. It may rectify things that have been done in the past.

MR. ROBLLIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to follow the example of my colleague and speak as the Member for Wolseley constituency on this matter and not as the Leader of this Government, and wish my views to be given weight only insofar as they are the views of the Member for Wolseley constituency. The question of second reading on a matter of this sort poses a bit of a dilemma and perhaps this might be of particular interest to the many new members of this House that maybe have not come across a problem of this sort before. On normal occasions when we have second reading of the bill in legislature, that is the time when men stand up and be counted. That is the time when people say whether they are opposed to the principle of the measure or whether they favour it and in most cases it's quite simple to make up one's mind on matters of that sort. That rule, I think, is a rule that should not be broken or in any

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd). . . . way ignored insofar as Government measures are concerned, or perhaps insofar as views may be put forward by opposition parties as representing their political -- their particular views on the various matters that come before the House. When matters of that nature come up I think it's quite easy for members to decide whether they're for or against and they stand up or they speak their piece as the case may be. I suppose one of the reasons for that is that people who should be, not always are, I'll admit, but who should be qualified to present all the aspects of the case for and against are in the Chamber. In other words, we expect members of the Legislature, particularly those who carry portfolios, to be able to stand up in the House and justify their measures in an authoritative way and in that way all the information that should be taken into consideration is usually placed before the House. I'm sure the same could be said of members on the opposite side of the chamber as well. But when we come to private bills such as this is, we are on a little different ground. And that is that all the facts or all the advocates, let us say, of various policies are not in the chamber. Very often members who introduce private bills do so not because they themselves are particularly concerned or have any detailed knowledge of the matter in question, but because they wish to offer a courtesy to people who are entitled to have a bill of that sort presented to the chamber. And it has been the custom in this House, I know, on some previous occasions, perhaps not in all, for members to take a different view of second readings as they normally do. And that is when a private bill of this sort comes up, one isn't under the same pressure to stand up and be counted in respect of one's views on the measure that a person necessarily is in the case of government business or matters of that sort. For the reason that it is usually considered that there's some merit in having a private bill go to a Committee where it can be discussed by experts who are particularly knowledgeable on the point in question. I think one of the reasons that makes people take that view is the desirability of giving a person his day in court. It's not only necessary that justice be done it's necessary that justice appear to be done. I know that in our various legislative problems one of the things we try to do is to get people that don't like what's being done to them before the court so that they have their day in court, and if there's any merit in what they have to say, why, then it can be dealt with. I think probably the same line of argument might hold true in connection with second reading on private bills. And that there is a point to be considered here as to whether we should not let the bill go to Committee for the purpose that I've mentioned. Now, I for one, am completely in sympathy with my colleague on the points that he has raised in connection with the expansion of this particular form of service into fields where it's not competent to operate. That's the main point of the bill, I think, and I can very well understand the feelings of members who are sufficiently exercised by that to wish to have nothing more to do with the matter, and, of course, if that is the majority of opinion in the chamber, that's what will happen. There are one or two matters in the bill that are not of such a serious nature that perhaps might secure the approval of the majority here if they were dealt with in isolation. But I put it before the Chamber whether it is not possible to consider the point of view that people should have their say before a Committee of the House, that it be understood that in this vote at any rate, that all the people who might vote for it to go to second reading don't necessarily approve of the subject matter of the bill, which is contrary, I know, to the usual rule of the parliament. But in that way, those of us who are not familiar with the problem, will have an opportunity to hear it dealt with in Committee and also we'll have an opportunity of declining to report the bill should it not meet with the approval of the Committee or dealing with it at some other stage in its passage through the Legislature should it in fact proceed. So, I'm just coming to the view as a private member that perhaps I might vote for second reading of this bill to enable it to go to the Committee and to have the kind of discussion that has been referred to by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and others, but only on the condition that it be clearly understood that I for one would not the first time at any rate, feel disposed to approve of the main request that is made in this piece of legislation, but I am prepared to allow those who are interested in it for and against to appear before a Committee of members of the House and to say what the facts are in their view and then we can judge again. Now, this is a delicate point of parliamentary procedure. It bothered me very much in the past as to whether a vote on second reading on a private bill should be carried on the point of principle or whether it should be allowed to go as a matter of courtesy in order to allow all facts to be heard. I don't know whether I'm right on

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd).....this. Certainly one could work up a very good debate on the other side of the question. But I think I would vote for second reading. Not because I'm in any way attracted by the principle of the measure, but rather that I would, in the interests of perhaps leaning over backwards, one might say, allow those concerned both for and against to have their say in the proper Committee of the Chamber.

MR. CAMPBELL: On a point of order and only for clarification. The Honourable the First Minister referred to this bill as a private bill. I imagine he meant to say private member's bill.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm not sure, it isn't in fact a private bill, is it?

MR. ROBLIN: Well, I would broaden my scope of the comment on this occasion to take in whatever kind of bill this is. It might be -- I believe it's probably described a private member's bill rather than a private bill.

MR. CAMPBELL: The only point I was wondering, I'm not on private bills committee and I don't imagine they've met. Did this one originate by petition? I think not.

MR. ROBLIN: We'll ask perhaps -- on a point of information perhaps the mover might tell us.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): I think it's a private member's bill. It didn't originate by petition. ....

MR. GROVES: Mr. Speaker.....law amendments I think we could straighten out the present Act. Thank you.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Rouge): I'd like to say this, that I feel as the Honourable Member for Wolseley does. I shall be voting for the bill to go to second reading. I know, as contradictory as it may seem, I'm so far at the moment opposed to the principle of the bill, but I would like whoever is concerned in this matter to have an opportunity to give me technical information that I don't possess.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, I will vote for second reading of the bill: I want it clearly understood in doing this I not only want to have a look at the amendments which are being proposed but I intend to have a look at the original bill as it now stands. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, one of these days I think that this House will have to have a look at all the bills which various professional groups have had passed giving them very wide authority. And I say this not in any critical sense but the medical profession has tremendous power under bills passed; the Bar Association has. I haven't looked at it since I left the pharmaceutical profession, but they have wide authority and I think one of these days this House would be well advised to look at all the authority given to all the various professional groups. Certainly if we're going to look at it we have to look not only at the amendments proposed to this bill but in fact, at the original bill and the authority given to this group as to any other group. (Interjection) They have no particular right, Mr. Chairman, labour unions are not incorporated.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, this has been very, very interesting, the discussion, and everybody who has taken part in it has taken part as individuals. And I think some of the points raised are very, very interesting, particularly in view of the fact that we're going to have second reading on many other bills. And if the members opposite who have taken part in this debate, as to whether or not this bill should be given second reading and sent to Committee, are going to take the same line of reasoning on other bills that are going to be before us, it will all be well and good as far as I am personally concerned. It is the first time that I've heard this argument from the Member for Wolseley, who happens also to be the First Minister of this House, because I've heard him argue in the past - on other bills - that we were dealing with the principle of the bill, at the time of debate on second reading. And being opposed to the principle of the bill, opposed the second reading. I'm going to watch with great interest, what is going to happen, when say, for instance, a bill that is being proposed by my Socialist friend from Wellington in respect of margarine, because as you can well recall Mr. Speaker, that bill, I think it even was proposed upon one occasion by my Honourable Friend who leads the Government, on numerous occasions was debated for weeks as to whether or not it should be given second reading. And it appears to me Mr. Speaker, that if the policy principles that have been enunciated this afternoon by my honourable friends as to whether or not we are dealing with the principle of the bill, and on the basis of principle, we should make

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd). . . . our decision. We've come a little way from that in this House, this afternoon.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): All this discussion has raised a question in my mind, especially in view of what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has said, and the question that arises is this: Does an amendment to a bill, specifically as we have presented here, then open up for examination in Committee the entire original bill, or does that have to be treated by specific amendment in turn, if such an amendment is desirable? Now I rather hesitate to ask that question because I know there are several lawyers in the House and we will probably have six or seven viewpoints on it. But it is a little puzzling to me Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Is the Honourable Member for Brandon asking a question of me, because I would be glad to take the place of the six or seven lawyers and answer it correctly if he wants me to. Well, it opens the whole bill up for discussion and that might be very beneficial but as far as specific amendments were concerned, another bill would have to be introduced.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member is closing the debate.

MR. GROVES: Some time ago after the Honourable Member from Wellington made a speech in this House, he closed his speech by saying that I had introduced a very controversial bill. Dealing with some of the points that were raised in the discussion, first of all the Honourable Member from Burrows raised the point of the confusion between podiatrics and pediatrics. I would suggest that that's something that people more expert than us could advise us on in Committee. With respect to the additional rights which this Association asks for as raised by the Honourable Member for Inkster - I'll read from a copy of a letter which I requested from the Association's solicitor, explaining what the Association wanted from this bill. He says the definition in Section 2 (b) has been altered to conform with the definition in the Saskatchewan Act R. F. F. 1953, See 291. As the services rendered by the Association may include treatment of conditions involving infection it is considered that the Saskatchewan definition is preferable and more accurate. The words appearing in the proposed definition "but shall not include amputations or anaesthetics other than locals" do not appear in the Saskatchewan definition but contain prohibitions which now appear substantially in the present definition. It is felt desirable in this respect that members of the Association be permitted to use local anaesthetics. That is from the Association's lawyer.

The Honourable Member from Gimli has given us a very interesting address on the principle of this bill. And in his capacity as the Honourable Member from Gimli and in his capacity as a medical doctor, I think he has given us a very careful and a very thorough analysis of this situation as it appears to him. I would suggest though that it would be unfair to the members of this Association since the Legislature has in its wisdom in the past seen fit to allow to give them their right to practice. I would suggest then that they should have the right to come back to this Legislature and ask for amendments to their bill, and this we can only do in Committee.

I would like to also say that I am introducing this bill not because I'm a chiroprapist or a particular fan of the chiroprapist but because I was asked to by a constituent of mine who is a very reputable chiroprapist. And I might also point out that the Honourable Member from St. Matthews seconded this bill because I asked him to in order to get it on to the floor of the House for the purpose of discussion. I might also point out another matter that could be gone into very thoroughly in committee, that is that Saskatchewan had seen fit to give these people some wider powers than they have in Manitoba and for those of you who take the Winnipeg Tribune, in last Saturday's edition, you will note that there is an article about a chiroprapist in Regina who is permitted by the health authorities of the Province of Saskatchewan to practice in the Regina Geriatric Centre. And I say that not unfairly but to point out that this matter has been given pretty thorough discussion in other jurisdictions and I feel that the members of this Legislature and the members of the Association concerned can only have their proper say in Committee.

As far as approval of second reading, I would state this, insofar as my own position is concerned, that if I was asked and had to vote approval of the principle of this bill, if that's what I would be doing in voting for it to receive second reading - I would not be prepared to do so because I feel that I am not competent to judge some of the factors involved which we can

(Mr. Groves, cont'd).....only receive expert opinion on in committee. But I do intend to vote for second reading of this bill on the understanding that -- on my understanding that it is merely voting in favour of having this bill sent to committee where all of the sections in aspect of it can then receive a thorough going-over by our Committee and at which time we can receive expert advice from not only the medical profession but the Association that is involved here, and perhaps other associations who have other legislation of a similar type.

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

.....(Continued on next page)

MR. ROBLIN: Sir, we have now reached Government Orders on the paper and I would like to suggest, Sir, that we proceed with the second reading of the three bills that are listed here and when we have completed that perhaps we might go into Committee of Supply. That would enable us to put these bills through one set at least today.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading Bill No. 27. The Honourable the Minister of Health and Welfare.

Mr. Johnson (Gimli) moved that Bill No. 27, an Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, the Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act is — embodies a new definition of the terms "birth" and "stillbirth". These changes have been recommended by — 1. The Vital Statistics Council for Canada, the Canadian Public Health Association, The Medical Advisory Committee of the Dominion Statistician and the Council for the Commission on Uniformity of Legislation in Canada, and similar legislation is being proposed throughout Canada at this time.

Now at the present time, the definition of "birth" is the foetus after which complete separation from the mother shows any signs of life. This new definition merely spells it out and — it really spells out the actual signs of life, to remove any possibility of confusion as to what is a live birth and to what is a still birth. Now if there is any movement of voluntary muscle and so on, this has to be recorded as a live birth.

In the course of "stillbirth" the definition of stillbirth at the present time is birth after 28 weeks of pregnancy which after complete separation from the mother does not show any sign of life. Again this new definition is amended to mean the complete expulsion or extraction from it's mother after at least 20 weeks of pregnancy. The main reason for this is that they have decided that they will get better statistics on prenatal mortality; that is, under the present act, if the pregnancy is under 28 weeks gestation in period of time, you don't have to record it as a stillbirth. By making this rule they expect to get more statistics as to the causes of death in cases of stillbirth, and for the sake of uniformity across Canada they have agreed on this figure of 20 weeks.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 35. The Honourable the First Minister.

Mr. Roblin moved that Bill No. 35, an Act to amend The Treasury Act be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, under the present wording of The Treasury Act, it's amended by the bill before us, that at the close of the fiscal year if there are any excess of revenues over expenditure that excess may be carried into the revenue division of the Consolidated Fund as a revenue of surplus or as a revenue surplus, or it may later on be transferred to — as an excess from the revenue division to the capital division of the Fund. This amendment makes it possible not only to transfer that money into the capital division of the Fund, but also into the revenue division as a revenue item rather than a revenue surplus.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carleton, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 73.

Mr. Roblin moved that Bill No. 73, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1960 be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, this is the bill covering the interim appropriation that was dealt with in Committee of Supply and Committee of Ways and Means last Friday. It has two main provisions in it — (1) that there be allotted the sum of \$247,640.00, being the whole of appropriation No. 5 dealing with the first session of the 26th Legislature that is to be found under the Legislative heading of the estimates. The first item in which we are voting the whole of the matter. The second item is the amount of \$26,913,285.60 which is the one-third of each of the remaining items of the department for the reasons which were explained when

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) . . . the matter was before the Committee.

Mr. Speaker put the question and declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, that the rules of the House be suspended and that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following Bill, No. 73 an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1960:

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

Bill No. 73 was presented for second reading and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered a certain Bill and directed me to report the same.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN: I beg to move seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour that the rules of the House be suspended and that Bill No. 73 an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year ending the 31st day of March 1960 be now read a third time and passed.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the House might delay our proceeding on to the next order of business until such time as I am able to bring His Honour in because it would be desirable to obtain the royal assent to the bills that have been given third reading so far. So if the House will permit me, I will go and get His Honour.

The First Minister leaves the House and returns with His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.

THE CLERK: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please your Honour the Legislative Assembly in its present session has passed Bills which in the name of the Assembly I present to your Honour, and to which Bills I respectfully request your Honour's assent.

MR. CLERK: No. 7 An Act to amend The Old Age Assistance Act.

No. 10 An Act to validate Order-in-Council 1443/58 and the Guaranteeing of a Debenture Bond issued by Co-op Prairie Cannery Ltd.

No. 15 An Act to amend The Interpretation Act.

No. 16 An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.

No. 18 An Act to amend The Companies Act.

No. 19 An Act respecting the Provision of Group Life Insurance for Public Servants of the Province.

No. 21 An Act to amend The Municipal Boundaries Act.

No. 22 An Act to amend The Local Government Districts Act.

No. 25 An Act to amend The Hospitals Act.

No. 28 An Act to amend The Blind Persons' Allowances Act.

No. 29 An Act to amend The Disabled Persons' Allowances Act.

No. 31 An Act to amend The Licensed Practical Nurses Act.

No. 33 An Act to amend The Insurance Corporations Tax Act.

No. 34 An Act to amend The Public Schools Act (2).

No. 36 An Act to amend The Reserve for War and Post-War Emergencies Act.

No. 46 An Act to validate By-law No. 608 of The School District of Winnipeg, No. 1.

No. 47 An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate the Sinking Fund Trustees of the School District of Winnipeg No. 1.

No. 48 An Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956.

No. 50 An Act to amend The Public Works Act.

No. 60 An Act to amend The Greater Winnipeg Water District Act.

In Her Majesty's Name, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these Bills.

MR. SPEAKER: We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subject of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in session assembled approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and government and beg your Honour to accept this Bill No. 73, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1960.

MR. CLERK: His Honour The Lieutenant-Governor doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and consents to this Bill in Her Majesty's name.

MR. ROBLIN: I beg to move Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial-Treasurer, I am sorry, the Provincial-Secretary, that the House do now leave the Chair -- that the Speaker do now leave the Chair -- the excitement of getting a Bill passed is a little bit too much for me; it hasn't always been as simple as this -- that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House do now resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and asked the Honourable Member for St. Matthews to take the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 21 - Education: Item (1) administration.

HON. MARCEL BOULIC (Provincial Secretary) (Cypress): If I may at this time, I would like to answer the question asked by the Honourable Member for Radisson concerning the compensation -- "Who if any were excluded from compensation?" All civil servants are protected under compensation, The Compensation Act. They are protected by an Order-in-Council made pursuant to Subsection (c) of Section 3 of The Workmen's Compensation Act. This protection is similar to that provided by the Act for employees in industry. The Province is assessed for each accident presented to the Board and adjudged to them as falling within the terms of their Act for the payment of compensation - and Order-in-Council 1287/38 governs the application of this Act for the civil servants.

Now the Honourable Members for Rhineland and St. Rose referred to savings to be occasioned through the office of the Queen's Printer. There were the figures of \$22,000. mentioned and \$58,000. And I finally quote the Honourable Member from Rhineland said "We see an increase in the estimated revenues, receipts recoverable of \$22,000. plus \$58,000. is \$70,000. I guess maybe it did confuse me a little bit because I always thought \$22,000. and \$58,000. made \$80,000., but overlooking this little error in arithmetic, the estimation for the \$22,000. is very simple. It takes into consideration in the known facts of increased costs, in stationery, paper, stock and salaries from \$193,000. to \$213,000. This increase in cost should certainly not be tied in as the Honourable Member of Rhineland attempted with the proposed savings on stationery and printing costs. And referring to this proposed saving which the First Minister stated Thursday night might be around \$50,000. - I think the Honourable Member for Rhineland used the \$58,000. - referring back to that \$50,000. I think that's where he picked up the \$58,000. That is the amount that is estimated can be saved by the Queen's Printer in standardizing stationery and different other things. And I can give you a couple of examples to that effect, for instance, the government used 2,000,000 envelopes last year and by standardizing the sizes and the use of printed return addresses by the departments, approximately \$6,000. can be saved. There is also the purchase of carbon paper, by standardizing there also, we can save .31 per box of 100 and as you undoubtedly know we use many thousands of these carbon papers. And this - around \$50,000. will be a saving divided in all departments. Is that satisfactory?

MR. MILLER: I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, you called item -- resolution 21 (a) Minister's salary - on education, and I would prefer to refer back to the Provincial Secretary's department afterwards because that item stands anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes and the Provincial Secretary . . . . .Item 2.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I take it we are on Item 1 - Minister's Salaries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes . . . . . Resolution 21

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, in this connection I would like to make a few comments at this time. I want to be as brief as I can and trust that I will be through by the time that you call it 5:30. I want to first, commend the Minister for his statement in introducing his estimates and I want to express my satisfaction to him, that after twelve months in office, he found that things weren't as bad as they were when he first took office. Now I want to thank him too, for

(Mr. Miller, cont'd.) . . . being kind enough to refer to me - not in terms of opprobrium but rather in terms of commendation. It comes very strangely from the honourable members opposite to commend one who has been damned all over this Province by them during the time he held office. And so I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister's colleagues might well do the same when they examine the policies of the previous administration, and give credit where credit is due.

MR. CAMPBELL: Hear! Hear!

MR. MILLER: He says very definitely here, and I am quoting him: "I would agree with him (referring to me) when he says that all is not wrong with education." Now I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that that was a phrase that I used very extensively and I'm very, very glad indeed that after the Minister became acquainted with his department, that he found that I was right. And he goes on to say and I must apologize, Mr. Chairman, I have a little throat trouble due to the vagaries of the weather, and I might say that the weather in Manitoba these last few days is nearly as variable as the moods of the honourable members opposite.

MR. ROBLIN: Oh, we're not that bad.

MR. MILLER: I'm certain however, -- oh, you say that we have obvious differences of opinion about some matters of policy. Well, if we have he hasn't told us of them in his speech the other day. And then he goes on and says that he conducted the affairs of his office, according to his beliefs and did so in a most diligent manner. I wonder if he might say to his leader, 'go thou and say thou likewise'. Now, he again said what I've said for a great many years - "that he has a good staff." He inherited that staff and the other day he gave some credit to the man who had the co-operation of that staff for some considerable length of time. And I want to assure him that any Minister is just as good as his staff, and any department is just as good as the Minister. Because if the Minister is derelict in his duties, he will find that the staff soon copies the Minister's example. And so, I want to thank him for, after twelve months in office, realizing that everything isn't as easy as when you are on the hustings or when you are in opposition and I am going to try at this time, to emulate his example and be as kind as I can to honourable members opposite. Now the speech was remarkable in not for what it said, but for what it left unsaid. It wasn't a speech describing the progress, the hopes and aspirations of the Minister in the field of Education. He mentioned briefly the vote on the School Divisions and gave the Government great credit for that and again I say that I'm not one to find fault with the steps taken. But I pointed out that the provisions for a vote, for re-organization and the voting of considerable sums of money alone won't do the job, and I think if the newspapers quote the Minister correctly, he will . . . .when they say in last night's paper - 'Government Curb on Teachers' Salaries. Want one Scale for Province. M.T.S. Backs Salary Limit for Some,' I think he will agree that all is not rosy even after we have had the vote, and that many problems remain. Many problems remain! And if to some extent, at least, the purpose for which this money was provided namely, not only to provide for greater assistance to one branch of education, namely the teaching profession, but to a large extent to provide for reduction of the Municipal load - the Municipal tax load - and I suggest to him, that his hopes in the latter connection have not been realized. And I suggest to him further, that the Government was in quite a hurry, that they did not study the question of the scale of teachers' salary - to where the scale of teacher's salary would lead them, because they did not take into account the other recommendation of the Royal Commission on Education, namely that merit rating should be tied to that scale. And I can't emphasize too much that if the Government had seen fit to accept that recommendation contained in the interim report, they would not have had the same amount of grief that they are experiencing now.

A MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. MILLER: And there is yet another matter that I want to touch on, and that is the question of this interim report. On many occasions, I've asked the Minister this question: "Who asked for the report? Why an interim report? Why not the full report?" and I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that there again they were perhaps a bit hasty because I sincerely believe that the whole aspect of improvements in education should have been dealt with as a package deal; teacher training, curriculum, examinations, the question of the private schools - all these things should have been considered as one package. And I suggest again, Mr. Chairman, that the Government would have experienced less grief. The grants - and I say this, they were very

(Mr. Miller, cont'd.) . . . generous grants - but as one reporter put it, they had been largely dissipated by the teachers' grab, and I think as I've said on so many occasions that while of course we realized that the teaching profession and those most highly qualified could stand a substantial boost and I think we are all in favour of that - for the best qualifications - but under this wholesale scheme and the undertaking by the Government to make itself responsible as a province for a salary scale up to the amounts indicated, included remuneration for a great many of those who are not fully qualified. And while I am on the subject of Teachers' Salary Scales, there are a great number of very well experienced teachers in the elementary section who because of advanced age and everything else, cannot make themselves qualified for the higher amounts set. And I think something should be done about that, because as one person put it (well qualified to speak) 'they are the backbone of our elementary system.' And I offer these suggestions, not in a spirit of criticism, but as suggestions that the Minister might well look into and see if something can't be done about it.

HON. STEWART E. MCLEAN (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Would you include merit rating with that recommendation?

MR. MILLER: Absolutely! I think I stated just a few minutes ago that the Government would have been well advised to accept the recommendation of merit rating in connection with the establishment of the salary scale. And I think that it wouldn't be too difficult to implement that. Now I don't know whether the Minister has been correctly quoted "McLean hints at Ceiling if Pay Continues to Skyrocket. The Honourable Stewart McLean, Saturday dropped a hit" - hint I guess it means, or threat - "that the Government may set teaching salaries if they continue to rise at the rate they did this year." The Trustees appear to be up in arms, "Trustees Aim Blast at Teachers for Salary Appetite - Want One Scale for Province." Now on that question, I think that I agree with the Minister when he said on that same occasion that he would prefer to leave the question of salaries with the employers, and I think in practice, we should do everything to encourage local autonomy. Now, what can we do about it? I think the Minister should use his best efforts to strengthen the Trustees Association. Get them united. Give them the same bargaining powers that the Teachers Society has. And if legislative action is necessary, I think it is his duty to introduce that. And the other alternative - and if he wants to control salaries provincially and absolutely, I think that he should look at the Australian system, where teachers are in effect civil servants - and I'm speaking particularly of West Australia - and where the central authority determines salaries and has the right of allocation. And if the Minister has in mind an investigation or the setting up of one of these famous 'study groups' that we hear so much about, to investigate that system, above all things, let him insist on the right of allocation if he adopts any such measure. Because without that right, we will still have a scarcity of high school teachers and I might say in passing, in West Australia, the great number - the central authority under the Minister - Deputy Minister, had the right of allocation. And they can determine where each teacher shall teach, and the practice has been - according to the information given to me by the Deputy Minister of that country - that the practice is that they spend some time in the country and then come back to the other centres. And while in theory the Minister has complete control of allocation, yet the wishes of the individual teachers are taken into account.

Now there is another matter that the Minister didn't touch on and it ties in with the general situation, with regard to education. I think we're all agreed that we want the best possible teachers for our children. We want to give these teachers the best possible training and I want to refer to the standards of admission at Teachers' College. I had thought, that after a year that the standards might have been raised. But according to a statement made by the Minister of this Chamber, that the minimum requirements are still Grade XI, plus two Grade XII subjects. And I think on another occasion I suggested to him, that with much larger numbers applying for admission to Teachers' College, instead of raising the fees and making it more difficult for beginners to obtain assistance and get that training, he might have been well-advised to raise the standards and leave subsidization at the same level as it was under the previous administration.

I want to say a word and repeat what I have said on other occasions and I think during the period of time that the Minister has been in charge of the department, he has also found this statement of mine to be true; namely that the size of the unit does not determine the quality of the product. That the product of our schools compares well and favourably with the product of

(Mr. Miller, cont'd.) . . . the schools of other jurisdiction. And the mere fact of changing the organizational set-up won't improve that product immediately. It will take time. Re-organization was a good thing. I didn't agree with the way it was brought about. I stated my objections and reservations when the Bill was brought in and I've said nothing outside that I didn't state here. But I want to emphasize at every level my information has been and my experience has been that the Manitoba children, moving to other parts, to other jurisdictions, stand on their own feet and their efforts compare favourably with the efforts of the children of other jurisdictions who have re-organized setups long before we started. I was disappointed too, that he said nothing about his plans for the future. He never mentioned a word about the accreditation for instance. I wonder if he received a report of the High School Examination Board? I asked for that report some months before I left and I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that the First Minister will remember all about the High School Examination Board and the setup, because we used to debate who was responsible for what. And there again is a statutory limitation of the powers of the Minister of Education and unless you change the Statute the Minister is powerless, and I'm sure my successor will agree with me on that. But those are things that should be studied. Now I realize that he has been busy with re-organization, but I think when he make a broad statement that we have obvious differences of opinion, then I think he should elaborate on that. What does he think of accreditation? What does he think about the setup of the High School Examination Board? What does he think of the Committee setup of setting papers - where there is again divided authority between teachers, University people and members of the permanent staff? Am I right, Mr. Chairman, in recalling that on another occasion he talked an Institute of Technology? My understanding is that monies are available for capital purposes of that kind. Is he going to go ahead with that - nothing contained in his statement of the other day. What does he think about the position of the private schools in this province? Is he going to await the Commission's Report and when are we going to get that Commission Report? And I want to say, Mr. Chairman, somebody was in a great hurry to get an interim report, but it appears to me that the same "hurry" is not evidenced at this time to get the full report. I realize, very well, that the private schools of this province are making a very valuable contribution to the educational set-up in this Province, and I think some consideration - provincial consideration, and I emphasize the word "provincial" - should be given them so that their efforts might be recognized. Now I realize full well that the Minister might say in his reply "why didn't you do it when?" Well, I said we have moved along in recognition of the affiliated colleges, for instance. The Government hasn't extended that policy, except to change it from one tied to the Canada Council formula to a percentage. I'm talking of course, about the construction grants.

And I want to at this time too, pay tribute to the Board of Governors of the University and I want to thank them for the co-operation I received from them and the careful management they gave to affairs of the University. The Chancellor, Dr. Sifton, was most co-operative. The President - and I knew two and had dealings with two - our relations were very cordial and indeed why shouldn't they be, because in the last few years they got everything they asked for. Everything they asked for! My honourable friend and neighbor, the Member for Fort Rouge, if we want to use that term, smiles ---- but he knows members of the Board, and I can give him that assurance. Naturally costs are going up - more money is required in that field, and I want to commend the Government for carrying on the generous policy initiated, of University support, initiated by the previous administration.

The other day, the Minister too -- and I'll be through in another minute -- suggested that contributions from the Provincial Treasury have gone up from three million, I think he said in '46 to thirty million now. Well, we went up steadily during my tenure of office to the tune of an average better than two million a year - from five million six, to twenty-four million, and that is no mean contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I see it is 5:30 and I want to terminate my remarks at this time. In closing I want to say that I am very, very worried about the format of these estimates. Even I, who am supposed to have some knowledge of the various sub-appropriation, find it very difficult to break down these various items. I trust that the Minister will not be too disturbed if he is being asked many question. Because it is practically impossible, even for the older members, to get the information they desire without asking these questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is 5:30 and I shall now leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, June 30th, 1959.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1 (a).

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Chairman, it's somewhat difficult to be critical of a department and a Minister who is bringing in a proposal for an increase in expenditure of the magnitude we have tonight. At the same time I do think there are a number of items in these estimates which should be given a good deal of consideration. From the point of view, Mr. Chairman, of the local school districts, the most important item I think is the item listed under Educational Grants. Now there can be no question, of course, that this item is substantially more than it was last year, indeed than it ever was in the history of this province. At the same time it seems to me that the grants as they are now set up have pretty important future implications for the local school district, and one which I know they are all concerned about. Now the Minister in introducing this bill originally--in making his speech on education at the regular session, said on March 18th - and I'm going to repeat what I said earlier in the debate, but the Minister didn't reply to the questions I raised, Mr. Chairman. The Minister said at that time and I quote that "it," (speaking about this plan,) "will relieve in large measure the real property from the burden of school finance transferring the larger share to the tax base which we have in the Province of Manitoba. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no question that the province is paying substantially more for education than it did in the past, but is it really paying a larger percentage. I question it.

I pointed out, Mr. Chairman, during the last session, and we now have it confirmed by the budget which has been struck by the local school district, that in fact the money required to finance local school districts is up this year, and nearly every school district in and around Winnipeg has a larger tax rate because of the increase for educational costs. It is true, for example, in Winnipeg that we got \$600,000.00 more this year than we did last year but as a result of the negotiations between the Winnipeg School Board and the school teachers the cost of salaries in Winnipeg is this year \$160,000.00 higher than it was last year. Next year the situation will be even worse because next year the grants to the City of Winnipeg will go up by approximately \$50.00 per teacher while the increments which the teachers have negotiated with the City of Winnipeg will mean that the teachers will get either two or three hundred dollars each in the way of an increment. And what is true of Winnipeg is of course true of every municipality, certainly every urban municipality in the greater Winnipeg area, and I'm sure it's true of Brandon, it's true of Portage, it's true of Flin Flon and the other urban centres. So that the result is, Mr. Chairman, that for the next eight or ten years at least, the cost of education on the local taxpayer will increase both in total and percentage-wise rather than decrease as the Minister has said. Now I don't think that this situation is too serious this year - a tax increase of one mill or half mill or a mill and a half is not very serious but in the long range this is going to be of the greatest importance to the local taxpayer and I think, Mr. Chairman, that the government is going to have to revise the formula which they have devised.

Now it's true that the Honourable Minister may say that the grant schedule was set out in the interim report of the Royal Commission and that it said very clearly that the increment should go up \$50.00 a year for 44 years, and if the local school districts want to make an agreement which permits teachers to go up to their maximum in 14 or 15 years that that's their hard luck, their tough luck and they'll have to pay the difference. But Mr. Chairman, I suggest that it's completely unrealistic to expect the teachers to wait for 44 years to get to their maximum. After all we want teachers who are qualified, that means that we want teachers who have at least their B.A. plus one year in the School of Education. I presume that they would be on the average 23 or 24 when they had that. If you add 44 years to that and if they retire at 65 it's obviously impossible for them to ever get to their maximum before they retire. On top of that I think, Mr. Chairman, that the teachers would say with justification that by the time the teacher gets to the age of 50 or 55 and certainly to 60, that he is not at the maximum of his ability to make a contribution to the education of the young people; and so therefore to suggest that they wait till they are 60 or 65 to get to their maximum is completely impossible. And this is one thing which I think, Mr. Chairman, the government and this

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) . . . Legislature is, going to have to look at, and look at very seriously in the next couple of years.

Now another item, Mr. Chairman, which I think is woefully inadequate is in the field of scholarships. Now I know that the Minister can say with justification that last year we only provided \$69,000.00 for scholarships and this year we propose to provide \$173,000.00 for scholarships. And in the Education Revolving Loan Fund, last year we provided \$50,000.00 and this year we're providing \$140,000.00 -- and this is a substantial increase, Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate what I've said on other occasions both in the House and outside the House, that there is probably no country in the world - we used to say it was only true in the western world, but from what people like Dr. James and others who have been to eastern Europe are telling us, they are doing even more than we are - but there is probably no country in the world which is doing less in the field of education, certainly in higher education, than Canada. I'm not blaming this government, and it's not only true of this province -- every province is in the same boat, we are caught in the squeeze. We say that we can't provide the money - that the Federal Government should do it, and the Federal Government says that because of the constitutional problem and probably also because of political considerations and the desire of the Province of Quebec to go it alone that they can't do it. But the fact is that there's probably no country in the western world which is doing as little to provide needed funds for students who haven't got the financial wherewithal to go on to University than this country. And I want to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the amount of \$173,000.00 for scholarships and \$140,000.00 for the Loan Fund is completely inadequate in the kind of society in which we live. If we're going to get the people who can use University and who can make a contribution after they go to University to go and to attend and to be able to take the courses which are available, then surely we ought to set it as our objective that no youngster who has the ability to meet the requirements - the educational requirements - should be kept out of University by virtue of the fact that they can't afford to go to University. And yet I'm sure the fact is that there are hundreds in this province and in every other province who don't go simply because their family can't afford it.

One other item, Mr. Chairman, on which I think I would like to say something. It's an item which the Honourable Member from Rhineland spoke on, and that is the requirements for the people who attend the Teacher's College. Now I know all the arguments that were used in past for not making the qualifications higher - we had a tremendous shortage of teachers and that's not completely gone yet; we weren't paying enough to attract the best people. One could go on and on and on and probably we will have a good deal of discussion on this item when we get to it. But we are now paying pretty substantial salaries to teachers. We are now, I think, that teachers, particularly those with qualifications, can now earn in the teaching profession, salaries comparable to that paid in other professions. And I want to say that as far as I'm concerned, and I think that I can speak for every member in our group, that we would like to see the day, and if it can't be done this year, then next year, when nobody should be able to attend the Manitoba Teacher's College, who has not at least got a clear Grade XII. I'm about 95% certain that this is the situation in the Province of Saskatchewan. You can't attend the Teacher's College in Saskatchewan unless you have a clear Grade XII. And my information - I wasn't able to check it tonight - but my information is that the same is true in the Province of Ontario. And I for one, am not satisfied with a situation which permits students who have Grade XI, and I saw a return which the Honourable Member for Burrows got last year, I think, which showed that a couple of years ago I believe there were people attending Teacher's College who hadn't a complete Grade XI. Now I don't know whether they just aren't permitting them in now, or whether they've changed the regulations, but that isn't good enough Mr. Chairman, and I don't think it is good enough to say that if they have a Grade XI and two subjects, pass in two subjects in Grade XII, that they can get in to Teacher's College now. I think that we are now paying sufficient so that we can expect a good deal more from their teachers.

And the last item I would like to make some comment on, Mr. Chairman, is one which has very little to do with finances, at the moment at least, and that is in the field of curriculum. We are spending about the same this year as last year. I think, Mr. Chairman, that here again a good deal of work and a good deal of effort has got to be put in in the next couple of years. Because we have at the present time a very peculiar situation. I suppose about 70%

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd) . . . of the students attending high schools in Manitoba are taking the matriculation course. And what is a matriculation course? In essence it's a course which permits students to go on to University. Now if you look at the number who attend University, I suppose not more than 20% of our students who finished Grade XI go on to University. And because so many -- one of the reasons why so many attending don't go on to University - at least one of the results of this is that if they're going to pass, and of course if they don't pass we will all hear about it, and the principals will hear about it, and the School Inspectors will hear about it and the department will hear about it, - I'm sure the Minister will hear about it. If too many fail, there will be delegations to see the Minister. And so what do we do in order to get around this, we make the courses easier. Or else we say that 'x' percent only can fail, and if the pass mark is 50 and too many fail - the Member from Rhineland shakes his head but - the case is different depending on who you talk with. You talk to high school examiners, you get one story; you talk to university professors who have acted on the examining committees, you get a different case -- the fact is that the matriculation course is not doing what it ought to do.

Now there is an alternative. I don't think we ought to make the courses easier. I think the courses, the standards for those entering University ought to be made tougher. But the alternative is to provide a course for those people who are not going to go on to University. Now there are some cities, some provinces, which are doing this, for example, the Ryerson Institute in the City of Toronto provides a very excellent alternative to those students who are not going on to University. What I want to say, Mr. Chairman, is this, I would hope that in the next year or so that a good deal of time and effort on the part of the department and it's advisory in the University and whoever else they will use, and of the Minister, should be taken in looking at this whole question of curriculum. Because I think that unless the curriculum is revised so that everybody works to the best of their ability -- now I'm not one of those who believes that if a person can't manage the University entrance that they ought to be thrown out of school -- I think that everybody ought to have the opportunity to take the education which they can assimilate, but I think it is a waste of funds and effort and the time of good teachers trying to get students who are not going to go on to University, who are not able to pass the present matriculation course, to have them working at it when they should be at something else.

With these few remarks I am going to sit down Mr. Chairman. I think that one would be mistaken and somewhat foolish to be entirely critical of a department which is expanding at the rate which this department is, but I think a good deal still needs to be done. I wasn't here when the Honourable Member for Rhineland was the Minister of Education. I'm not trying to defend the government -- I find it hard to follow his explanation that all that is being done is an orderly continuation of what he started. This is quite a continuation. I find it hard, for example, to . . .

MR. MILLER: . . . . . examine it.

MR. ORLIKOW: Well, alright, let's examine it and I'm sure the Minister can handle his own department, but I notice that the . . . (Interjection) Yes, I know. He said that the University got everything which they wanted from the former government. Well, I notice that this year they are getting \$700,000.00 more than they got last year. Now their sites jumped suddenly - I'm inclined to think that probably what happened was that the University (and they are probably doing it with this government, they would do it with any government) - they don't ask for everything they would like to get or for everything they need to get; they probably ask for a little more than they expect to get, and that's why they asked for a good deal less from the former minister -- and they got a good deal less, -- that's why they are asking and getting more now. And probably if we were in the government they'd get more.

MR. MILLER: May I interject, Mr. Chairman? I want to put the honourable member straight. If he will consult the previous estimates he will find that in each successive year, very, very substantial increases were granted to the University, and I am entirely correct in stating that the University in the last few years got all they asked for. Naturally they increased their sites, time changed, I mentioned it this afternoon that costs increased, the enrolment increases and so forth. Naturally they get more.

MR. ORLIKOW: Well, Mr. Chairman. . . .

MR. MILLER: . . . . . all in the evidence.

MR. ORLIKOW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm looking at the evidence on this page. They are getting an increase of \$700,000.00 this year. The total they are getting this year is \$2,800,000.00. If you go back by \$700,000.00 steps, you wouldn't have to go back very many years until they would have got nothing

MR. MILLER: Again I want to - I want to list the services.

MR. ORLIKOW: I'll read it back, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MILLER: No, no. I just want to correct the information.

MR. WILLIS: Who's making this speech?

MR. MILLER: On the year ending March 31st, 1958, University of Manitoba general grant \$1,500,000.00; the year ending March 31st, 1959, \$2,157,000.00; non-recurring expenditures in the previous year '58 - \$96,900.00; in the following year \$115,000.00 so there has been a substantial increase and I'm sure the Minister will correct that statement when he replies.

MR. ORLIKOW: Well, Mr. Chairman, how shall I put it, the honourable member when he was the Minister of Education got his religion very late in respect to education. He learned very late.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my job - nor my desire to particularly defend this government. I think that the estimates show that a beginning has been made in a number of important fields. I've tried to point out some important matters in which I think a good deal more consideration will have to be given, and I can assure my Honourable Friend from Rhineland, and the members on the other side, that if we don't think they are giving the consideration to the items we think are important, that we will continue to remind them. I've tried to highlight a few. I'm sure as we gone on with the estimates, item by item, that we will come to other matters on which I am sure we will have some suggestions and criticisms to make.

MR. M.N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C., (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Chairman, what I am about to say has more or less been prompted by some of the remarks made by the Honourable the First Minister and the Minister of Education. I will try not to be critical; I will try to be factual in what I have to say. I would like to refer to the remark of the Honourable the First Minister when he was introducing the motion before the Chamber, and if you turn to page 242, I believe it is, we see this statement when he came to the Department of Education - "Manitoba citizens voted overwhelmingly for a change in the system of education". Well, whether that vote was overwhelming or not, I think is a matter of opinion. I feel that we have many more people than the 47% that voted that are interested in education, and it would be of some interest to know why so many people who are interested in education failed to turn out on that vote, especially after you consider the fact that there was a great deal of concentrated propaganda, a great deal of money spent, hundreds of meetings held.

And while I am on this subject, I think it would be of interest to the members of the House if the Minister of Education could give us all the approximate amount that that campaign prior to that vote cost the people in this province, breaking it down into advertising and transportation, and so forth. But with that tremendous propaganda, with the hundreds of meetings that were held, it is surprising that so few turned out to vote. And there may be a good and sufficient reason for that. It could very well be that the people of the province sensed that they were not being told the whole story - and I don't think there is any question about that. We heard some criticism from the Minister of Education here the other day in which he chided some of the members of the Opposition for pointing out the disadvantages of the plan and I think the chiding was misplaced. After all is said and done, I think the people of this province who are paying the shot, are entitled to know the whole story, both the advantages and the disadvantages, because if the disadvantages are not told them, then of course we come back to that old adage that the "chickens will come home to roost". And I do believe that some of those chickens are winging their way to the government rookery right now. They will be roosting there not before too long and some of them, in fact, have just about alighted. And I believe it would have been wiser had the people been acquainted with both the advantages and the disadvantages. As to the Honourable Minister's chiding of the Members of the Opposition for pointing out some of the disadvantages, I don't think they can be blamed for it. The plan at best is only half-baked and I'm not altogether blaming the Minister for this. There is a long, long way to go yet before the plan will come anywhere near providing equal opportunity to the children of this province.

Now the Honourable the Minister made another statement that I didn't think was well

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd.) . . . considered, and that statement appears on page 367 of the Hansard. He went on to speak about the high calibre of the trustees that offered their services to the school divisions and then he makes this statement, and I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that I think that statement is ill considered. "That the success of the plan depends in a very large measure upon the way in which they are able" (and here he is referring to the trustees of the division boards) "in which they are able to conduct the business of the school division during the first year of operation." Well, Mr. Chairman, that looks very much to me as if the Minister is trying to pass the buck to the trustees of the board divisions. With a shaky foundation such as was provided to these division boards, how can you expect them to build anything sound upon that foundation.

Now all that is almost entirely due to the fact, Mr. Chairman that the government failed for reasons best known to itself to implement the main features of the recommendations of the Royal Commission: and one of these was the merit rating. As I understand the press reports, the trustees of the board divisions are somewhat concerned with the manner in which the secondary teachers salaries have skyrocketed. Well, there was a provision or a recommendation in the commissions report anticipating this possibility and the commission recommended that the increments be limited to 2-1/2 years immaterial of how many years of teaching any particular person had to his credit. If that ceiling had been placed on the salaries, the boards wouldn't have found themselves in the position that they do at the moment, nor would the Minister find himself in the predicament that he does find himself in. I can say quite sincerely, I can compliment the Minister and the government for having brought in the skeleton of a plan that they have -- but as far as the plan itself is concerned, it has too many weaknesses, very serious weaknesses that could have been overcome by simply following the recommendations of the commission, and this was not done. Now the grants have been considerably increased but the plan calls for considerably greater increases if we wish to attain or achieve the objective that the government has set for itself. The honourable member who just preceded me pointed out that the cost of education, in spite of the fact that the grants have been increased, the cost to the local taxpayer is still high percentage wise. And from what I see in the rural areas, Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that the additional costs are going to be placed on real estate in the way of municipal taxes - are going to be beyond the ability of the taxpayers to pay. And if anything of that nature should happen, this plan may die in its infancy, and I'm quite sure that none of us would like to see that happen. And I quite seriously, Mr. Chairman, recommend to the government, and in particular the Minister of Education, that they get themselves well acquainted with the difficulties that have arisen and that they prepare to meet those difficulties.

This isn't the session at which this particular plan is being implemented, this is the third session that we have had in which education has been discussed and no improvement has been made at all over the original plan that was inaugurated in the special session of 1958. And I say to you Mr. Chairman, that these weaknesses were evident then and drawn to the attention of the government. Nothing has been done. I'm afraid that these troubles are going to pile up. They may pile up to a degree where the government will not be able to cope with them. And I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that something should have been done at this session to meet those very obvious failings of the plan. I would be interested to know, for one, what is the committee on merit rating doing? Can we expect a report from them before the session is over, or have they been dissolved and the committee no longer in existence? Because I do think, Mr. Chairman, that without some system of merit rating, and what we've seen happen in the last two or three months, is evidence enough that we must do something about it. There may be no easy solution, but we have ventured upon a plan and we must be ready to meet all the difficulties and obstacles as they come along.

Now Mr. Chairman, I know this is a difficult task. It's an enormous task. I've known the Honourable the Minister of Education for quite a number of years as a private citizen and as a public official in the Town of Dauphin. I know he is a hard worker. I know he is conscientious -- but I say to him in a friendly gesture, without any criticism, that he'll have to take a much more serious view in anticipating the headaches that he can expect from this particular plan. And I want to repeat in closing Mr. Chairman, that he'll have to be ready to come out at the next session with a great deal more than he has to offer us at the present.

MR. E. GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Chairman, considerable concern has been

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd.) . . . expressed in my constituency by both the school trustees and municipal men over the government regulations dealing with maintenance grants. I'll quote some figures from the Lundar school district to prove my point. In the Lundar school the estimated maintenance costs for a year are \$5,000.00. Their estimated rentals, for this year will be \$3,600.00. Now the policy of the government is that the School Board must deduct the rental from the estimated costs which is \$3,600.00 from \$5,000.00 leaving a balance of \$1,400.00. The school is, therefore, eligible for grants 75% of the \$1,400.00 which is \$1,050.00. The maximum grant allowable by the policy is 75% of the \$750.00 per teacher or \$562.50. Now if this school didn't, those three rooms, they would be eligible for grants - for maintenance grants of \$2,812.00 or an increase of \$1,762.00 over the present policy. The School Board feel that this is an injustice - that they are not getting the full maintenance grants that are being offered by the government in view of the fact that they are renting a number of rooms to the larger division. And they want this government to eliminate that regulation whereby they must deduct the rentals from the estimated maintenance costs.

MR. HAWRYLUK: Mr. Speaker, in the first place I would like to express some opinions, more of a constructive nature rather than being critical of the Honourable Minister of Education. I don't think that at the present time we have any reason to be critical of the stand of the job that the Minister of Education has done in the past twelve months. As a matter of fact, I would say that it could be due to initiativeness, aggressiveness on the part of the Minister himself that I . . . that education definitely has taken a step forward which should have been taken many, many years ago. There's no question about it. Let's be honest about it. And I think the public is fully aware of that.

What I intend to say, Mr. Chairman, it's something that I have spoken before, there is something I might add to it. The previous years that I attempt to clarify the position that the teachers are faced with in the province, particularly in Greater Winnipeg, which I wish to reiterate today is that all that we've waited many, many years and we've read from time to time and I know that I speak for the fact that we on this side of the House for many, many years hoped that the previous government would go ahead and give that opportunity to the child whether they lived in the city or in the rural areas. Equality of education - it's a phrase that has been bandied a little too much. There's no question in my mind and in the mind of the public as a whole that I feel that the children in the rural areas possibly did not have those opportunities. Now why do I say this? Because we're faced with the same problem in Greater Winnipeg even up to the present time. Now the type of course we are offering to our students for many many years, we have been, and still are, catering to the select few. We still are, in spite of the fact that statistics prove that for every thousand children that start in Grade I and by the time they reach Grade XII or supposedly finish Grade XI, barely 8% to 10% enter University. Even today, 1959, where the parents have the means - have the funds - and a desire to say, "my child should get the very best", but you cannot in many cases force your child to higher education unless they have the faculty and the ability. It's impossible. And yet in 1959 right across Canada, statistics prove that we are actually catering in the courses that we are offering today to barely 10% of the people that will enter the University. And yet there is a big demand for these people. There's a shortage of geologists and doctors and research workers. We need those people. Other countries are attempting to do it on a mass scale. What I'm trying to say is this, Mr. Chairman, have we lost the sight of the fact that we've got to cater to the other 90%? That problem has faced me and faced many other teachers who have taught in this province for many years but I offer this, the one type of course to my students knowing that I can't give them anything else and yet we find that in many cases he cannot continue, he had to . . . . .no ability to carry on in the particular courses that we offer. Now we do offer three types of courses. As a matter of fact in some towns they even offer a course in commercial training. We also offer a specialized technical course in some of the towns. But the bulk of our people - the bulk of our efforts - is for the select few. And as a result, we lose hundreds and thousands of our young people who are left by the wayside because we cannot offer them something else. Now I'm speaking about Greater Winnipeg. I think your problem in the country is probably just as bad. But for years I've asked and appealed to the government - the previous government - that they should also give the opportunity to the people outside of Winnipeg, anybody within easy range of a city of say 20 to 25 miles in which the daughter or son

(Mr. Hawryluk, cont'd.) . . . can come in and take a vocational course. The City of Winnipeg fortunately has one of the finest vocational guidance schools on the continent. They have, there's no question about it. But can I turn around to a pupil in a suburb and say, "Son, I don't think it's desirable, or you cannot continue with the matriculation course". The only thing we can offer in many cases right now - at the present time - is a commercial course incidentally which was just introduced two or three years ago in the suburbs of Greater Winnipeg. And yet I cannot do anything about it. We keep that youngster in for a year or two and then it's inevitable, he's discouraged or else he gets into difficulties, he finds it a problem to cope with the work and he quits at the age of sixteen, seventeen. What have we done for him? Are we preparing him for anything? You can't blame the teachers. You can't blame the principal in charge because we have nothing else to give that youngster. And if I want to send somebody to Tec Voc and I'm faced with the problem continually then unfortunately the parents have to pay and the sum today is around \$375.00 per child. That's a lot of money. I've asked from time to time, that I felt that the government should also build a vocational school probably in the suburbs - after all there's still land available - where all the people as I say within a range of 25 to 30 miles could go to that school and the government would then make some arrangements with the municipalities and they would subsidize it and the municipalities would come across and pay maybe 50% for the student that was attending that school. Now I'm speaking very sincerely because this is a problem that I'm faced with at the present time, and yet there is no way of finding any way of solving this particular problem. And I think it is the duty of the members of this House to realize that we cannot all be doctors, we can't all be professional men - it's ridiculous. If we took a survey of the members of this House here - I don't know how many are professionals here but I would venture to say possibly 25%.

(Interjection by a member)

MR. HAWRYLUK: Well they're not professionals - a profession is a line of work but they're not professionals. But the question is that you have to remember that we have to give the unfortunate people an opportunity in this world of competitive jobs - an opportunity to make a living. Your son - your child possibly is in that position - will be in that position right here in the House because I venture to say that all of your children in this House here will not go to University and yet you have to give them some type of vocation - something that he will be able to benefit - something that his talent, whether it's with his hands - a diversified course - giving more of our people an opportunity than it has been up to the present time. Possibly the largest group plan that you have has come about, has been conceived - I know there is a lot of pitfalls in that - but possibly the fact that the largest school area might solve that problem in rural areas where you are going to set up vocational schools on a small scale. And I'm appealing for those people in Greater Winnipeg, that is in the suburbs of Winnipeg. We have nothing to offer our people. We offer shops, yes. But the kind of shops that we offer is just bare fundamentals. I'm talking about a vocational school where they can learn a trade. Our youngster goes there when he is seventeen, or a girl, she's got a trade. Something they can fall back on when they leave rather than looking for a type of employment that many of them can't get. Don't forget, a youngster going out seeking a job in this day and age and I have a lot of them come back - a youngster that quits in Grade IX, his chances of getting work today are very very limited because competition -- for every Grade IX child or VIII child that attempts to get a job at age sixteen or seventeen, there are four or five boys and girls with Grade XI education, and they possibly would have preference. And I would certainly appeal to the government that you should give it a lot of thought. We lose too many of our young people who are left by the wayside and they are lost - they are completely lost and unfortunately our juvenile courts are littered with young people who have nothing to do - they are the ones that have quite - hang around corners, poolrooms and our homes are pretty well filled - girls' homes, boys' homes, filled with these youngsters. And I think society can take some blame to that - I think we should take some blame for that because of the fact that we aren't giving these people an opportunity in some other type of vocation.

May I say something now, very briefly, about one other aspect in order to raise the standards of our young people that we've got to raise those standards by setting a level where our young people in Grade VII, VIII, and IX and X and XI have to be prepared to do. What has been the policy for years? We have allowed many of our youngsters going in from grade

(Mr. Hawryluk, cont'd.) . . . . seven to eight, to nine, to ten on probation. Our records prove it. I've got the facts here for what we've allowed to get . . . . . in the normal schools for the past five years - people with 'sups' in Grade XI and in Grade XII. But at least they have the Grade XI. . . . . We actually have been encouraging youngsters to say, "Well, if I can get a 50%, I'm in." That's exactly what we've been doing for many, many years, possibly we're not the only province, possibly every other province has done the same because, mass production I would say. But, we have lowered our standards of achievement -- lowered the standards in the eyes of the youngster, for he has been pushed from one grade to another for years and he's always had two or three 'sups' hanging over his head, and he never has to worry about writing them off. It's paradise, and with that attitude, is there any wonder that the results of the university level have been what they have in the past number of years? I think that the government will have -- the Department of Education will have to insist that any youngster going into -- I'm starting at the Grade IX level, that goes into Grade X -- and goes into Grade XI will have to get his supplementals off, in order to get a clear standing. You simply have to advocate that and you simply have to make sure that those youngsters will have understood that unless they get those supplementals off they will not have a clear standing and in some cases I would even suggest that they be penalized. You simply have to do that. They go in with a lackadaisical attitude and the result is "I'll go into University, I've made my Grade XI -- I've barely made it with a 51%" and he goes out to the University and the result is -- the results have been deplorable.

I would suggest that summer schools be set. But, a real summer school, something that has meat to it, where a youngster if he's ambitious or she's ambitious, then the parents would be compelled to pay a fee, a fairly good fee, because if a parent has to -- if the youngster knew that he had to go to summer school, and the parent knew that he had to pay for that, I can assure you that the parents would make sure that they would get after the youngsters too, but they take the same attitude - so my child got away with two or three 'sups' for Grade IX or X, why should I worry about it? and, the result is that the parents to some extent are to blame as well. I think that summer schools should be set up, and in various centres whether it's in the rural areas, in the largest centres where the youngster is compelled to spend a period of a month or five weeks and pay for that, and I can assure you that the standards would go up within a space of four or five years.

I'll not go into details about supplementals, I have some interesting figures here, that seem to fluctuate from one year to another. I'll just briefly tell you. Why is it that one year in Grade XI or XII you'll have 50% failures, another year you'll have 35%; social studies one year it's 32.8, another year 19.6; physics 40.1, 23.4 another year; and so on. Now it might be due to the paper set, the type of examination questions asked, possibly the marking of the papers, and those are some of the factors that could be considered.

Now in some of the other provinces, - and may I say at the outset Mr. Chairman, that these criticisms are something that have been published in the papers from time to time, and at any teachers' convention they talk about this particular problem and they feel that something can . . . . . For example, in British Columbia, the examination results are used as a guide to establish the lowest group in the province. And if for instance it was found that the long-term average failure rate in physics was 15%, that's possible, and it happens in Manitoba, the department fails the lowest 15% writing exams, not just those that happen to get less than 50%. I think, Mr. Chairman, that a provincial group of educators should be set up to advise, I know we have a board in operation now, and I don't want to be too critical, I don't think we are in a position to be critical of the board that is set up at the present time, and studying the current examinations that have been in operation for many years. But this is a suggestion that has been brought to my attention, in which this board would be set up, made up of the University of Manitoba representatives and some from the Department of Education, who would check and check the examination set-up and do some extensive research work in the various subjects.

There should be a survey made - now possibly this is being done -- I'm not going to question that -- maybe I'm repeating something that has been done, or is being done, and that a survey should be made in the province before an examination is set in order to determine the norms for this examination, and there should be more choice questions given which will enable the student to cover fairly that paper. I think there are certain types of papers in which they

(Mr. Hawryluk, cont'd.) . . . cannot get too many options, but we find that sometimes the questions are given in such a way that they can have a great deal of ambiguity. It's very difficult for the youngster to understand exactly what the core of that question is. There should be clarity.

Now, one more appeal to the Minister is this, I think it would be about time, Mr. Minister, that we should have an overhaul of some of the textbooks that are being used. Some of those textbooks have been used for a minimum, in many cases, of ten years if not more. And I would like to appeal the fact that I think that we have many Canadian authors -- we have some top-notch Canadian people that should be given an opportunity to have their books used in the various schools in Manitoba. I think we have many capable men and women who have published books in which I don't think we have taken advantage. We should encourage more of our Canadians, former students, former graduates, and I think we should use a great deal of their books.

Now, oh, a few months ago I read an article in the paper -- whether this was done in jest or whether it was done in a sincere way by this particular person or persons on a general discussion -- you might have recalled that Mr. Minister, in which somebody said that each teacher should be allowed to given latitude to select his or her own choice of books to the classroom -- I think you might recall that. Now, I think that would be the biggest mistake ever, to allow each teacher in each classroom to take the book that she or he wanted to teach or use in that particular case. It would be the biggest mistake ever and I think that the curriculum committee that had been set up should continue doing the good work in choosing the best type of books.

The only thing I can say in closing is this, I think the fact that you've increased the number of inspectors in the province, is an excellent idea, because Mr. Minister, this is the problem, we've heard about merit rating as far as teachers, is a must, and I agree wholeheartedly with the person who deserves more pay should get it for the work they put into their work, but the job there is going to be a very delicate one and I think the fact that you will have enough inspectors, I think the bulk of your inspectors are going to have to be the central pivot point in which they are going to have to work with your principals and possibly with your superintendents and supervisors in any area in order to make this merit rating a partial or even a wholly successful venture. It's a very touchy problem, merit rating, because you are dealing with teachers, because it's not merit rating, based on qualifications academically, but on the ability of a teacher as a teacher. The only criticism I can say Sir, is this; by the fact that we've appealed time and time again about accepting students into the teacher's college, I was very sorry to hear, to read in the paper that for this coming year that you were taking these students in with Grade XI standing and two clear subjects and any number of 'sups' in Grade XII. I think this is the only province in western Canada and that includes Ontario as well, if I recall that are taking teachers -- future teachers into the teacher's college with those low standings. I think that Saskatchewan has eliminated that -- Alberta certainly did many years ago, so did British Columbia and Ontario, and unless we are to encourage more of our young people in, I think we should within a year or so accept no one unless they have a Grade XII as a standing, and with these words Mr. Chairman, they have all been of a constructive nature and I can assure you that I speak from experience, I hope that the government will see fit to do something about some of the main problems that I have mentioned this evening.

MR. GROVES: Mr. Chairman, ever since the new schools plan went into effect, each time the session has met we have -- it has always been fair game -- everybody has chosen to snipe at this new plan and as we sit here today we hear a lot of backhanded compliments being paid to the Minister of Education, everybody gets up and says what a wonderful fellow the Minister is, how hard he is working, what a good job he's doing for education in Manitoba, and then they say but -- and then they start off with anywhere from half to three-quarters of an hour dealing with all the things in the Department of Education that are wrong and all the things that the Minister is doing that are wrong, and they're telling him that his chickens are going to come home to roost and this, that and the next thing.

Well, I've done a little bit of research in my own constituency. I made it my business to find out how things were standing educationalwise in the constituency of St. Vital, since this new plan went into effect. A few days ago, the Honourable Member from St. Johns mentioned the fact that he had phoned the St. Vital School Board or School Division office, and they had told him that there was going to be a one and one-half mill increase in the school taxes

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.) . . . this year. Well that is quite correct, Mr. Chairman, there is going to be an increase of a little less than one and one-half percent in the school taxes in the St. Vital School Division this coming year. This coming summer, the School Division of St. Vital is building a number of new school -- two new schools and they're making substantial additions to three others. The contracts awarded for this construction work amount to \$1,105,690.00. If you take into consideration the blackboards, and the furniture, and the fixtures that have to go into these schools, and the additions, the total cost of this building program will amount to \$1,170,000.00. All of this new school construction was planned well before the new schools plan was introduced into this House. As a matter of fact, all of this new construction was planned by the old school board of St. Vital, prior to the government's receipt of the Royal Commission report. Under the old system of grants, the school division would have received a 40% grant on this new construction. Now, with the combination of the 40% grant on the elementary school and the 75% grant on the secondary school, they will receive approximately \$600,000.00 by way of provincial grants towards this construction program, and the taxpayers of our school division are going to be on the current year's operation some \$132,000.00 better off with this new plan than they would have been with the old. All of the members of the House will remember that the school divisions vote was not actually held in St. Vital. The vote was deferred pending the outcome of a referendum to be held in the municipality for the formation of a Municipal School District to consolidate the six existing school districts within the municipality. The Minister of Education, of course, had agreed after a meeting with the school boards in question and the council, to defer the vote until after the result of this referendum was known. The Municipal School District was approved by a vote of 10 to 1, and it was subsequently declared to be a division by the Minister. Now, even although the majority of the ratepayers knew that they were adding schools to the existing School District of Glenlawn that were not up to the standards of the schools in Glenlawn District itself, they did approve this by a very substantial majority. The School Division Board this year intends to spend on these schools that were added by way of maintenance -- not maintenance, but repairs and major alterations this coming summer the following amounts in the following schools: Mountbatten School - \$8,565.00; St. Germaine School - \$5,150.00; Lavellee School - \$13,065.00; Vermette School - \$10,020.00. This is a total of \$36,800.00 in expenditures by the new School Division to bring up to standard these smaller schools from the smaller districts that were incorporated into our system by the Municipal School District Referendum. And I might point out that the Board is this year cutting down very considerably on the repairs and maintenance of the existing schools in the old Glenlawn District in order to better the facilities for the children in these smaller schools. And this is a very commendable action. In fact, it's one of the things which was mentioned quite often when the new schools plan was being considered. Because what we're doing is that we are taking away from those that have and giving to those who haven't.

I might also point out that this 1-1/2 mill increase is a 1-1/2 mill increase in the rate for the new School Division compared with the rate in the old Glenlawn School District. And we'll find if we analyze that situation that, although there is a 1-1/2 mill increase in the old Glenlawn District, there are increase of more than that in some of the other districts and also some substantial decreases. With the 1-1/2 mill increase that would make the school assessment this year 26.1 mills in all of the districts -- the old districts that now form the St. Vital School Division. In Glenlawn District in 1958 their mill rate was 24.6; this year it'll be 26.1 -- so there's an increase of 1-1/2 mills that the Honourable Member from St. Johns brought to our attention the other day. In Lavellee School District their mill rate in 1958 was 28.78; this year it'll be 26.1 -- so there's a decrease of 2.68 mills. Vermette School District last year 20.13; this year 26.1 -- an increase of 5.97 mills. St. Germaine School District in 1958 a mill rate of 20.48; this year 26.1 -- an increase of 5.62. Now, we have a very interesting one. Mountbatten School District - 38.98 mills in 1958; in 1959, 26.1 -- a decrease of 12.8 mills. Campau School District - 27.23 in 1958; 26.1 in 1959 -- a decrease of 1.13 mills. So we can see that although there is a mill rate increase of 1-1/2 mills in the larger of these districts, and there are increases of larger amounts in some that there are some fairly substantial decrease that we must take into consideration when looking at the overall picture. But the School Board isn't actually complaining, even although, I'm informed that teacher's grants in the new St. Vital

(Mr. Groves, cont'd) . . . Schools Division will exceed the amounts that were set out in the schedule to the new plan by a fairly substantial amount. But, and the Board members tell me that they agree with this, the people of the province and of our school division were told at the time that they voted for the new school division, particularly in respect of the teacher's salaries, that the Government would pay in teachers' salary grants only up to a certain maximum that was provided for in the regulation. And I think that everybody, School Trustees and the general public, knew that if the School Board were going to pay teachers' salaries in excess of these maximums, that these excess salaries, if we could call them that, would then be a charge on the local taxpayers.

Although our school budget actually has not been approved for the year and is not yet public information, the estimates prepared by their staff and the Department of Education indicate that they will receive this year increases in Provincial Government Grants of a fairly substantial amount. And you can well imagine the situation this year had the new grants not been forthcoming. It would have been a very dismal picture indeed, I would say, for the local taxpayers. And I would like to emphasize that in my opinion none of the expenditures of our School Board have been increased directly because of the fact that the new schools plan came into being. Even with respect to teachers' salaries they were already paying good salaries that were attracting teachers from the City of Winnipeg, and I think that the action taken by the West Kildonan School Board in respect to teachers' salaries had more to do than anything else with the salary situation as it existed in Greater Winnipeg, particularly the suburbs.

We must also keep in mind, I think, when we're discussing this new schools plan that this plan was implemented primarily for the purpose of equalizing educational opportunities in Manitoba. To guarantee to each boy and girl in the province a high school education and a decent school in which to receive that education. And there is every reason to believe that this new plan is going to see that this happens. And there's also every reason to believe that the new School Division Boards in the province are approaching this matter from this point of view, of putting the interests of the boys and girls of our province first. No speaker that I know of at any of the meetings that were held during the campaign to sell this new school plan, was foolish enough to make the statement that this was the cure-all for all of the educational ills in Manitoba. And I was privileged to speak at a good many of these meetings, that this plan wouldn't be a cure-all for education in Manitoba; that it was going to take time and that it was a big step in the right direction.

I'm sure that both the Royal Commission in recommending this plan and the Government in implementing it realized that municipal property taxes for educational purposes had reached a dangerous high, and it was my interpretation of this new system that it's prime purpose was the improvement of secondary education in Manitoba and the Government was prepared to bear the additional cost that was necessary to accomplish this. I'm sure that as the years go by, and the cost of education rises, as surely it will, that grants will have to be correspondingly increased to cover expenditures approved by the Department of Education necessary for the operation of a good system. But at the same time I sincerely believe that School Division Boards also must bear their share of the responsibility in this regard, and realize that if they are to spend money over and above the reasonable maximum and the reasonable approved operating expenses set by the Department, that expenditures for these purposes must be passed on to the local taxpayers. This then is a partnership venture of the Provincial Department of Education and the Division Boards; a venture towards the improvement of education in Manitoba and a venture in which both have their part to play and their responsibilities to shoulder.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I take advantage of this opportunity to recapitulate on some of the matters which were brought up during this sitting this evening, and in addition there might be one or two matters quite new and quite undiscussed thus far that I will raise.

The very first thing which I think should be pointed out to the Minister is something which already has been pointed out and that has to do with the situation as regards the tax on real property at the municipal level. Unfortunately a lot of people are not aware -- and this should be some comfort to the Minister -- a lot of people are not aware that even had we remained under the old organization, the old set-up in education, that the tax rate, the mill rate would have had to go up. Honourable members over in that group must be feeling, - they must be presupposing that teachers would have been content to teach for salaries as low as they were

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd) . . . before when they say that it's the Government's fault or when they do impute or infer that the rate or the rise in real property tax is a result of the School Divisions plan being put into operation. I would hasten to tell the Honourable Minister that it is true that there is growing dissention, at least I can speak for my area, there is growing dissention due to the fact that the mill rates this year that we're concerned with, has gone up, on the general levy from 4 mills to 11 mills. A rise there of 7. some mills. I try to tell the people and I suppose I'm being too kind as far as the government is concerned, I tell them whenever I have the opportunity that there would have been a rise in the mill rate regardless. And I would also like to go on record this time as being quite satisfied with the School Division organization as it's shaping up so far.

As the Honourable Minister knows last fall, this winter rather, when the campaign was on to sell the idea of the larger secondary division to the public, I certainly participated to the fullest extent I was capable of, and I feel very strongly on this point, that if there's going to be any great improvement in our educational standards in this province it will be thanks to the scheme which has been implemented. In that scheme or in that type of organization lies the greatest potential for education progress. Granted there are some problems and hitches arising; we can see them arise right now for that matter. But certainly I think it would be very unfair of any opposition member to criticize the government unduly on this score. Honourable members who say that the "chickens are flying home to roost", obviously forget that prior to the Conservative Government coming to office the chicken never even became airborne insofar as education was concerned. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, if there was one thing that prompted me as perhaps a lot of other young men to enter into politics, it was the fact that there were a lot of shortcomings and a lot of things being left undone that should have been done in the field of education in this province.

My colleague from Burrows spoke earlier this evening. Many of the points which he raised I concur in. I perhaps do not feel as strongly as he does on some matters, but I do sense this, even though I'm a newcomer to the profession to the teaching ranks, I do sense this in education in the last two or three years, that there has been a continuation of policy of easing off on standards or easing the standards downward. I don't think that it should surprise too many people if it were stated that a good, in fairly many cases, bonuses are given on examination marks obtained by students. Now perhaps there's an argument that could be advanced for doing this, but in the long run it would seem that this is not in the best interests of education. I don't believe that it's in the best interest of the students affected because if they do graduate they graduate only as comparatively mediocre products of a mediocre educational system. Surely we owe it to students to try and get the most out of them for their own sake, and this can only be done by having an educational system that is quite demanding. That, of course, brings to light or reveals another obvious fact which my colleague from Burrows mentioned, and that is, what about those who aren't capable of competing or producing in such a demanding school system, or under such a demanding curriculum? Well, that of course, should immediately suggest to all interested in education, that we must take some greater steps to provide non-academic instruction. I wouldn't want to hazard a guess as to what the ratio is at the moment, the present, but surely at least half of all students entering into our high schools are not, academically speaking, capable of continuing. And so I think that we, the state, the government is obliged or should be obliged to provide adequate instruction in trade and technical education. And surely we all know, that in this modern day and age, the need is a crying one, that is to say the need for technicians, tradesmen. It is greater than it ever was. We're pitifully short of high pressure welders, steam fitters and men such as that. Some large scale construction provinces here, at least, construction companies, have to get these fairly skilled to highly skilled tradesmen from outside the country. So here is something that ties in and I do believe that here is an aspect or a particular phase that we can make some great strides in.

And while it is still in my mind, I think the time is appropriate to make some mention of the attitude which I seem to discern in the remarks made by the Honourable, the Member from Rhineland. He didn't actually say so but it seemed to me at the time that he was of the opinion that teachers' salaries were responsible for a good part of the problem which affects education right at the moment, and also the financial, the tax aspect of it.

MR. MILLER: Don't you read the newspapers?

MR. SCHREYER: Oh yes, I do, honourable member. It seems to me that as a teacher and as a newcomer to the ranks I would certainly have to say this, that teachers cannot complain of their salaries. They cannot complain any longer. However, I don't think that it is fair for any member in this Assembly to infer that they are getting too much; perhaps we have hit the right scale right now. In any case, in any case, Manitoba has always followed the other provinces, at least our western neighbour provinces as regards the paying of teachers. Perhaps for the first time in 30 or 40 years, this province is paying more - teachers in this province are being paid more. So this surely is no cause for complaint. I would say, and I'm speaking as a teacher now, that any further increases in salary might be unjustified. But up to now, I think it has perhaps been a very fair and happy situation.

I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to some more specific matters. There is the matter of language instruction in our high schools. As you may or may not be aware of, German used to be taught in city high schools, at least in eight of the city high schools, until some few years ago. And then because of the meagre government outlays for education - the teaching of German had to be cut in five of these eight schools. As a result in this fairly large city, there are only three high schools that are able to provide instruction in German.

And then there is the matter of education or rather of examinations. I would just like to point out to the Minister that intermittently now for the last seven or eight years, (that's as far back as I would care to comment on), intermittently it's noticeable, very noticeable, we see grammatical errors and awkward sentence structure in the composition of the paper. I wouldn't say that the people that make up the paper are necessarily the ones to blame. I would like to know this, and if the Minister is in a position to answer, I would appreciate it very much. Does the department or the examination board provide that board or the staff making up the paper, provide them with a proof reader? - someone to, in a formal atmosphere and in a formal way proof read that paper - checking it for wrong spelling, for sentence structure, awkward sentence structure and for grammatical errors outright? Because, for example, here I have a grade ten science paper, and just to give you - I suppose some honourable member will think that this is trivial, but it is not because learning is a unity and there is no excuse for having wrong English usage in a science paper. Students when they sit down to write an examination, their minds are greatly impressed with the type of English used there. And if their mind fixes on awkward use of English, they are very apt to become victimized and use it themselves. And after all, we spend a great deal of money to teach students the proper use of English, for twelve years, during the twelve years that they go to school, if they do go to school that long, and then on the examination paper, perhaps the only paper that they really pay special attention to, -- there is improper English usage. And how much would it cost, the services of one proof reader for one day perhaps for two days to check all the papers. Surely this isn't a question then of an outlay of money. And I believe it should be done.

Here we have some awkward use of the language, for example "Classify as to mixture or solution, milk, wine, concrete, ink". It's rather awkward. "Diagram and label neatly to show", there again rather awkward. And then we have a word spelled wrong, principle - there is an obvious misspelling, no need for that. And then we have a rather glaring example of awkward useage "Give three problems in families which arise from the excessive use of alcohol. I mean, that is awkward. I just don't see why it should be allowed to happen. There are some other comments that I would like to make, but however I notice that they might more properly come under some of the specific items later on. Thank you very much.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, the comments which have been contributed to this consideration by the member for Brokenhead and the member for Burrows and others, in part, serve to emphasize the concern which I know they and all the members of this House have, and indeed all citizens, about the standard of excellence of our educational system. And this is not a new problem because I am quite certain that it has been the problem which has existed ever since we have had formal education, and no matter what standard we might reach, naturally and properly so, we should always desire to raise the standard. Of course we mustn't get this matter, particularly of examination results, out of perspective, and I would remind the members of the House that Sir Winston Churchill himself failed in some subjects in school, perhaps according to the standards that were set in those days and might even be now, he would not be counted a good student, but he certainly made a very fine mark, perhaps made one of the greatest contributions to the welfare of mankind - so sometimes we mustn't overestimate the importance of examinations or examination results. On the other hand it is the standard by which we judge the effectiveness of an educational system. But, as I say, these points and these questions serve to underline the real concern which we have and that's good.

Now, I wouldn't wish the members of the House to think that we are unmindful of these considerations and I would remind the House that the -- we are on notice that the final report of the Royal Commission on Education will have something very definite to say concerning the matter of curriculum, standards, examinations and all of the related matters. And may I just point out that if we are successful in having the estimates of this department approved by the House, that we have plans made for a Director of Curricula and also for a Supervisor of Research because it is perfectly true, as the Honourable Member for Burrows has pointed out, that there is a need for constantly surveying the results, the effectiveness of the courses that are being taught, of determining the forms and the standards which should be applied, and we intend to pursue that matter with vigor, providing as I say that we have the necessary funds provided by the House to establish these positions. In addition to that, we have provided for additional grants for vocational and technical education. Now the suggestion that he made that there should be a technical or a vocational school established in the suburbs is certainly a most interesting one. I'm not -- wouldn't be prepared to say whether that would be the proper function of the Provincial Government as such, but we are not unmindful of the need for providing facilities and courses for boys and girls who cannot for one reason or another benefit from the strictly academic courses that are given, and it is quite true that there is need for providing these alternative courses so that those who can benefit from the matriculation course, the academic course, will have full opportunity to do so, and that we will be able to make the standards for those people as high as is reasonable, and at the same time make it possible for other students to obtain a good education, perhaps in a slightly different field and under -- with slightly different subjects. But we've made provision in our plans. We have increased the grants that are available for technical and vocational training and it is our sincere hope that many of the school divisions, indeed all of them, will be able to take advantage of that fact and to make considerable advance in that field.

And while speaking on the subject of technical education, and because it was raised by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, who asked the question, "What about the Technological Institute?" - it's still very much alive. We -- the plans under which we could share with the Government of Canada in the construction of an institute along the lines of the Ryerson Institute in the Province of Ontario were to have expired on March the 31st of this year. We were however able to arrange with the Minister of Labour and with those responsible at Ottawa to give us an extension of one year within which to prepare plans for consideration. Now it must not be misunderstood, no final plans have been made. We have that extension and we are working vigorously on the preparation of the plan to be submitted to the people at Ottawa for their approval. This of course will not be something that will take the place of High School instruction as such, because it is a method or it is an institution if it is established, which takes the place of the University and College for students who after Grade XI or XII do not wish or are unable to benefit from taking the courses which are offered at the University. It gives training of various types on the technical side as distinguished from the more academic aspect. I mention these things Mr. Chairman, to indicate that we are fully alive and I appreciate the fact that these points have been so ably presented here tonight - we are fully alive to the

(Mr. McLean, cont'd). . . . problems which have been indicated and know that it is important that we get on with that aspect of our educational program, bearing in mind of course, that no matter what we do, it will never be entirely satisfactory, but we do have an obligation to keep pressing forward and to improve our standards as best we can. Turning, Mr. Chairman, to some of the points that were raised by other honourable members, and to deal first with a mathematical matter, that I call a mathematical matter raised by the Honourable Member for St. George, who referred to the school district with an estimated maintenance cost of \$5,000, receiving rentals of \$3,600, net cost to them of \$1,400 on which they receive a grant of 75%, and he said the school district would like us to eliminate the rentals in calculating the maintenance costs. I am quite certain they would like us to eliminate the rentals, but I would point out that we pay to the school division a maintenance grant on the \$3,600, and I hardly think we could be expected to pay the grant to both the Lundar School District and to the School Division at the same time. I fail to share with my good friend and neighbor, the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, his undying faith in merit rating. I'm not at all persuaded that it has the magic in it that he suggests. However, I want him to know that the Merit Rating Committee is still in existence and they certainly have my instructions to bring in a report and to enable us to determine what we are going to do about this important matter. As I have said before, I know that within school districts, and indeed within larger spheres, we do in effect merit rate teachers. The very obvious thing is when a school district or school division is going to employ a teacher, is to ask someone who has had some association with the teacher before about the teacher. Generally speaking, it's done by speaking to the inspector, and inspector or inspectors who have supervised the work of the teacher, and the report of the inspector is in effect merit rating of that particular teacher. We mustn't overlook the fact, of course, that all of this has a very large degree of - what shall we say? - differences of opinion that will arise among people because some will regard a teacher as good while others would regard the same teacher as something less than good, and perhaps poor. But we do in effect have a system of merit rating, but we must not forget that the system of merit rating, the idea of merit rating, which was proposed by the Royal Commission, was a system of merit rating which would have affected the position of the teacher in relation to the grant scale, any place in the Province of Manitoba, and when one considers that, one must bear in mind that it would have to be such a system as would be fair, objective and one that would be accepted by the teachers and School Districts and School Divisions, because remember that a particular district or division might wish to have a teacher, might wish to employ the teacher at a certain salary, but if the teacher couldn't get a merit step in order to earn a larger grant, then we would not only have the teacher after us but we'd have the School District or the School Division, so that it underlines the importance of having any system of merit rating as one that will be accepted by all concerned. The Minister of Education whoever he may be, is, generally speaking, reasonably busy, and the last thing I think he would want would be to have School districts and teachers coming to him to complain about some decision that had been made as to the merit rating of a teacher. But, one other thing with respect to what the Honourable Member has said here tonight. Merit rating has nothing whatever to do, or the lack of merit rating has nothing whatever to do with the system or with the position that now exists regarding teachers' salaries at the present time, because the grants that are payable in this year at least are all the grants - the first grant, and the merit rating system that was proposed by the Royal Commission would have only affected future grants and have no bearing on the grants that would be payable this year, so that I would suggest to him that no difficulty has arisen this year for the lack of merit rating and maybe, maybe if we're fortunate we will have a merit rating system in effect by the time the grants, that is the increases in grants payable to School Districts come into effect from here on as the plan develops.

Now, the honourable member has warned us of course regarding the difficulties we may expect, and that is perfectly true that we may expect many difficulties. I think however that the Honourable Member for St. Vital has stated the situation in a -- certainly in a more optimistic tone and in a more realistic tone, because the fact, and I say this again, is that the School Division -- School Division Trustees have had a very large measure of success even at this early date in establishing themselves on a sound footing. They realize the problems, they realize the need of continuous application to duty, and that working together we will be able I'm

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . . certain to make this plan work effectively. Not perfectly, indeed no one could claim perfection for this plan or any other plan, but I think with a very large measure of success. The Honourable Member for St. John's referred to the need for future increases in grants to School Districts and questioned whether the Province was paying the larger share that was suggested. Well, I think we all made it extremely clear when we were discussing the new plan, that so far as salaries and indeed the other items were concerned, that the grants only went as far as the levels established by the Department and by the Legislation itself. No system can be devised - no system can be devised to always take the larger share of the cost of education in any district or division, because it's perfectly obvious that a board could always keep ahead of the Provincial Government no matter how much money the Provincial Government might put in. We have to establish certain standards and if the board of its own initiative decides to go beyond that, then it obviously is their responsibility and a matter which they have to square with their ratepayers. But may I just remind him, that in two instances at least, in the case of the Town of Birtle we have a report that the -- there is a reduction of four mills with respect to their school requirements and I understand that in the Municipality of Minitonas, a reduction of some eight mills, so that it is not entirely a black picture and I haven't made any study of mill rates so far as the schools are concerned, but I mention these to indicate that the story is not entirely one-sided in respect of the local requirements for school support. As this plan progresses and because of the fact that additional grants are provided as teachers improve their qualifications and as they have further experience in teaching, because the grants and the provincial share of the grant increases, that will be where the increase will come. It would seem to me that as we go forward there will be a larger and larger part of the total cost of education which will come from provincial taxation, with the local taxation being related to the general levy according to the formula that is set out in the act.

With respect to scholarships, may I remind the Honourable Member for St. John's that a fairly large part, not the largest part but a fairly large part of the money that was spent last year for scholarships in the -- and when we use the term scholarships we are talking about scholarships and bursaries, was used to assist high school students, students in Grade X, XI and XII. Very little money will be required for that purpose this year because under this new system that we have every student is provided with books, there is no tuition to be paid because the student has the right to attend a high school, they are provided with transportation or alternatively an allowance to be paid on board and room. So that not only have we expanded the amount of money available for this total matter of scholarships but there is an important segment where it was necessary before that it will no longer be necessary and that in effect that we have added to the assistance in two ways, and I would just point that out for his consideration. The Honourable Member for Rhineland asked me to indicate to him where our differences of opinion were concerning education. He wished me to elaborate on these differences. Well, I said the other day I didn't think there was any very useful purpose to be served by thus engaging in that but I would just like to mention one or two matters where there is a difference of opinion and I make no criticism of his views, that he is -- quite is entitled to his approach to these matters as I or any other member of this House. But I wouldn't have him think that there are no differences of opinion. Perhaps the largest difference is with respect to our views about the role or the duty of the Government in providing leadership in advancing our educational systems. Now it's quite true that the previous administration was in office when the legislation concerning school areas was enacted and the legislation concerning secondary school areas, but the attitude or the view was the Legislation is there if you want it, you can take the necessary steps to obtain it, but as far as we're concerned we're not going to take any particular steps ourselves to promote the adoption of the new plan. Now, when we brought in the new plan I said that we believed it was a good one and that we had a responsibility as a Government to ask the people of Manitoba to accept it. If we weren't prepared to do that then we had no business bringing it in. We brought it in and we did accept that responsibility of asking the people of the Province of Manitoba to accept the new plan, in other words to take a positive role, some say too aggressive, too hasty and other adjectives that are applied, but that is a difference of approach and indicates what I meant when I said we did have some differences of opinion. With respect to the University I know not what he -- what the relationship between the Government and the University was during the time that they had the responsibility for the administration of the affairs of this

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . . Province and I am not in a position to question his statement that the University always received exactly what they asked for.

MR. MILLER: In the last few years I said.

MR. MCLEAN: Well, in the last few years . . . . .

MR. MILLER: Not always.

MR. MCLEAN: . . . . but, may I just tell the House that here again we took a somewhat different approach by going to the University and saying, "Tell us what you need, not only to get by on, but give us your plans for expanding your plants and establishment to provide the widest possible University education, the best possible University education for the young men and women of the Province of Manitoba." In other words we invited them, we invited them to expand their operations and to tell us how we could help in that field, and I strongly suspect that perhaps that was a somewhat different approach than had been adopted before. The question was asked and it sort of suggests a mystery. Who asked for the report? The Interim Report, speaking of the Interim Report, and that question has been asked a number of times. Well, I'd like to answer that question simply by saying that nobody asked for the Interim Report. The Royal Commission had been appointed by the previous administration and after we came to office last year, very properly, I consulted the Chairman of the Commission and asked him if he expected that they would have their report for us and he said that they would like to give us an Interim Report, that they were not ready to bring in their full report and that they would like to present us -- present an Interim Report, and they did present an Interim Report -- and that's the answer to that question. Some of the times I -- sometimes since I wished that they hadn't brought it in but they did and they wanted to do it and we were prepared to take some action with respect to it.

MR. MILLER: Why did it take them so long to find the answer?

MR. MCLEAN: Well, I -- I - Mr. Chairman, you know it's a good idea for any person who expects to have to do a little speaking from time to time to keep something back . . . .

MR. MILLER: Well, you sure did.

A MEMBER: You sure did! You sure did!

MR. MCLEAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland referred to some press reports arising in the past few days concerning an address which I made to a group of trustees at Clear Lake and the press report is quite accurate although I think perhaps the headline sort of telescopes it a little bit, but he did refer to the duty and responsibility of the Minister of Education to have the trustees -- to get the trustees united. He said that it would be the Minister's duty to introduce the necessary Legislation. Well, I'm not so certain about the Legislation but . . .

MR. MILLER: If necessary -- I said if Legislation is necessary.

MR. MCLEAN: That's correct. But I'm happy to tell him and the House that we have taken some fairly positive steps in that direction and last night, that is, previous to last evening, I arranged a meeting of the executive of the two associations and that meeting was held last night at which time I informed the -- and when I say the two associations I'm referring to the Manitoba School Trustees Association and the Manitoba Urban School Trustees Association, I informed them of my view that the public of Manitoba would be best served by one trustee association, and suggested to them that they might well consider the formation of a completely new association for that purpose, because I recognized the difficulties of endeavouring to, as it were, mesh in two organizations, and I'm not unmindful, Mr. Chairman, of the attachment which many people have for the Manitoba School Trustees Association and its long record of service in this province. Indeed I am glad to acknowledge that because it was formed very largely as a result of the work of a citizen of my own community of Dauphin, the late Dr. Harry McNeil, who conceived the idea of the formation of such an association and was its first president and was the president for a number of years in its early times, and I have -- I'm aware of the history and the associations which that association has, but I do feel that perhaps the time has come to have a new association which can serve all of the interests of the different School Districts and School Divisions in the Province. It's even more necessary now in view of the fact that we have School Divisions which one can't necessarily classify as being urban, they're urban and rural and there is really no clear line of distinction between any one group. I offered to that group my -- whatever to do -- whatever I could through my office, to assist the formation of such an association and I hope that our deliberations and consideration will bear fruit in that direction, because I am satisfied that the -- it is important and necessary and will be

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . . welcomed, not only by the trustees, but indeed by the teachers who recognize that it would be good for education if we had a strong trustee association prepared to sit down around the table with the Teachers Society in the Department of Education, to work in the partnership which all of us have in that field. With respect to the standards of admission to Teachers College may I remind the House that we have taken one important step in improving the standards when we discontinued the Permit Course at the Teachers College, and it would seem to me that that is a substantial step in the direction of improvement, but may I just say this, that, and I perhaps should have made this more clear when I spoke in relation to a news item which had appeared a short time ago with respect to the admission of teachers -- students to Teachers College. Actually the standard is Grade XII. However for a number of years it has been an understanding and has been so stated in the calendar, that while that is the standard, applications will be accepted from students with at least two -- with complete Grade XI and two subjects in Grade XII, but it must be clear that if for example we had accommodation for six hundred students in our teacher training institution, and we received six hundred applications with complete Grade XII under that ruling and understanding, we would take all of the Grade XII students, because we are not obligated to take those who have less than the Grade XII standing unless we wish to do so, and so what I did want to make clear only with respect to the news report that had appeared, was that we were still prepared to accept applications from students with Grade XI plus two subjects in Grade XII, reserving of course as the syllabus points out, the right to select above that according to our accommodation that we have.

MR. MILLER: No change.

MR. MCLEAN: That is correct, When will the final report of the Royal Commission be in? I believe that we will probably have that report in September or October of this year. In the only discussion that I have had with the Chairman of the Commission to enquire what he expected in that regard he informed me that in his opinion it would likely be in either the month of September or October. The Chairman, Dr. McFarlane, is here now spending his full time at the present time in connection with the report, and I believe the Commission is holding regular meetings in order to bring its report to a final conclusion.

One final word, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Rhineland is worried about the format of the evidence. He has of course, had much longer experience in this matter than I have and as a very poor student in mathematics, I find any format of this type very difficult to understand. However, I do believe that it is reasonably clear, and I would point out to him that a few years ago the number of appropriations or the number of items if that's the proper term, was reduced from 27 to 6 under his administration, and we have now made a further reduction from 6 to 4. Everything however is here and I would hope that I would be able to answer all of the questions which I understand are going to be asked on the various items and will be able to explain the relationship between -- hope to be able to explain the relationship between the way in which the estimates are set out in the present estimates in relation to the way in which they were set out last year. And I will welcome the opportunity to explain any item and to relate it to the way in which they were set out last year. (Hear! Hear!)

MR. PAULLEY: Just before the thought leaves me, the Minister mentioned the fact of the possibility of the balance of the report of the Royal Commission on Education being received in September or October. I would like to ask him, Mr. Chairman, has the Government come to any conclusion as to how they will handle that report when it is received? Will it be released generally to the public, or whether we will have copies of the report for study, because I presume or realize that the matter will be up for consideration, possibly at our next session, and I'm sure that the members of the House would appreciate receiving copies of the report as early as possible. But I do think it's important if it's possible for the Minister to let us know how the Government intends to handle the report.

MR. MCLEAN: Mr. Chairman, it was my view last fall that any Royal Commission Report should actually be tendered in the first instance, that is, brought in or -- and made public only when it is tabled in the legislature because the Royal Commission should report to the legislature. However, the plans that I had in that connection got slightly off the track and after that experience, I think I perhaps would be inclined to adopt some different procedure. Let me put it this way however, that while no decision has been made, indeed we haven't even thought of it, I imagine I'm the only one that has thought about it, other than the honourable member --

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . . that if it were decided that the contents be released to the public immediately upon receipt of the report that arrangements would be made to provide each member of this Assembly with a copy as soon as it is printed. Now if on the other hand, the decision is to again try to have it come to the Legislative Assembly, as I think is the right procedure, that would be the procedure that would be adopted.

MR. MILLER: Just one word in explanation. I'm sure the Minister didn't want to leave the impression that because we a couple of years ago reduced the number of appropriations to six that we didn't sedulously list the sub-appropriations, and my only criticism is that he failed to do so in this new one, and I can point out if he wants me at the appropriate time, how that has been effected.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister be kind enough to explain the answer he gave to me on that point about maintenance grants?

MR. MCLEAN: Well, the School Districts of Lundar has a school building in which they rent certain rooms to the school division -- I'm not certain of the name of the division at the moment -- \$3,600. is the rent which they receive. The School District of Lundary has total estimated expenditures of \$5,000. for the maintenance of the school building. From the \$5,000. we deduct the \$3,600 which is the rent that they receive from the School Division and the maintenance grant to the School District of Lundar is based on the remainder, \$1,400. In the budget of the school division, they include as a maintenance item the rent which they pay to the School District of Lundar and they receive a grant on maintenance on that \$3,600., so that we pay, the maintenance grant on part of it goes to the School District of Lundary, and the maintenance grant on the other part goes to the School Division. Now I am assuming, of course, and if they haven't done so, that -- at least it's the responsibility of the School District of Lundar to make certain that the rent which they receive is proper in relation to the total cost of maintaining the building. But that's the answer that I had given to the honourable member.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, the Board maintains that if they didn't rent, they'd be better off in getting the maintenance grant because they would get \$2,800. -- that's roughly figuring -- and now by renting, they'll only get \$1,000. in maintenance grant. (Interjection). That's quite true but isn't the Lundar School entitled to a fair rental in view of the fact that the people around Lundar are paying for that new school, not the division. Aren't they entitled to a fair rental for those rooms because the local people pay for that school.

MR. MCLEAN: Well, it may be, Mr. Chairman, that the School District of Lundar is not charging a large enough rent. I've made no comment about that except to say that it's their -- it's up to them to set the rent, and I presume they would do so bearing in mind the very factors that you have mentioned.

MR. GUTTORMSON: They're charging \$120. a room now, and if they charge more they're punishing the school division.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer briefly to, particularly the Hanover School Division, and in general to the four areas in Manitoba which failed to vote for the school plan and therefore are not receiving this equality of education that is tossed around so freely in this House; because this is a matter of fact that these areas at the present time are operating under duress and will probably find it increasingly so rather than, a matter of opinion, where other areas might be having troubles of one kind or another, or where greater opportunities should be -- should be found and things like this. So, I would like to refer to the areas, but more specifically to my own activities in these areas, because they have been subject to some disparaging remarks by both the Minister of Education and the First Minister. And I have many, many times stated my position re the Hanover division, in particular, very clearly to the people of Hanover, to the people of La Verendrye, in public, in newspapers, the local newspaper. I have advertised my opinion very clearly, and of course during the campaign, and in addition, I have without -- I might say without hesitation, I have said the same thing in private to all persons that I have said in public at any time before the school election was held at any time before the election -- the provincial election, and at any time I have spoken about it before or since. And I would like to have that made perfectly clear now -- I can say it with complete free conscience, and in fact I'd like to go through some of the things I said then, I said during the provincial election, and will say now, because little did I know how right I was.

I was accused of being a false prophet, as you all know during the campaign. I didn't

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) . . . realize that this was so wrong as it was because the things I said have so soon turned out to be true. (Interjection)... The electors of La Verendrye passed judgment on that, Sir, and you noticed the results. They passed judgment on my opinion of the school division because I campaigned mainly on it, so I don't have to back on that one. (Inter-ruption). I'm sorry they didn't have an opp'rtunity to.

When I spoke to the people of the Hanover division, the parts that lay in the La Verendrye School Division, unfortunately the Minister of Education, as far as I know did not come into the Hanover -- at least my part of the Hanover Division, but the First Minister did on several occasions, and the Provincial Secretary did and I spoke with them whenever I had the opportunity. There were occasions when meetings had been changed, the dates and time and place of the meetings were changed, and I was not notified of it, therefore I did not appear at the meeting, but otherwise I appeared whenever I received advice that the meetings were to be held. And, the things I said at that time I would like to repeat now. I came out wholeheartedly in favour of the plan because it provided an equality of opportunity to the children of Hanover to go to school -- and this was the first things I stated and these were the last things I stated -- because I felt that any plan that offered an equality and opportunity for every child in the constituency of La Verendrye or the Division of Hanover to go to school, to the best school possible at no extra cost to themselves -- this was worth supporting. I also naturally was in favour of any plan that offered a greater portion of the cost to be paid by the Provincial Government, the cost of education, and at the same time of course, offered the equalization of costs, which this plan is purported to offer. And, for these reasons, I supported the plan and said so. But I think it was my duty, and I think it was only right that I should point out the things about this plan that might -- that should be pointed out -- the things that should be expressed, the things that the people should know. They should know why they are voting for and why they're voting against, or what they're voting for and what they're voting against. They should know both sides of the story. They shouldn't just hear the propoganda thrown at them saying "This is wonderful, this is good, this is going to save you money, this is better education." They should also know what the other side of the story is too. And, I have never at any time expressed any other opinions than the ones I expressed on the platform in front of the people, in front of the First Minister, and the Provincial Secretary on the different occasions.

And the first opposition I had to the plan, and the most important one was this: That it offered no alternative. And then whoever the case might be, in answering questions later on, whoever the member of the Cabinet who might be present at that time -- whoever -- whenever the question was asked, "Is there no alternative to this plan?" They'd say, "certainly there is an alternative, if you vote for it, you get all these things, if you vote against it, you stay the same as you are now," which of course, we know now not to be true, because the people who voted against the plan aren't in the position they were before February the 27th -- they are far far worse off. Because the teachers within their divisions, if they can hold them are demanding thousands of dollars more money, and so they are not in the same position they were in. They are having to raise the money -- they are having the problem of holding good teachers, and the alternative to voting for this plan therefore was going downhill, not staying where you are now, and I think that that was only fair that you pointed out that this thing -- the alternative to voting for it was a drastic one.

Then the other thing that I always mentioned is that I felt it was unfair to some areas, or at least some areas would not receive a fair shake on this, was the sliding scale of construction grants, because the large portion of Hanover Division is a fairly sparsely populated Division with -- of necessity -- because the Minister said so, they said, you'll be able to have all the schools you want and wherever you want them -- would of necessity have two and three and four-room high schools, would have to construct some of these, and they would only receive 40% construction costs paid by the Provincial Government, whereas large areas would receive 75%. And if this is true, I think I was only right in pointing it out.

And then the -- well the Minister of Education denies that he ever said this, but of course, the First Minister, the Provincial Treasurer stated quite point blank that this would not cost the taxpayers anymore money. And of course, we all knew that this wasn't true; that any plan that's going to throw another so many millions of dollars into the cost of education in the province is going to cost somebody some more money; and we might as well be fair about it --

(Mr. Roberts, Cont'd.) . . . . it just doesn't come out of the sky. And then the fourth thing that I always mentioned was the fact that merit rating was left out and that's been thoroughly discussed today.

And on every occasion, I always encouraged the people to vote for the plan, that I thought it was right; I thought it was my duty; I thought it was the role that I should play as their elected member to point out the good parts, the best parts, and also the dangers of a plan such as this, because electors as intelligent people should be allowed to vote for or against a plan, knowing both sides of the story. (Interjection). I don't think that's true, I don't think that's true, because I made a great point of praising - more so than any of the government speakers -- a great point of praising the equality of opportunity, the opportunity of every child in every district to go to school at no extra cost to himself or to his parents, and to go to good schools. And these things I praised, because I felt that this was the important part of the whole plan -- instead of that what do we get? A money talk. This will save you money. And then, so soon, so soon after the plan has gone through and the first tax notices are out, well we hear stories of increase in mill rates all over the province already. And a very interesting one from the Union of Manitoba Municipalities Convention at St. Pierre, a week ago tomorrow, June 24th, attended by 102 registered delegates to the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Judicial Districts of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities -- and they passed a resolution unanimously stating I haven't got the exact wording here - this is out of a press report -- "that whereas municipal taxes for education have increased in 1959; and whereas the new provincial government policy was said to lighten education load on municipal taxes; therefore be it resolved the Provincial Government provide larger grants to education to relieve local taxpayers." So soon after it was said that this will relieve the burden on the local taxpayers. And so I don't think that I have anything to be ashamed of in my stand -- in fact, I feel only more right about it than I ever did, that I saw fit to, saw it as my duty to point out these things to the people before they voted. And I think that should be the case in any type of referendum that's held.

..... Continued on Next Page

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1. Administration.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I have usually made it a point to deal with matters of this kind on the items, rather than on the general discussion, but inasmuch as my remarks too range over several different individual items, I perhaps might say a few words on them now.

I'm not concerned as some of the folks with giving a present opinion as to merits of this plan. I think the real answer will be given within a few years time rather than now, because the real answer is going to be whether there is an improvement in education or not. And that's going to be the proof of the pudding.

But one thing that I feel that I simply must say in view of some of the remarks that have been made here this evening is that I don't take exactly the same view as some of the honourable members who have spoken with regard to equality of opportunity in education. I even differ from some of the views expressed by members of my own group, because I think that I'm to quite an extent, a bit of a radical or still a conservative or old-fashioned, or whatever term you like to apply to the ones who hold the views that I do in that regard. But I do want to say once again—as I've said several times before, that I can not join with my honourable friends the members of the C.C.F. Party and some others when they insist on weeping crocodile tears over the plight of education in rural Manitoba. The part of rural Manitoba that I am best acquainted with—and it's been my pleasure in the last few years to become acquainted with a great many parts, to some extent -- but of course the local area best of all-- the parts in the well settled areas of Manitoba, in my opinion, did not need anyone from the City of Winnipeg or any place else to be concerned about the kind of education that they were getting. And I think it's time that somebody got up once again, and struck a blow for the good old one-room school--call it the little red school house on the hill if you want to, call it whatever you like. The fact is it was giving a lot better, and still is giving a lot better education than a lot of people give it credit for, and some of the ideas of the so-called experts in education about trying to urge on the people of Manitoba, that they adopt some system -- and that's called leadership, I know -- that they adopt some system that would get away from that school, is something that we need to still consider pretty carefully. And I just don't go along with my honourable friends when they attempt to take it for granted that the people in most of the rural areas -- and I know of course there are some exceptions, were not getting a fair deal on education.

I want to ask the Minister this question -- or the former Minister, or any of the other educators, how is it if things were so wrong with the one-room school, how is it that in practically every town and practically every city that you go to that the ones who had the high school classes are the ones who came from the rural schools -- from the one-room schools? And I'll bet you that if you cast your minds back, and you'll find that regardless of where you come from you find that's a fact. And how is it that the young lady, and I think it has been a young lady in each case, who has won the scholarship that the school trustees are responsible for out here at the Teacher's College, every year, that I remember, has come from a one-roomed school? And this idea that is so prevalent among the experts - so-called - in education, and accepted as gospel by my honourable friends in the C.C.F., that the people in rural Manitoba, have in some way been suffering under some second rate education, just isn't right, in my opinion.

And that leads on to some other things with regard to this whole program. I think about the only thing that my honourable friend from Burrows said that I heartily agreed with was that merit rating is a "must". I think that's right, but, I'll bet anything that if my honourable friend and I gave our definitions of merit rating, we'd find that there our agreement ended because I'm sure that he and his group have a completely different idea on merit rating to what I have. There is a great tendency again among the experts, and the people who are bound to reform education in this province, that merit rating, the qualification - -merit rating depends upon their so-called qualifications and among their qualifications two stand out as pre-eminent, -- academic standing and experience. And I say to you with the responsibility of a person who has had something to do with education, that I think that the other qualifications are equally important, and in many cases more important than those two that I'm sure my honourable friend would put up as the qualifications. I say that attitude, and aptitude -- those two things, are equally important with academic standing and with experience. And, if a teacher has no

aptitude for teaching-- and some of them haven't -- they get worse with experience, not better. And I'm telling you that a lot of these permit teachers that you have talked about, because they've been young people, young people with the right attitude, have gone out into the rural parts of Manitoba and have taken in one-room schools, all the classes -- all the grades from Grade I to Grade IX -- every one of them; and made a mighty good job of it because they had the right attitude, and a better attitude than a good many of the high-priced teachers right in the City of Winnipeg have had.

Don't run away with the idea that these qualifications are just academic and experience -- you can have qualifications that are just as important -- more important than those. And don't be too much in a hurry -- don't be too fast, and I know I have the reputation of not being too fast as a rule, but I counsel the Honourable the Minister and the government, don't be too fast in accepting the recommendation of all these people who say to keep on eternally raising the qualifications. Don't kick the people out of the Teacher's College until you're sure that you've got a sufficiency of teachers. Because I ask you, what is the need -- what's the need of a degree-- a University degree, and then a lot of extra training -- to go out and teach a rural school where they go up only to Grade VIII? What you need is, first of all, the right attitude, and the aptitude and a lot of enthusiasm -- it takes a good bit of it, I admit, but if you've got those things. . . . . One of these teachers, much of these permit teachers have done a dandy good job, and while I'm in favour of getting rid of the permit teachers, I say don't make the mistake of letting these so-called experts raise their so-called qualifications so high that you weed out these young people that have been doing a great job.

So this matter of equality of education. We've had a lot more equality in education than the most of the people that I have heard speaking here tonight realize-- and don't set the clock back in that regard. One of the places that there has been inequality is the way, and you can say to me "Why didn't you correct it in the years that you were there?" But one of the places that there has been inequality is this matter of accreditation of some of the high schools and not others. And one of the reasons that the young folks have not been making -- the students have not been making the progress that they have when they come up against examinations, is because there has been a tendency by these so-called progressive educationalists to get away from examinations. There again I'm showing my old-fashionedism I suppose, but the fact is that I think, and a lot of other people think, that examinations are a good thing, should be carried along through the years-- and no wonder these students that have not been exposed to examinations at all -- no wonder that they don't do too well on them when they first come up against departmental examinations.

Well you'll probably ask about my qualifications to discuss these questions. One thing I've never wanted to do is to talk of personalities in a matter of this kind. I very seldom offend the rule of relating my own personal experiences, but I grew up in a rural school and went to the rural school, went all the way to grade X, took Grade X at Flee Island school -- I'll get the name in again - Grade X as well. And when I went in for the next two years to the Portage la Prairie Collegiate Institute everyone of the top youngsters in that school -- and I wasn't one of them, I'm not personal in that regard -- but everyone of the top ones in the years that I remember, the two years that I was in there, were from rural schools. Every one of them came from one-room schools. Not one of them from the City of Portage la Prairie at that time. And that has been my experience through the years. Then I had a couple of years at Brandon College. I often think that Brandon College has a lot to answer for when it included on its role of scholars people like Tommy Douglas and Walter Dinsdale and Stanley Knowles and myself. At least you could say that it gave them a liberal education I guess, or a broad one, or something. And I didn't graduate there. After that I saw seven of our own children go through, most of them, through the elementary grades in rural schools, then some of them in all the different grades in the Portage la Prairie School; and then all of them in some of the grades in the City of Winnipeg schools' and six out of the seven graduated from the University. The one who didn't graduate from the University graduated as a R.N.-- so I've at least been exposed to a good bit of education during the years. And I want to go back again and say that as far as the education that our youngsters or other youngsters got out in the rural school there was nothing the matter with it, just as good as what any youngsters are getting in the City of Winnipeg today. And don't think that you can't have good schools out there if you've got the right kind of teachers

Mr. Campbell (Cont'd); and that doesn't mean that you have to have one with a University degree either. But I am getting a little off the subject that I -- but I admit that I am old-fashioned about these things, but it rather disturbs me to hear my honourable friends from this corner particularly -- they've been doing it for years and I wasn't in a position when I was sitting over there where my honourable friend the First Minister is that I could speak as freely as I can now. They've been doing this same thing for years, assuming that the people in the rural parts of Manitoba have not been getting a good education. They have been getting a good education as my honourable friend the former minister said today "when our students went to other provinces whether they were east or west they were found to be not only on a par with them but ahead of them". And you can ask your own friends who have made those moves - military people or others. Just ask. They will tell you that they were at least equal with the rest.

Well to quite an extent that's a diversion. What I really got up to talk about was the same point that the honourable member for LaVerendrye got to, and naturally you would know that I was getting to this question of cost. And when some of the honourable members of the C.C.F. Party said tonight that it was difficult to criticize a Minister who was expending so much more money than had been done before, I think that rather fairly represents their philosophy. So long as a lot of money is being spent, they assume that that's an improvement. But we're not criticizing the Minister and I'm not criticizing the Minister at all. I have a very high regard for the Minister. We criticize policies not the people. The only criticism that I have to offer is that my honourable friends made the mistake of selling this program on a financial basis, and they went out to the parts of Manitoba and told them that this was going to save the local taxpayer money; real property was going to benefit. And as the Honourable Member for Brokenhead said, perhaps with the developments that are taking place perhaps the mill rates would have gone up anyway because--teachers' salaries would probably have gone up anyway -- maybe they would have been up against that same thing. But the mistake that my honourable friend made was in being so positive that because they were injecting a lot of the taxpayers money into this system of education that the local taxpayer was going to benefit directly. They didn't try to conceal the fact that he was going to pay his share of what the province was putting in, but they did certainly try to make the point that the burden on real estate would benefit. And one of the things that I said at the time was that I had seen so much of the increasing costs of education, seen the developments -- that while I realize that the government was putting a lot more money into this scheme, --that I was very doubtful that the local taxes would stay down -- maybe they would for a year or so but not for very long.

And like my honourable friend for LaVerendrye I'm certainly not pleased to see that we have been proven right so quickly but the fact is that we have been proven right, because in the most of the municipalities that I hear from their taxes are already up, and I can give you as the Honourable Member for St. Vital did, some figures in that regard. And you would expect me to start with Flee Island. I got my tax notice just the other day as a taxpayer in the rural municipality of Portage la Prairie, and the special school rate is up in Flee Island. Oddly enough the very next district to it isn't up, its down almost as much as Flee Island is up --not quite but almost. But all the rest of the group practically all the rest are raised here, and the proof of the pudding -- and this is the one that I think the honourable the member for St. Vital should have given us, and if he did give that figure I didn't hear it-- is that what happens in the municipality as a whole. The municipality as a whole in Portage la Prairie, their school costs are more than \$30,000.00 up this year compared to last year, and that's why I say that my honourable friends made a mistake when they were saying -- as the honourable member for St. John's quoted the Minister last year when he said last spring "it will relieve in large measure the real property from the burden of school finance, transferring a larger share to the tax base which we have as the Province of Manitoba". The last part is correct; a larger amount from the tax base we have in the Province of Manitoba, I doubt, as someone else has said already, I doubt that it is in the light of the present circumstances, a larger share even. Certainly it has not in the most of the municipalities that I have heard of, relieved the local taxpayer. And that, Mr. Chairman, is the mistake that is made when any group of people do what my honourable friends did in this occasion and nailed their flag to the mast not only of improved educational facilities -- it is true they mentioned that -- but also the fact that it would reduce taxes in the local area. Well now that has not happened in most of the districts that I know, and

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd)... so to go back to the statement of my honourable friend the Minister of Education the other evening, I think that - I can't agree with what the honourable member for Ethelbert has said - because I think that perhaps the Minister is right in saying that the success of the plan depends in a very large measure upon the way in which they are able, meaning the trustees, to conduct the business of the school divisions during the first year of operation. Then he went on to say, "I think a lot does depend because a great deal of the reaction of the local people to this will be their first impression of it and their first impression is not good as far as the financial end is concerned, and I think that that is apt to prejudice their outlook toward the educational end of it". Then he went on to say "the plan is working in a most excellent manner". Well educationally perhaps it is; financially I am sure it isn't. Then he continues - "Many of the problems which people feared have failed to materialize and the operation of the plan is being accepted well - has not caused anything but favourable comment in all of the parts of the province where it was accepted. I am afraid that my honourable friend is going to be disillusioned in that regard, because it just isn't being accepted in that way, and I am afraid that the education advantages, that it has - and it certainly has some - not as many, at least I don't concede as many, as a lot of other people do because I still maintain my old-fashioned principles that centralization is not necessary in the way that a great many people think it is. I still think that the disadvantages of a high degree of centralization are outweighed - the disadvantages outweigh the advantages. And I think that the government was wise during the course of this campaign to play down very greatly the basis on which they had started off, and which the Royal Commission recommends, of a high degree of centralization and financial inducements. Because what my honourable friend from LaVerendrye said is certainly true, as far as I attended the meetings, that it was a fact that when this question of centralization came up that both the ministers and the inspectors were quick to say that they could keep their local school if they wanted to do so; that that would be left to the judgement of the division board.

So I'm not criticizing the Minister when I mention these things, I criticize the government as a whole for the fact that they too hurriedly - and I certainly think that this plan was hurried. The honourable member for Rockwood-Iberville was taking me to task the other day for having said that we would have taken two years to have put this kind of a plan in. We probably would; I think it would have been advantageous if more time had been taken. This is an extremely important step. It's turning out to be a very very costly one, and I think it would have been better, but that was the judgement of the government, and then having taken that step I think it was a mistake to emphasize so greatly the financial contribution that the province was making and what that would mean to the local taxpayers. Because, Mr. Chairman, in my experience it just hasn't worked out that way, and as the honourable member for St. Johns mentioned awhile ago, I can see nothing but a worsening of the situation. I was glad to hear him say, - I was glad to hear him use the term that the situation would be worse next year, because usually he's an advocate of the fact that if more money is going to be spent by any government body that's all to the good -- but for once he used the term worsening of the situation.

Well I sympathize with my honourable friend the minister in the predicament that he finds himself in - but he will do his very best I am sure with it, and if he can't make a good job of it then I am sure that nobody else over on the first row there could, because I think I can do him the plain justice and of the compliment in saying that he has worked very diligently at his job-- that's the term he applied to the former minister -- I think he has been very very diligent, and I think that the effort that he has already put into it if continued will lead toward an improvement in the general situation. I don't like to hear the honourable gentlemen advocating under the guise of leadership, still more and more direction of what's to be done in the local area, and even the knocking of the heads together of the two trustees associations. A lot of things that are called leadership these days are really just another name for dictatorship and I would warn my honourable friend while working so hard at this, to not develop a dictatorial attitude because this is a pretty difficult operation that he is attempting, and I sure he will need the goodwill of everybody and the co-operation of all these organizations in carrying it through.

MR. HAWRYLUK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to reply to some of the remarks made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. It's as usual the attitude of passing the buck; it has been going on for 10 years since I have been a member of the House. As far as I'm concerned

(Mr. Hawryluk, cont'd):... the C.C.F. party advocated a rise in raising the standards of the teachers of this province; we're proud of the fact they are getting something that's been coming to them for the past 10 years. I just want to read - I'm just wondering what the Liberal Government would have done if they had been in power and had received the Commission's report on Education advising all these drastic necessary constructive changes. I believe that the policy of the Liberal Government would have been to look it over and say it's going to cost a few hundred thousand dollars or a million dollars - we'll shelve it. That's exactly what the attitude would've been. Because if the Honourable, the Leader of the Opposition wants to go back to the horse and buggy days where the one-room rural school was being paid in 1958 an average salary of \$2, 639, then I'm afraid that you would have had a lot more teachers resigning from the profession. That's the average salary the teachers were getting in the one-room rural area in 1958 - \$2, 639 and you are actually advocating that you were satisfied and no one has ever questioned the fact that a one-room school has not given the best of education. The bulk of the teachers teaching on the city staff right now are people that were trained and came from the country schools; and they are the backbone of the teaching profession in this province or any other province across Canada. The bulk of our teachers in municipalities are people that came from the country, and if you were to check the records of the teachers attending the Normal School you will find that 80% of those are all people from the country.

MR. MILLER: Sure they are.

MR. HAWRYLUK: All right - nobody's questioned that. And at no time -

MR. CAMPBELL: It's good training for them.

MR. HAWRYLUK: All right, but don't say on one hand that we are advocating it and nobody else is. I can say this that if we are responsible in making a government, and I know that there are 3 or 4 members that were sitting on this side of the House from the Conservatives agree with us because they voted time and time again for larger school areas, raising the standards of the education of the teachers, and also most important, to raise their salaries. And if you're proud of this record and that goes back to your regime for the fact that you were able to pay to the one-room rural schools an annual salary of \$2, 639 then as far as I'm concerned that is possibly the policy of the liberal government. I disheartally agree with you, Sir, when you claim that the C.C.F. are always advocating spending money. Does anybody in this House question the fact that the teachers have been working for miserable salaries in this province for many, many years, and the fact that the average salary might go up to about \$3,300 to \$3,500. When you compare the fact that these people are graduates, have spent 4 and 5 years at University level and compare them to other professions. I think that's ridiculous, really ridiculous. I think the people want good qualified teachers. No one has ever questioned a non-qualified or non-academic teacher. As a matter of fact the bulk of my teachers on the staff are non-academic teachers and they are my best teachers.

MR. MILLER: And what do they teach?

MR. HAWRYLUK: They are teaching junior high, 7, 8 and 9. And I can say this, that as far as merit rating is concerned, at no time did we on this side advocate the fact that the most important thing was academic standing and experience.

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh, yes.

MR. HAWRYLUK: No sir-ee I didn't say that. I never said that, and I didn't say that in the House tonight. We take that into consideration their attitude, and aptitude. Why is it non-academic teachers in my district are principals of schools? Why?

MR. CAMPBELL: That's the main basis in the . . . .

MR. HAWRYLUK: All right then, in other words the recommendations of the, my recommendations, when I recommend a teacher to become a vice-principal or a principal in my district, it's because I figure that that teacher has the quality. I'm not looking at the fact that he hasn't a degree. And I think that everybody else takes that into consideration.

Well I just resent the fact this idea of passing the buck - it's been going on for years and years. But I can readily see by the attitude that the Leader of the Opposition has taken the fact that if they had got the Commission - it's obvious by his words, that they would have read it through and said " gosh this is going to cost us a couple of million dollars, we might as well shelve it for the next ten years." And that's exactly what would have happened.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry I don't know whether you will ever get

(Mr. Wagner, cont'd)... tonight to Item I, but I will just change the subject - deface it a little bit. What is concerning me, I was watching that time if I were the honourable members, and if I was on the farm that this time w've been speaking here tonight I would have disced 20 acres on the land if it would have been dry, of course.

While I'm up, I would like to ask the honourable Minister a question, possibly I am out of order but I don't see in these figures any place where the Department of Education would supply some money for the building of roads. There is a provision in transporting the students, but I am very much concerned on what roads those vehicles are going to transport those students to school. And possibly the Honourable Minister will recall that I discussed with him just a few moments about the road program, and I must refer myself when there were spokesmen out in our area speaking about larger school area, that's very fine and dandy, but there was also discussion and the main source of discussion was roads. And actually we were told by some spokesman that the roads will have to be built. I very well realize that it is the Public Works Department, yes, but if we were told that a road will have to be built to transport the students to school possibly we can tie a sum of money here under the Department of Education to build some of those main roads that we are going to transport our students .

MR. MCLEAN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make it quite clear as I have always done, that the Department of Education has no responsibility in the matter of roads. I have a very good friend of mine who looks after that department and I think that's a good place to leave it.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a few words yet. The Honourable Member for Burrows prompted me to get up. He says about passing the buck. I don't blame him for so vigorously defending what he was, evidently he is pleading his own case, and if I was in his position I would do the same thing, I suppose. Now there are others, several honourable members have spoken before this on this plan. I'm not up here to criticize the plan, because as I've said before I agreed with the plan, I still do, I did in the past, and never once did I say that the plan was no good. Several honourable members did speak, some of them were teachers and I'd say that they are very happy, they have reason to be happy. They almost convinced me that I should go back to teaching myself. It would pay. Of course I'm not going to say that the teachers do not deserve what they are getting at the present time, but we have to also consider at times who 's making the most noise on this. The Honourable Member from Brokenhead suggested a few moments back that our educational - the former government with its educational progress wasn't even air borne. I could say only a few words to the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, and this would be a good....

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I said comparatively speaking.

MR. TANCHAK; All right, comparatively speaking or not it doesn't matter, but I'd say "stop, look and listen awhile longer." The educational progress was not even air borne. I'll say it's still air borne. The Royal Commission is still sitting. We haven't got the report. The present government probably took advantage of, I'll say, requested parachuted bundles and took advantage of that in the form of interim report -- and I say that this progress is still air borne. Look up and see. I'm very happy about the educational grants and we know that the educational grants have been increased year by year. I'm very happy about that. It's something in the neighborhood according, comparing these figures here, it's something in the neighborhood of 5 1/2 million dollars more this year than last year - I may not be exactly correct but something a little above 5 1/2 million dollars. And we know that when this plan was first discussed and when the ministers and other officials went out into the country and even the Honourable Minister himself was quoted by a former member from Hansard had said that this plan would lighten the burden of the local taxpayer.

MR. MCLEAN: Quoting from Hansard, not from my speech in any....

MR. TANCHAK: From Hansard. That's what I say, quoting from Hansard, I'm sorry, the Minister -- well, I believe that if it's in Hansard that the Honourable Minister did say that, at least I didn't hear any correction made after the Hansard was printed, and I say that most of the people in the rural areas were under the impression, and they were led to believe that their tax burden will be lowered. A lot of them are disappointed at the present time. The Honourable Member from LaVerendrye my neighbor here, just read a resolution that was passed at St. Pierre. Well, -- if they were not disappointed we wouldn't have had this resolution. Now, I'll have to say a few words again in my defence. The Honourable Minister of

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd). . Education has stated that the only condition that another vote would be allowed in the areas that did not accept the plan, and I'm being treated as if the whole of my constituency did not accept the plan. I'd like to inform the members here that a considerable portion of my constituency did accept the plan across the river, accepted it overwhelmingly too, almost I'd say about 85%, but the rest did not, and I do not take any blame for that. True, I presented the advantages and disadvantages, and I think I was one of those members of the legislature, although I wasn't a member of the legislature during that time part of it — I was, I was one of those that was not afraid to tell the ratepayers, the people, the truth, and now I'm being chided for that, for telling the truth. Now I have a copy of the disadvantages that I stated where the Honourable Minister of Education was present, and at one meeting the Honourable the Attorney-General attended, and I have no quarrel with the Attorney-General because of all the different speeches I heard, I think the Attorney-General was the best in stating the facts, because even when he was asked at that meeting by one of the taxpayers, "who is going to pay for this educational cost?" , the Attorney-General did say, and he pointed to the man, "you are going to pay." So I give him credit for that, he didn't try to hoodwink the people, but there were two inspectors at that same meeting and I hope that the Attorney-General will bear me out, and when the question was asked, "Will not our taxes go up on account of this division?" and one of the inspectors got up and he pointed at some figures on the blackboard and said, "I do not believe that they will go up, in fact if anything your tax should be lower." That's one of the inspectors said at that meeting. I didn't participate in that meeting. I was asked by the Chairman if I had anything to say, and the only thing that I did say was that I thought that what the Attorney-General had said was defeating the purpose of the bill, because it was stated that centralization was not — was not asked for, and that's all that I stated at that meeting.

Now here are some of the disadvantages that I stated and I'd like to go through them, and there are six of them, at the meeting. First one, the disadvantage. I said I did not believe that the taxes will not go up on account of the school division. That's one of my disadvantages. But at the same time, and I'm sure that the Honourable Minister, if he still remembers, will bear me out on this. I stated this, that even if our tax does go up, we should look at the value, and I believe that the value, the return for our tax dollar will be worthwhile and I said we should consider that. That's the way I presented the disadvantage.

Another disadvantage where the Minister took strong objection to, that Ridgeville when I mentioned that we may lose our own local school, but again immediately after I stated this I said, "but we should look at the other of the coin. Even if we do lose our school, supposing we had to go to Dominion City or Emerson, our students would have to go there, let us look at this. Would it be to the advantage of our children, and I believe, I said I believe it will, because we'll get broader form of education. That's the way I stated disadvantages. I didn't try to bear them out and then not to explain.

Another disadvantage where the Minister took objection to was, that I thought that the plan was being rushed too much, and I still say it was rushed, especially in our area. Why? It came at a time when the roads were almost impossible. There were many many of the people out from the rural area, from the country where the roads were impossible at that time and they couldn't come to the meeting. Although it was in the press — but you go out into the country, the remote areas of my constituency, many of these residents do not receive the daily paper. Some of them only receive the mail once a week, therefore they couldn't understand the plan. And I was right about the plan being rushed. It was rushed. He took objection to that, that was another disadvantage.

Another disadvantage that I stated there was this. After the Minister had said that we are nother to take away your local schools from you. We are here to expand the existing schools. In fact he says, I hope to see the day when I'll be here at Ridgeville, opening a twelve-room high school. These were the exact words of the Minister. We at the present time have a two-room high school. I do not think we could ever have a twelve-room -- build a twelve-room high school at Ridgeville -- it is a very small hamlet -- but that's what was stated in there. This is the disadvantage that I told them. I said, "I do not see why we should, because we are smaller, why we should be penalized and only get a 40% grant towards construction, while the people who are large, say in the City of Winnipeg, Portage la Prairie and other districts, will be getting 75% construction." I did not think that was right.

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd)... Now the anxiety about transportation. I told them this may be a disadvantage. The students would have to be transported over rough roads or during the winter time; a storm may come up when the students are in school, the parents would be anxious about them. But again I told them that it only happens maybe three or four times during the winter. That's the way I presented the disadvantages.

And finally I ended up as I stated before, that the way I saw it, the advantages outweighed the disadvantages, and I do not see why the Honourable the Minister, the way he stated before that he has to have proof from us that we will show leadership. The Honourable Member from Brokenhead, although he does....

MR. MCLEAN: I'm afraid I didn't say that Mr. Chairman, I said that it was up to the Honourable Member to declare his position with respect to his attitude to the plan. I don't require any proof from him for anything.

MR. TANCHAK: Well at least it was stated that was right what the Honourable Minister had said "proof" but at the same time we should show leadership. I think that was mentioned also in there. I do not think I have to make that declaration, I have repeatedly made that declaration in here that I wasn't against the plan and I'm not against the plan at the present time.

There was some suggestions that I would like to make, increased grants. Even though we are not in the school division during the election campaign all on the other side who campaigned against me promised a 50% increase in grants -- school grants. 50% increase. And although we're not in the division I think that our area is still entitled to a 50% increase in school grants. That's a suggestion that I think he should take, increase construction grants up to 75%. That's another suggestion that I would like to pass on. I see that I have taken more than my time, there's some other things that -- probably have another chance at, but I don't like to keep the Honourable Members any longer, therefore that will be all I have to say tonight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker. The committee rise and report. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted a certain resolution and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin that the Report of the Committee be received.

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

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

Mr. Speaker presented the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and declared that the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.