



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



Vol. VII No. 53 2:30 p.m. Thursday, April 5, 1962.

5th Session, 26th Legislature

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. D. Watt	Reston, Man.
ASSINIBOIA	Geo. Wm. Johnson	212 Oakdean Blvd., St. James, Wpg. 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Robert Gordon Smelle	Russell, Man.
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832. Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	E. R. Schreyer	2-1177 Henderson Hwy., Winnipeg 16
BURROWS	J. M. Hawryluk	84 Furby St., Winnipeg 1
CARILLON	Edmond Prefontaine	St. Pierre, Man.
CHURCHILL	J. E. Ingebrigtsen	Churchill, Man.
CYPRESS	Mrs. Thelma Forbes	Rathwell, Man.
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean Q.C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	William Homer Hamilton	Sperling, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Melrose Ave., Winnipeg 15
EMERSON	John P. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT PLAINS	M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q. C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	Peter Wagner	Fisher Branch, Man.
FLIN FLON	Hon. Charles H. Witney	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	Nelson Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	Morris A. Gray	141 Cathedral Ave., Winnipeg 4
KILDONAN	A. J. Reid	561 Trent Ave., E. Kild., Winnipeg 15
LAC DU BONNET	Oscar F. Bjornson	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
LA VERENDRYE	Stan Roberts	Niverville, Man.
LOGAN	Lemuel Harris	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEBOSA	Hon. Walter Weir	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MORRIS	Harry P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Obte Balzley	185 Maplewood Ave., Winnipeg 13.
PEMBINA	Mrs. Carolyne Morrison	Manitou, Man.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	Hon. John Aaron Christianson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RADISSON	Russell Paulley	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
RHINELAND	J. M. Froese	Winkler, Man.
RIVER HEIGHTS	W. B. Scarth, Q. C.	407 Queenston St., Winnipeg 9
ROBLIN	Keith Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	Hon. Abram W. Harrison	Holmfeld, Man.
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	Hon. George Hutton	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	J. E. Jeannotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent Desjardins	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
ST. GEORGE	Elman Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guildford St., St. James, Wpg. 12
ST. JOHN'S	David Orlikow	179 Montrose St., Winnipeg 9
ST. MATTHEWS	W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Fred Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Wpg. 8
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	Ste. Rose du Lac, Man.
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q. C.	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	Arthur E. Wright	4 Lord Glenn Apts., 1944 Main St., Wpg. 17
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	Fred T. Klym	Beausejour, Man.
SWAN RIVER	A. H. Corbett	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	E. I. Dow	Bolsevaln, Man.
VIRDEN	Hon. John Thompson, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WELLINGTON	Richard Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	James Cowan Q. C.	512 Avenue Bldg., Winnipeg 2
WOLSELEY	Hon. Duff Roblin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, April 5th, 1962.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.
Reading and Receiving Petitions.
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.
Notice of Motion.
Introduction of Bills.

The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville) introduced Bill No. 112, An Act to amend The Animal Husbandry Act.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Flin Flon) introduced Bill No. 119, An Act to amend The Fish Dealers Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider the following proposed resolution.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution recommends it to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Predator Control Act by providing, among other matters, for the reimbursement from and out of the Consolidated Fund, of part of the bounties for the killing of predators paid under the Act by municipalities that fail to produce to the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation the certificates respecting the bounties on or before the thirty-first day of August next following the date on which the predators were killed but do produce the certificates on or before the thirty-first day of October next following.

Resolution be adopted?

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, the bill provides for two things -- one, it provides for the exclusion of a municipality from the necessity of carrying out the provisions of the Predator Control Act and paying bounties during the period in which a poison bait program is in force and for the year following. It also provides for the late filing of certificates claiming assistance for bounties. As all the members in the House are aware, each year we bring in an act authorizing the Minister of Agriculture to honour these certificates which have been filed after the deadline set out in the act, and the deadline has come to mean less than nothing, and so, we are amending the act to provide authority for the Minister to pay half of the sum which would be forthcoming to the municipalities if they were to file on time. It shouldn't be any hardship or inconvenience to the municipalities to file on time. We hope that we don't save any money in this respect, but we feel that it is a little more realistic if a penalty were provided for, for late filing. We propose that where late filing has taken place we will pay half the normal share, the government share of the bounty program.

MR. D.L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I'm glad that we did get the explanation of the Minister because I had thought when I first glanced at this resolution that it was just practically the same as the one that's been introduced year after year after year, of picking up the accounts of those who, through inadvertence, had run past the filing time, but I realize from what the Honourable the Minister has said that there is a new principle being invoked here, or established, in that there will be a penalty from now on if they do not meet the time. The Minister said that the filing date has come to mean very little. My recollection was that we usually had only a few municipalities who overran the time, that in general it was pretty well -- the regulations were well adhered to. Is it a fact that it has come to mean almost nothing?

MR. HUTTON: municipalities that are late each year, and it would appear that

(Mr. Hutton, cont'd) there is some justification for -- well let me put it this way -- it seems rather needless to come to the House each year to get authorization to meet these late filed claims. At the same time I, as the Minister, recognize that if I came to the House and asked for the authority to pay these late filed claims in full that this wouldn't be very realistic because on what basis would I have dispensed judgment, and secondly, wouldn't there be a tendency for municipalities, knowing that the Minister had the authority to do this, to just put the thing off? So therefore it appears, to our way of reasoning at least, that some penalty would be justified for late filing. No one needs to incur the penalty, and at the same time, if they are late in filing, they're not going to lose the total contribution that the province makes. So this course of action, its logic has recommended itself to the department and we feel that it is more realistic than coming back here every year and authorizing the payment of these late filed certificates.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I would agree with the Minister completely if it were established as a matter of fact that the practice had been growing and had grown to the extent that the filing date meant almost nothing, as the Minister suggested, but my recollection is that not many municipalities had erred in this connection, and I suppose that they just erred through inadvertence. However, that's all I care to say at the present time, and we can have more to say when the bill comes before us.

MR. PETER WAGNER (Fisher): Mr. Chairman, applies for the local government districts?

MR. HUTTON: It covers the responsibilities of the Department of Agriculture in respect of the municipalities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? Passed. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

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

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

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

MR. HUTTON introduced Bill No. 113, an Act to amend The Predator Control Act.

MR. SPEAKER: I should like at this time to introduce to the members of the Legislative Assembly 24 pupils from Faraday School, Grade VII, under the guidance of their teacher, Mr. Single. The school is located in Inkster constituency and has the Honourable Mr. Gray as their representative in the Legislature for many, many years. Mr. Gray was a member when I first came to the Legislature. I am sure that as the students look down on the legislative group assembled here that it will bring to their minds that this group are the law makers of Manitoba and provide services for their education. We hope that they will, this afternoon, take home with them favourable opinions of the Legislature of Manitoba.

Orders of the Day.

MR. ROBERT G. SMELLIE (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to correct an erroneous impression that was given by a report in the Winnipeg Free Press yesterday of some remarks that I made on Tuesday last. In yesterday's edition of the Free Press it says: "A government backbencher said Tuesday, the University of Manitoba should not be expected to decide which members of the healing arts can use the title of doctor." Now Sir, this is not what I said and certainly not what I intended to say, and I wouldn't like to leave the impression with anyone that I ever intended to say anything like this. The words that I used, Sir, were as follows and I quote from Page 1345 of Hansard: "In my opinion, Sir, it is not fair for us at this time to ask the university to remedy a wrong -- if we feel it is a wrong -- that was created by us. If it's wrong then let us change it." And I went on to say, Sir, a little bit further down on the same page: "I believe Sir, that the only satisfactory answer to this problem is for those practitioners of the other healing arts who wish to call themselves doctor is to establish at a recognized university, a faculty for the teaching of their own particular art." I would like to say most emphatically, Sir, that I believe that the university is the correct body to decide who should have the title of doctor, and that no further titles of doctor should be given by this Legislature at any time.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to make some comments on the business of the House. Last year, Mr. Speaker, we entered the estimates -- discussion of estimates -- on the 27th of February, which gave us two days in the month of February, the 27th and the 28th. We concluded the discussion of estimates, according to my notes, Monday the 3rd of April, having spent some 97 hours. This year, Mr. Speaker, we entered estimates on Thursday, the 1st of March, two days later than last year. We are now Thursday, the 5th of April, having spent therefore a number of days more time than last year. We have so far spent something in the order of 60 hours on estimates. Now Mr. Speaker, my reason for bringing this up is that I fear that with the good weather coming on, the desire of some of the members who are in agriculture getting back home, that unless we proceed to do more work on estimates, spend more time, that we may end up by rushing through this very important business in the last few days of the House. It seems to me that the situation which I have shown, where we have done substantially less work compared to the number of days, is because the government has this year brought in a number of resolutions which have been discussed on government days. Now these resolutions, Mr. Speaker, are important, I agree. They are not, however, essential to the business of the House or the business of Manitoba, because in every case the government could proceed and, in fact, has proceeded to take action on the matters discussed in these resolutions without the consultation of the House. If my honourable friends want to discuss it, fine. But I would suggest that we should change the order of business in the House and on government days proceed with estimates which is one of the vital matters. I make a second suggestion that we should have committee meetings called. So far we've had two committee meetings with one called tomorrow. I see no reason why Public Accounts, possibly, should not be called very shortly and gone into -- second suggestion. Third suggestion, Mr. Speaker, is that we should give consideration at this time -- and I want to make it very clear when I say this that I'm not suggesting this would be a practice that we would necessarily accept in other years -- but in the light of what has happened this year with government resolutions that we might consider having some morning sessions, say, 10:30 in the morning until 12:30 in the morning on certain days of the week so as to employ the mornings and proceed with the business of the House.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I think that some of the proposals made by my honourable friend are certainly constructive and I welcome them. Some, of course, perhaps I would not be so completely in accord with him about. It seems to me that the resolutions that the government have placed upon the Order Paper are all of them of an extremely important public character on which the opinion of this House is definitely, in my opinion, desirable, and it will be our intention, and I want to assure the Chamber, to proceed with those resolutions no matter how long we sit here until we do make some disposition of them. And I really don't suppose that the honourable gentlemen opposite will disagree with that. We also intend to see that private members' resolutions receive the same consideration, because I'm anxious to have them discussed as long as members wish to discuss them within reason, and see that they are also dealt with as expeditiously as possible. Now, the reason why committees are not called is because there is no work for committees to do with the exception of Public Accounts which I think I will still suggest ought to be called in its usual order. But I do agree with my honourable friend that the House might well consider meeting in the mornings. I think that this has been discussed in an unofficial way, and I'm pleased -- it has been discussed in an unofficial way between some members of this House, I know -- not with my honourable friend -- but it has been discussed in an unofficial way with some members of the House. I, myself, took some part in those discussions. So I think this is a welcome idea and I'm quite willing to suggest that, committee work aside, we should start next Monday and meet at 10:00 in the morning and sit till 1:00 o'clock and deal with, if members wish, deal with government business during the morning sessions. As far as we're concerned we'd be quite happy to limit it to estimates and in that way expedite the business of the House. Now I don't really think it would be fair to ask honourable members to decide what they think about this idea at the present moment, but I would be quite pleased indeed if we could agree that the Whips might consult about this and consider whether they would like to meet in the mornings and if so, when and for how long. And if we could come to some agreement, I'm sure we could expedite our business in that way.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Mr. Speaker, as far as we are concerned here, we certainly will take the matter under consideration. It has been sprung on us rather suddenly this afternoon and we've had no consultation among ourselves or with anyone else in respect of meeting mornings. Possibly there would be no harm; it would facilitate the business of the House if we did meet, say, a couple of mornings a week. But I do agree with the First Minister that possibly the Whips could get together and map out a plan of action and we could pursue it from there.

MR. ROBLIN: I think that would be very helpful, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with the Orders of the Day, I'd like to lay on the table of the House, a Return to an Order of the House dated March 6, 1962, on the motion of the Leader of the Opposition.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Gary): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I should like to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 26, dated 16 March, 1962, on the motion of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead; a Return to an Order of the House No. 25, dated March 16, 1962, on the motion of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead; a Return to an Order of the House No. 29, dated March 23, 1962, on the motion of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead; a Return to an Order of the House No. 23, dated March 16, 1962, on the motion of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead; and a Return to an Order of the House No. 24, dated March 16, on the motion of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Welfare. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I'm sorry I didn't give him notice of this but perhaps he could take the question as notice. I'd like to ask him whether the government will give first option to the former owners of properties expropriated for the floodway if the land or portion of land are not going to be used for the floodway. In other words, will they be given first priority to repurchase the land if it's not going to be used for the floodway itself?

MR. HUTTON: your question as notice on that.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. SCHREYER: A supplementary question also as notice. Would this sort of unwritten agreement be that they have this option to repurchase at the same price at which they sold to the government?

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the honourable member to enlarge on this just a little bit? At what time? When the floodway is completed five years from now or what is the ...

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, what I have in mind is, if the government should find that certain lands which they have bought are not going to be used in the actual floodway -- for the floodway -- if they decide to sell, will they give first priority to the former owner? This could be in any given period of time, six months to six years.

MR. HUTTON: Well Mr. Speaker, I can think of no reason why they wouldn't.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Welfare. Second reading of Bill No. 87, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I had intended to ask leave of this House to allow this matter to stand as I feel that it is a very important subject and I had more work to do on this. But I do not wish to delay this important matter too long. It will come to committee and then we'll have also the third reading, so there'll be other chances to deal with this. Especially after the words from my Leader, trying to go ahead with the business of Manitoba as soon as possible, without rushing things, of course, I feel that it might be better to say a few words on this today.

Now Sir, I might say that after trying for the last four or five years to have something done in this field, I certainly will not oppose this bill, but nevertheless, Sir, I must say that I'm very disappointed in the bill and especially in the information, or rather lack of information, that we have received from the Honourable Minister speaking on behalf of the government. Now there is

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd) no doubt that the government is not ready to face this kind of work. It has been very backward in the past in this respect -- in this field and other fields relating to this. Whenever suggestions were made to them they have refused them, passed the buck and patted themselves on the back. The last two or three years there have been resolutions here asking them to either study certain things -- to look into certain things -- but they were always amended, saying that the Department of Education had things under control or that the Legion was going to take care of it, or it wasn't anybody's business. They felt that this wasn't too important; but the Prime Minister of Canada woke up. He realized that this is important. He knows that the people of Canada know it's important, and I guess he felt that just before election would be as good a time as any to bring this into force -- to do something in this respect. Now this government is faced with standing in line to get their share from Ottawa but not knowing what to do with this money.

The Honourable Minister practically copied, word for word, the bill C 131, an Act to Encourage Fitness and Amateur Sport, as passed by the House of Commons on the 25th of September, 1961. I think that, in itself, that might not be too bad because this Act doesn't mean very much. In fact the only thing it does is set up the mechanics to enable the Province of Manitoba to get its share. That's all it does, and it makes it clear that they have no program whatsoever -- that they are not ready to go with this, and certainly I can't see how the Minister can get up -- his speech didn't mean very much and he was careful to read every single word. I guess he was afraid of varying a bit, but he looked at us and with a smile he told us that this government would be ready to face the challenge of providing leadership in this field, but he hasn't told us how they will do it. He has refused to tell us anything about it. Those are words, Mr. Speaker, and I think that at the present it is obvious that it could not provide leadership when the government hasn't even got a program. But, Sir, it's not too important now -- it's not important what this government, or for that matter any other government, did or did not do in the past. The important thing is that finally something is about to be done and it would be wrong to throw cold water on this at this time. Rather we should get together. The First Minister just a few minutes ago said that he had these things coming in in the way of these resolutions and bills because he wanted the opinion of this House -- the opinion of the members of this House; their desires. Well, if he's sincere in doing this maybe we should get together and forget what wasn't done and try to do something about this. Too often politics are dragged into these things and I hope that this is serious enough, and for once no party will try to capitalize on a thing like this -- trying to play politics with this to the detriment of the citizens of Manitoba and Canada.

Now I said a while ago that the Minister copies practically word for word the Federal Act. Oh, there were a few things changed -- (a) became (b) and (b) became (a), but it's easy to recognize that it was exactly the same words. Now the government tried in a few instances to go a little further, such as definitions, and I think that that was a mistake, Sir. They're not ready to provide leadership. They have no -- it seems that they have nobody qualified to start this program, but then they're defining leadership. They intend to name an advisory Board but they will define -- not leadership, I should say fitness and amateur sport. Now the Federal Act could see that this would be wrong. It reserved the right to define these terms but did not try to define those before studying the program, and this doesn't seem too important, Sir, at the surface, but it is important. And then the Honourable Minister told us that he will train coaches and referees. Well he might be stopped right there, because a lot of these coaches get paid; the referees get paid; and they would not have the right to do too much in this field. Now the definition of "amateur" is a very ambiguous one and I feel that at times you might have to help a semi-amateur group for the good of amateur sport and for the good of fitness. There will be an occasion very soon -- I understand that the Polish national team of track and field will compete in Chicago some time in July and they are interested in coming here. It would be a terrific thing for sport to bring in the Polish national team to compete against Canadians right here in Winnipeg. Now somebody would have to underwrite this. I don't think that it would be a grant. I think that this would finance itself, but it would have to be underwritten, and under this term this would be impossible.

Now, Sir, I think that if the Honourable Minister reconsiders this he will see that there is time -- let's get the program set before we define these words. Now "fitness" has been defined

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd) -- no doubt it could be defined a little better than that. It seems that it's just rush -- yes, let's admit when we're wrong. We weren't ready -- or the government wasn't ready for this, and they're certainly not going to stand back. They're going to get in line and receive this money from Ottawa. I'm not condemning that at all, but let's not pretend that this is something that we had in mind, we were going to do all along, because it's not true -- it's not true. --(Interjection)-- How do I know? How do I know, Sir? Well, I know because the last three or four years there were motions, resolutions brought in this House and what did you say about it? What did anybody from that side of the House say about it? Not a thing. The Minister -- it's not right? I'd like the Leader of this House to prove that it's not right -- to tell me what has been done at our suggestion. What has been done? I'll be the first one to admit that I'm wrong but if he says how do I know -- that's another good question. This is what we're here for, to find out things; and what do we do? We will accept this challenge to provide leadership. How? Well we don't know. That's not too important. He said we would -- that's not important. This is the question -- how do I know? This is what I want. I want to know what is being done. This is what the people of Manitoba want. How will this money be spent? What are you going to do about it? We had a Committee on Youth. This was so mixed up again. It was under the Attorney-General. Well, they were kicked out. This is how I know. I had a few resolutions in the last few years. The Member from Brokenhead brought in a few resolutions. What happened to them? This is how I know, Mr. Speaker, Now, as I say again -- I hope that the Honourable Leader of the House will bear a little longer -- remember, the opinion of this House is desired, so I wish he'd let me finish and then prove to me that I'm wrong -- if he wants our opinion. Of course I might not be included in this, but I'll give it anyway.

Now, as I say, in advice to the Honourable Minister, reconsider this definition, and there's no great rush to give this definition. You will have an Advisory Board -- talk this thing over with your Advisory Board. You haven't too many experts in this field right now and you're not using them. Let's have this Advisory Board discuss this -- it could be dangerous -- it could lead them into trouble later on. This, Sir, I'm giving only as constructive criticism. It doesn't have to be accepted but I think it is valid. Now, Sir, the important thing -- as I said, this was copied to get ready to have the handout, to get this money from Ottawa, and that's good, but this Federal Act -- the point that I felt was very important is number five: "The Minister may" if I might read, Mr. Speaker, "with the approval of the Governor-in-Council, enter into an agreement with any province for a period not exceeding six years, to provide for the payment by Canada to the province of contributions in respect of cost incurred by the province in undertaking programs designed to encourage, promote and develop fitness and amateur sport. (2) In this section cost incurred by a province means the cost incurred by the province determined as prescribed in the agreement made under this section between the Minister and the province. (3) In this section the expression 'programs designed to encourage, promote and develop fitness and amateur sport' in respect of the province means programs as defined in the agreement made under this section between the Minister and the province that are designed to further the objects of this Act."

Well, Sir, this information, quoting here, said -- put out by the Department of Industry and Commerce March 23rd of this year -- \$100,000 Dollars Earmarked for Sports and Fitness. The Manitoba government is planning to spend \$100,000 to advance the cause of fitness in the Province and it has reasonably firm guarantees that the federal government will make another \$200,000 available for the same purpose." Well if we follow this, Sir, we have defined cost as seen in this Act, and we have also defined the word "programs." In other words, this money will be paid to pay the costs incurred in promoting these programs. Now the Minister says that we are practically sure of receiving this money. Well if they're practically sure of receiving this money, Mr. Speaker, it means that they have to present their program to Ottawa, and if they have to present their program to Ottawa, why, why are we afraid to discuss this program here, where we can have the opinion of the members of this House? Why, Sir? It seems obvious that either we are not ready and I'm right and the Leader of this House is wrong in asking me "how do I know," or we have a program that we don't want to discuss. Now, why? This is what I'd like to know. We've asked questions. Is that so unusual? We've asked questions: When are you going to start? Are you ready to start? Have you got a program? No answers, Mr. Speaker. Are you going to spend the \$300,000? No answer. Are you going to spend this --

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd)whether it's earmarked for this year -- are you going to spend it this year? No answer. But: "We will be ready. We accept the challenge to provide leadership." This is what we've been told. What kind of leadership? That's poor leadership.

Now, Sir, oh yes, we've been told that we want co-operation between departments. Now isn't this obvious that we need a department -- somebody to co-ordinate, to provide this leadership? We were told by the Honourable Minister himself, that some of it was under the Minister of Education, and I think that he knows less about this than anybody else. I'm talking about the Minister of Education. He talks about, in his speech before the estimate -- he talks about, well this year there was a program to give sport, inter-school sports. I asked the question, "Well, what is inter-school sports? What are you doing?" "Well, I can't tell you too much about that. I know that they had a meeting, and I know they'll have another meeting; a group will have a meeting." What leadership is that? A group of people that are interested or volunteered, decided to do something. What has that got to do with his department? Is he spending money on this? Did he institute this? No, he doesn't know a thing about it. He told me himself. He knows that there is a committee and he wasn't instrumental in forming this committee. The Honourable Minister of Welfare passed the buck to the Minister of Education. Now is it so wrong in advocating that somebody -- that all these services should be together and maybe have a Department of Youth that would take care of these things? If this government would have listened to me three years ago and looked into that -- they didn't have to take everything I said and put it into force. I'm not on that side of the House, but there must have been something in that they could have used. My first motion was not a department. Now I'm sure we need a department to look into this and other matters, but this would be one field that you'd be all set. You could take over and you'd say, "Here's the money -- we know how to spend it." But they just laughed at me. It wasn't important. I think that they can see now that they should have listened. Now there's no leadership in -- I've never heard -- these were the first words that I've heard the Minister of Education say in this House about sports. I've heard very little. He -- I'm not blaming him. He has a big job and this is a small part of his job and he hasn't got the time to look at it. I'm not blaming him at all, but I say that it's in the wrong place -- that he cannot look after this properly, that he cannot give the leadership in this.

I think that it would be wise to start with somebody that can lead; that can co-ordinate the efforts of the government in this. They followed the federal Act and they formed a committee also. In fact they were saying that most of this \$100,000 is -- well I'll read it. "The \$100,000 would be earmarked for expenses in connection with establishment of an advisory council on fitness, employment and salaries of full-time staff and grants and training expenses." But there's nobody on the staff yet -- another group that we'll ask to give opinions. Now maybe you need this, but this is being done in the federal field. This is done in the federal field. Now I'm not making an accusation, Sir, but I'm asking myself, "Is this another group -- will the government play politics with this group?" This is very vague the way they're They don't say that the work will be done for nothing; they don't say that they will pay the chairman; they don't say there will be a full-time chairman. They don't know. How can they say? Now they've got something pretty good here. They will -- it gives how these members will be appointed. Now, they say a member of the council is eligible for reappointment for a second consecutive term of office, but he is not eligible for reappointment for a third term of office as a member of the council unless at least one year has elapsed since the expiry of any previous term of office as a member of the council. This is wrong. If you have a man -- there are so few people that know something about this -- if you have a man on this board such as Mr. Kennedy or Mr. Currie or Kas Vidruk or one of those people -- now what are you going to do? Kick them out for one year? Why? Are you doing them a favour? He can't come back if he's going to get that much money? Or don't you want his services any more? I think that's wrong. I think that you have to have a full-time staff on this. I think that you should start, first of all, before you even name this group, in getting a good qualified recreational director who will give you some advice. A man becomes a Minister, a head of the department. He's not expected to know everything -- to become an expert in everything because he's elected. Let him ask advice, and you've got the people doing that kind of work -- a man like Bill Orban at the University of Saskatchewan -- a man like that who could do an awful lot of good. A man who has worked for the -- I'm giving you an example -- with a man like that, I'm saying his name because I know his qualifications;

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd) I know what he's done and I think that this is the man that, if I were in the Minister's place, I would go for that manner of man, of that calibre, as soon as possible and listen to him. We're not experts on this. We're farmers, doctors, even funeral directors. We're not experts in this field. Let's listen to them -- not try to name a board and then say, "after you've had two terms on this you're out for a year." Well, what are they going to do? Why? Why are they going to be out for a year if they're good men? I can't see that, Mr. Speaker. They're doing us a favour by giving their time. You might have a doctor at the head of an advisory board. Is he going to be kicked out after awhile? You're doing him a big favour? No, I think that this is -- just copied the Act in a rush and we didn't look into this. We don't know what we're going to do with this, but we'll have 20 members to advise. How long will that take? What will be done this year? How long will that take to have this board functioning? You need an advisory board -- there's no doubt about that -- and those should be people qualified in their field come and meet once in awhile, but you need somebody that's going to lead. The people, the volunteers are terrific -- they're needed -- but this is what the government -- The government can't do everything. I agree with the Honourable Minister -- we don't live in Russia where the government's going for force you to do this and that even in sports. I agree with that, but the government must provide us leadership and co-ordination, and according to what we've been told -- well I don't see how that can be done. The government is not ready for this. They're just getting in line to get this money and let somebody else do it. And this is too important to start in a way like this; to let politics creep into this; it will be very difficult to change after that. It's wrong to define amateur sport now. We're not ready for that. Who's responsible for that definition? I'd like to know. This was done in a rush to show that they were thinking for themselves. They copied everything else except that. But there's no need for that and I hope they will think about this, and I'm sure they will agree with me, and I hope that in committee this might be changed. The main thing that we need is co-ordination and co-operation between all these volunteer groups.

Now we're talking about spending money to train referees. Well I'm lost. What's referees got to do with amateur sport? What are you going to spend money to -- but that is so small, so incidental. That will come in itself. I can't see where you're going to provide leadership with training referees. And now, I would like to have a further discussion with the Minister. He said that he will have the qualified people to train these people. Where will he get them? A hockey player doesn't mean that he's a hockey coach, especially when you're trying to develop fitness -- and mental and moral fitness, the way you're talking about -- because I've seen some hockey players that I would never want to see coach my kid. They might know how to body-check and how to shoot and how to pass, but if that's what we want -- I'd like to know a little more about this program. Who is going to help you do this? You're going to have clinics here and there and you're going to have a repetition of what is done in Ottawa? No, Mr. Speaker, this is not -- the government is not serious in this. I am not saying that they're wrong, and as I've said, there is no use talking about the past but at least let them wake up now. Let the government wake up now. I'm not saying that this is wrong in getting ready to pick up this money. They'd be crazy if they didn't. That's fine. But let us get ready before we talk about leadership. Maybe the Minister is very sincere -- he wants to provide leadership. But because he wants to do it doesn't mean that he will automatically do it -- especially without a program. When is he going to give us leadership and what? Like the Minister of Education gives us about sports in his department. He doesn't know a thing about it -- not a thing about it. Like the Attorney-General did in this respect when he didn't even bother with this Committee on Youth? Told them that they wouldn't exist. Is that the leadership we're going to get? Well, Sir, that's too important, and this government has bragged about its leadership for too long, and in this respect let's not have any of this. Let's get together. This is something there shouldn't be politics in this. Not at all. They have the majority; they can steamroll everything but this is not a time that they should, and if they try to play politics with this, Sir, I can tell you right now that it will backfire. It won't work, because these are people that are not too interested in politics. --(Interjection) -- The member has asked me a question. Could he speak a little louder, Sir? I can't quite make out what he's saying. Oh I guess he was just mumbling or dreaming. Now Sir, I think that the Leader of this House told me that I was wrong. That I'm wrong in speaking like this. Well maybe I am. It's understandable because we've tried -- we've

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd)asked the Minister to give us more information and he has refused. I want to know how he's going to provide leadership. I want to know how he's going to appoint this committee. Will it be a political committee? Are they going to be paid? Is the chairman going to be paid? And why, if you have a good man, you're going to say, "stay out for a year before you come in another term?" Why was this put in? Why does he feel that his definition of amateur is right? These are the things that we want to know, and when this is answered, when I am told that this government is ready for this, has everything set as a program -- the program must be there, because they say they are reasonably assured of getting this kind of money. And it's clear, it's clear that this money will be given as a cost, and the definition of cost is there and the cost is for putting these programs into operation and the definition of programs is the programs as defined in an agreement between the federal and the provincial government. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm asking the Minister, what is your program?

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, when this bill was introduced, I was very pleased because it is the beginning of a program which is long overdue in this province. Unfortunately, it appears the provincial government is only bringing in this bill because they have been forced into doing so by the introduction of bill C 131 by the federal government. If the federal government bill hadn't been introduced, I am certain, as are so many others in this province, that this bill would never have been brought in. When the federal bill was introduced enabling the Government of Canada to make an annual grant of \$5 million to encourage and support fitness and amateur sport, the Province of Manitoba was the only province in Canada not equipped to deal with grants which we were entitled to under Bill C 131. Why hasn't this government acted before? Why didn't this government act upon the Commission report submitted to the government in June of 1958? I don't blame the present Minister for this inaction because he has only recently been appointed to his present position, but his colleagues are certainly subject to criticism.

The report I speak about is "Physical Education and Recreation in Manitoba," which was prepared by a commission chaired by Frank Kennedy, Director of Physical Education for the University of Manitoba. He had many other competent people working with him on this commission. Many provinces were so impressed by the recommendations of this report that they have implemented many of its suggestions, but this government has chosen to ignore it. For the benefit of members of this House, this commission report was obtained following a resolution passed in this Legislature in March 1957. The present Minister of Industry and Commerce was one of the prime supporters of the resolution. The resolution read: -- it's not very long -- "Whereas physical fitness is a matter of great importance to present and future generations; and whereas physical fitness depends in large measure on facilities for recreation, training and leadership; and whereas it has been suggested that the present physical fitness program is inadequate to the needs of the province, therefore be it resolved that the government give consideration to the advisability of having a study made of the provincial needs on physical education and recreation as recommended by the Manitoba Recreation and Physical Education Committee." This report was submitted to the government in June 1958. I'm sorry to say that it appears that the present Minister of Industry and Commerce doesn't have the same interest since he became a member of the Treasury bench.

As I said earlier, I am in favour of this program but I think the approach is certainly wrong. Any fitness program and amateur sports program should be centred in the schools, and consequently should be administered by the Department of Education. It is true that the federal bill was administered by the Department of Health but they have no Department of Education on the federal level. Here are my reasons for saying this, the main one being that all children go to school. Teachers already have some training in physical education although a great deal more is needed. All schools should have facilities for physical education activities, gymnasiums and playing fields, etcetera. The school is a public building and its facilities should provide a physical recreation for all members of the community be they school children or other members of the community. Until now the Minister, in introducing this bill, has been very vague and has left many questions unanswered. How is this program to be administered? How large a professional staff is going to be hired to look after the program? Who is going to benefit from the program? Is it just for the adolescent boy or are the girls going to be considered? Girls certainly are entitled to their share of equality of opportunity for

(Mr. Guttormson, cont'd) fitness and amateur sport. Another question I would like to ask is this: Is a woman specialist going to be included in the central staff which I presume and hope this government is going to establish? Is the staff going to be sufficient to organize and conduct workshops and clinics in the rural areas? I suggest that instructors could advise and train volunteer leaders who in turn could pass on their knowledge to the younger people. Does the government plan to use the schools in this province for this recreation program? These are some of the many questions which I would like to have answered by the Minister when he replies.

It was suggested earlier, I believe by the Minister, the agricultural representatives should be used in this program. I think this is basically wrong. Although the ag reps are a competent and able group, their present duties tax them to the limit and they would be unable to do justice to such a program. They have their hands full with their present jobs. I think that if a proper fitness and amateur sports program is introduced that it would be just a matter of time before we have physical instructors located in all parts of the province just like we have ag reps. Admittedly the program must start out slowly, just as the ag rep program did. As we know, that program expanded and I fully expect that if this program is handled properly, the number of physical instructors will also expand. Here are what some of the communities in the province said when they were questioned about what they thought of a physical fitness program. I know in my own Town of Lundar they said the needs were a qualified physical education instructor, adequate indoor facilities. They recommended the development of inter-school sports, inter-service training, field supervision for schools, grants for facilities and equipment. At Ashern they asked for more qualified teachers, more participation, less specialization, supervision and leadership training required, university training for specialist teachers, special grants for qualified teachers. Here's what -- the recommendation made by Portage la Prairie, the area which the Minister represents -- I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I can't find it at the moment. I was reading it just before I came in here. But they have strong feelings on this matter and they recommend that such a program be introduced in this province. These are just some of the recommendations anyway, and the feeling is pretty general throughout the province regarding this program. Everybody is in favour of it and they feel the need is very great.

In closing, I would like to suggest that this government, when implementing this program they give serious consideration to the recommendations of the commission chaired by Mr. Kennedy. Here are just a few of those recommendations. They suggest a director of physical education and recreation to be responsible for the organization and direction of all services provided by the branch. An assistant director of physical education and recreation to deputize for the director in his absence. A supervisor of physical education, a woman; a supervisor of recreation trained and experienced in community program organization; supervisors of physical education each responsible for an area of supervision of approximately eight inspectorial districts. These recommendations are outlined on Page 14 in the Roman numerals of this report. I won't take the time of the committee to read them all -- they're all there for the Minister to read. I would like him to answer when he replies whether he has read this report, because it certainly is an excellent one and, as I said before, many of the provinces, I think Saskatchewan and Ontario are included, have taken sections of this report for their own use because they were so impressed with it.

HON. J. A. CHRISTIANSON (Minister of Public Welfare) (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, if anything, I guess I should answer some of the questions that have been raised, although I must confess that my interpretation of parliamentary procedure was that at second reading of a bill we dealt with principle and, in discussing principle, it isn't usually considered necessary to go into exhaustive detail. However, the only man who spoke from the opposite side of the House that had anything to say generally about principle was the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. We've heard quite a diatribe from the honourable members of the Liberal Party about the vagueness of our program. Why didn't we go into detail? Why haven't we spelled out our program completely? Why haven't we crossed all "t's" and dotted all the "i's" so that they could pass judgment upon it?" Well I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, that I haven't been able to do this for them, and I must say that I don't intend to do it for them at this time either. It always amazes me when the Leader of the Opposition jumps up at every point and asks for more detail. He never seems to get enough detail. He has an insatiable appetite for it. Well I'm not

(Mr. Christianson, cont'd) going to suggest programs for coaches, training schools, or clinics, or that type of thing because I don't think it would really serve any useful purpose at this time. I'm sorry that I didn't go over the matter of the Advisory Council or the fact that we were going to appoint a director again during second reading because we had dealt with that matter quite exhaustively, I think, during committee stage of the bill. Now I did refer to the ag reps and that we would be working with the Department of Agriculture who have done a wonderful job in the province, particularly in the rural areas of the province, and I think I said that we would be working with the ag reps. We don't intend to employ them; we don't intend to add to their work load, but we certainly do intend to make use of the organization they have in the province and to aid and assist them in the job they're already doing. But again I'm getting into detail and I shouldn't really do that.

I'm really surprised, though, at the Honourable Member for Lakeside and particularly, I might say, I'm surprised at his impatience. It's not surprising that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is impatient nor the Honourable Member for St. George. This is their nature to be impatient with everything that we do on this side of the House. It would do no good, I suppose, for me to suggest the expenditures of this government have increased some 50% in the last four years from 80-odd million to 120-odd million; that we have had to work pretty hard and spend a lot of money to overcome some of the negligence of the leadership that was in the province in past years. But then this is bringing in politics and the Honourable Member from St. Boniface doesn't want me to mention politics. But I really think I should refresh the memory of some of the honourable members opposite about some fairly recent history. I'm relatively new in this House so this history all happened before my time and it happened before the time of a good many of the members here and I really don't -- I really think, though, that they should perhaps pay a little more attention to history before they rush into battle. What was the previous history of this type of legislation in Canada? Well, federally there was a National Fitness Act in 1944. This was repealed in 1954 by the federal government with very little notice. This was a sharing program and the Honourable Member for Lakeside when we were in committee, warned us very solemnly about rushing into agreements with the federal government and not get too tightly bound up with them because they have a habit of cancelling programs at short notice. The Honourable Paul Martin was then Minister of National Health and Welfare and I can see why he would feel as he does, having had that experience. The provincial government had a program which paralleled very closely the federal program. It was a cost-sharing program; it ran for ten years from April '45 to March 31, 1955. In that time they spent an average of \$11,000 a year, Mr. Speaker, \$11,000 a year. They had five people on staff when the program was closed off. It was closed off, when? In March 31, 1955. I'm told in my research that public interest ran so high when the bill, which dissolved this department, was before the Law Amendments Committee, that it took two sessions to deal with the public representation. Ninety-seven local and provincial organizations presented briefs. The Minister's own advisory committee at that time strongly opposed the repeal of the act. However, it was done nevertheless. It was done by the Honourable Member for Lakeside and his government -- the government of that day. Now they come and say, what are you going to do? What are the details? Why haven't you got a program ready to spring full-blown to make full use of all the money that the federal government is going to make available? Well, Mr. Speaker, they don't have to ask me to answer that question -- they know the reason. They answered that question some seven years ago when they cancelled the previous program, and it was a matter of no little regret when I was in Ottawa at the committee that I found that the other provinces had carried on their program and had substantial programs going to take advantage of this new federal program, Bill C 131. But we had started even before the federal government had announced their bill, on a recreation and fitness program, and the Honourable Member from St. George should remember that when he speaks so harshly about us. This was started in the Department of Industry and Commerce last year and I think it was a very successful program, although it was a modest program admittedly, but it did lay the groundwork upon which this program will be built.

Now I was just at a loss, really, to follow the Honourable Member from St. Boniface. As usual he was going in both directions at the same time. He was complaining about detail -- we didn't have enough detail -- and he was telling us we weren't going fast enough. Why didn't

(Mr. Christianson, cont'd). we have all this ready; why couldn't we tell them what we were going to do. But at the same time he said, "Don't go too fast. Don't make any definitions. Don't do any of these things -- just go slowly." And I can't quite figure out why he feels that by appointing an Advisory Committee, composed -- and we know it will be composed -- of the leaders in this field in Manitoba today -- and he suggested we should make use of all the advice we could get -- when we appoint this committee, how this is going to be bringing politics into the program. Well, I leave it to you to try and figure that one out -- I can't. He intimates that we're not--

MR. DESJARDINS: I did not. I made sure that I said it wasn't an accusation. I said, "I hope this will not be a case where this will be done" and the Minister --- All right, we can all read Hansard tomorrow before the Orders of the Day.

MR. CHRISTIANSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, what's the saying -- "the wish is father to the thought" or something. Anyway, we can certainly assure him that we will be picking the most qualified people to man this committee, and I can assure him too that there are many people in Manitoba fully qualified to sit on that committee and to give us good advice, because they are already very active in the field and doing a wonderful job.

The member for Lakeside surprised me again when he suggested we should build facilities. Well that, of course, would be the easy way out. One Olympic swimming pool would pretty well take care of our program this year, I suppose, and then we could sit back and wait for next year. However, we feel that this program can't be built on bricks and mortar. We can't build facilities with this program. We've got to help the people in the other areas and we must leave it to the other sources that are available for providing the funds with which to build these facilities, and there are many. Dauphin has built an excellent recreational centre using the Fairford grant available through the Department of Agriculture. I believe Carman has done the same thing. Many communities are using the winter works program -- the much maligned winter works program -- to get substantial assistance in building facilities, and of course these things are still available to them.

The Honourable Member from Carillon -- and I'm sorry he isn't in his seat -- thought that there was a conflict in our definition of fitness. I'm sorry that he thinks that. I'm sorry that he doesn't think that there is any character building aspects to taking part in amateur sports. They're a saying, though, I think -- I seem to recall some saying to the effect that the Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton, and I think it's implicit in the word "sport." It is the ideal of good sportsmanship. Learning to play the game according to the rules is one phase -- one very important phase of building the character of youth, and while they learn to win they learn what is, I think, perhaps a much more important thing, they also learn to lose, and to lose like gentlemen, and there's probably no more effective therapy for the rough edges of a boy's personality than the abrasive treatment of healthy activity with others of his own age, and of course the same applies for girls too, because I can assure the Honourable Member for St. George we aren't going to forget the girls -- we will do our best to look after them as well. However, we don't intend to take over any of the functions that are more properly performed by the Church or the home.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that I can't -- I really don't feel it would be proper to take the time of the committee to go further into details on this. I think that the Act is very clear. I think that the principle embodied in this Act is an excellent one -- the principle of providing government support and leadership -- yes, I use the word advisedly -- "leadership" -- to the volunteer groups, to the municipal people and to all the others, parental groups, who are presently engaged in providing for the leisure time of their youth.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, before the question is put I would like to raise a point of order. The Honourable the Minister who has just spoken has given us his interpretation of the rule of the House that it would be actually out of order for him to present a program on second reading. I think it would be a mistake if we allowed that premise to go unchallenged. I think it's quite in order -- in fact it's the responsibility of the Minister -- to present the program; that that's not detail, that is the principle.

MR. ROBLIN: comment that the subject my honourable friend raises is debatable.

MR. CAMPBELL: that's the rule.

MR. ROBLIN: No, that's your opinion of it.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The question before the House is the proposed motion by the Honourable Minister of Welfare for second reading of Bill No. 87, an Act respecting Fitness and Amateur Sport.

A standing vote was taken with the following result:

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Desjardins, Dow, Evans, Froese, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hawryluk, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Hutton, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Molgat, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Prefontaine, Reid, Roblin, Scarth, Schreyer, Seaborn, Shewman, Shoemaker, Smellie, Tanchak, Wagner, Weir Witney, Wright, Mrs. Forbes and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Nil.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 47. Nays, Nil.

Mr. Speaker declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour for second reading of Bill No. 102, an Act to amend The Labour Relations Act. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, we are dealing here with probably one of the most important bills that will be before this Session of the Legislature, and with an item that's of extreme importance to all the residents of the Province of Manitoba. Possibly the best proof of that would be the statement made in this year's report of the Labour Department by the Deputy Minister himself. On page 13 he says, "Labour relations will continue to hold the popular spotlight for years to come. There is little which more directly affects the individual living in Manitoba, and no one can gainsay that the relationships between the generality of employers and their employees have shown fewer upsets in Manitoba than elsewhere in Canada." Mr. Speaker, this agrees with the statement which has been made in this House -- I made it myself in the Throne Speech debate; the Leader of the NDP made it here; I think the Minister himself -- that we have a good labour relations in the Province of Manitoba these past few years. It might be useful in that regard, Mr. Speaker, to examine exactly what has gone on in this matter of strikes and labour relations, and I've obtained here the copies of the departmental reports for some years back. This first that I'm going to quote from is the one for the year ending March 31st, 1957, and it shows that in that year one strike took place during the period of negotiations. The strike was by 55 truck drivers. It lasted for two hours and 40 minutes. That was 1957. The fiscal year for the departments changed then and the next report is a nine-month report ending December 31st, 1957, and its statement, page 50, is "there were not strikes or lock-outs during the period over negotiations for collective agreements, renewals or amendments. None whatever. The following year, ending December 31st, 1958, we find that there were two strikes during that period -- one of a certain Winnipeg hotel employees covering some 400 people lasting five days; another one, Pioneer Electric employees, some 60 people, lasting from October 24 to November 4. The following year, ending December 31, 1959, again the same report, we find that there were two work stoppages during that year -- one, employees of some sash and door companies, 90 employees affected from the 12th to the 25th of June; another one, employees of the Co-op in Flin Flon of the retail clerks, some 40 employees lasting from the 17th to the 21st of December. Next year, December 31, 1960, we must admit the situation is not quite so good in that year. There were some 11 strikes -- I won't go through them all -- that did involve a large number of employees. In 1961 -- and that is the latest report we have from the Minister -- things had improved and we had some five strikes during that period covering some 60 employees. Mr. Speaker, when you relate that situation in Manitoba with the fact that there are -- the best figures I can obtain -- some 55,000 employees covered by collective agreements, I think that we are justified in agreeing with the Deputy Minister, that the statements that were made here do indicate that we have had good relations.

Now this doesn't mean, of course, Mr. Speaker, that we should not be looking at our laws. Once again here, I would like to quote from the Deputy Minister himself. Same page, he says,

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd) "Yet there's no excuse for complacency, and just as industrial accident prevention programs must aim at eliminating the hazard that causes the accident, so in labour relations emphasis must be concentrated upon eliminating the causes of discord." And I skip a few paragraphs and he says: "There is much, much more to the employer-employee relationship than doing routine work in return for stated wages and fringe benefits. That industry and commerce have thrived in Manitoba is a credit to all concerned, but neither management nor labour leaders can make their proper and necessary contribution if they merely accept without query as to intrinsic validity the procedures they have inherited." With this, Mr. Speaker, I agree as well. Our conditions are changing and are changing ever more rapidly and we must be prepared to look at our laws in the light of those conditions. Certainly in the field of employment, the development of automation, the increase in fringe benefits, and one big factor -- the growing competition that we are finding, not only in the markets of Manitoba, but as well those markets to which we export. All these factors mean that we have to be constantly revising our own position here; comparing it to other jurisdictions; making sure that we are doing the right thing.

Now this is what I am concerned about, Mr. Speaker, in this legislation, that we do the right thing, and I mean by this, the right thing for all parties involved; the right thing for employees; the right thing for employers; and above all, the right thing for the consumers, for the people of the province. This means, Mr. Speaker, that we have to look at the situation very carefully. As I said on the Throne Speech, the policy that we follow in labour matters are those of conciliation, cooling off periods, negotiation, voluntary arbitration, and everything done to ensure if possible, a mutually agreeable understanding between the parties involved. And this, to me, is of the essence in this matter. Just as in a marriage, the vows that are made at the altar are no guarantee of happiness in the marriage, similarly in labour-management relations. There cannot be a guarantee of proper agreement without mutual respect and mutual understanding between the parties involved. This is what we must strive for in our legislation.

Here again, there's any amount of evidence, Mr. Speaker, to support my views, that too often in the past the parties involved have looked upon each other as contestants rather than as partners. The Deputy Minister, again in this year's report, on Page 14, says: "So long as management and labour operate merely as contestants for the profits of enterprise, they are both foredoomed to failure; but as soon as they deliberately join forces with proper regard for the several contributions in giving the best possible quality of goods and services to themselves and their families as consumers, in ample quantity and with a minimum of unearned levies by opportunists, they will find the rewarding field of joint and constructive endeavor which will be their sufficient justification." This, Mr. Speaker, is the policy of the Party which I represent.

Last year at our leadership convention -- I'll quote only one short paragraph to the statement that we made. "The Liberal Party of Manitoba subscribes to the view that there is no incompatibility between the interests of employers, employees and the general public. We do not believe in the class struggle. We believe that the real interests of management and labour can be shown to coincide if representatives of both are brought together to negotiate their differences with a reasonable attempt on both sides to reach agreement." This, Mr. Speaker, I come back, is the spirit in which we must look at this legislation if it is to be successful. Too often in the past, the Deputy Minister himself says, there has been a pro-management view and a pro-labour view, and we cannot pass good legislation with that background.

Very recently there has been an exhaustive study made of certain labour matters. Quoting now from the Canadian Bar Review, March 1962, and it's a book review, a book entitled "Government-Supervised Strike Votes" by S.R. Anton, Professor of Political Economy, University of Alberta. This is a study that this professor made under a grant from the federal government. He states in his conclusions -- this is the book review -- "Legislation is thus seen both by the opposing parties and by the public as a pro-management or pro-labour value judgment of the legislature, rather than as an even-handed adjustment of competing interests. This image brings legislation into disrepute and if evasion is not actually condoned, at least obedience to the law is achieved in an atmosphere unlikely to produce industrial peace. One wonders whether labour legislation might not better achieve its objectives if followed consensus between labour and management rather than being imposed on one party at the behest of the other."

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that at this time, in the aftermath of the Brandon strike, and I think also in the overflow of a great deal of labour news from across the line to the south of us, that there is a danger that we could be proceeding with labour laws that would seem to one party or to the other, to be aimed against them rather than laws aimed at the general agreement of all. One need only listen and read back the speeches made here last week in this matter. The Minister presented his bill in a very quiet, in fact one would think that his whole purpose was to protect the union man. When listening to the Leader of the NDP and to believe him, one would be convinced that to pass this law would mean the end of all the unions in the Province of Manitoba. Now surely, Mr. Speaker, this is indicative of a bad situation. It seems to me that we cannot deal with this on an emotional basis. We must look at it from a cool, unbiased, proper attitude if we are to achieve the right solution.

Possibly here we should look, Mr. Speaker, at what's been done in other jurisdictions. Let us take, for example, the Province of Ontario, and I would suggest that Ontario is probably one of the areas that we in this province should look at very carefully when dealing with this particular subject. After all, labour matters are much more important to that province than they are to Manitoba. They have a great deal more of labour and organized labour than we have here. Here, Mr. Speaker, I'm quoting from a book, "The Labour Relations Board in Ontario" -- a Study of the Administrative Tribunal, " by Adam Bhoneke, and this is produced by the Industrial Relations Centre, McGill University. He states, as he is reviewing the labour legislation of that province -- so far he has been speaking of the period up until 1957 -- he says: "Throughout all those years, however, the pressure of public opinion for public enquiry into the field of industrial relations was steadily mounting. In March 1957, the government responded to these demands by appointing a select committee of the Ontario Legislature" -- and this is quotes -- "to examine into and report regarding the operations and administration of The Labour Relations Act in all of its aspects. The Select Committee performed its task in a conscientious manner. From April 1957 to July 1958 it held 61 meetings, 16 of which were organizational and executive sessions, and 45 were devoted to public hearings. A large number of representatives of various labour, management and other groups concerned, as well as some noted specialists in industrial relations, appeared before the Committee. Altogether, the committee received 90 briefs containing 715 recommendations, a great majority of them suggesting amendments to the Act. Following upon this, the committee reported to the Legislature on the 10th of July 1958, and some year and a half later on February 24th, 1960, the Bill was presented to that House." That, Mr. Speaker, has been the experience in a province very close to us, in a province, as I said, that has more to do in this field than we have.

Coming back to Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, what has been said here? Well, Mr. Justice Tritschler in his report on the Brandon Packers enquiry made quite a number of recommendations, not the least of which is a strong recommendation for more public education in this matter of industrial relations. On page 87 of the report, it says: "Nearly everyone is an employer or an employee and the bulk of the population are affected by, and ought to have some understanding of the problems of industrial relations. In the opinion of the Commission, the rank and file of labour and management are insufficiently instructed in this subject. There is evidence of ignorance, misinformation, misunderstanding and apathy." Then there are a number of things which he recommends where greater teaching should be done -- the use of the university; the use of the high school; the use of the affiliated colleges; and one in particular, "every encouragement should be given to the establishment of labour-management institutes and seminars." In other words, Mr. Speaker, through all this the same pattern; more information, more knowledge, more study.

Now the Minister said the other day that there's no need for more study in this subject, that there's been ample time to do this. Well I can tell the Minister this, I have endeavoured to study it. I've spoken to labour leaders; I've spoken to people in the legal profession; and I've spoken to management; and I've found, Mr. Speaker, that, by and large, the attitude that they take in this regard is directly a reflection of the professional field in which they are. When you speak to the labour leaders, they take the position that this could be very dangerous. When you speak to management, they take the position that this is absolutely essential and a great deal more. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that we can arrive at the proper solution without

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . a good thorough study and more information to both sides in this particular field.

I'd like to refer now, Mr. Speaker, to the bill itself and certain aspects of it. I appreciate that under second reading, it isn't the time to go into the details and it's not a question of going into section by section, but the basic principles of the bill, as I see them, are two, and I would like to cover just briefly those.

The first one deals with the question of strike votes and it calls for the board to conduct every strike vote by secret ballot. The information I obtained, Mr. Speaker, the majority of the labour unions now have in their constitution that there should be a secret strike vote. The difference seems to be, who is the supervisor? Whether it's to be the union itself or whether it's to be government. Here again it might be useful to look at what's been done elsewhere. My information is that the Province of Ontario, in their very recent Act passed in 1960, came to the conclusion that the proper way to do this was to treat the labour unions as responsible people; leave them supervise their own strike votes; but if it were found that they did not follow this procedure, then the government would intervene. This is not what the present act provides. The act in Manitoba as presented to us now would appear to provide for a supervision in all cases by government, meaning that the unions, in the opinion of the government, are unable to regulate themselves. The study to which I referred by Professor Anton was one directly related to government-supervised strike votes, and this is what the Professor stated: "Available evidence does not appear to support a clear-cut prima facie case justifying the proposed extension of strike vote legislation into the labour legislation of those provinces which are under pressure to adopt such a requirement." Then further on: "Recent Ontario legislation implicitly assumed what Professor Anton's study discloses, the virtually universal provision for a strike vote found in union constitutions. The Ontario legislation is addressed to the danger that zealous union officers or a vocal minority might coerce an indifferent majority by social pressures or propaganda into voting for a strike they do not favour. Accordingly, the remedy applied is not government supervision but rather the secret ballot internally conducted." That then is the experience in other jurisdictions in this matter, Mr. Speaker.

One small item, which I might refer in passing, in the bill is that of the mediator. I note that the government intends to have his costs and salaries paid for by the union and the companies who employ the mediator. I might suggest that, as a mediator is in certain cases only a replacement for the conciliation board and that conciliation boards have normally been paid for by the government, that it might be wise to keep this same provision instead of making a change.

The other major principle, Mr. Speaker, is that of making unions legal entities. Well again here, in my search for information, I found a great deal of variety. We need only look at the court decision in this province, where there appears to be a conflict at the moment between the judges as to whether or not you can sue a union at the moment, to show the difficulty of the situation. It's not quite as simple as one would first assume. The Minister says it is; the Leader of the NDP says it will ruin the unions. I think it has to be looked at very carefully. I think we have to look again at other provinces and other areas where the same situations develop to see what is the proper and the right answer. I'd like to point out here that, in the legislation as written at the moment there is no protection for the union which is not involved directly in what might be called an illegal strike. Let us assume a branch plant and some over-enthusiastic union member convinces the members there to go out on strike. The union itself, the leadership may not have approved or assisted or done anything with the strike, the illegal strike, and yet under the legislation they would be assumed to be responsible. Again I think if you check other jurisdictions, you will find that in most cases there is some way; where there's no responsibility on the part of the unions, that they do not become involved.

One much more important aspect though, Mr. Speaker, is that of the protection of the individual union member. The Minister spoke about this the other day. I fail to find in the bill where there is protection for the individual union member in relationship to his union, except where it deals with a bargaining agreement. Let's take the situation which was certainly very well known here in the Province of Manitoba, that of Tunney versus Orchard, or the Teamsters' Union. I cannot see under the present legislation where Tunney would be protected any more than he is at the moment. He would still have to have the same very difficult, let us face it,

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) recourse that he did; and one only needs to follow that case to see how costly and how, in the interests of the labour man himself, unsatisfactory the whole arrangement was. This, I fail to see, provides any protection of that sort for the member.

So those are the details of the bill that I wanted to cover, Mr. Speaker, but I come back to my original point that we must produce labour laws with understanding and mutual respect between the two immediate parties involved, labour on the one side and management on the other. Unless we do that, Mr. Speaker, we will have great difficulty in having sane and good labour laws which will work to the advantage of everyone. That is why I suggested in the Throne Speech debate originally, and why I suggest again to the government, that when you look at the background of our labour laws in the Province of Manitoba; when you look at the very few strikes that we have had in relationship to the total number of people involved; when you look at that background, that there is no need to rush at this moment into a change in the law unless we are absolutely certain that that is the right change and that it will yield the results that we seek. I suggest to the Minister that this bill should be referred to the Industrial Relations Committee. I suggest to him that the committee should be empowered to sit at the end of this session if it has not completed its work and I suggest that it would not have completed its work because I'm sure there will be a large number of representations made to this. I think there's a great deal to study. We could very well look at the other provinces. If we were to do that, I think we could arrive at an act that would be mutually satisfactory to the two main parties and that it would then be followed by them in a much better spirit than the one which we're in danger of getting into if we proceed at this time.

Possibly again, Mr. Speaker, I could refer here, in my conclusion, to the statement of the Deputy Minister of this Department. In 1960, a year ago, in the report then he stated and he submitted his report to his Minister, Page 7: "Labour relations always have been and will long continue to be a field of cut and try; effort and error; conflict and confusion. When one remembers the past, when the employee was less valuable than the machine because more easily and cheaply replaceable, it is understandable that the employees should now, with their newly-recognized status in power, seek an ever-improving share in the products of industry and commerce; but this is an over-simplification of the matter. Employers and employees alike and the whole human race are consumers of these products and the objectives of employers and employees have not yet been identified in terms of the welfare of them all as consumers, least of all, have they been identified in terms of the amazing strides in mechanization, automation and invention. It is imperative that an objective and practical investigation be made into the inter-relation of production, pay, price, profit and consumption. To such an investigation, industry and commerce; organized and unorganized labour; the universities; public service organizations, religious and secular; must contribute in a selfless way if the answer is to be found."

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in the interests of good labour relations in this province, in the interests of our growing industrialization in Manitoba, that we should take a very careful look at this whole matter. We will not oppose the second reading of this bill. We do it, with a suggestion to the Minister that he refer it to the Industrial Relations Committee; that the Committee be empowered to sit between sessions; that we work together; ask all the parties, as his own Deputy Minister has suggested, to arrive at the proper solution of this problem.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that the debate be adjourned.

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

. Continued on next page.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 75. The Honourable the Minister of Health. Mr. Johnson (Gimli), presented Bill No. 75, an Act respecting the Sanatorium Board of Manitoba for second reading.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, the Lieutenant-Governor having been made acquainted with the purpose of this bill has given his consent so far as Her Majesty's interests are concerned that the House may do therein as they shall think fit.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this second reading of this Bill respecting the Sanatorium Board of Manitoba, this particular method of bringing it in was recommended as necessary by the Clerk of the House and that is why the message has followed the introduction in the second reading. The purpose of this bill is to transfer the title of the property on which the Rehabilitation Hospital is built from the government to the Sanatorium Board. The board is presently holding a 99 year lease on the property, and since the board is regarded as the nominal owner of the hospital building it was considered desirable that the board should have title to the property for the sake of legal consistency. In any case, ownership of both buildings and land by the Sanatorium Board will be provisional only since it is predicated on the agreement between the board and the government under which ownership is ultimately vested in by the government. In presenting this to the House it was felt by the Legislative Counsel that it was necessary that the agreement be appended thereto so that the honourable members would not be asked to validate something which was not produced for them. This is really the whole purpose of this bill. It is felt warranted by the legal counsel of the Sanatorium Board and the Legislative Counsel here, in that the province is transferring this land to the Sanatorium Board.

MR. SPEAKER: question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I can see the logic of the presentation that the Honourable the Minister has made following the representations of the Sanatorium Board. I have no disagreement with them. What I do rise to ask you to enlighten us on, Mr. Speaker, is the method of presentation and the consent of His Honour. It's contained in a way that is unusual -- in fact as far as I'm concerned I think it's unique -- and I would like you, Mr. Speaker, to give us an explanation of why it's brought in this way.

MR. SPEAKER: I might refer the Honourable Member for Lakeside to Beauchesne, fourth edition, page 231, which reads as follows: "The consent of the King or Queen, as the case may be, (to be distinguished from the Royal Assent of Bills) is given by a Privy Counsellor to Bills (and occasionally amendments) affecting local and personal interests which concern the royal prerogative, the hereditary revenue of personal property or interests of the Crown or Duchy of Cornwall (May, 598). The Royal Consent cannot be communicated in committee, is generally given at the third reading, and its omission, when it is required, renders the proceedings on the passage of a Bill null and void. Similarly to the Consent is the form of communication from the Crown "placing its interest at the disposal of Parliament", which is required in the case of Public Bills specially affecting the rights of the Crown, its patronage or prerogative, and should be given before the committee stage. In 1868 the Queen placed her interest at the disposal of Parliament for the purpose of a Bill in reply to an Address of the House of Commons. This consent of the Crown may be given either by a special message, or by a verbal statement from a Minister. In the Canadian House, it is generally signified on the motion for the second reading, though cases will be found of its having been given at other stages. The procedure with respect to signifying the "consent" is different from that in giving the recommendation of the Crown. The recommendation precedes every grant of money, the consent may be given at any stage before final passage, and is always necessary in matters involving the rights of the Crown, its patronage, its property or its prerogatives. In any case where a private member wishes to obtain the consent of the Crown, he may ask the House to agree to an Address for leave to proceed thereon before the introduction of the Bill." And in this instance the Crown is giving something away and it's desirable that they do have a message from His Honour.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's an interesting point and I appreciate your comments on it. I think it's perfectly clear and knowing this government as well as I do I'm not surprised to see them start giving things away now.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 76, an Act to amend the Limitation of Actions Act. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry) presented Bill No. 76, an Act to amend the Limitation of Actions Act for second reading.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and put the question.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, honourable members will recall in 1960 making an amendment to this statute which extended the limitation period on oil leases which might be under contest in court following upon a one-man Royal Commission, the Norton Commission, which made certain recommendations to the government in that respect. Last fall, as a measure to ensure that people involved in this Royal Commission were aware of their rights, we caused a circular letter to be sent to all persons who had made submissions to that Royal Commission as available from the list given to us by the Royal Commission. A number of them reported back, Mr. Speaker, that they were unaware of the right that had been accorded by the Legislature to them giving them the extended period of time in which to bring suit or action with respect to contested matters of mineral rights on their properties. As a result of this we thought it was advisable and in the interests of the people affected to give a further year's extension on the period that had already been given -- the two year period that had already been given -- and this is the purpose of the amendment. The former period expired on the 31st of December, 1961. Members will notice that this legislation is retroactive to that day so that there is no period or vacuum in between, the action will continue, and any right that they have to bring action will now not expire until the 31st of December, 1962.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable the Attorney-General a question? I understood him to say in his opening sentences that this bill dealt with cases where actions had been commenced. I think he didn't say that because he later -- I'm sure I misunderstood him because his later comments made it clear I think that this applies to all contracts that were entered into. Well, that being the case I'm certainly going to compliment the Honourable Minister for bringing in this legislation -- but I'll disappoint him too. Having complimented him I'll disappoint him, because I'll have to tell him that he's going to be deprived of the pleasure of listening to a speech that I was going to make on this subject. Seeing that this has come in I won't have to make that speech. I'm glad it's come.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I simply rise to compliment the Minister too. I wasn't aware of the fact that the Honourable Member for Lakeside was going to make a speech in respect of this matter because I was in the process of preparing one likewise, but now that this legislation is here it will save the House from two speeches apparently.

MR. CAMPBELL: Two speeches --

MR. LYON: If no one else wishes to speak--

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, one question of the Minister. Will those people concerned be informed of this, or have you a list of those that are desirous of starting action?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the first comment I must make after hearing from the Honourable Member for Lakeside and the Honourable Leader of the NDP, is that it is a real shame that posterity is being denied these wonderful addresses that I am sure they were prepared to give.

MR. EVANS: First time I have ever heard anybody making speeches about not making speeches.

MR. LYON: The second point with respect to the question raised by the Honourable Member for Lakeside. This does refer generally to rights of action rather than to actions that have been commenced. And with respect to the point raised by the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party, the only list we have is the list of those persons who appeared before the Commission. It was that list that we used last fall -- I believe it was some time in October -- just to advise the people that this period was coming to a close, and it would be our expectation and intention to use the same list again to advise them again that the period has now been extended again and that they have until the end of this year to bring action if they wish to do so.

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

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 77, an Act to amend the Surrogate Court Act for second reading.

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 78, an Act to amend the County Courts Act for second reading.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): one question, Mr. Speaker, and this refers to the other bills as well -- they're all complementary. It may not be a fair question to ask but is there any intention on the part of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council by Order-in-Council to change the hours in any of these courts? And the second question is that supposing a judge who resigns his office or is appointed to another court or is retired under the Judges Act, he's given the power within eight weeks of his retirement or removal or resignation within which to finish a judgment in respect of a case which he has heard. Now supposing he doesn't wish to do so?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister indicate what changes in the hours are going to be made and if the hours are going to be made what are the employees affected going to be compensated?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable Member from Selkirk has observed, these bills are all complementary and they include -- the same sections are common to all of the bills. I should say with respect to those sections dealing with the retirement of judges pursuant to section 99 of the British North America Act, the other sections previously obtained in the various Court Acts and we merely add this new provision to look after the situation which has arisen by virtue of that amendment which involves the compulsory retirement of judges at age 75.

The hypothetical question that the Honourable Member for Selkirk put to me, I really can't answer. I would love to be in a position some day, perhaps, to be able to answer that question from the position of one who would know, on reaching the age of 75, but I really can't tell my honourable friend. Certainly it's not contemplated within the legislation. I'm sure that we can always depend though upon judges as we have been able to in this province over the years to do what is right, fitting and proper toward the end of their terms.

With respect to the question raised by the Honourable Member from St. George, the power is being accorded to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to establish hours of Court. It should be noted that that section will not come in except on proclamation. It is true that consideration is being given because of volume of work, particularly in the Winnipeg offices; and this section refers, of course, only to the offices of the court, that is the offices through which pleadings and so on are filed and other documents are filed, not with sittings of the courts themselves. Consideration is being given to extending the hours particularly during the long vacation in July and August because of the volume of work that we find growing and accumulating in our courts particularly in the eastern judicial district. I can't answer my honourable friend in detail as to what the hours would be because that has not been decided and I can only assure him that the interests of the staff, as is the usual case, will always be attended to faithfully by this government.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House may I direct another question to the Attorney-General? He has intimated to us that he might through personal experience be able to answer that question. Could he advise us when he expects to receive his appointment?

MR. LYON: I wish I could.

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

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 79, an Act to amend the Court of Appeal Act for second reading.

MR. LYON presented Bill No. 80, an Act to amend the Queen's Bench Act for second reading.

MR. HUTTON presented Bill No. 86, an Act to authorize the Reimbursement of Certain Municipalities for Amounts paid for Bounties on Predatory Animals for second reading.

MR. HUTTON: well I think the title of bill in itself is self-explanatory and the House has dealt with bills of this kind every year.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I think this bill is different to the ones that we have dealt with, and so at the moment I would like to ask a question of the Honourable the Minister. Is it not a fact that this bill is incorporating the same principle that was contained in the

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) . . . resolution that we dealt with just at the opening of today's sitting? -- (interjection) -- I think it is. Is it not?

MR. HUTTON: What principle are you speaking of?

MR. CAMPBELL: The principle of paying less than what has formerly been paid to these municipalities. I have a second question that I'll put to the Honourable Minister that he can answer at the same time. Does this bill not also rather controvert the statement that he made earlier in the day that it was becoming all too much of the rule for the municipalities to ignore the time limit of getting their accounts into the department. Because I notice there are only two municipalities concerned here, and those for comparatively small amounts.

MR. HUTTON: Well it's true that in the numbers of municipalities involved at the present time under the present legislation and in referring this matter annually to the House you have a type of control, but if this were taken as we want to do in the future, taken out of the hands of -- have the authority vested in the Minister to do what the legislature has done -- then you'll remove this restriction, if you like, upon the municipalities. We feel it is something that the legislature should not have to deal with every year, it means just more paper, and we feel that there should be provision for the Minister to be able to authorize these payments. But at the same time unless you implement the principle of a penalty, I'm afraid it wouldn't mediate to a condition that we would want to see exist. And so it is because of the change that we contemplate making that we would anticipate that there could be some -- I wouldn't say abuse but you tend to take the onus off the municipality, because at the present time they know that they must come to the legislature and that in itself tends to discipline -- maybe that's not the best term to use, but nevertheless there is a certain element of discipline in the fact that they have to come to the legislature. At the same time, we feel it's something that shouldn't have to come to the legislature. But you know you're caught on a two-pronged fork here therefore you have to impose some penalty. I would hope that no municipality should have to suffer any financial loss through the penalty, and maybe it's too much of a penalty, but we can try it and see how it works.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Committee of the Whole House.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department 5 - Education. Resolution 22 - passed.

MR. DAVID ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose I was making a few comments about the pension situation. I don't want to repeat what I said the other night. I want to say, however, Mr. Chairman that I have checked my sources of information and I think these sources of information are reliable, and I reiterate again that to the best of my knowledge in no other province do the school districts contribute to pension plans. And if the Minister has information which would indicate that this is not the situation, I think that members of this committee would be interested in hearing this.

I said the other night, Mr. Chairman, that the average monthly pension in Manitoba for retired teachers is one of the lowest in the Dominion of Canada; it's certainly the lowest in the four Prairie Provinces by a very substantial amount. Now, Mr. Chairman, according to a survey made by the Canadian Teachers' Federation to determine the relationship of Manitoba pensions granted to teachers in 1958-59 and those of other provinces, we find the following facts. For teachers with 30 to 35 years experience, Manitoba rates sixth out of seven provinces -- sixth from the bottom. With teachers from 35 to 40 years experience, Manitoba rates seventh out of seven at the bottom. With teachers over 40 years experience, Manitoba ranks seventh out of eight provinces. In June of 1960, Mr. Chairman, the pension fund had over \$16 million in its reserves. This is increasing at a rate of about \$2 million a year. In 1960 teachers paid in almost a million and a half dollars; the government and the school districts together paid in almost \$1 million, but the 648 teachers on pensions got only \$681 thousand. Many teachers are retiring on pensions of less than one-third of what they had been making as teachers. This is wrong in principle, Mr. Chairman, and is contrary to the system which this government

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) . . . established for our own civil servants. And as I said the other night, I can see no difference in principle between the two groups of employees. Teachers who leave the profession or the province before they have taught for three years automatically forfeit their pension contribution. The Minister has announced that legislation will be brought in changing this but we have no assurances that the teachers will be entitled to the entire amount which they have contributed. Manitoba Teachers' Society has calculated that this forfeiture amounts to about \$100 thousand a year.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that in my opinion, there can be no moral justification for this. The Minister said the other night that those who say that this is illegal are wrong. I am not the lawyer and I don't want to challenge that, but I want to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that while it may be legal, it is in fact, just as much theft as if it were not illegal -- and if for no other reason, Mr. Chairman, that the money, instead of going, which is forfeited -- money paid entirely by the teachers instead of going at least into that part of the fund, contributed by the teachers, goes into the government's share of the funds -- (interjection) -- The Minister says "no," but it goes into the unfunded part and the government then I suppose pays that much less. Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is proposing again that we have another committee with experts representing the various interests to make another study, presumably to make a report--

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Minister of Education)(Dauphin): Mr. Chairman, I don't suppose that anything I say will have any bearing with the honourable member, but at no time have I used the word "study." May I repeat that my statement was that we proposed to introduce legislation. I referred to a committee to do the preparatory work for the legislation and that in planning for the revised pension plan, etcetera. At no time did my statement say that we were going to study anything.

MR. ORLIKOW: Well, Mr. Chairman, the difference is so minute that in fact it's no different. The fact is that the committee will be -- doing what? -- it will be, I presume, preparing the legislation, preparing the, I suppose, detailed figures on cost and sharing of cost. Call it what you want. In fact, the legislation which will make the basic changes which even the Minister now says are needed, will not be brought into this House until next year. So call it what you want, it will still be 1963 before the basic changes will be made. If the Minister wants to quibble about the wording I have no real objection as long as we understand in this committee that it will be at least 1963 before we get these changes which we all agree we ought to have.

Now I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that in my opinion, there is no need for this long detailed -- not study, the Minister better supply a better word -- preparation, because after all we have had recommendations from the Royal Commission; we have had a recommendation -- a pretty detailed recommendation from the Manitoba Teachers' Society, and surely, Mr. Chairman, we have had enough in the way of preparation. It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that if the government were prepared to accept the same principle for the teachers' pensions as it has already accepted for the civil servants as a whole, that there is no real need for this detailed preparation. Except this, Mr. Chairman, I can only assume that what the Minister and the government have in mind is that we need a funded plan -- a fully funded plan, because obviously if we have a fully funded plan, the details must be worked out very precisely. I want to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there is no, absolutely no need for a fully funded plan particularly since the whole trend of government pensions is away from funded plans, and if we don't need a funded plan, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we can go ahead right away. Funded plans, as far as governments are concerned, are certainly going out of style, and so they should, because the only reason for funding a plan, Mr. Chairman, is that you have to have guarantees that the employees who are paying into a plan will, that the money will be available when they retire. And for private plans this is obviously required, but surely the government's promise to pay is sufficient, because if the government's promises to pay the pensions which are agreed upon for teachers or any other group are not lived up to -- if they're not funded -- then surely the government's promises to pay any other amounts of money for education or for welfare or for anything else, cannot be expected to be counted upon, so I see no reason why we need to fund a plan. And in fact, Mr. Chairman, in nearly every other province they've gone away from the complete funding of the plan.

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.)

And without going into detail I just want to draw the attention of the committee to what is happening in other provinces. In British Columbia the teachers' pension fund is not fully funded; Alberta has no government fund at all. After the depletion of the old fund, the government will pay 100% of its share of the pensions for teachers from current account. In Saskatchewan there is an account but it is not funded and all money is in the hands of the Provincial Treasurer. In Ontario, the scheme is not funded but the government guarantees payment out of Consolidated Fund. In Quebec there is no fund on the part of the government or the teacher. The government guarantees the pension. In New Brunswick they have a fund for teachers' contribution but the government simply guarantees its share. In Nova Scotia the government matches the teachers' contribution and adds \$325,000 a year to the fund. In Prince Edward Island they follow the same procedure as New Brunswick and a similar procedure is followed in Newfoundland. So, Mr. Chairman, if we adopt the basic principle that the teachers are entitled to an adequate pension and that the government's contribution over a period of years should be approximately what the contribution is of the teachers in total amount, there is no need for funding, and I submit, Mr. Chairman, there is no need for the detailed preparation which the Minister suggests is required and therefore proposes that no legislation be brought in 'til next year. The teachers are now paying enough as their share of an adequate pension plan; we are now paying enough if our portion does not need to be funded, and so I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the pension scales could be increased immediately.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to close by reading to the members of this House and by commending to the Minister a statement made in this House on March 7 of this year, and members will find it on page 498. We were discussing then, Mr. Chairman, the civil service pension, and the First Minister made a statement which I think is much more eloquent and much more expressive of basic principles than anything which I could do, and so I want to take just a minute or two to read the several paragraphs and commend it to the members of this House and commend it to the Minister. And here is what he says: "We formerly had a fully-funded plan. Under the semi-funded plan the employees pay in their 6% which accumulates with full interest to their credit to provide a fund from which pensions shall be paid when the employees retire from the service. The government does not match that amount in any way at all, because their contribution is not funded. Their contribution is paid at the time the pensions are paid. Where we pay the same as the employee, indeed more than the employee, is when the pensions are paid out -- not on the funded basis when the money is paid in in the first instance. Our contribution here represents what we need this year to match and more than match the payment that the fund is making to civil servants who have retired. On that basis my honourable friend is correct in saying we are matching and more than matching the contributions, because you have on one hand the pension fund which the employees have created and which pays out a pension of a sum towards pensions. On the other hand, you have the provincial government which matches that payment to retired civil servants, and indeed more than matches it, because we assumed the responsibility of taking care of those payments that might have been made, and perhaps should have been made in days gone by by employees who have now retired, in order that their pensions should not be based on the old rather low pension -- I could say niggardly -- I could use a lot of adjectives about it but I'm not going to. I'm simply going to say that they are lower than they are now." Mr. Chairman, I could go on reading but I think that the First Minister expressed, in explaining the civil service pension, enunciated their principles which are equally applicable to the teachers, and if these principles were adopted by the government and adopted by this committee, there would be no need, Mr. Chairman, for another delay of at least a year before we got down to the payment of an equitable pension to our teachers.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know that in the back of some people -- and I'm not suggesting in the back of the mind of the Minister -- but in the back of the minds of some trustees, at least, and in the back of the minds of some people in the general public, is the feeling -- because I've heard it expressed -- that the teachers are doing quite well enough now -- and that may be, Mr. Chairman, insofar as salaries are concerned. Although I think if members of the committee were to compare the salaries of teachers in Manitoba with the salaries of teachers in other parts of Canada, one would find that our teachers are not overpaid. But even if it's accepted

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) . . . that our teachers are adequately paid, Mr. Chairman, that is no reason for our teachers continuing for one more year -- for one more month, to get a pension which is completely inadequate. Mr. Chairman, I think that when the Minister says we have to wait another year, that he is being overly cautious and that it's completely unnecessary.

MR. MOLGAT: on the matter of teachers' pensions. On the 19th of February when we -- a very few days after we opened the House -- on the Throne Speech debate, I spoke about this matter, and at that time I quoted directly from "The Manitoba Teacher," the publication of the Teachers' Society, an article on teachers' pensions by Mr. Gordon Newton. I outlined to the House at that time the whole background of this matter insofar as the Minister was concerned. Now subsequent to that the First Minister, in his reply to the Throne Speech debate, of course attacked the previous government and said they hadn't done it, and so on. That's his normal reply when he hasn't explanation for not having done something, he accuses the others -- but he went on to say then, on the 26th of February: "But I want to give my opinion on that it isn't a very good scheme for teachers' pensions. I want to give my opinion, Sir, that it does need a very considerable reform and overhaul, but I don't think that all those complaints of undue delay were quite as justified coming from the mouths of the honourable gentlemen who made them. I will say this, that in this session we do hope to make some improvements in the teacher pension plan and we acknowledge the responsibility to see that a thorough reform and overhaul of that plan takes place just as soon as is reasonable under the circumstances, and that is exactly what we are going to do."

On the introduction of his estimates last week, the Minister responsible said, "I draw attention to the matter of teachers' pensions. We have not resolved the matter of teachers' pensions, although some legislation will be introduced during this session and we will have an opportunity of discussing that fully before we complete our session here. I acknowledge however, that this is a problem. The pension plan in the Province of Manitoba for teachers is not a good one. It requires considerable revision and I acknowledge that as frankly as I know how." Mr. Chairman, I return to the statement that I made in the opening on the Throne Speech debate. This is sheer, and nothing more than the worst type of procrastination possible. I simply cannot understand how the Minister can sit there and tell us that he is now going to set up a committee to study the subject.

MR. McLEAN: I didn't say study.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the history -- and I'll go over it because apparently the Minister doesn't want to admit that he simply has done nothing about this. This as I say, I'm quoting directly to what the teachers themselves have said, after the Royal Commission Report (1958) on education, and the very report that said: "The commission found the service type pension to be basically unsound, unrealistic and outmoded." The Minister then told the teachers that he would postpone action on teachers' pensions until after the matters of finance, secondary divisions and boundaries had been attended to, but that he would establish a committee on which the Manitoba Teachers' Society would be represented to make a thorough study of teachers' pensions. Now that, Mr. Chairman, is almost three years ago now. At the fall session of 1958, the Minister introduced the revisions to the School Act. During the months of February and March of 1959, the Minister conducted the election campaign, supposedly for larger school divisions, but really for the re-election of his government which took place the following May. The matter then of secondary divisions, finance and boundaries was settled back in 1959. Nothing more from the Minister. Well the teachers went back at him then once this matter wasn't undertaken, and in June of 1960 they had another meeting with him. They told the Minister that a detailed brief was being prepared for presentation at a later date. -- (interjection) -- Beg your pardon? That was on June 20th, 1960. The Minister indicated that he would look forward to receiving the brief, June of 1960. In November of 1960, a brief on pensions and one on group insurance were presented to the Minister. He congratulated the Society upon the clarity and thoroughness of its presentation. He further expressed his interest particularly in the type of plan and proposals for funding and promised to start the brief on its way through the proper channels. In November of 1960, that is -- on the proper channels. Now that's some year and a half ago, Mr. Chairman. In June 1961, the Society in the brief to the Minister included the following statement in the matter of pensions and so on and they told him that they'd presented their brief in November and at subsequent meetings -- so

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . they had further meetings with the Minister. Beg Pardon?

MR. McLEAN: Lots of them.

MR. MOLGAT: And they reminded him of his willingness to co-operate in the establishment of a final earnings pension plan. The Society urges the Minister to initiate an immediate study of these briefs with a view to implementing the provisions at the next session of the legislature. That, Mr. Chairman, would have been at the session a year ago. Now what does the Minister say then? The Minister promised to begin a study of the brief on pensions with the teachers as quickly as possible. He said that the details would be considered.

MR. McLEAN: I didn't say study.

MR. MOLGAT: Then in September 1961, the Society again call upon the Minister with respect to pensions. At that time the Minister indicated that he could not foresee any likelihood of action to improve teachers' pensions. And now what did the Minister do, Mr. Chairman? He tells us that he's going to set up a committee to study it. Well I simply cannot understand how this government operates and I charge him with the most complete procrastination on this subject. He should either tell the teachers that he intends to do nothing or he should have proceeded two years ago when he said he was going to.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Chairman, seeing the Minister is not quite prepared to answer the charges, I'm not going to make any further charges insofar as the pensions are concerned, but I'd like to shortly review what has happened with the divisions since they were implemented and started here in the Province of Manitoba.

When the division plan was being sold to the people of this province, it was sold on the basis that the whole foundation of the scheme was to equalize opportunity and to place the rural students or the rural boys and girls in the same position as those in the cities. And in fact, picking up the Tribune of yesterday's date I see in the the editorial that they're still playing that same type of a tune -- and, that is, that the whole thing was to give the students a chance in the rural areas to have equality of opportunity. Now there was a lot of hope generated and the plan was accepted by the people on the basis of those promises, and I think that had the government proceeded to implement the recommendation of the commission insofar as this equality of opportunity was concerned, I think that by now that opportunity would have been far nearer to equalization than what it is.

Now there does seem, Mr. Chairman, to be a very persistent rumor -- now whether it's founded on anything worthwhile or not we've been unable to find out, although we've asked the Minister for answers to certain questions, and I'm referring to the failure rates. Now there is a persistent rumor that the failure rates in the divisions are higher than they are in the old districts that are not within a division. Now whether there's anything to this rumor or not I think that before it goes too far and it is taken for granted, I think that the Minister should give us the answer to that and squelch that rumor if it is false. And if it is not false, if the results in the old school districts which do not come within the division are as good or better than those that we get out of the divisions then there is something wrong with the way we are implementing this plan.

MR. McLEAN: is the other way around.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: If it's the other way around then we are making some progress. Now, Mr. Chairman, in order to make the division plan work as we had hoped it would work, there were several things that had to be done. And, of course, the things were, more qualified teachers, better equipment, better schools, better transportation, because if we were to centralize our secondary schools then transportation became a very important part of the whole program. Now let us see what we have done since the plan has been implemented and I would like the Minister to give us an explanation for the trend that we can see. He may have a valid reason for not following the recommendations of the commission; maybe he's found out that the recommendations weren't as good as they looked in the first instance; maybe he has some other plans which are better than what the commission had recommended. But he told us the other day that insofar as the teachers are concerned -- and to me the teachers are the important factor in the over-all program -- that the permit teachers have only been reduced by two out of 480 some -- they've been reduced by two. Well that's not making progress--

MR. McLEAN: That's in the high schools.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: I'm talking about our divisions now, so that's the high schools --

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd.) . . . have been reduced by two out of 480 some odd. Well I don't call that progress. I think we'd have had that same type of progress without the division plan at all. I think we've got to show a little more consideration there. And then you wonder why that improvement isn't there. Well probably the pensions that we just heard about are one of the reasons. Maybe the teachers that we are producing in the province are going elsewhere. It could be. The Minister probably has the answer.

Now insofar as equipment is concerned. I'm told that the equipment in our rural schools -- in the new schools, the science equipment, the lab equipment, for example, isn't up to standard; that there is a great deal to be desired; that there is no grant towards science equipment insofar as reference libraries are concerned -- and I think this was raised by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead here the other day that the reference library falls within the grant of the library grant. And I don't think we need to mention the fact, Mr. Chairman, that reference books in the school are vital to a rounded out education on any subject. And I think we should have some grants there. The Minister should take a look at this.

Now what about our schools? I mentioned in the Throne Speech that according to the information I had, we were building too many schools in a division to carry out the basic principles of the recommendations of the Royal Commission. The other day the Minister laid on the table a Return and on checking that Return, Mr. Chairman, I find that although I had criticized the government that time for not following the recommendations, matters are worse than I thought they were -- much worse. Looking at this return, I find that in the Turtle River division, there are seven new schools in the one division, Mr. Chairman. Now I'm going to read out the rooms and the places where these schools have been built, that is in accordance with the Return that the Minister has filed: Alonsa - 7; Amaranth - 7; Glenella - 6; Kelwood - 7; Laurier - 7; McCreary - 9; Ste. Rose - 11. Now you would have noticed, Mr. Chairman, that there is not one 12-room school in the whole lot, and the commission felt that a 12-room school should be a minimum, and if more schools than one were needed that they should be 12-room schools. And that stands to reason, because that is the purpose of the whole thing. Here we have so far in a very short period, in a matter of less than three years, we've got seven schools in that one division already, Mr. Chairman. Now there's room probably for more by the time this government gets through with it; maybe nine or ten for all we know; maybe there is no more room for anymore. But we are getting away altogether from the principle of those recommendations.

MR. SCHREYER: They're replacing the elevators.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Yes, we're replacing the elevators as the Honourable the First Minister said at one time. The point, Mr. Chairman, is that this is establishing a precedent. Maybe the Minister will say that there's good and sufficient reason for having all these schools built in that particular division. Well I know the division fairly well and he'd have to have some reason that I'm not aware of for building these schools, except one reason, Mr. Chairman--

MR. ORLIKOW: Politics!

MR. HRYHORCZUK: He took the words right out of my mouth, so I don't have to utter them; they're already on record. The point is this, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister trying to please every little town that had a high school at one time in this province by building schools to replace them? And if he's only concerned with pleasing the local people, how does he expect to carry out the recommendations of the Royal Commission? I'd like him to explain that to this House so that we can give the explanation to the people when we get back home.

Now the next point, of course, in this particular division transportation is no question because the schools are close to the home to most of these students anyhow. And if he carries on at this rate then the transportation will go out the window. We won't have to worry about it. But let us look at those divisions that have not been covered with new schools -- and before I leave that there's one point I mustn't forget. This Turtle River division in which there are seven new schools has a \$5 million assessment, more or less. The cost of these schools will be running pretty close to a million -- that's my estimate that that's what they'll run, close to a million. Can you imagine the load that that has placed on the local real estate tax? In construction alone, close to a million dollars in a \$5 million assessment. Now what about our transportation? In the division that I come from, I know that the students are losing a lot of

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd.) . . . time in their school, and I'd suggest that the Minister check that. During very heavy rains which we haven't had in the last summer, but when we did have some rain some of the buses couldn't go through the roads that were there. If we have a normal year there'll be many more days like that. During the winter months I think the buses were off the roads quite regularly because of lack of snow-plowing. We must make better grants toward the maintenance and the construction of the school division roads as well as the main market roads, and looking at the Public Works Department I notice that the grants towards municipalities for this type of road is being cut this year by nearly a half a million dollars. Instead of improving the roads and giving better transportation to the students in the rural areas it evidently is becoming the policy of the government to do less towards this particular fact. Now these are just some of the things that occur to me at the moment and I do believe that the Minister should give this House, and through the House, the public, information as to -- and an explanation as to why these particular things are being done and why some of them are being overlooked.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains has become the great centralizer and I shall be indeed glad to discuss that subject with him here and now.

It will be remembered that the Royal Commission report recommended, as he has told us, that high schools be limited to schools over a certain size. When I introduced the legislation for school divisions in October, 1958, I said, quite clearly and plainly, that that was one of the recommendations of the Royal Commission which we were not accepting as it had been made. There has never been any doubt -- never been any doubt whatsoever concerning our position on that particular item, but we adopted the view that it would be the decision of the trustees who would be elected in the school divisions to determine how many schools they would like to have in their particular division -- in other words, a matter for local decision. But it will be remembered, Mr. Chairman, that we had a scale of grants -- construction grants -- that did give some preference to the larger schools -- that if the division constructed a school of 12 rooms or more it had a decided advantage over any other category of high schools. And, Mr. Chairman, those who were here will remember, how I was beseeched by the members on the other side -- why this wasn't fair -- this wasn't fair to the rural parts of the province -- only the City of Winnipeg would be able to earn the maximum grant. I can see the Member for Carillon pleading with me -- pleading with me to be fair to the people in the rural parts of the province. We went into committee and we debated this back and forth and as a result -- this was in the law amendments committee -- and as a result of the desires of the members as expressed in the law amendments committee, we worked out a scale of grants that was absolutely -- how would I put it -- well, it was graded so that no one would suffer a disadvantage or gain an advantage simply by having a larger school -- and remember that this was unanimously agreed and everyone was so appreciative of how understanding I was of this serious problem that there was going to be in the rural parts of the province. In those days I wasn't apparently considered as being quite as stubborn as some folks think I am now. Well that's fine, we got that -- and I want to emphasize that scale was the scale that we were asked to have by all the members of the House and particularly those in the Opposition groups and I have no complaint about it. It was fair enough -- that's fine. Then what happened? What happened?

At the 1959 session we received the first resolution on the Order Paper asking that 75 per cent grants be made to schools irrespective of size and where did the resolution come from? From the Liberal Opposition in this House. And they kept putting it in and putting it in, and finally persuaded us that well I guess they had a point and we didn't want to be unfair -- again I was beseeched to be not so stubborn about this; this was necessary in the rural parts of the province. And I remember the Leader of the New Democratic Party -- then the CCF Party -- getting up and saying: this isn't fair, Mr. Minister, in the rural parts of the province and there is need for having some relaxation and having some occasion when this 75 percent grant can be made for a four-room school or anything over that but under 12 rooms. And we agreed. And so now what do we come? The people who were so concerned about this have now become great centralizers and they want us -- they say, "you haven't carried out the principles of the Royal Commission Report because you've left too many schools and they're too small and so

(Mr. McLean, cont'd.) . . . on. What eye wash and what hog wash. I challenge the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains to make his speech in the Village of Ethelbert and get up there and say: "Ladies and gentlemen, the principles of the Royal Commission require only one school in the division and I'm going to ask the Minister of Education to see that there is one school established in this division at Fork River--"

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Will the Honourable Minister permit a question?

MR. McLEAN: and make that speech and I would like him to invite me to be present. I would just love him to invite me to be present and hear that speech made -- in Ethelbert, in Pine River, in Winnipegosis. You tell them. You just get up and tell them that everybody should be educated in one high school in that division--

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that the Minister permit a question.

MR. McLEAN: I would invite you to have the Leader of your party with you. He wouldn't make that speech in Laurier -- I'll bet him a good new hat that he wouldn't. He stood up and he's very pleased about the high schools in his division -- which incidentally happens to be Turtle River -- and he hasn't made any objection, and I'll bet a something or other that he won't join you in that speech at Ethelbert, or any other place, or he wouldn't make it himself. Now the whole principle of this thing is that the division trustees make their own decisions. They have to take into account all of the factors that the members of this House drew to my attention so many times, that, you can't have people getting on the bus at 6:00 o'clock in the morning -- the road conditions and all the other sort of conditions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we stated the matter as clearly as we knew how on the very first occasion when this matter was ever discussed that we were not accepting the recommendations of the Royal Commission with respect to this particular item; that it was going to be a matter to be decided by the trustees in the division and I have yet to hear one member in the Opposition, with the sole exception of the Member for Emerson -- who I must acknowledge always got up and said "now the only way for this to work is to have centralization and you can only have one high school" and so on, and of course I would follow him and explain very carefully the well, that might be his opinion but that the division was not necessarily bound to do that -- but he's the only one -- and the only one of the parties opposite who got up at any time in my presence and said that in their opinion there should only be one high school in the division and that there must be centralization. I don't believe it that there must be centralization and I don't accept it, and I gave this committee figures when I made my original statement, to show the tremendous improvement we've had even now in the reduction in the number of places in which high school education is given in the Province of Manitoba -- and it's been a tremendous change and a beneficial change. And it's been made in the right way, on the basis of local decisions arrived at taking into account factors that operate in each of the individual school divisions -- and they do differ, very much. It would not be right to assume that every division has seven high schools because many of them do not have anything like that number. There are special circumstances in Turtle River. I think there are some special circumstances in Duck Mountain, which is largely represented by the Member for Ethelbert Plains. There are particular circumstances in Lakeshore division which is represented by the Member for St. George.

If it was a matter of politics, Mr. Chairman, -- if it was a matter of politics, would I have gone out of my way to help the school division trustees of Turtle River to get seven schools and get them where they wanted them? They elect the Leader of the Opposition and that's fair enough with me, but there's no politics in it for me I can assure you. We went to considerable trouble to explain and to give them the advantage of every possible financial assistance on that five million assessment that you've spoken about, in order to ensure that they would get the schools -- the number they wanted and thought they should have and at the places that they want. I can use no other term than the term hog wash and eye wash in this whole performance. The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains doesn't believe it. He's never believed it and he wouldn't get up in public in his own constituency and say so. With regard and I--

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Would the Honourable Minister give me the chance to say so before 5:30?

MR. McLEAN: I'm really going now and I think I ought to get this off my chest.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: We know when you're bluffing.

MR. McLEAN: This only happens once in a lifetime for me, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, with regard to the number of permit teachers it is true that I reported that in 1958 there were 82 permit teachers in the high schools of Manitoba. There are at this time 80 permit teachers in the Province of Manitoba and that's a reduction of two, but let me remind the members of this committee that there has been an increase -- an increase in the number of high school classrooms and teachers of over 300 in that same period of time so that we've had a reduction of two in our number of permit teachers and an increase in the total number of teachers by not less than 300 in our high schools, so that while I'm not particularly pleased that we have 80 permit teachers in the high schools, I think that we might reasonably say that we've been holding our own.

Now with regard to the rumor. I always enjoy the rumors that we hear. I must say I hadn't heard this rumor until just a few moments ago. I suppose there'll be more before we get finished. I haven't heard the rumor. I know of no conceivable way to check it; and I don't think that any useful purpose would be done in doing so. I was at the opening of a new school, if you'll pardon me, Mr. Chairman, -- I'm sorry that I was there now because people don't seem to like these new schools, but it was a kind of a nice school and it was a nice evening last evening, at which the chairman of the division board was reporting on the passing averages. And, Mr. Chairman, if there are enough individual school districts to have a higher passing average than he was reporting in that one school division last night, well I'll have more faith in rumors than I have at the present moment -- that's for certain.

Perhaps when the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains gets up tonight -- it will be after supper -- he might tell me where this lab equipment is not up to standard. This is the sort of thing, Mr. Chairman, that I suppose it's good to be discussing it but there's no use getting up and saying just a blanket charge; "the lab equipment is not up to standard." I think you'd better tell us where it is not up to standard -- name the specific place -- because obviously somebody is not doing their job and I'd like to know who it is that isn't doing the job.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I call it 5:30.