

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, April 20, 1966

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions  
Reading and Receiving Petitions  
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the second report on the Standing Committee on Private Bills, Standing Orders, Printing and Library.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Private Bills, Standing Orders, Printing and Library beg leave to present the following as their second report. Your Committee has considered Bills:

No. 86 - An Act to incorporate The Brandon Community Chest; No. 96 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate St. James Scholarship Foundation; No. 120 - An Act for the Relief of Tjitske Medgyes, Feikje Bosma and Tina Stuve. And has agreed to report the same without amendment. Your Committee has also considered Bills:

No. 66 - An Act to incorporate Manitoba Conference Corporation of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church; No. 77 - An Act respecting the Diocese of Rupert's Land; No. 106 - An Act to incorporate The Manitoba Institute of Registered Social Workers. And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

MR. CLERK: Your Committee recommends that the Fees paid in connection with the following Bills be refunded, less the costs of printing:

No. 66 - An Act to incorporate Manitoba Conference Corporation of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church; No. 77 - An Act respecting The Diocese of Rupert's Land; No. 86 - An Act to incorporate The Brandon Community Chest; No. 96 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate St. James Scholarship Foundation. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, in accordance with the report, I move seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain that the fees paid in connection with the following Bills be refunded less the costs of printing: No. 66 - An Act to incorporate Manitoba Conference Corporation of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church. No. 77 - An Act respecting The Diocese of Rupert's Land; No. 86 - An Act to incorporate the Brandon Community Chest; No. 96 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate St. James Scholarship Foundation.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion  
Introduction of Bills

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day I would like to attract your attention to the Gallery where there are some 27 Grade 8 students from Tuxedo Park School under the direction of Mr. Reimer. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education)(Gimli): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House, No. 8, on a motion from the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(Dauphin): Madam Speaker, there really ought to be a fanfare of trumpets as I put on the table the Return to an Order of the House, No. 40 asked for by the motion from the Honourable the Member for Lakeside, March 16, 1966. Since I spoke of this this morning the information which we did not have this morning has been obtained and the Return is complete.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Thank you very much.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary)(River Heights): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to reply to a question of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia who was inquiring why certain employees who terminated their

(MR. STEINKOPF cont'd).....employment with the Manitoba Telephone System between April 1965 and September 1965 did not receive retroactive pay as a result of a new agreement which was signed on September 16, 1965. The Telephone System advise me that this agreement was concluded following negotiations under which there was a conciliation officer, and there was no provision made for payment to employees who had left the service.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Provincial Secretary. Are there copies available of any working agreement between the Manitoba Employees Association and the Government of Manitoba? And if so, would it be possible to obtain one?

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, there is one agreement that was signed last year, a temporary .....agreement. I think that could be made available for the honourable member, but there is no other agreement that has been concluded since then.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I have a subsequent question to the same matter. Some of these employees were with the MTS for some 20 years, and some of them longer, according to the information that I received, and I would like to know if the Honourable Minister agrees with the agreement that was signed with MTS and MTA at that time? Personally I feel that these employees are entitled to retroactive pay.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Utilities. I directed a question to him the other day about the monies that have been deducted from Hydro employees' salaries.....

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, I replied to that the other day while you weren't in this House. The answer to that was that this is a federal law that employees who received their pay last January for services rendered even in December, the deduction had to be made by the employer.

MR. GUTTORMSON: It didn't happen in private industry.

MR. STEINKOPF: Yes, the same thing happened in private industry. This is a federal regulation. I checked it.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. STEINKOPF: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table of the House a reply to Order No. 39 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Radisson.

MADAM SPEAKER: .....the Whole House.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce)(Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, now that we have entered upon the Orders, may I ask you to call the adjourned debate on second readings at the bottom of Page 2?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 82. The Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Madam, I believe that the Honourable Member for Gladstone adjourned this debate on my behalf, and with permission of the House I would like to speak ....

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: This is one time, Madam, where we haven't got our wires crossed. I have read with a great deal of interest the remarks of the Honourable Member for Lakeside respecting this Bill, and quite frankly, Madam, I concur in everything that he has said. Frankly, I am amazed at the government having brought in legislation of this type because I was convinced about a year ago that the government's intention in expropriation matters was to place the emphasis more on acquisition by negotiation rather than acquisition by the use of the mail fist.

On August 20, 1964, on Page 97 of Hansard, I submitted a resolution to the House which died on the Order Paper. That resolution read as follows: THAT WHEREAS the Government of Manitoba through various departments and utilities purchases a great many parcels of land every year; AND WHEREAS there is often doubt in the minds of the public as to whether undue hardship has been caused by the purchase of such property, and as to whether the proper price has been paid; THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that a Committee of the Legislature be established to sit between Sessions to study and report on the following: 1. The present methods used in the purchase of land by the government boards and commissions. 2. The feasibility of establishing an agency to handle the purchase of all properties by the government; and 3. Other matters that the Committee feel should be studied and reported upon.

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd).....

When I moved that resolution, Madam, I did so with the intention and hope that we would be able to come to some conclusion in a Committee of this House regarding the best method of land acquisition to take away the sting from that word "expropriation", and to try and convince the people of Manitoba when land had to be acquired by them, that our primary interest was in protecting their liberties, and their rights, and acquiring that land by the least painful methods.

When I read Bill 82 for the first time, Madam, I was convinced that this was a most vicious piece of legislation, in fact I think its about the most inequitous piece of legislation that I have ever read. It completely denies the rights of individuals and has as its basis a main theme - the use of force, particularly the force of the state or the force of the state's agencies.

I understand that the Honourable Minister, the Attorney-General intends that this Bill should be submitted to the Committee on Statutory Rules and Regulations to be studied during recess. Madam, I have a better suggestion. I think that this Bill should be wrapped up in brown paper and sent to the Smithsonian Institute as a perpetual reminder to the world of medieval fuedalism. I am also convinced, Madam, after reading this Bill that what we need in Manitoba more than anything else is a Bill of Rights. Something that would protect the properties of individuals, and where individuals will be continued to be treated with that respect, dignity and humanity which is their entitlement.

I don't intend to go into all the aspects of this Bill as these matters were fully dealt with by my honourable colleague from Lakeside, but a study of these matters clearly indicates to me that this Bill is so far removed from what I considered would have been the intention of the government, that it actually bears no resemblance to previous discussions that we have had in this House regarding land acquisition. I believe that the Honourable Member for Lakeside has dealt with each and every objection that he has to the principles embodied in this Bill. I support the Honourable Member for Lakeside in what he has said and I concur in everything that he has said. To me there seems to be one underlying principle here which is a denial of natural justice, and that is the fact that this board which is being set up as an arbitration board, is composed of nominees of the government. This board is going to deal primarily with government agencies in the acquisition of their land. This board is going to be paid by the government. It will hold office during the pleasure of the government, can be fired at any time the government wants, and to me, when this board is going to deal with the rights of individuals, how can it deal in that impartial manner which is the basic concept of justice in this province, and justice in Canada? I have always believed, Madam, and I still believe, that who pays the piper can call the shot, and I think in this particular instance this setup of a board appointed by the government is wrong in principle and should not be adhered to.

There are numerous other matters in this bill, Madam, that are repugnant to my sense of justice, but I think I have said enough to indicate to the House that I do not intend to vote for this bill on second reading.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, if no other member wishes to speak, perhaps I might speak briefly in closing the debate. Madam Speaker, may I express my appreciation to the members of the House who have taken part in the debate and by so doing have served to illustrate the point that have to be borne in mind when one is discussing an important matter like the law relating to expropriation. The debate also illustrates the emotional overtones as so very clearly illustrated in the remarks of the Honourable Member for Selkirk, who either didn't read the bill or failed to comprehend its intent and meaning. I think it should be said whether one has achieved, whether the bill achieves that or not, as I endeavoured to say when I introduced it, that many provisions are in this Bill which are designed specifically to equalize, or attempt to equalize, the position as between the expropriating authority, which parenthetically I might say is not always the Province of Manitoba, and the person or company or whatever whose land may be the subject of expropriation. Now, one may well argue that the balance is not equal. I know very little about the expropriation law as such to be able to express any firm opinion on that score. But I do know this, Madam Speaker, that as compared to the law now, much of which has been on the statute books many years, much longer than those of us on this side of the House have been here, much is in this proposed bill that is more beneficial to the owner of land being expropriated that is now the case. And when I say that, I'm not criticizing any other person or government or anything else. I'm merely stating that we have put into this draft bill protections for the individual person whose land is being expropriated that doesn't exist at the present time. I would not claim perfection for that and I wouldn't say that we've reached the millennium, but I think that a fair appraisalment, a fair appraisalment of the Bill will indicate that to be the case.

(MR. McLEAN cont'd).....

It may well be, Madam Speaker, it may well be that there ought to be further protections and certainly when it comes to protecting the rights of the individual I count myself among those in the front ranks, because I'm very concerned about that sort of thing, and I for one would be the first to support any measures. We do of course have to remember this, and this is of course the great problem about the topic of expropriation, the very name itself arouses one's emotions. We are living in a difficult time when we are concerned about the rights, the property rights of individual citizens, and rightly so; but we live in a society when one government or another in all its aspects, school, municipal, provincial, federal, must assume more and more and more responsibilities for the provision of services, facilities of all sorts, and it simply can't be done without the acquisition of more and more land that in former times were - no one ever thought of being disturbed by a government agency. I merely put it to the members of the House that that's a fact of life and one with which we must live here and now. So our objective is to establish the machinery, establish the machinery that first of all - and that's one of the objects of this bill - first of all is in one place, so that as much as can be done we have in one place codified, if one might use that expression, the law respecting this procedure which whether we like it or not must go on from time to time.

Secondly, that it is clear and precise that it maintains what we would hope would be an even balance between those who have the authority to expropriate and those whose land is going to be affected by expropriation, and that it has within it a means of resolving differences of opinion and dispute -- and I direct this remark specifically to the, if I may to the Honourable the Member for Selkirk - based in the hope the necessary procedure is established so that wherever possible these matters may be resolved by negotiation. And I want to say that I believe that a very honest effort has been made in this draft bill before us to provide the kind of machinery which will encourage and facilitate agreements or negotiations and that it is not the mall fist as suggested but that more possibilities are provided for negotiation and settlement than is presently the case. I want to make that point without in any way claiming perfection, but I want to make it quite clear that I believe this to be an improvement on the present situation but not necessarily the final improvement that might be made.

And that brings me to another point, an important point in this debate because it proves my case. Indeed I must say that the Member for Lakeside proved it beyond any question that the procedure being adopted here was the proper procedure, namely to introduce a bill which would serve as the basis of consideration in this important matter and refer it to a committee for more detailed consideration; and it may well be that the bill will come out of at that committee, back to the Legislature, with many improvements, and I for one would be the first to welcome that fact. One thing I can guarantee the members of the committee, having as I think I said before, sat through many hours of discussion on the bill that is presently before us, knowing the strong opinions that are held on all sides of many questions, I can guarantee that the Committee will have an interesting time.

That is why I take perhaps some slight exception to the remarks of the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains who said it was an unusual procedure, that he objected to it going to the committee - and of course he has some colleagues who now think it ought to go to a committee - that it was a waste of time and effort and indeed he went so far as to say that it was political expediency. Well, he's more of a politician than I am, but if this is political expediency I say again as I did on another occasion, I can think of some easier ways to achieve political expediency than to get involved in expropriation laws.

It is important however, and I think this ought to be said, that it is important when we're going to ask a committee of the Legislature to examine something, to have a bill which is before the members for consideration, because if it were not so, first of all, we wouldn't have any right to ask a committee of the House to consider it. You just simply can't summon a committee to talk over something in general. Secondly, by the introduction of the bill we put in the public purview a plan, not a perfect one, but at least an idea, which the public can see. They're entitled to get Bill No. 82 and to look it over. They're entitled then to come and make their representations to the committee and to suggest changes and alterations. We couldn't properly do that with the general public unless the bill has received some measure of approval in this Legislature. To do otherwise would be to violate - not violate a confidence, but to violate the rules which apply to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba.

So I want to say that I believe that the procedure which formally presents to this Legislature a bill which by reason of its presentation here puts it into the public domain, which

(MR. McLEAN cont'd)..... refers it to a committee of this House which can consider it, and allows for people who will have views they would wish to express, gives them at least the document, the basic document, and an opportunity to come and make their views known and influence the decision or the views of the Committee, and through the committee hopefully the legislature itself. So I want to say that I believe that the correct steps have been taken in respect of this matter, and especially in view of the obvious differences of opinion that exists in this rather difficult and very controversial field.

I mentioned at the committee stage the matter of the Board, and I note what the Honourable Member for Selkirk says that the appointment of a board is wrong in principle; and I noted what the Honourable the Member for Lakeside said, that he didn't really believe in that, he thought that it ought to be the courts - a judge, or at least the court, and may I just remind the Honourable Member for Selkirk that of course judges are appointed by governments the same as members of Boards. I don't know whether that has any bearing on the argument or not, but they're not really too different in their genesis. But let me say this, let me say - sometimes there's a difference as to who appoints, but that's another matter. Let me say this, that among those who are concerned in acquisition procedures and expropriation, there is a strong body of opinion that the court is not the proper forum to decide these matters. They argue that it ought to be a group of people who have special knowledge, or who acquire special knowledge by virtue of their working in this field, who deal with these matters; that it ought not to be a judge who may have one expropriation case and then go a long time without ever having another one. What I'm really wanting to say is that we've put forward in the Bill the idea, which is supported by many people, that it ought to be that function which when all other means have failed to bring about settlement of the matter that the function of making a determination ought to be placed in the hands of a Board. Well, that's good debating ground, and I would want that to be clearly understood. There are opinions held on both sides. There is no attempt here to in any way prevent the very widest possible consideration of that concept. I think it is a concept which is worthy of consideration. I know that some members of the sub-committee of the Law Reform Committee who started out with very firm conviction that these matters ought only to be dealt with by a judge, came before the finish to the conclusion that it ought to be by a board, indeed the Bill represents the majority opinion of that sub-committee and the majority opinion of the Law Reform Committee itself. Those who have read the British Columbia Royal Commission report on expropriation will know that that matter received a great deal of attention in that consideration. So I just put those matters on record as best I can to simply say that it's a fair thing to consider these differences of opinion in order that there would be a consideration of it.

Perhaps I'm a little overly-sensitive about one comment made by the Honourable Member for Lakeside when he said the Minister seemed to be quite impressed with the Bill and that implies that I was perhaps claiming some special quality for it. I hope I didn't convey that impression. I present this Bill as the consideration of quite a number of people, and I don't want to create any impression that I think it's the best Bill that's ever been introduced, or the best Bill on this subject. In fact, what I am really hoping is that the Committee will produce a better bill. That's why I have this here. It's a starting point, and would recognize that it needs probably and will have many improvements before we see it again.

I believe some matters of detail, that is some matters of particular expropriation proceedings were mentioned. I think perhaps I wouldn't make any comment about those other than to say that it is a difficult subject.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland said that some of the proceedings here could be regarded as unconscionable transactions - he said he objected to the power of expropriation being delegated. I think I should just make this comment, that there is not delegation of expropriation power in this Bill. The Bill does not extend the power of expropriation beyond what already exists. It is rather a, as I have already said, a codification of the existing law, by and large, and certainly doesn't extend or increase the number of bodies that may expropriate. All that can expropriate under our present law would be covered by this legislation and we have not made any extensions of that, and there is no delegation of the authority to expropriate.

Madam Speaker, I leave the matter at that stage and say that I am hopeful that on the basis that this Bill needs careful consideration that all members of the Legislature will feel that they can support it at this stage so that it may go to the Committee for the careful consideration which I believe this subject, not necessarily the Bill, but the subject, deserves, because I am confident that the Committee can undoubtedly come up with a much improved Bill for the consideration of the Legislature at a later occasion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, may I ask the Honourable the Minister a question, or two questions?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister has closed the debate. Are you willing to accept a question?

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I have no objection to answering the questions if I can, if it's in order to do so.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable the Attorney-General if he agrees with my interpretation of the provision in this Act, namely, that if the expropriating authority gets the agreement of the Board that the expropriating authority having already filed a declaration of expropriation, does not need to inform the owner that he has been expropriated, for six months.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I paid particular attention to this provision when we were discussing it a far way back, and that is not my understanding. I listened to what the Honourable Member for Lakeside said about that, and I would not wish to go any further at this moment than to say that may be an interpretation that could be placed on it. That was not the intention and was not my understanding in the original instance.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I want to ask my honourable friend a subsequent question. If my honourable friend says that that was not the intention, then I assume from that that he would agree with me that that should not be the effect of the Act.

MR. McLEAN: Yes. I think that it was the intention it would be my wish that the notice would be given at the earliest possible moment in all cases, except where for reasons beyond normal control notice could not be given.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, before you put the question, would the Minister clarify a statement he made. I was asking if you would clarify a statement that you have made in your .....

MADAM SPEAKER: In my opinion, when the Minister closes the debate, unless other provisions are made in the rules, this is clearly out of order.

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 82.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Cherniack, Cowan, Evans, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Moeller, Paulley, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Molgat, Patrick, Smerchanski, Tanchak.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 32; Nays, 10.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill 111. The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I adjourned this debate on Bill 111 to ask the Honourable Minister if he can tell us what are the pressing needs at the present time for a Commissioner for Northern Manitoba? If there is any urgent and pressing need at this time, I would like to know what will this Commissioner do which is not done at the present time, because if you look inside, this Commissioner will have wide powers to do such things as locate town-sites and create parks and so on. He will have great powers, so to me it would appear, Madam Speaker, that this is almost setting up a complete new department, and I wonder if it is needed at this time because I am sure the Commissioner by himself will not be able to serve the North by himself, because if you take the distances between the present towns or the small communities that we are concerned about which are probably anywhere in the neighbourhood of 200 to 300 miles, this person will have to have an airplane of his own, and probably a staff.

And there's another point too, Madam Speaker, there is a Minister of Northern Affairs in the Federal Government. Is this Commissioner going to work in conjunction with the Federal Government or is there going to be some duplications, or is it strictly to service the Indian population of the North? We'd like to know something about this and to just look in the Bill itself it certainly gives wide powers to this Commissioner. I would like to know, is there a need for it at this time, and what will he do that is not presently done by the government itself?

(MR. PATRICK cont'd), . . . I know we have the RCMP up North. There's a railroad connecting most of the larger centres, the smaller centres that there is no communications. I know that he will have to have more personnel, more staff and probably air service to service these communities. I would like the Minister to tell us just what are the urgent needs at this time?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, the problems of Northern Manitoba have been discussed in this House on many occasions and I have spoken on them on several occasions myself. Some years ago I was involved in a rather vigorous debate as a matter of fact over the problems of Churchill, and I would like to know from the Minister what the position of the Commissioner is going to be with regard to centres of the size of Churchill. Yesterday, when I heard the - I think the Member for the Churchill constituency speaking - he was referring to the small centres of - a population like 100 and 200 population along the Hudson's Bay Line, and I realize that in these areas there is a particular problem of local organization because you don't have the bodies with which to set up local council or in some cases an advisory committee.

On the other hand in the case of Churchill, we have a major centre, but a major centre where there are some very difficult problems, Madam Speaker, which are still unresolved. They were brought out as I say in this House several years ago and there was a complete discussion then but as far as I know there have been no further steps taken to deal with the problems of Churchill. Now I don't fault the provincial government totally for that because I realize that in the case of Churchill there is a joint responsibility. There's a certainly a federal responsibility there because they own a good part of the installations that exist at Churchill - the railway to begin with, the transport facilities, the Port itself and of course the very large base which was previously the army centre and is now being used for northern purposes.

I think it was very fortunate for the Province of Manitoba that when the Department of National Defence decided that the army base had to close that they were prepared through other departments - their Northern Affairs - to establish in Churchill some centres for the federal northern activities which I understand have kept the activity at the Town of Churchill itself at least equal to what it was when the army establishment was there. This certainly has had a good effect on Churchill. Had the base simply been removed and nothing replaced, we would have had I think a serious problem of unemployment or of people leaving the area.

So there we have a situation now that the Federal Government have continued their operations and I think it is very important now that the Province of Manitoba take the steps to see to it that there is co-ordination and steps taken between the Federal Government and the province to ensure the continuity of (a) the Federal establishment so that we don't find them four or five years from now announcing that it isn't suitable and they must go elsewhere, which means then I think some steps to ensure such problems as housing and services. Now my understanding is that there has been nothing further done in Churchill with regard to sewer and water. Again I don't minimize the problem. I've been to Churchill many times and I know the difficulties there are because of terrain and because of weather, but surely, terrain and weather of that type are known elsewhere, Madam Speaker. The development of the DEW Line up in the Arctic certainly indicated what could be done in much more isolated areas, in areas of even worse weather conditions, and communities have been established there with facilities. Churchill is still suffering from the complete lack of these. I think this is one place where the Provincial Government must take the initiative. I repeat that I recognize the Federal Government's responsibility but I think that the initiative must after all come from the province itself because the townsites are basically one that is responsible to the province. There is a local government district and an administrator appointed by the province so the initiative and the proposals should come - I'm sure the Minister will tell me that he has held some meetings, but so far we have seen no results from these meetings. The important thing I think is to get these services going and build up the Town of Churchill.

I'm advised by residents of Churchill that you can hardly buy any lots for example at the moment in Churchill. I think there is something like nine residential lots available. I'm told that the situation so far as commercial property is somewhat the same, that you cannot expand because you cannot get the necessary space. I'm told, for example, that the school is apparently going to be rebuilt in the centre square of the town; that there are problems of town planning and so on.

I don't suppose that Churchill has maybe arrived at the point yet where it can establish its own municipality. I think its problems are such that this might not be feasible, unless

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd).....we could convince the Federal Government that they should pay taxes on their establishments. If they were prepared to do that then there would obviously be a tax base. Without that or without a sizeable grant, there isn't a sufficient tax base in Churchill at the moment, in my opinion, for a local council. But I think it is very important that there be an elected local advisory board. I understand that at the moment, some of the Members of the Advisory Board moved out sometime ago and have not been replaced. It seems to me that steps should be taken there to have local consultation and have the people participate in the development of the townsite of Churchill.

It seems to me, Madam Speaker, that in Canada - this applies not only to Manitoba, but in Canada as a whole - we have not been making the forward steps in northern development that certainly have occurred in places like Russia. The Russians share with us the other half or two-thirds of the Arctic and Northern regions. Their problems are undoubtedly greater than ours even, because their distances are greater, and yet they have been able, in their far northern areas they've been able to develop major cities and major industries. I recognize that under their system of government they can, shall we say, encourage people in a different way than we can, to establish in these areas - and I don't recommend any steps insofar as we're concerned of the type of movement to Siberia. That isn't what I have in mind. But I think that we can by proper incentives and by proper planning and co-ordination of our activities in the north, really do more than we have accomplished in the past. I have been critical of the government on many occasions for their lack of concern for Northern Manitoba.

The Member for Churchill constituency shared my concern because even in his reply to the Throne Speech at the beginning of this Session he recited to us the failures of the past and I think gave us a pretty correct picture of the situation in Northern Manitoba. Yesterday, when speaking about the bill, he was most enthused about the steps that are to be taken. I am hopeful that this will be the result. It seems to me that it has been a long time in coming - eight years is a pretty fair period of development for this area. However, I'm not going to complain at what is being done now, if it is in fact going to produce the development in Northern Manitoba that all of us look forward to. I hope the Minister will be able to give us in Committee stage some further details on exactly how the commissioner will function. I would think that many of the northern services that presently exist will probably be amalgamated into this function and that it will not in fact mean a great new overhead, because it appears to me that there are areas here where there could be some amalgamation, certainly the use of Federal Government activities wherever we can.

I'd like to know from the Minister on another line, what are the responsibilities of the commissioner insofar as the very large tract of land which is now going to be - partially at least under the jurisdiction of Monoca or whatever the proper pronounciation is for the term. These people now have a very large portion of Northern Manitoba - in fact the map that was supplied to us by the Minister of Industry and Commerce shows it extending from the Saskatchewan Border right across the northern edge of Lake Winnipeg and incorporating Thompson and very much of the Hudson's Bay Line. Now will the commissioner have exactly the same jurisdiction in that area as in the balance of the north or, because of the grant to the company, will he be restricted in any way insofar as his activities?

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, I think there have been some questions asked which should be answered before the matter comes to a vote. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia asked what are the pressing needs for a commissioner of Northern Manitoba, now? If he asked that question today, Madam Speaker, he could not have been in his seat yesterday afternoon when the Member for Churchill was speaking. He couldn't possibly have heard the Member for Churchill and have asked that question this afternoon.

The Leader of the Opposition asks us how this is going to affect Churchill? Well, it isn't going to affect Churchill directly because Churchill is one of those areas that has some form of local government now. But if the honourable member will look at Part II of the Act he will see that the Commissioner has the power to enter agreements with numerous other parties including local government districts, or even municipalities, where it's deemed advisable to do so for the purpose of improving conditions in that community.

As members of the House are aware, the area of responsibility, that is the actual physical area of the province is very large. It includes all of the area of the province right down as far as Bissett and extends throughout all of the north and east part of the province -

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd). . . . in fact all of the province that isn't already in some form of organized government or in provincial parks and so on where there is no need for any assistance. It could be of assistance to Churchill in that the Commissioner is authorized to enter into agreements with a community like that to assist in the provision of services.

But when we hear the Honourable Leader of the Opposition talk about Churchill, one would think that nothing that had been done in Churchill in the last few years. I want to assure you, Madam Speaker, that this is not the case: That 2-1/2 years ago I approached the Federal Government with the Minister of Health, now the Minister of Education, and we put forth a most pressing plea to the Federal Government to make it possible for us - possible for us to provide sanitary services in Churchill of a standard that we could all be proud of; and we offered to put up the capital cost providing sewer and water in Churchill if the Federal Government would pay taxes on the properties, or grants in lieu of taxes, on the properties they have in that community. And I must say, Madam Speaker, that they didn't say no; but they haven't said yes yet either. We've been negotiating with them ever since trying to find out just what they will pay and I must say that within the last year there has been some considerable improvement.

We had an announcement a year ago that National Harbours Board were now going to pay grants in lieu of taxes on 50 percent of the assessment that they agreed upon. Well, we've been trying to find out what sort of an assessment they would agree upon in Churchill ever since. We have the assessment figures calculated by our people. We have taken their people to Churchill with us and gone over everything and only recently are we beginning to find out what they're talking about. We still haven't got any definite figure. We did get an advance, oh some months ago, in November I believe, of about \$2, 200 - an advance on the grants in lieu of taxes for 1965, and the balance is to come when they make up their minds. But we're not sure when that's going to be. I thought it would have been last June the way the announcement came out in the papers.

I recognize that there are many administrative difficulties that they have and that they can't deal with Churchill in isolation, that any policy that they come up with for Churchill is going to affect many other places, including places where they have large installations such as the major seaports at Vancouver and Halifax and Montreal. But I do believe, Madam Speaker, that there has been ample time for the Federal Government to have made up their minds and to have told us so that we could be budgeting for Churchill. But our offer for Churchill to provide services there provided all the taxpayers in Churchill are prepared to pay either taxes or grants in lieu of taxes in order to cover some of the costs that are involved in the provision of municipal services, that offer still stands.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition says you can't buy lots in Churchill. That's not true, Madam Speaker. Last year we went in and prepared nine lots, although we had no firm offers to buy any of them, we prepared nine lots, we removed all of the rock. All the lots are properly filled and drained. They are available for sale and they are being offered for sale to the people of Churchill at approximately one-half the cost that we have already been involved in to provide those lots. Now, I don't know what more than this we can do, Madam Speaker, unless we are prepared to go in there and build the houses and then just turn them over to the people for nothing.

He suggested that in Russia they have done more in the development of the North than we have in this country. And that's true, they have. Very true. But he pointed out one of the reasons very succinctly. They have the power to pick up a person and send him there and say "You will be a citizen of the community whether you like it or not." But the other reason is because the government of the country, not a local state, but the government of the country has been prepared to put up the money to develop those communities in Northern Russia. When the government of our country is prepared to go in and put up the money to develop communities, they do so; but in Churchill they didn't. The government of our country has neglected the community of Churchill ever since they first established the Port there. They have allowed that community to grow with no assistance; and we all know it, and I am sure that my honourable friend agrees with me that this is a deplorable situation and the day can't come too soon when the Federal Government will realize properly what its responsibility is in that community. I think there is a growing awareness of what their responsibility is there, but I still say that it's long overdue.

The Northern Commissioner will have a responsibility in the area that is granted to Monoca for their woodcutting rights, and for the communities that are already there, or that

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd).....may develop in that area, the services of the Commissioner of Northern Affairs will be available.

You know we've had some rather interesting comments on this Bill, Madam Speaker; within the ranks of the Liberal Party itself we have had at least three different expressions of opinion. The Member for Gladstone yesterday said "This is deplorable. It's going to require a tremendous staff to do this job." And today, we had the Member for Assiniboia say "Well one man can't do it all. To do the job that has to be done you've got to have a lot of people." And we have the Member for Burrows in his booming voice stand up here and tell us, "You don't need anything at all. The people in the North have got everything they need now." And you know, Madam Speaker, I hope he was speaking for the Liberal Party. I shouldn't say that. I hope he wasn't speaking for the Liberal Party. I can't believe that any responsible Party in the Province of Manitoba would stand up and sincerely mean the things that that man said. I can't believe it! If he really believes that he's never been in Northern Manitoba.

A MEMBER: Have you?

MR. SMELLIE: You bet your sweet life I have and I'm going to be there a lot oftener. And then we had the Member for Rhineland, and he suggested that on the day this Act is proclaimed we should have a coronation. Well, I'm sure he was being facetious, and I'm just as sure that whoever accepts that Crown would find it had many thorns in it, because this is not an easy task. This is a responsibility, a challenge that any member of this House could accept with pride, and I sincerely hope as I said before that I'm going to have the opportunity to accept that challenge, because there's just so much crying to be done in Northern Manitoba that has never been done by this or any other administration in a cohesive manner; that this is an opportunity for service that not many of us get.

The Honourable Member for St. John's talked about red tape, lack of communications and ambulances, and he suggested that we should be listening to the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks when he pleads for an ambulance service. I want to suggest to you, Madam Speaker, that the service that's provided by the airlines -- not the airlines necessarily alone, but the chartered air services in this province, and the air services that are already in Manitoba, are doing a fine job. But this is not the kind of communications that I was talking about. Nor was it just the provision of telephone service and this sort of thing.

I was disappointed to hear the remarks of the Leader of the New Democratic Party yesterday afternoon. He talked about the tremendous powers that were being given to the Commissioner. He talked about the fact that the Commissioner had power to regulate, for example, what the qualifications of voters would be. This is not an easy problem. You can't just take the Municipal Act into an area where you have a nomadic population, and expect it to work. It's not that simple. --(Interjection)-- You bet I believe in the equality of rights, but if you want to follow the rigid standards set down in The Municipal Act, you disenfranchise many people, those nomadic people who would otherwise have some rights, and could be given some rights to take some part in their affairs in small localities in the North. --(Interjection)-- Poppycock, my foot. My friend doesn't know those communities or he wouldn't talk like that.

And then he went on to talk about giving away the resources of the North. Giving away the resources of Manitoba. What a bunch of ridiculous nonsense, Madam Speaker! I never heard anything like it in all my life. --(Interjection)-- Have you ever been there? Have you ever been there, my friend.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, I've been there a dozen times.

MR. SMELLIE: Well, did you ever see the unused harvest? Did you ever see the forests of Northern Manitoba that have never been harvested and never would as long as my honourable friend had his way?

MR. PAULLEY: You give them away.

MR. SMELLIE: No, they're not being given away, my friend. Far from it. Far, far from it.

MR. PAULLEY: You certainly did around The Pas.

MR. SMELLIE: No, Sir.

MR. PAULLEY: You bet your life you did.

MR. SMELLIE: I can remember very well, Madam Speaker, being employed by a major oil company shortly after I got out of the service, and on one occasion the manager of the office in Calgary contacted the chap who was in charge of our Party by telephone. He couldn't find him the first day. He contacted him the second day and we were in a small town in Saskatchewan, just across the border, and the boss came out of the telephone booth after

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd)..... talking to the office in Calagary and he said "Pack your things fellows, we're going home." And we couldn't understand why. All I remember was that his instructions were to get out of Saskatchewan and stay out.

MR. PAULLEY: ....Potash developers who got out but they wouldn't come into Manitoba.

MR. SMELLIE: They'll come into Manitoba. Don't you worry about potash, my friend.

MR. PAULLEY: Not while you are there, buster.

MR. SMELLIE: Don't you worry about potash. And what happened in the oil industry? Although the known oil reserves in Saskatchewan were greater than they were in Manitoba, which was developed first? The small area that we had in Manitoba was developed far sooner than the area we had in Saskatchewan, because that government over there was going to save all those resources for the people of Saskatchewan. They saved them all right. Under the ground where nobody in Saskatchewan got anything out of them for years. And the forest in Northern Manitoba would sit there till it burned or rotted if my honourable friend had his way.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Madam Speaker, whether the Honourable Member would permit a question on oil?

MR. SMELLIE: I'll permit a question after I'm finished if you .....

MR. PAULLEY: I.....should stick to the facts ....

MR. SMELLIE: I usually do stick to the facts, Madam Speaker, and I am doing the best I can under the circumstances in spite of the interruptions from across the way.

MR. PAULLEY: You're lucky you got protection. --(Interjection)--

MR. SMELLIE: I'm just counting to ten. Madam Speaker, I wish each member of this House had the opportunity to go into many of those small northern communities, and talk to the people in those communities to find out from them what they want. You know it's an unfortunate thing that the word "vision" has come into such disrepute in this country. A very unfortunate thing, because there were men who had some vision as to what could happen in the North. There were people who had some real desire to do things in this last frontier of Canada. We had programs that were started and dropped, like the Roads to Resources Program. A terrible thing that this program should be dropped just after it was nicely started. These are some of the things that people in the North are asking for. They don't want a great deal most of them, but they do want some recognition. They want some recognition of the fact that they live in isolation. They want some recognition of the fact that it isn't easy for them to visit their friends and relations in other parts of the country. They want some recognition of the fact that it isn't easy for them to even keep up with the news of the country. In many places in the North they can't get radio service. In almost all of the communities in the North they can't get television service. Even there telephone communications are on a less frequent basis than they are in communities where we consider the service in many cases, not completely satisfactory. These are the things that are bothering these people. They want a little road; they want a new dock, and they haven't got the resources on their own to provide these facilities.

This Bill, Madam Speaker, provides for a director and the other staff that he will need to look after the work that's involved. At the present time what we envision is one director and possibly four administrators. Each of the four administrators would have approximately 18 to 20 communities for which he would be responsible. If that is all of the communities he has, it should surely be possible for him to visit those communities on a regular basis where the visits would not be so few and far between that the people forget what he looks like before he comes back the next time. One of the big problems in the northern communities in the past is that although they did see some representatives of government occasionally, they never did see anyone who had the authority to co-ordinate the activities of government. They never had this opportunity and when they did see someone in authority, it was very seldom, and not on any regular basis.

This Bill will provide a pipeline of communication between government and the people in the small communities of the North. This Bill will provide an opportunity for government to give more service to the people of the North, and an opportunity for the people who live there to receive many of the benefits that government already offers that they don't even know about, and that government hasn't been aggressive in promoting in those areas. This Bill, Madam Speaker, can make the real difference between enjoying life in the north and merely existing.

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd).....

Madam Speaker, as the Member for Churchill said the other day, this is one of the most important pieces of legislation for Northern Manitoba we've yet had and I hope that when copies of Hansard are distributed through the North they won't all believe the Member for Burrows spoke for the Liberal Party; or that they won't believe that the Leader of the New Democratic Party has as little interest in them as he indicated here yesterday.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege, I ask that the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs withdraw that last remark. I indicated clearly during my contribution, if it was such, to this debate, that I had the interests of the people of the north at heart throughout, that they should receive the amenities of life that they're not receiving at the present time, and I ask that he withdraw that erroneous statement.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, I told you what my impression was. It's still my impression.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I'm not concerned with what his impression is. I'm concerned with what he said, that I had no interest in the people of the north and I ask my honourable friend to withdraw it. Then, Madam Speaker .....

MR. SMELLIE: I didn't say he has no interest .....

MR. PAULLEY: That's what you said.

MR. SMELLIE: No, I said that he showed very little interest in the people of the north, and if the attitude that he took towards this Bill is indicative of his interest in the people of the north he has practically none.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, that is not what my honourable friend said. He said that I had no interest in the people of the north, and I ask him to withdraw it. And if he will not, Madam Speaker, on my request, I ask you to request it.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, if it will make him feel any better, I will withdraw the statement, but I still retain my opinion.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, that is not sufficient. I want a clear withdrawal of the statement.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, I withdraw the statement, --(Interjection)-- but I won't change my mind.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a question of the Minister?

MADAM SPEAKER: In my opinion, when the Minister closed the debate, I put the question. Are you ready for the question?

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

.....continued on next page.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 16. The Honourable the Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): I'm sorry Madam Speaker, I was so absorbed in the proceedings I didn't realize that this Bill was coming up.

I'm happy that this Bill does not call for any new commissions, committees or study groups - of course, it does call for a new study group, or the Minister indicated so, because lately practically all we've been doing in here is discussing commissions, committees and so on. It appears as if this government is a government by commissions, by committees and so on.

However this bill - I'm not opposing the Bill - in my thinking of the Bill, it's quite an improvement on Bill No. 39, that bill that we discussed last year, the completely useless bill -- and I'm sure by now the Honourable Minister will agree with me that it was a Bill that didn't do anybody any good. It was simply a waste of time, a waste of paper and didn't make anybody happy but made very very many people unhappy. I hope that this bill before us will make all of Manitoba happy, and I do support the Bill. I think it's quite an improvement on the bill that we had previously.

But I would like to make a few observations as far as the Bill is concerned. I still think that the Minister cannot make up his mind definitely what he wants to do with regards to single district divisions. That's my opinion. He may argue it's not, but I don't think that he's still made up his mind what he wants to do, because it seems to me that if he had arrived at a definite conviction he would have and could have taken more decisive action than what this Bill calls for. I'll come to that soon.

I mentioned before that there are no new commissions, but yesterday, which is not a commission but another group, the minister told us that a planning group has already been named to plan a campaign of education of the public on the benefits of single district divisions. I am not complaining about this group. I think that this is absolutely necessary. I haven't heard anything. That's the first time I heard there was such a group being planned and I would like to know whether the group has been named already, and who. Are they outsiders or are they people - he doesn't have to give the names - people within the Department of Education or some other department, who are the group that have been named. I agree also that such a setup would be a very good one.

The same thing I think was done when the larger school divisions were implemented. There was a group set up and there was a group that went throughout the Province of Manitoba conducting a campaign of education of the people of Manitoba, but I regret -- and this is why I say to the Minister he still hasn't made up his mind. I regret that this bill does not call for a province-wide referendum after the campaign. I think there should have been a province-wide referendum similar to that of the implementation of the larger school divisions. I think that this would have been wise; it would have been proved prudent and more economical; because if we take the attitude of convincing the people of Manitoba by piecemeal it'll be more costly to the department and it'll take much much more time than the other way. I think that tackling this problem provincially, as I said, would be both more economical on a province-wide basis, prudent and more economical than the present system that the Minister proposes in this bill. I'm sure that it would be advisable in view of the fact that these changes are inevitable, because in many districts the people are asking, not as an organized group, but they're asking that this be done. They say they have to form larger divisions, larger consolidations or divisions of some sort. They don't so far -- there hasn't been real group action taken, and I say why procrastinate if it is possible, may be possible to do it at once? I'm convinced that this is more economical, would be a more economical and more practical system, so why shouldn't we try it? Why shouldn't he, as the Minister, show real true leadership? I'd like him to do that. Maybe it's not too late yet, a province-wide referendum.

We noticed that this bill gives tremendous powers to the Boundaries Commission which was set up or was voted on, I think it was this morning, and that could be for better or for worse. I hope it is for the better, so my only suggestion here would be that when this Boundaries Commission is set up that the Department be mighty careful who the personnel of the Boundaries Commission are because they will have a terrific responsibility, as has been mentioned before, and we must be very careful to see that this Commission -- that the best possible brains, when the Commission is set up, are available because this Commission will have the power to make or break this plan for the schools, and we would not like to see it destroyed, because as I've always stated, I was in favour of more centralization of educational facilities, and I still am, here. I have been ever since I entered this Chamber.

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd)...

This Commission, as I understand it, will be responsible to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, at least the Commission will be established under him, but it seems to me that it will perform for more than one Ministry. I think that it will perform for the Minister of Education as far as organizing or changing boundaries. It will also act for the Department of Health, if I understand it correctly, in outlining the boundaries for the Health Units, and at the same time I think that the Commission will act for the Minister of Municipal Affairs as far as the municipal boundaries are concerned. Therefore, although it originates in one department, the Commission will act for more than one department, and I wonder if this may not sometimes create a conflict of interest, because people are human and the Ministers I imagine are human too, and it may create -- maybe the services of this Commission may be required simultaneously by three Ministers, or two Ministers, and it may create an overload, too much demand on the services of the Commission, and as I said before, it might even create conflict of interest because one Minister maybe one decision and another, another one.

It is possible, quite possible, that when you have so many departments involved, that quite a bit of time may be lost - a year sometimes, two; it was mentioned in certain cases, even ten years, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs mentioned two years, not referring to the school divisions but other problems that it may settle, and I'm afraid that when we have a commission established which will have, we can say, three masters, that we may be lost in all this bureaucratic procedure for years and years. We know our bureaucracy is growing and it is possible that it'll take more time than it should.

I also notice in the bill that the recommendations of the Boundaries Commission, at least as far as school boundaries are concerned, are not final, that the Minister still has that prerogative or the privilege of accepting the findings or rejecting them, and if he does not agree with the recommendation of the Boundaries Commission, he may ask the Boundaries Commission to reconsider again. So that's what I mean, that some more valuable time may be lost. As far as the bill is concerned in principle, I support the bill, only I'd like to see these several changes made.

There's one thing which is also a principle, although I'm going to refer to a specific section, but it does involve a principle. Reading the bill, studying it carefully, I may not be interpreting it correctly, but I notice on Page 5, 444 B, in the fourth line, it says, "the Minister shall refer the matter to the Board of Reference which shall, after holding public hearing of the resident electors of the district by its written award, grant or deny the request." So here it says "shall". And again in 444 C in the fourth line, the same thing: "The Minister shall cause to be held, " - "shall" again, but if you turn the page over, top of Page No. 6, it reads: "The Minister may (a) in his discretion, or (b) under written petition . . ." - and I think, and I may be wrong because I'm not a lawyer, not a counsellor - I think it should read, "The Minister (a) may in his discretion, or (b) shall under written petition." I think those two should be split. Maybe there's an explanation to that, but I think that's the way it should read: "The Minister (a) may in his discretion, or (b) shall under written petition", because in 444 and 444 B and C that's the language that is being used, and it seems to me that this one can conflict with the principle in the first part; in other words re-negate it. I may be wrong, so as I said before, we are willing to pass this bill on second reading, but I would like the Minister to consider my main point, and that is, a province-wide referendum to settle this question because I personally - and I'm sure the Minister - although I said he didn't make up his mind, I'm sure that the Minister is in agreement with me; he'd like to see this happen. So why not take more definite action and do it?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, Bill 116 is an Act to Amend The Public Schools Act and it deals with a number of sections, so that I naturally might agree with certain sections of the Bill but also, on the other hand, I strongly oppose certain sections that are contained in the Bill.

As I went through the Bill I find that on the first page they are now going to amend the Act to the effect that if there has been an Official Trustee operating those schools that have been closed for more than two years, then it's automatically taken over by the Division Board. Maybe this is good - I don't know. I haven't been in too close contact with these districts that have been run by Official Trustee, although if I'm correct, most of the Hutterite schools are operated this way, and I would like to know from the Minister what the reaction is from these people. Has he any indication to give us as members of this Legislative Assembly on this matter and will these people be asked to be represented at the committee meeting? I think we should hear from

(MR. FROESE cont'd)... them or at least have a statement from the Minister on this part.

Then there are other sections I would agree with. I'm very interested in extending classes for special courses - and I'm certainly in approval of this - to the effect that they will be able to collect fees for this purpose. There is the matter of exchange teachers. I'm just wondering why you were excluding the teachers from the United States from benefiting under this section. Wouldn't it appear likely that we should be able to attract some of the teachers from across the line? Perhaps we needn't extend the amount - make the amount that large as is contained in the section - where we quote the figure of \$600, probably we could do with less. But on the other hand, I don't know what the situation is there. Are the teachers getting that much more that the \$600 would not be sufficient? I'm just wondering whether it could be the other way round as well.

I'm concerned with another principle here and that's in subsection 10, where we are now setting in my opinion a precedent of allowing one-third of an indemnity to be not taxable. I think this matter probably comes up because we as Members of this House - one-third of our indemnity is tax-free. I would rather see that we did not have this benefit than to extend it to other areas. I think this should be confined. I certainly couldn't go along with this principle. I'd rather see that we as members not have this privilege than to see this extended, because once we extend it to one group, I think we will have other groups on our necks who will want the same privilege and who is to say that they should not have it. So that I take exception to this particular section and principle.

In the following section we deal with the matter of the mileage that is being paid to Division Boards. However, here we also make a distinction that only divisions that have an area of 200 square miles are able to take advantage of this situation. How many divisions have we in rural Manitoba that do not have the necessary 200 square miles and who cannot benefit under this section? I would think that we have a No. 1 District Division in the Greater Winnipeg Area that will not be able to avail themselves of it, but there could also be some rural divisions in my opinion. Certainly I would be glad to hear from the Minister on this point, whether we're denying any rural Division Boards the mileage for their services.

I notice also in connection with the closed schools grant - the schools that are closed for two or more years - that the Board of Reference will have to put these under the charge of a Division. This is becoming mandatory under Section 6 and I just wonder whether this is going to be for the good of all those schools. Perhaps some of those schools that have come back after a year or so, that they might have the necessary enrollment and want to operate again, and it would then not be up to the local district to decide, but I would imagine it would then become a matter of the Division Board to decide whether that particular school should function or not. So we're taking a certain thing away from the district in this case, certain powers that they now have.

But I come to some much more important sections and principles from here on, especially in the next section where we come to the matter of the Consolidated School District. Here we find that, "Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no consolidated school district shall be formed or enlarged under this section without the approval of the Minister." Regardless of whether the people in that Consolidated School District voted for it - they would be denied this prerogative. What we're doing, we're denying democracy in a sense by not following the wishes of the majority, at least not necessarily, and this same principle applies to the other half of that section, Part 2 of Section 313.

But this is more serious in my opinion because here the Minister is denying himself a right, and I'm just wondering, has the Minister not confidence in his own decisions or what is the reason for this section, or does he want to hide and does he want to attach blame to the commission for making mistakes. Because it says, "... the Local Government Boundaries Commission for its recommendation; and unless the Local Boundaries Commission so recommends, the Minister shall not approve the bylaws." This concerns bylaws that may be passed by Municipal Councils, School Boards, arbitrators, and also the Board of Reference and its connection with enlarging Consolidated School Districts by adding one or more school districts as the case may be. I'm just wondering what are we electing a government for if the Minister does not want to take on the responsibility? Why are we creating an almighty commission here which will exceed even the Minister's power? Why is he letting himself be tied into a subordinate position to that commission? He is letting his hands be tied and I think this is very foolish. I think this should never appear in a Bill of this type when we are amending The Schools Act.

And further, there will be no appeal. Whatever the Boundaries Commission is going to recommend is going to be final and there's no way of appeal. It says in Part (3), "The Local

(MR. FROESE cont'd)... Government Boundaries Commission is not required to hold a hearing with respect to any matter or thing referred to it under this section." They can decide and there's no appeal to their decision. I think this is very wrong in principle and I certainly could not vote for such a principle as contained in that particular section.

On the following page we find a similar situation - this is in connection with the Board of Reference - and the Board of Reference is going to be put in a similar position. We find in Section 11 that a Board of Trustees, which in a rural case might be a board of three, a majority of that board - two people - can decide to petition to have their district placed under division control and there won't be any vote on that. Following that, the Board of Reference can make the decision although this is after a public hearing. They don't have to cater to a majority wish; they can decide on their own. There's nothing in the section that spells out that the majority rules or that they have to go accordingly. The Board of Reference is the one that makes the decision.

And who have we got on this Board of Reference at the present time that is supposed to do this dirty work in my opinion. We have five members on this board. There is Mr. Tom Olson of Glenboro; there's Mrs. Richardson of Portage la Prairie; Mr. F. Taylor of Minnedosa; Mr. A. A. MacDonald of Fort Garry, a former official of the department; and Mr. G. Johnson of Winnipeg. These people are presently constituting the Board of Reference. I think in my opinion they're putting the responsibility on the shoulders of these people that the government does not want to bear themselves and that they don't want to account for themselves. It's just that they want scapegoats, just like the other commission, to have someone to blame for and not to have to take direct responsibility for.

There's also provision here that not less than 20 percent of the resident electors can call for the same thing, not necessarily the Board of Trustees, but also any number of people as long as they're not less than 20 percent of the resident electors. But still this is a minority and the minority in a district will then have the right to ask for Division take-over, and again I'm telling the Minister this is wrong. We pride ourselves in believing in democracy. We, as Members of this House, are elected on this basis that the majority rules, and here we find that we're just defying this principle and will now consider minority or just a member of the board having this power to change all this. I think this is wrong. This should be done by a referendum and that the majority of the people would vote in favour. Unless this were done, I cannot see sound reasoning behind it to make these changes and I certainly oppose these sections where we call for this type of legislation.

I find further on in the bill that we are now going to take care of the retarded, and I congratulate the Minister on this because so far I think this has been the responsibility of the Department of Health and that the grants have been very meagre in my opinion. A lot of the money for the purpose of these schools was brought up locally and local people put in a lot of effort in this direction. I think that it's very timely that we do this. I note that it will be the Division Board that will be in charge and not the districts, but the costs will be spread over the whole Division.

I also note that there is going to be a 10 percent increase in grants given to these various Division takeovers, although you have one District Division, I don't see the reason for it. I don't see where they will give that much better service. In my opinion, if you have local people who take an interest, will do a better job than those that come from far away and do not know the local situation.

What is happening by Division takeover is that you will have to employ additional people to do those very jobs that are now being done voluntarily by School Boards across this province, and not only are they doing a good job and have the interest at heart, but it will also mean that we will be losing interest in education in this province by a lot of people who are very dedicated at the present time and serving to the best of their ability. I certainly would give credit to the trustees of this province who are doing and have done over the years such a tremendous job in looking after our schools.

We have another part of the Bill, Part 22, in respect to regional vocational schools, and while I'm all for vocational schools, and probably putting them on a regional basis is the best thing to do, but under the legislation before us we are giving a blank cheque and approving ahead of time something we don't know what is going to come about. This is under Section 498 and 501, that we're approving ahead of time whatever the Boundaries Commission is going to determine, and I personally do not like this type of situation.

Also in Section 501, it mentions the various grants that will be available to regional

(MR. FROESE cont'd)... vocational schools. Just what are these grants going to be? I would like to hear from the Minister what type of grants there are and whether he intends to increase them, if there are certain grants in effect at the present time, or how are these schools to get their revenue. I know that we will have a new level of government in that these regional vocational schools will also have the power to tax and impose an additional tax on the properties of the region.

So I think we need some further information on this Bill, and as I've already indicated, while I support certain sections of it, while I'm in support of certain parts of the program, nevertheless because of certain principles in the Bill, I cannot support it.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JOHNSON:- Madam Speaker ....

MADAM SPEAKER: I would say to the House that the Honourable Minister is closing the debate. Any member wishing to speak should do so now. The Honourable the Minister of Education.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I felt the debate was excellent until the last speaker stood up. I hardly know that I share the Province of Manitoba with him as an elected Member of this Legislature the explosion in education today. If that is the policy of the Social Credit Party of Manitoba, they are in for a real downfall. I don't believe that the opinions - and I'm not saying this in a personal sense - the opinions expressed by my honourable friend can stand the light of day and I intend to deal with him in due course, section by section. Unless we show more understanding of what's gone on in the past and have more understanding of what the department is trying to achieve at this time in the evolution of our educational system, unless you as the members of this House go out with the message, it's going to delay the implementation of the kind of measures so needed today.

The very nature of this legislation in forming this Commission and giving them an opportunity to plan regional vocational high schools, for example, without interference from the Minister or from the department, and just to make sure we're not accused of that, we're spelling it out in the legislation. My honourable friend knows these schools have to be at least 700 student capacity. He knows that a couple of divisions will have to get together to form them. They can't be small. The Federal Government won't share them if they're small. He knows that.

He also knows that if up to 50 percent of our boys and girls do follow vocational high school training, which is happening today in Toronto and New Brunswick and other jurisdictions, and if we're going to follow this, offer these other opportunities and offer more courses to maintain the interest and keep our children in the system, how is he going to do it unless we plan this kind of facility on a regional basis across the province. We can't have the one-room little red schoolhouse and the kind of program demanded today. We can't have both sides of the coin. We've got to make a decision. Are we going to make an attempt to rationalize elementary education when the new maths can't be taught in Grade 4 and Grade 8 in these one classroom schools? What are we going to do? When half the kids are going to be going from their present academic high schools into regional vocational high schools, what are we going to do? We've got to have more central planning whether we like it or not, and if we don't do it, we can be justifiably accused of wasting the taxpayers' money in the future.

The last six years we've evolved an excellent divisional system that has resulted in a 90 percent increase in the number of boys and girls going to school. That's what we've accomplished in this province and it's just Stage I. It was Stage I of the revolution. We're now embarking on Stage II, and I want my honourable friend from Rhineland to get out and tell his people what's happening in Manitoba. The member from Emerson I know, as the spokesman for the Liberal Party, endorses this legislation. I'm glad to hear him say it and I'm going to be out on the stump with him on Boundary Divisions, and I want you out there too.

And with the retarded, I think this is a major step forward in North America. We'll be with some of the few states in the union where large districts are charged with capital and current support of mentally and trainable retarded. We're moving into this. We're moving into this at a very important time in the history of the evolution of these services in our province, and the support has been significant - the increase since 1958. In 1958 the grants were \$25.00 per child per half-day in the classroom. They were increased over the last six years to \$40.00 per child per day. The age was increased from 18 to 21 in those classes. The aid to the Association for Retarded Children increased from around twenty-four to around a quarter of a million. The maintenance of people with mental defects outside institutions

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd)... increased from \$80,000 to \$700,000 in the last few years.

Now we're embarking into the second revolution where we're making it our business to do everything we can in education, in concert with the Health Department, to take all those measures we can to keep our mental retardates in the community, to keep them not out of sight and out of mind as has been the course not only in this province but across the world since the beginning of time, not out with the birds and bees but in the community, and with a big division having the responsibility and being able to provide and plan adequate sized classes over a wider area. This is the spirit behind this Public School Act. This is revolutionary, I suggest to you. It was spelled out in the working paper. It shouldn't have come as a shock. It was spelled out in the Speech from the Throne; it was reiterated here.

But I want to point out one other thing. The Board of Reference, my honourable friend, operated for a long long time. This House directs the Board of Reference. . . . districts closed over 10 years should go to the Board of Reference who shall have the power to recommend the division of that district. Lord Harry, we can't let this go on. I'm happy that every other member of this House, I know, was convinced that these schools that have been closed two or more years as spelled out in this Bill will in fact be apportioned and put in a district or under the divisional board. This is going to take some effort. We're going to do it division by division. I would hope the Official Trustee would measure the assets and liabilities of those districts that are still operating and where we operate them as Official Trustee, and either send them to a Board of Reference or over to the division, if they're not dissolved, and they will come under divisional control.

I wanted to make those few points though because I think there is real important to the Bill before us. This has been done in consultation with a large number of people and I think the methods that are opening themselves -- it's an opening up of the Act where individual districts can opt in, where the government is giving the leadership and committing itself openly to bringing about a rationalization of elementary education so far as we're able and to bring about, wherever it's possible, single district divisions.

We have already laid the groundwork by appointing one of our senior inspectors as the planning officer of the department. He has already met with the Teachers Society and the Manitoba Association of School Trustees to develop a campaign to inform the people of all the facets of this bill, all the way from the closed schools and Official Trustee Districts being dissolved, all the way to the concept of the regional vocational schools; and I'm convinced, when the people of this province understand just what we're trying to achieve and what we're up against in 1966 in this era of change, they will be prepared to give serious consideration to the very measures that are before you. Certainly it's been a long time coming and let's get on with the job.

I don't know if there'll be a province-wide referendum or not. I had a phone call yesterday from a division that want to come in and present me-- when this Bill is passed and has received Royal Assent, I think they are ready to go right away. We may have half a dozen districts in within a few months. These other measures are other ways of opting them in, of encouraging them to form larger divisions. We have the mandatory legislation in the Interlake contained in this Bill which should give us many guidelines, which should give us much experience in the coming year as to how to tackle other areas on the basis of what we run up against here.

I would answer the honourable member, when he says we're denying democracy, in Section 8 of that Bill I believe it is, "No consolidated district can be formed or enlarged without the approval of the Minister." That is the case today. Every consolidation must be approved by the Minister and I have refused, for his information, to form consolidations that were not adequate in the opinion of the educators and in my humble opinion charged with the responsibility of this department. I want to be able to turn that to a commission that's made an over-all study who can say to me, not as I'm faced with now, a request for a six-room consolidation knowing full well there were four other districts nearby who would be coming in next year and me wasting public funds if I should recommend the thing be proceeded with now. This is the common sense behind this Bill and I would ask my honourable member to try and understand that. If he needs any help with it, I would be happy to do so.

There were some very good points - one point brought up by the honourable members yesterday and today concerns the matter of the number of trustees in the section dealing with the Interlake. It suggests that the Board - the Boundaries Commission could name the number of trustees in those divisions. If they should reconstitute them or recommend single district divisions, they should recommend the number of trustees.

We didn't put a ceiling on that because at the present time in The Public School Act, any

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd)... division can have anywhere from five to nine trustees. We have found in the existing single district divisions in the province, the number of trustees ranges all the way from 5 to 9 with only four districts in the whole province having 9 or more trustees, for example Dauphin-Ochre, in existence for 22 years, has 7 trustees, Norwood 5, St. Boniface 5, Kelsey 7, Fort Garry 6, Flin Flon 5, St. Vital 7, St. James 8 - 31, in other words, out of 37 multi-district divisions have less than nine. Winnipeg has about 15 trustees, Brandon 10 trustees. We gave a great deal of thought to this and thought it might be wise for the Boundaries Commission to be able to recommend how many trustees they would recommend over a wide area because, for instance, the Interlake Division for example is a huge one, maybe 11. If 11 seems to be the figure it might be wise next year to say to any single district division, "You can go up to 11." In other words, as many of them have been in operation for several years, since very few have even 9 trustees when by bylaw they could have them, we didn't intend to raise the numbers here at this time.

Respecting the abolishment of the position of Official Trustee, this is a matter which we will carry out in -- it's a thing that will be gradually phased out as the districts are turned over to the division, and I'm sure the staff there, which isn't large, can certainly be absorbed in the expanding activities of the Department.

The Member from St. John's mentioned the Minister approves consolidation, but first referred him for ... to the Boundaries Commission. As I pointed out, the Minister has always had to give permission to new districts being formed, and we are now saying not only new districts but if a district's enlarged it should come to the Minister for approval, and of course the reason here, sending these to the Boundaries Commission, is to be sure that whatever is approved by the Department or the Minister does, in fact, fit into an over-all plan within the boundaries of that division.

..... also pointed out the Minister has permission to pay grants and could refuse same. The point is that we want to pay grants not just to any consolidation but to a sufficiently, and what we hope will be as properly and fully constituted a consolidation as we can attain.

There are a few matters in this bill before you, and again the Member from St. John's raised it, but before I deal with that, that concerns the one-third indemnity to the trustees. This was a resolution brought forward by our Manitoba Association and one which I referred to the Department and to our Legal Counsel and we thought it was in order, and of course that's why it appeared in this bill. On the grounds that the Federal Government might refuse to amend its Act - it may or may not - but I think if we leave it in this bill the trustees might feel that this is sufficient authority for their action and in that way it could be misleading, in my opinion, and I would like to move at Committee stage that we give some consideration to withdrawing Section 10 of the bill on that ground. I think this could be a very real danger and I must say it way only today on hearing the Member for St. John's and consulting again with the Attorney-General that he advised me this is indeed the case, that this is not covered under the Federal pension.

There are a couple of motions I would like to move in committee, the second motion dealing with Section 13 of the bill which mentions school areas and districts with respect to receiving grants for the mentally retarded. In a typographical error or something they omitted school divisions, which is most important, so I would have to move that amendment.

I will also, when we get to committee stage, ask for another section to the bill because a very bizarre thing has happened. We discovered the other day that last year's Public Schools Act (2) concerning the Northern School Division and our operation at Cranberry Portage North was to come into effect on proclamation, and we completely overlooked this fact when we gave effect to the bill by forming Frontier Division and we're therefore adding this amendment to give the Northern School Division bill effect from the 8th of July 1965 to validate our action since that time. This of course would have to be with the permission of the committee, and I would like to move it at third reading. Even in an efficient department like the Department of Education, some of these things can happen to you.

I do want to say to the Member from Emerson that I certainly am pleased that he and his group are willing to support Bill 16, and I think the educational activity we would hope to enter in, in concert with the educational groups in the province, and the legislation before us, it may-- I couldn't commit the administration to a referendum at this time. It may well be that we will have achieved much of our goal in the not too distant future. If not, we can always give consideration to it but certainly we are planning first of all to get out and inform the people of the alternative that this Act presents to them.

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd)...

Madam Speaker I believe I have covered all the points that have been raised. Thank you.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 108. The Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, if it were not for the stage of the Session I am afraid that I would be inclined to speak at some length on this bill, but having regard to the time of the Session I think I can be mercifully brief. It is a challenging situation to say something about this bill and to engage once more in the friendly dialogue with my good friend the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation, and it's a challenge to me to debate this subject with him to some extent, especially because I thought, both in the committee stage and in moving second reading, that my honourable friend for some reason or other didn't have his usual self-assurance. He wasn't employing his usual free-wheeling style. I trust that's not unparliamentary, Madam Speaker. He was, I thought, rather on the defensive, rather, if anything, apologetic, because I'm afraid that he himself recognized that with all the language that there is contained in the bill, that the likelihood of accomplishing anything, either soon or definite, was somewhat remote.

I think nobody that has an interest in agriculture, Madam Speaker, could object to the terms of the bill because it simply states that the main object of the Council shall be to further the development of the Agricultural Industry in Manitoba. Surely we are all in favour of that. And then we have some specific objectives and I see nothing whatever to object to in that. My only - and it's not a complaint by any means, and it's not a worry because it's just a fact of life - my concern is the fact, which I am sure the Honourable the Minister himself realizes, and that is that these objectives are easy to state; they are not so easy of accomplishment. I am sure my honourable friend would be the first to say that the setting up of a Council is not of itself going to accomplish the ends that all of us desire. For instance, one of the objectives was the definition of goals and objectives with respect to the agricultural industry and the means of achieving it.

Now as far as goals and objectives are concerned, I think these are known. They are easy to state. We know our objectives pretty well. I think, Madam Speaker, that we have an objective now, not only an objective but a responsibility, I believe that agriculture is faced with, in all the surplus-producing areas of the world, to really get down to business and try and produce what is needed for the world population.

I spoke about this at some length on one other occasion in this Session and I'm not going to repeat myself at any length at all, but Madam Speaker, I am sure you are aware that the statisticians of the United Nations and other international organizations, food and agriculture and others, agree that, given the fact that there will not be a war - which for goodness' sakes surely the people are not stupid enough to initiate a war - but given that premise, that in 35 years or less there will be twice as many people in the world as there are now. Well if there are going to be twice as many people in the world as now, and if there are already pretty nearly a third, or some people go even higher than that, who are hungry, the job of agriculture, the main job, is to see to it that as many as possible people get as near as possible to a proper diet, and that's both the responsibility and the opportunity, in my opinion, of agriculture, and I think that's one of the main objectives. And when I have been, in the past and I guess in the recent present as well, criticised for the fact that I have been honest enough to admit what I believe to be honesty and realism, to admit that the things that are of the main concern to agriculture lie outside of the realm of the province, some folks have said that that's a defeatist's attitude. I still believe that, because though we have the opportunity of the markets - they are there; the demand is there - but the operation to get the demand and the supply together, in my opinion leaves much to be desired, and this is something that my honourable friend - I'm not blaming him for this - my honourable friend and his department and the various other organizations and associations . . . join together, can't do in the Province of Manitoba.

I am becoming more doubtful as the years go by of whether even the national government can make the full contribution that I had hoped it could. It's an international subject and it's a big subject, but it's one that needs to be solved, and if this Council can do something even in a small way to implement some kind of a program and to emphasize the need of the people who are willing to produce and who are able to produce, the need for them to be guaranteed that they are going to have a market, and at a remunerative price, then that opportunity will be accepted, that responsibility will be fulfilled by the agriculturists of this province in common with others.

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd)...

So I have not only no objection but I applaud the effort to continue to produce, but as I have mentioned before also in this House, Madam Speaker, and I'm not going to belabour the obvious; as I have mentioned before and as the Honourable Member for Rhineland mentioned a few days ago, in order to help the farmer to achieve his full potential we do need to have some guarantee that he will have a reasonably remunerative price, and this is what is difficult now. It is admitted on all sides that the cost-price squeeze has not only not been dissipated but that it has actually been increasing. The squeeze is there, in my opinion. The thing that is so difficult for the family farm is the squeeze that's being put on the farmer because of the increasing cost of production with no corresponding -- perhaps some increase but no corresponding increase in the price of his products. And more money is what is needed by the farmers in so many areas. I am not going to argue that point any longer, I simply state it as what I believe to be a fact.

One of the things that I should mention in talking about this population figure, Madam Speaker, before I leave it entirely, I have here a population study, or the results of a study that was made by the United Nations quite recently, and this points out in connection with this tremendous increase in population that we're going to face as the years go on, some interesting figures as to where those great population increases will occur. I would hazard a guess, Madam Speaker, that if we conducted a test of the honourable members right now and asked them where is the biggest single population going to be, my guess is that they would say Eastern Asia, thinking of China. Well this study doesn't say so. This one says it's South Asia that's going to have the biggest one of all, principally India; and East Asia, chiefly China, is going to have the next biggest one; and the next biggest one -- and they all work together to mean a doubling of the world population in less than 35 years -- the next biggest one is Africa. And right after that one comes Latin America; and it's only after Latin America that the North American continent gets in, and with an extremely small increase compared to those others that I have mentioned. The columns are something like that, and here is North America here, with the U. S. S. R. and Europe behind those.

Now Madam Speaker, the important thing about that is, that in general these areas that are going to have the tremendous population increases are the underdeveloped countries as well, and the need of food production to meet the human consumption of those areas that already are deficient in diet and are faced with the large population increases, is so obvious that it doesn't need to be argued. So what we need to do, in my opinion, is to put the farmers of the country in the position that they can compete, that they can produce with some assurance that they're going to have a remunerative return, and that this cost-price squeeze that is the bugbear of Manitoba agriculture today is going to be in some way contained and as time goes on, eliminated. I don't know how it's going to be done. I do know, as has been mentioned here frequently, that the present trend is to go into larger and larger farms, and I do see in that -- I hope it doesn't occur, but I do see in that a difficult position for the family farm in the years to come. But I am not going to try and give the answers. If this council can do something to produce the answers and the recommendations, then I'm all for it.

But one of the things that I think we might pay some attention to is the tremendous increase in the returns that the service industries of one kind and another, and including agriculture, receive as compared to the returns that the producer himself receives. And I have before me the results of a study that was made in 1963, and oddly enough, similar studies were made both in Canada and in the United States at about the same time, with regard to the distribution of the return in a loaf of bread, the proportions of the returns to the different factors in putting a loaf of bread on the consumer's table. And I do not raise this as by any means the most important factor at the present time. I simply present it as one of the things that is indicative of the point that I am mentioning, that in my opinion the producer is still not getting his fair share of what the consumer pays.

Some figures that I had worked out from this study, and in this case they're my own rather than the study but they're based on the ones that were given in the study, and oddly enough, Madam Speaker, not only were the two studies carried on at relatively close times together, but the results seem to be very similar.

Well now, basing my figures on that study, I went back to just at the beginning of World War II, back to 1939, and the price of a one-pound loaf of bread at that time in this city was 8 cents. Wheat at that time was 60 cents a bushel, and it wouldn't have been 60 cents a bushel, perhaps, if it hadn't been government-supported at that time. And I think you will find that the

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd)... experts agree that it takes approximately a pound of wheat to make a pound of bread, in the form of flour of course, and that would mean that there was one cent worth of wheat in a loaf of bread at that time. The farmer got, let us say, approximately one cent for the wheat that was supplied. The cost of the loaf to the consumer was 8 cents. There was a 7-cents spread. Now, for the farmer looking at it, that's pretty big spread. He gets one cent; the consumer pays eight. There is a lot in between.

But do you know what's happened since? And here I am taking the figures from the - you can take either one, the Canadian study or the United States, because they're almost exactly similar, but I take the United States one because it's the more recent of the two, 1963. Now the price of bread is 21.6 cents, in this case. The farmer gets 3 cents, or 24 percent. The grain elevator and the transportation agencies and processors get 1.2 cents or 9 percent; the flour mill .6 of a cent, or 5 percent. The baker wholesaler, taking them together, get 6 cents or 44 percent; and the grocers get 2.4 cents or 18 percent. And that is up considerably, as anyone can tell, to what it is now.

Those were the 1938 figures that I was speaking of. Now, the farmer gets a still smaller percentage, 14 percent instead of 24; the grain elevator gets a slightly smaller one, 7 percent instead of 9; the flour miller gets 5 percent, exactly the same as he got before; the baker wholesaler gets 55 percent against 44 before; and the grocer gets 19 against 18. But figuring it into our terms here - and again taking these figures and translating them to the Manitoba situation - I am told that the price of a loaf of bread here is approximately 24 cents, on the average, a one pound loaf, I think we would be not far out if we said that the cost of the wheat is now 3 cents instead of 1 cent, and that means that instead of a 7-cent spread that we had back in the beginning of World War II, we now have a 21-cent spread. And this situation, in my opinion, Madam Speaker, can be followed through, whether you take bread or meat or vegetables, pretty nearly anything that you deal with the amount that the farmer receives compared to what the consumer pays is very high, and the squeeze goes on.

I'm not trying to blame anybody in this. I see the Honourable Minister of Education looking at me, expecting me to say it's the government's fault. I am not trying to blame anybody. I am saying it's the situation that exists and it's difficult of a solution. I know. And I think we have to get international arrangements made so that some organizations of various countries take a stand on this regard; just as they deal at high levels with regard to other matters of great importance, that they have to begin to deal with the situation regarding food prices, and getting the supplies to the places where they're needed. And while I'm not an advocate in general of subsidies and subsidized industries, yet I do point out the fact that Canada is one of the few countries in the world that does not subsidize its agriculture very heavily. As one of the complex factors in this, perhaps I should mention that when I was talking about the price of bread back in World War II times - just at the beginning of World War II - as being 8 cents here, the price of a pound loaf of bread in England at that time was 4 cents, and quite a little bit of the mix in their bread came from Canada. How they managed to transport the wheat or flour, as the case might be, all the way from here, and put a percentage of it in their flour, mix a percentage of it with their flour which was much higher priced because even then they were subsidizing their farmers to a very great extent, how they managed to do that and sell it at half the price that it was sold here, I don't know. But that was the fact.

Now this is an area that I think somebody might be looking at. I admit that it's not the only area, there are a great many. I do feel it incumbent upon we folk who feel that we speak for agriculture to once in awhile point out some of the problems that the farmers face. If this productivity council can do something, can make some suggestions and get somebody to carry them out as to how we can -- and I know they have under this bill the terms of reference that allow them to explore any avenue; it allows them to look at the problems - I hope they can do something that is worthwhile, because it is my conviction, Madam Speaker, that there is no group of people in Canada that is more ready to do its job as far as production is concerned, than are the farmers, but they've got to be assured of a reasonable return at the end of the road.

So if this council can do something along that line, I am all for it and I apologize for taking what is probably more time than I indicated I would at the start, and if somebody thinks I've been long, let me tell them that if it wasn't for the stage of the House that we're at, I'd have been quite a bit longer.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Madam Speaker, it was a pleasure to listen to the Member

(MR. HARRIS cont'd)... from Lakeside reiterate what I said last fall in the last speech in the House. I said the identical thing, all the way through. Now, I'm not saying that he's going along. I'm glad he's going along with what I was trying to put across then.

I was saying at that particular time, and one of the Members here said to me, "You're going all over the world." I said, "Yes, I'm going all over the world just to show to you. . . ." I was speaking on automation at the time - "just to show to you what we can do with automation. I don't preach or say that it is no good. I just show them what is in this world, what is coming up, what we have to feed, and we in Canada here with this country so vast — and to see our farmers having to beg, you might say; starving. Yes."

I went to a dinner there the other day, down in the Fort Garry, the Manitoba Export - I forget the last word - but anyway, the speaker got up and he spoke identically the way that you spoke. Identically. I turned around and I said to one of my colleagues here, I said, "Listen to him, now. What does he say?" And it was really nice to listen. As I said last year, down in the United States they pay heavy subsidies to these farmers. The time is coming when these people will have no worry at all. Their stuff will go out into the world and everything will be taken like that. We see today Japan who never took in imported wheat; today she's importing wheat; and all these various countries, the people won't take degradation any more. They want the best that comes along. They say, "We earn this money; we want what is coming into this market of the world," and we have the golden opportunity here. We could raise all the beef, we could raise all the grain, we have all the metal, we have everything in the world. We only need the will to do things now - not to hold people back. And sometimes I think, I wonder to myself when we are in here, what are we doing? Are we holding ourselves back because we are a little bit too timid to go ahead and do things? I just wonder that. We live for today, we don't think for tomorrow - it's far off. Today, we are here today.

Over in Europe, when I was over there not so very long ago, I looked at them and I said, "Well, you don't seem to have the same fear as they have over in North America." They said, "Why should we? Why should we? We lived for four years and we didn't know whether we were going to come up tomorrow, so why should I keep and save a penny for tomorrow because tomorrow to me will never come." So these people in these various places are living -- they say, "I live for today. I live for today. I don't live for a tomorrow that maybe's never going to come."

So I will say to the Member from Lakeside that he made a very wonderful speech and he made it the way I would have made it myself. Thank you.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Berville): Madam Speaker, I would like to say a few words. I'm glad to have the support of the Honourable Member for Lakeside in using this approach to try and find a better solution. I think that he would agree with me that whenever agriculture faced very real crises, whether it was in the grain industry or whether it was in the dairy industry, or whenever it occurred, the solutions usually were found through a joint effort of the industry itself together with government, and when a crisis arose and everyone was convinced that something should be done about it, whether it was the case of the financial situation of United Grain Growers in the early years, whether it was the case of the pools later on, or whether it was the case of the chaos that existed in the fluid milk industry before it was reorganized under the Milk Control Board Act, whenever the dilemma was great enough everybody seemed to rise to the occasion, the government, the farmer and the other sectors of the industry, the processor and distributor and so on, and they got together, albeit on an ad hoc basis, and they solved that problem.

I think what we are trying to do here is to provide a permanent forum for the same kind of people, with the same kind of abilities and dedication, and on a regular basis carry on and make a contribution prior to us getting into a dilemma. Rather than put out our best efforts when we have gotten into a crisis, maybe we could put out our best efforts in a successful attempt to realize greater goals than we have realized in the past.

There is one other matter and it is only in a sense associated with this bill, and that's the consideration of the growth and population in the world and what it means to the producers of North America. I think we must always temper our enthusiasm for the opportunities to produce food for these starving people, or undernourished people; we must temper that enthusiasm in the knowledge that they are not going to find their salvation in the bulging grain bins of North America; that somehow or other we are going to have to find ways of helping them to till their soil so that their granaries have some grain in them on which they can rely. We know, through efforts that have been made over the years, that somehow or other it is no good for

(MR. HUTTON cont'd)... these people and no good for ourselves either if we merely use North America as a great storehouse to feed these people. What we have to do is help them to feed themselves, and of course their salvation is the same as our salvation and that is education.

Before I take my seat I would just like to tell you of one little incident that occurred this past weekend. It was my privilege to attend the Convocation of the Diploma Course in Agriculture at the University of Manitoba, and the guest speaker was a man by the name of Dr. Briggs who is the head of a Liberal Arts College at Morris, Minnesota, a college associated with the University of Minnesota. During his address he told us that his father had gone to school and gone to school and gone to school and gone to school, and finally left school with a Grade 8 education at a time when the educational mean of the folks on the average in the United States was Grade 3. He went out to western North Dakota and he built a sod shanty which my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside probably is familiar with - I never saw one. But he built a sod shanty and he took his bride there and Dr. Briggs' sister was born in this sod shanty, built out of sod cut from the prairie, whitewashed on the inside with a mud floor. The significant part of my story is this: A short time ago Dr. Briggs went to Nigeria, I believe the country was, and the native children were coming out of homes that were built of mud and the walls were whitewashed and the floors were dirt floors. Dr. Briggs' father started his married life in that kind of a home but subsequently went back to university, went back to school and university, and subsequently spent the rest of his life as a college lecturer and his one son is the head of this Liberal Arts College and another one holds a very important post in a large California university.

I think there's a lesson that we can learn here and that is, as education has really been the salvation of most of us in North America, so education and know-how is going to be the salvation of the people that we I think exercise legitimate and sincere concern for, who are unfortunate and who are not able to supply themselves with the food that they need, but I think that we should keep in mind that it is education and know-how they need more than our grain. To the extent that our grain and our food products can hold starvation at bay while they get this know-how, to that extent we have a responsibility to do our best to fulfil this role. I thank the members for their support of this bill.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 109. The Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, last evening the Honourable Member for St. John's, while taking part in this debate mentioned some of the things that he felt should have been included in this Metro bill, and I have - I don't know if you'd call it a beef or a suggestion, but there is something that I feel should have been included in this also. I think that this is something that is very important for the people of the Metropolitan area and something that the Minister would do well to look into, and I'm talking about the assessment that we have had since Metro's been here.

If Metro needed money it took part of the business tax, then it took the business tax figured on the way it was done in Winnipeg and the municipalities had to pay the balance. Now we've had bills changing this, bringing an equalized assessment, and we have that not only on business tax but in realty tax also. Now it seems very fair, Madam Speaker, to say "equalized assessment" and it would be, it would be if you had equalized services, and many people in this Greater Winnipeg area are paying pretty well along the same line as the people in the populated area, but are not receiving services at all - or very little services - and I think that this is something that should be looked into. This is something that will take lots of study but it's something that should be done. It's too late in this Session now but I hope that it will come.

I'm talking about, as I say, equalized assessment. You have people that live in the fringe of the area. You have people that live in the areas where there are no sewers, no water, very little if any fire protection, police protection, yes and even flood protection, people that were outside the main dikes. No sidewalks, very little lighting, and the Transit doesn't give them the service that the other people do. Now this is not a complaint, I'm not talking about these services not being there. After all, you need a certain part of the population, you need enough people to have these things, and before we had this Metropolitan form of government people had a choice. They could live in a place where you had all these services - they were paying for these services. Other people couldn't quite afford these things so they went out a little further. That brought inconvenience but they were ready to take this. They were pioneering;

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)... maybe this is what they wanted. They were satisfied with less but of course they were paying less. They had a choice. And now you haven't got this choice any more. You pay an equalized assessment - oh yes, you have equalized assessment with Winnipeg. The land at times is - of course certain land is worth more but on the real property you certainly are paying equalized assessment, and if the Minister who is shaking his head, if he doesn't believe me, we certainly won't get in a big argument at this time. I won't be able to speak after I sit down but I certainly would like to have him, between sessions, or after the election, we might compare notes and I think that he'll understand what I mean.

Now there is something else I think that has to be touched in this debate, that we have to talk about on this debate. There has been this question referred to by the Honourable Member from St. John's, the lack of support that Metro receives from this Assembly, from this government. And just a few weeks ago, one of the Metro councillors speaking to the Rotary Club complained about this. I have here a clipping from the Free Press of March 31, 1966 with the heading: "Metro Disowned By Government. Police Finance Planning Blocked, Huband Tells Rotary. The Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg has been disowned by the Manitoba Legislature." This is the way he starts. It says, "In an outspoken speech to the Winnipeg Rotary Club he accused the Provincial Government of yielding too often to pressure from Metro's critics and said the Liberal Opposition lacked the courage to reverse its original opposition to the creation of Metro. Councillor Huband said all too often the Provincial Government has avoided the ... support of Metro and has thus avoided the unpleasantness of irritating the local mayors and reeves."

This was an outspoken speech. I would like to try at this time to prove part of the statement that I've read and disprove other parts. I suspected that Councillor Huband, who is a known adherent of the policy of the party in power, had a message to give his friends, but then of course he felt that he would be going a little too far if he didn't include the Liberals in this. I think he certainly was wrong in the stand of saying that the Liberals would not do anything on Metro. It's not a question of reversing your stand. But I think he was absolutely right in saying that this government has disowned Metro. And I wish this afternoon, Madam Speaker, to quote quite extensively from Hansard, because if I just say certain things it will be denied later on and I won't have a chance to prove my point. So I will read from Hansard of other years.

In 1962, if you remember, Madam Speaker, Metro was founded and - I think it was the famous Bill 62 - started in 1960. Well at that time there was no one in this House who fought more against Metro than I did. No one; not a single one. I brought in many amendments; I voted against the bill; I asked for a referendum; I did everything. But I said this, Madam Speaker, I said that I felt it was my duty because of the constituency that I represented - and I feel that I was right then. I prophesied that in a number of years you'd have total amalgamation, that part of the St. Boniface which was the nest of French-Canadian heritage here in the west, would disappear, and I think that this is being done now and I think that in a few years, the way it's going now, this is what we'll have and we'll be forced into total amalgamation.

Now the government at the time said that this was nonsense. Madam Speaker, I represented the constituency of St. Boniface. I said at the time that if I had represented Winnipeg I would fight for total amalgamation, because this was the only thing for Winnipeg to do. It had to grow, it had to stretch, and it had to take in the suburbs. But I also said, Madam Speaker, in 1960 - not 1965 or 1966 - that it was my responsibility, my duty and my privilege to fight against something that I felt wasn't right, that I would do my utmost to see that this bill did not pass, but I stated, Madam Speaker, that if this bill became an Act then I would accept the democratic way of doing things and I would hope that I was wrong and that I would do my utmost to give Metro a chance to try to make it succeed. And I said that I hoped that the people of my constituency would do the same thing. And I am proud to say, Madam Speaker, this is exactly what happened. It wasn't a question of reversing my field. From one of opposition I became one that tried to give Metro a chance. But unfortunately, this government who had asked us without any concern for the experience of the municipal men, met a lot of resistance. At the time, in this famous bill there was a clause that stated that - well when this was explained, "Yes, we know," the government said "We know that we're going to have a lot of trouble, this is going to be difficult to achieve. So we have a clause that in five years we'll review." Well Madam Speaker, the next Session, the next year, the members from this government - not "the" members but some members from this government started to knock Metro, especially the Honourable Member from St. Vital, started to knock Metro because it was obvious that Metro wasn't popular. And this government, the members of this government did not have the courage

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)... to stand up, did not have the courage to stand up and back Metro. We had a mayor in Winnipeg that was too powerful for them. They did not want to cross swords with him. And they waited, and the man that they had confidence in, the man that they had named to head Metro was abused and accused and so on, but not once did any of the members of this government stand up and fight.

Now in 1962, just before an election, this Metro was going to be quite an issue. Then this government very conveniently took this responsibility and placed it on the shoulders of a commission, the Michener Commission, and nobody was supposed to talk about Metro. 1960, 1962, it didn't have the courage or the guts to stand on this principle. It disowned Metro.

Now, just before another election - and I'm not going to dwell on this since I spoke earlier today - we have a commission - boundary - and the same thing is going to happen again. Madam Speaker, I think it is most unfair and I think it is showing lack of courage on the part of this government, and I would like to quote - I haven't very much longer but I'll quote, and now I'm quoting from Page 231, February 27, 1962, from a speech that I made in this House.

I quote: "Now I said a lot of things on Metro, sir, and I was opposed to it, but I also said this. This is why, Mr. Chairman, I again warn that this bill is not fair to St. Boniface and in the long run will hurt us. I hope, I sincerely hope that I will be proven wrong. And when Bill 62 is passed, I and all the constituents of St. Boniface, I am sure, will do our best to make it work. We do not intend to be rebels. It is our privilege, it is our right, however, and our duty to oppose it if our conscience so dictates. Until the bill is read a third time and passed, this is all we have tried to do. And I say here, I would like to go on record as saying, Mr. Chairman, that I oppose this bill in principle. I am afraid that it will lead to total amalgamation, which in this case would be detrimental to my constituency. I would like to go on record as saying that when - and only when this bill is passed, I will do everything in my power to help make it a success. I accept this democratic way of doing things. I am the one that is not supposed to be reasonable, and you know how much I've fought against this bill of Metro. And didn't I keep my promise? Did you ever hear me say one word against Metro? Didn't the people of St. Boniface try to give Metro a fair chance? Ask the Chairman what he thinks. Did we give him a fair chance?" - and so on. Now -- well this is in answer to this councillor who I felt had to bring this in about the members of the Opposition because he wanted to knock the government, and after all he is a member of this party.

Now I'd like to quote the same year from a speech of the Member from St. Vital. And he says, "If I had known then, if I had had any idea what a schimozzle Metro would be in within a year, primarily because of the irresponsibility, Mr. Speaker - 'irresponsibility' is not the right word, perhaps 'arrogance' would be better - of Metro officials, Metro council, in the downright stupidity of its public relations people, I would not have voted for this bill even although at the time and now I think that this was a good Act. What has gone wrong, Mr. Speaker? Why has Metro, with the possible exception of the 1950 flood, become one of the most unpopular and most feared things in the Greater Winnipeg area? The animosity that the Metro council has attracted to itself in so short a time is a terrible thing to behold. Last year I was privileged on"-- well it's the same thing, Madam Speaker. He kept on, all the ....

Now before - I have a minute or two; I would like to quote from a speech that was made by the Honourable Member from Turtle Mountain at the time, Mr. Dow, and I think that this will bring out certain things that we prophesied at the time. "Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the members of this House should have to run for the journals to find out as to my recorded vote in regards to Bill 62 when it was before the House in 1960. I was one of the few that voted against the bill. I did so on the municipal experience that I had, on the basis that, in my opinion, Bill 62 was produced to this House without the blessing or recommendation of experienced municipal men that had done so much work for ten years ahead of the bill coming to a climax. I might point out to this House that immediately after the bill was passed, the Leader of the House called in for consultation the mayors and Reeves of Metro Winnipeg, and the question in my mind is why were these people not consulted prior to the passing of Bill 62? In my opinion municipal men were ignored when this government refused to accept the recommendations of the committee of the municipal men. They brought in a brief and they brought in recommendations. Now Sir, it is my humble opinion that in the introduction of Bill 100 this government has shown a lack of confidence in Metro Council; and when this bill is passed" -- this was asking for this commission -- "... you will immediately rehash and go over the same territory that was gone over for ten years prior to the passing of Bill 62. And I can quite truthfully say, in my opinion, Sir, that if I was elected councillor of Metro, and

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)... were Bill 100 passed, my resignation from the council would be in the hands of the chairman very quickly. The Premier stated as an introduction of Bill 100 that Metro was going too fast. Now Sir, I voted against the bill. I believe in democracy. I believe in the statutes that we pass in this House are law; but I ask you this question: Whose fault is it that they went too fast? This Bill 62 became a statute and there were certain mandatory clauses that came into this bill on the proclamation of it becoming law, and I would like to point them out to you, Sir. Section 66 of Bill 62 - The responsibility for assessment became mandatory. Section 78 - The sole and full responsibility of planning and development. Section 94 - Shall establish a metropolitan street business. Section 109 - The transit system and all interests of the transit system were vested in the Metropolitan Corporation."

Well, Madam Speaker, I don't intend to keep on after this hour, the 5:30. I would refer the members to Page 1673 of April 11, 1962, and I think that they will have a good idea of what is happening in this field since 1960.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, if no other member wishes to speak, I would like to adjourn the debate. I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 8:00 o'clock Wednesday evening.