

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, March 26th, 1963.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Gudmundor Paulson and others, praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate the Elizabeth M. Crowe Memorial Hospital.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of The Fidelity Trust Company, praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate The Fidelity Trust Company; and the petition of Niagara Mortgage and Loan Company, praying for the passing of an Act to authorize the petitioner to carry on business in the Province of Manitoba; and the petition of Industrial-Talcott Financial Limited, praying for the passing of an Act to authorize the petitioner to carry on business in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF (River Heights): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of The Central Trust Company of Canada, praying for the passing of an Act respecting The Central Trust Company of Canada; and a petition of the C.A.C. Realty Limited, praying for the passing of an Act to authorize the petitioner to carry on business in the Province of Manitoba; and the petition of Mary Eileen Abbott and others, praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate The Winnipeg Art Gallery.

MR. M. E. MCKELLAR (Souris-Lansdownie): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Mytro Mandybura, praying for the passing of an Act for the relief of Mytro Mandybura.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Sister Marie Robertine and others, praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate Providence Ste. Therese.

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

MR. COWAN introduced Bill No. 29, an Act respecting Associates Mortgage Credit Limited.

MADAM SPEAKER: We have among us today a very distinguished visitor, a former Speaker of the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota. Mr. Fitch was Speaker three years ago and was six years as Speaker in North Dakota. He resides at Fargo and he is seated on my right.

I would like to attract your attention to the gallery on my right where there are seated 90 Grade 5 students from Faraday School under the supervision of their teachers, Misses Stadnyk, Holme and Loewen. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

Seated in the first section on my right are 32 Grade 5 pupils from the Ralph Brown School with their teacher, Mrs. E. Silvester. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. John's.

We welcome you this afternoon as you watch the Members of the Legislative Assembly in action. Maybe as you see this for yourself today, you will say that school is never out. I am sure your observations will help you in your social studies. I hope your visit will kindle an interest to learn more about the government of your province and of your Dominion, and that it will inspire you to continue your education and to start thinking about your own career. Come back and visit us again.

Orders of the Day.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table of the House the Annual Report of the Manitoba Hospital Commission for the year ended the 31st of December, 1962. I think there are sufficient copies for the Leaders of the Parties, and I would point out that each member will be receiving a proper bound copy in due course. Also, I would like to lay on the Table of the House the statistical supplement to the Annual Report of the Hospital Plan for 1961, which should be of some help to the honourable members.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders for Return.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Utilities. Could he indicate at this time when those orders I have place on the Paper regarding the water contracts with Drake-Pearson and the other one dealing with McNamara and the subsequent structure of the Grand Rapids will be tabled?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, I can only comment with respect to the order affecting the water-hauling contract and that order should be tabled very shortly.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I understood the Minister accepted the other one as well, or is it another department?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): Madam Speaker, that was the one with respect to the bridge. The material isn't at hand yet; it's being scouted out by the department and as soon as it's available it will be in.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders for Return.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. With regard to the news reports today on the two cases of typhoid in the province, is there any likelihood of a more serious typhoid epidemic, and what is the Department of Health doing about the situation?

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, I have to say I haven't heard of these two cases, but I'll certainly get a report forthwith.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Elmwood, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: The number of tuberculosis cases in Manitoba known to the Department of Public Health (a) in hospitals; (b) in other institutions; (c) at homes under observation; and (d) the total cost to the Department of Public Health.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, I'd ask permission of the House to withdraw this Order. I have reworded it and re-submitted it. Do I have permission to withdraw this?

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have permission to withdraw? -- Agreed. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. E.R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return Showing: (1) Whether or not there are any initiation fees, dues, or other payments made by the Province or any of its Boards, Utilities, etc., for or on behalf of any Minister, Deputy, Director, or other employee to any social or private club or institution or like organization. (2) If the answer to (1) is yes, then particulars thereof showing: (a) the office held; (b) the name of the organization; (c) the amounts paid in 1962; and (d) the amounts budgeted for 1963.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Madam Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from St. John's, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: 1. The total amount paid by the Government, its agencies, boards, commissions, etc., for legal counsel outside of the Government Civil Service or for those employed by governmental agencies, boards, commissions, etc., on a full time basis: (a) For the fiscal year ending March 31, 1962, and (b) For the Calendar year 1963; and 2. The amounts, if any, so paid showing: (a) the amounts paid to each individual or firm: (1) as fees, (2) as disbursements, and (b) the purpose for which such legal counsel was retained.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, before you put the question, I believe there is a typographical error in the Return and it has just been drawn to my attention, mentioning under (b) "for the Calendar year 1963". It's

(Mr. Pauley, cont'd).... obvious that that should be for "1962".

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, the question rather puzzles me, because we're asked for the fiscal year ending 31st of March, 1962 and whether my honourable friend means that information and the balance that may have been involved in the rest of the calendar year '62 -- that's the question. Thank you.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Pembina in amendment thereto. The Honourable the Member for Burrows.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, I beg your permission to let the debate on the proposed resolution stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster. The Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. T.P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Madam, with the leave of the House, I'd ask that this matter be allowed to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, we beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. E.R. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the matter is going to be stood over by the Leader of the Liberal Party, if I might be allowed to speak to the resolution at this time.

I feel, of course, that this resolution is in a sense, a very important sense, one of the most important resolutions that members of this Chamber will be faced with during this Session or for many many sessions to come. Although I find it so important, I shall not speak at any great length because I feel that much of what I could say on the matter has been given a good deal of publicity in the various newspapers and over television by the various political party leaders in our country and so on and so forth.

I would like to say by way of preface that in reading through the speech made on this resolution by the Member for Roblin last Friday, that I for one was very impressed with the general tone of his remarks and the thinking which seemed to prevail throughout most of his address. That is not to say that every last statement that he made is identical in view and outlook to that which I have and which members in my group may have on the matter. The Member for Roblin made the point -- I think a very important point -- that matters involving the use of nuclear weapons because of the magnitude of the problem, the importance of the problem, should not be left almost by default to military leaders. I think this is a statement which everyone here who believes in democracy by civil authority -- democracy as such -- would subscribe to.

He also made the point that because of the nature of Bipolarization in the world today -- the world divided into east and west -- communism and the free world, that we cannot let up our constant vigilance against communist aggression and the threat of the appeal of the materialism of communism. That, too, I'm sure is a sentiment -- more than a sentiment -- that is a statement of fact. I believe that everyone here would subscribe to as well.

I think it's in proper taste for me to inform members here that for the last two years I have been studying under several professors, one of them Dr. Avakumovic, studying world communism under him. We are fortunate to have him here in Manitoba because he has an international reputation in the field, and I and others at the university have been lucky to have a man such as him under whom to study. Much of what we have learned in the past year or two is very close to what the member for Roblin had to say with regard to where the actual substance of threat lies with regard to communism. The member quoted a statement by Dr. Charles Malek, former president of the U.N. I think in that one short and concise paragraph, one finds practically the entire nut or the entire substance of what we, in the free world must face.

Well, faced as we are with this threat to our values, our way of life, our freedom and so on, man, on this side at least, has a choice; he can, on one hand, participate at every corner and every turn in the defence of the free world or he can decide to take the easy way out into neutralism. The member made the inference that many in our group were neutralists,

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd) . . . pacifists and -- (Interjection) -- yes, he said that many New Democrats are pacifists, ban the bombers, and so on and so forth. I think that the member and anyone else who suffers under those misapprehensions should be corrected. The majority of the group which I belong to, at national convention assembled two years ago, decided pretty clearly and pretty decisively what our attitude would be with regard to our posture in the western alliance. (1) We did not advocate any kind of unilateral withdrawal from NATO. (2) We did not believe in adopting a posture of neutralism. (3) We did not advocate that we should take a position half way -- the member put it "half-way between the U.S. and Russia" -- nothing of the sort. We also felt very strongly that we had a unique position in the western alliance and in the United Nations, a unique position which gave Canada an opportunity to act as a mediator, in many instances in the past and possibly in the future, and that we could make our most positive contribution to world peace by remaining in that role. If Canada were to accept nuclear weapons today, it is entirely conceivable, and in fact very likely, that our position, our role as a mediator would be somewhat impinged upon and our effectiveness would decline, at least in the U.N.

Members will recall very clearly that in 1956 Canada was able to play a very specific and a very worthwhile role in the U.N. with regard to mediation in the Middle East proposal for the United Nations emergency force. This in fact came from Canada. The fact that we were able to sell it diplomatically to Egypt and the other parties involved was an indication that Canada was highly respected; that her views were taken with a good deal of respect. But if a nation accepts nuclear weapons it automatically disqualifies itself from playing such a role. This is not a matter of opinion, it is a matter of fact, that United Nations emergency forces, if they are to be accepted by countries in which troubles are brewing, if they are to be accepted, they must be forces of a non-nuclear nation. I think the member for Roblin pointed that out and of course he is correct in that regard.

I was surprised -- perhaps this surprised me the most of the entire remarks made by the Member for Roblin -- he said that he does not think that now is the time for "ban the bomb" movements. Of course if he means unilateral ban the bomb movements, I would agree with him -- movements that favour banning the bomb in a unilateral sense -- I would agree. But it's entirely, not only false, but the height of madness to suggest that we should be opposed to ban the bomb movements as such, because ban the bomb movements can really be movements working for nothing more nor less than disarmament, and of course this is the principle or concept which the leaders of every political party in this country subscribe to. Of course one of the leading proponents is the Honourable Howard Green.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I'd just like to point out that I implied that most of the active ban the bomb groups are unilateral groups -- the ones that are active and getting a lot of the organization work -- in my opinion.

MR. SCHREYER: I think you meant that, but you didn't imply it here. It doesn't show up in the reading of it. But I really wanted to put most of the emphasis of what I had to say on the action which has taken place in this country in the last few months. It seems that there was a general area of consensus among the political parties here that Canada should attempt, to her utmost, to play a non-nuclear role. This was the general consensus of the people of all political parties, but then a very strange, a very unusual event took place in January last when the Leader of one of the political parties, the Liberal Party, made an about-face on the matter and reversed their position -- (Interjection) -- Well this is a fact. Do you want to deny it? I don't have to look up any detailed quotations here, but I happen to have one quote. The Leader of the Liberal Party nationally, on November 10th, 1962, which is just five months ago, less than that, said and I quote: "I would suggest that Canada should negotiate for a non-nuclear role in NATO." -- (Interjection) -- Certainly there's no question but that before January of this year the Liberal Party stood for a non-nuclear role. Certainly there's no dispute about that. I wasn't going to be so harsh on the members to my right that they have to -- (Interjection) -- I'm right -- I'll get to that in a minute.

The way matters stand now, Madam Speaker, the United States and the Soviet Union have sufficient nuclear destructive power to not only destroy each other's territory but to destroy each other's territory several times over, and that was brought out rather clearly -- rather plainly -- by the Member for Roblin; and I think that this must be accepted as fact. We now enter an age where it is useless to think in terms of defence; rather one must think in terms of

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd) . . . deterrents. The United States and the Soviet Union, because of their mutual ability to destroy each other, have brought us into a world situation where our only hope at the moment, and in the absence of disarmament, is deterrents. Concepts of 5, 10, 15, 20 years ago and more are entirely out-dated. The only hope then is that we must work towards disarmament. Until that happens we have deterrents, a ghastly prospect I admit, but nevertheless an effective one so far of avoiding world destruction.

Now it is proposed that Canada should accept nuclear tips for the Bomarc in the hope that it will give North American air defence some greater capability. The fact of the matter is that this is based on thinking that is about five years behind the times. The United States today is not concentrating, for its strategic nuclear trust, on manned bombers; and I suggest neither is the Soviet Union. I believe that should be accepted as being reasonably accurate. Therefore, for Canada to accept nuclear devices to be used on a carrier that is effective only against manned bombers is really an admission, an admission of spending money on obsolescence, continuing to spend money on obsolescence. And what good would it do? It would, among other things, have a very bad negative effect; namely, that Canada then would be responsible in one sense or another, directly or indirectly, would be responsible for the spread of the nuclear club. It is generally agreed that Canada, if it does nothing else, should not be responsible as a middle power for the spread of the nuclear club. It is difficult enough to get three or four countries with nuclear weapons to disarm; it would be infinitely more difficult to get 20 or 30 countries with nuclear weapons to disarm. In the meantime, as long as these weapons exist without disarmament, the picture is very stark indeed. So I don't believe that we should accept nuclear devices for our Bomarc carriers, for reasons of obsolescence; for reasons of being responsible for the spread of the nuclear club and so on.

So what possible reason could there be, Madam Speaker? Is it, and I suppose this is the main reason put forward by at least one of the political parties, namely that we have made a commitment to our partners in NORAD -- that is to say the United States -- we've made some sort of commitment to do that, to accept these nuclear devices. I challenge my honourable friends to produce any kind of documentary evidence to show that there is indeed such a contractual commitment -- show it. Well, one of the so-called Liberal defence experts, a man by the name of Drury I believe, said that when he was finally pinned down on this point, said: "Oh well, there are no real commitments but there are implicit commitments." So already, when confronted with the question, they backed away from it.

But is this such a strong arguing point, Madam Speaker? In the first place, commitments, even if they exist which I challenge -- even if they exist, are not to be considered as extending into perpetuity, and sometimes there is just cause and reason for negotiating for a change in commitments. I want somebody to suggest if there is any basic difference or difference in substance between the kind of commitment that we allegedly have with the U.S. with regard to the Bomarc tip and the kind of commitment that the United States had with Great Britain with regard to the Skybolt, and yet the United States, probably with just cause, saw fit to negotiate with the U.K. for a change in plans, and after a pretty hard and fast commitment with Britain to supply her with the Skybolt, the United States decided for reasons of economy that she would not go ahead with it and the United Kingdom accepted that. Who will deny that? Similarly, and by analogy, one could argue the case for Canada not accepting nuclear devices for the Bomarc at this time.

Now most of the items up to now, I believe, most of what I have said is parallel most of the way with what the member for Roblin has said -- most of the way -- but I notice that up to now, nothing very much at least has been said with regard to whether or not Canada's forces within NATO as opposed to NORAD should be armed with nuclear capability. Now I don't know why the honourable member chose not to deal with Canada and Canada's role in NATO and I'm not questioning his motives at this time, but I would like to just take a few minutes to say why, in the context of our resolution here, that we feel that Canada's forces in NATO should likewise not be armed with nuclear weapons. In the first place, it is only in the last two years that some kind of reality has come into the minds of the military leaders in NATO. Until 1961, our NATO capacity was based almost entirely on nuclear weapons and we would have been put in the strange situation where, if we had been attacked in Western Europe -- I say we -- the alliance had been attacked by Soviet ground forces and so on, conventional enemy forces, we were so

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd) . . . weak in a conventional sense that we would have been obliged to resist conventional attack with nuclear tactical weapons.

Now just think of the immense moral dilemma of such a situation. I think perhaps it is only in this one isolated sense that we can justifiably use the word "moral" here. We would have been put in the position of defending ourselves against conventional attack by nuclear tactical weapons, and this is sheer madness. But I'm happy to say that the NATO Command has changed its ways, or the leaders of the countries that go to make up the NATO alliance have changed their plans, and for the better, because now it is part and parcel of our NATO policy that we should build up our conventional forces so that we can inject a measure of flexibility. I don't think that this is necessarily a controversial political point to raise, but since 1961 and Kennedy's involvement as leader of the American nation, there has been this great and good change--if it's proper to use the word "good" -- change in our NATO defence policy.

Until 1961, we assumed that we could use tactical nuclear weapons against conventional forces and get away with it, but now the military experts agree and admit that the minute we use tactical weapons it would escalate, and if we use kiloton bombs in the defence of Western Europe we would end up within 24 hours having megaton bombs being dropped on the American continent. So we've gotten away from that and I say it's a smart thing that we have; but now that we have, we have to fill the gap and that means we have to build up our conventional defence forces and that is where Canada's role lies. Just because we're opposed to the acceptance by Canadian troops of nuclear weapons does not mean that our hearts and our reasoning in the matter is opposed to NATO. We're very much in favour of it under present circumstances. We feel that Canada's role should be that of providing, to the utmost of her capacity, both physical and financial contingents of troops so that NATO's conventional forces will be built up to a safe level.

What are the facts of the matter? I just happen to have the figures here that in NATO our entire strength is 24 divisions -- 24 divisions against 89 for the Warsaw pact nations, so there is work to be done in this regard. The United States realizes it; I think we do now and I think that we should proceed along that line. This is our stand in the matter and let's not have deliberate misinterpretation, some sort of nonsense that we're opposed to NATO. The longer we procrastinate, the longer we slough off this decision, we are going to remain slavishly addicted to nuclear defence within NATO and that, as I've said two or three times all ready, would be the height of folly.

I shouldn't anticipate, but I wouldn't be surprised if some members here wouldn't get up and try to say that if NATO decides that her forces shall be equipped with nuclear weapons as far as a multilateral NATO nuclear force we, as a part, would have to accept it; and if we didn't we couldn't belong to NATO anymore. I wouldn't be surprised if someone tried to say that, but that is not the fact of the matter, Madam Speaker, because right within the North Atlantic Alliance Treaty, one of the articles -- I believe it's Article 5 -- states: "that each component nation of NATO shall decide as to the composition of its force as it deems necessary". And so if we have to choose to interpret what we feel is necessary as far as our contribution to NATO is concerned, that is our sovereign right and because we choose to do so would not mean that we would be in any way abjuring any of the provisions of that alliance for freedom.

So I believe that judging by the general tone of the remarks of the member for Roblin and with the supplement that I have given with regard to our posture in NATO with what it should be, this resolution should carry. I wouldn't be surprised, but I would be disappointed if some members chose to vote against it for no other reason than that public opinion polls seem to indicate otherwise.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, I assume in the absence of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that this matter will stand in his name, unless some other member wishes to speak at the present time.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable the Minister of Education.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Minister of Education) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, with the approval of the House, I would ask that this resolution stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Dufferin in

(Madam Speaker, cont'd) amendment thereto. The Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, I adjourned the debate to study more thoroughly the content and the intent of the amendment that was moved by the Honourable Member for Dufferin. I might say at the outstart that I was a little bit surprised that my honourable friend from Dufferin would speak on this particular resolution. I thought perhaps some of the members living in the western part of the province, who travel over this section of highway that is referred to in the resolution might speak on it at some length, because it is a fact that they know the problem that is there and the problem that is enunciated in the resolution itself. However, I'm glad that the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie did place the resolution on the Order Paper because if he had not then this House would never get to know what the government's intentions were in this regard. I'm completely satisfied that we would not have been told that it was the intention of the government to do something about this particular section of road if we had not placed the resolution on the Order Paper, and that may hold true of several other resolutions.

Now my honourable friend for Dufferin -- the Member for Dufferin, he did give us a lot of statistics the other day. Most of them I had before I heard them from him, but it seems to me that his entire speech attempted to do two things. No. 1, to point up that there wasn't really too much wrong with the road surface, the condition of the road and so on, and that the accidents all stemmed from the fact that we have too many reckless drivers on the road. Now I will agree with him that there are quite a number of accidents on the road. By the nature of our own business in Neepawa, I know that and feel that we have too many car accidents, and we do everything we can to limit them. The province also does what it can I suppose, in this regard. They put out an excellent handbook -- this one isn't very up-to-date -- I attempted to get a supply the other day but was informed that they were in the hands of the printers -- I guess along with all the annual reports that we've been looking for. But anyway, on page 4 of this little handbook -- I don't see any date on it -- but it does outline the basic elements in accidents. It says, briefly, that 80 percent of the accidents can be attributed to the driver -- some may say the "nut" at the end of the wheel -- 80 percent can be attributed to that; 15 percent roughly can be attributed to road deficiencies; and 5 percent for car defects. I suppose they've made a pretty thorough study of that and that's what they have come up with. Well, if we can reduce our accidents by 15 percent by improving the condition of the road, well let's proceed to do just that -- cut them down by 15 percent.

I questioned some of the figures that were used by my honourable friend the other day. On page 559 of Hansard No. 24, the honourable member says, and I'm quoting, "In the majority of cases driver action was the main cause factor of the accident. During the three year period, 3,285,000 vehicles traversed this 27 mile section of highway and the accident rate was one accident for every 28,318 vehicles using this portion of the highway." Well now, I have done a little adding up and subtracting here and using his figures, that means that a three year period, 156 weeks, that there would be roughly 21,057 vehicles per week that travels over this section of the highway, and being seven days in a week, there would be roughly 3,000 per day. Well then my honourable friend says, "therefore, it might be assumed that 28,316 motor vehicles got by safely and two had an accident." That is, "there were two for every 28,000 vehicles" he says here. Well then that means an accident nearly once a week, about one every eight days, eight or nine days, using his figures. Maybe that is so, but in the way he was presenting it, it didn't sound that bad; but in using his own figures, it still works out to roughly one accident a week, or every eight or nine days.

Now I have the totals for the province for the years '59, '60, '61 and '62, and I would like to just read the average for the four years because it would take quite a while to read them out a year at a time. The number of licensed vehicles in Manitoba in 1961, roughly 300,000. There's an annual increase of about five percent. The total number of accidents for the four-year period was 53,124, so that averages 13,281 per year. The number of accidents where there was a fatality averaged out at 117 and the number of persons killed in same 138. That's an average per year for the four-year period. Then the number of accidents resulting in injury averaged, for the four-year period, 3,717; and the number of persons that were injured in them 5,096. That's the average annual. That is, for the four-year period there were 469 killed and 20,383 injured in that four-year period in Manitoba. Now in addition to that, there is approximately an

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd) annual property damage of \$6 million a year in Manitoba. In fact, just this morning I was told by one of the large insurance companies that 1962 would go down in history as the worst year for not only their company but for most of the insurance companies in the automobile insurance field.

Now I was just pointing out that it sounds a little worse, I think, when I give the figures than it did when it was given by my honourable friend for Dufferin. I happen to travel over this section of the road about 50 times a year and I know how close that I have come to accidents on so many many occasions, and there would be a lot more accidents, I suggest, if it were not for the extra careful driver who was avoiding an accident by being faced with someone who was not abiding by the rules of the road.

Now the amendment, Madam Speaker, that we have before us, points up the need the same as we did. They express "concern of the House" here, and they say that it "requires appropriate remedial measures". The next paragraph says, "and whereas the traffic flow projections on this portion of the Trans-Canada Highway indicates the desirability of increasing traffic facilities before long." Well that to me isn't very satisfactory, Madam Speaker, because "before long", in a lot of cases is a long long time, and I'm at a loss to know why a government of action would use that word because it's pretty vague and could mean a long delay in this regard. The next paragraph says, "Whereas the Department of Public Works is now negotiating with the CNR respecting abandonment of the Harte Sub-division". Well frankly, Madam Speaker, I know where Harte is, but I don't know what it would have to do with this, because the little station of Harte is up near -- well it's straight south of Neepawa, 18 miles. However, it could have something to do with it, but I question that the Public Works would have much to do with the CNR abandoning this particular line. However, I haven't any objection to that, and here they are in the last paragraph, they're going to continue with some more studies on the thing.

Well, Madam Speaker, by and large, I'm glad that they have recognized the need to do something here and we can pretty nearly -- pretty nearly go along with this amendment but I prefer instead to move an amendment. And so, Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Portage la Prairie

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I wonder if it is in order for the mover of the original motion to lodge as seconder to the amendment. My honourable friend might choose another member.

MR. SHOEMAKER: So, Madam Speaker, I will move, seconded by

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): On a point of order, Madam Speaker, it's not the amendment of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. EVANS: He moved the original motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: It's a different thing.

MR. EVANS: If there's any doubt about it, my honourable friend might take another seconder.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I don't care. Well, Madam Speaker, I move then, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the amendment be amended by: (1) Inserting the word "immediately" between the words "of" and "increasing" in the second line of the third paragraph, and striking out the words "before long" in the third line of the same paragraph; and (2) by striking out the words "continue with" in the third line of the last paragraph and replacing them with the word "accelerate".

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ALEXANDER: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Rupertsland, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The honourable member is now closing the debate.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Thank you, Madam Speaker. I was rather surprised that the Honourable Minister of Education didn't take part in this debate. I'm wondering if we might be safe in assuming that this iniquity exists. I feel it does. I've heard another speaker with the same feeling, and while I've only checked with two boards, I find the

(Mr. Johnston, cont'd) same amount of money being spent, needlessly I think from their point of view -- from the school board's point of view -- on interest.

Now I would like to read for the record a letter from another division. This is the Turtle River School Division No. 32 and is addressed to their member, who happens to be the Leader of the Opposition, and it says: "Dear Mr. Molgat: At the last board meeting of the Turtle River School Division, the trustees asked me to write you regarding the administration grant for the division. The work sheet used in preparing the financial budget of the division states the maximum grant for school divisions will be the greater of \$5,000 or \$60.00 per authorized teacher. As the number of authorized teachers employed by the division for the present school term is 26, the \$5,000 grant is the greater of the two and the grant which this division receives. The total administration expenditures for the Turtle River School Division in 1962 was \$14,131. The largest item of this was \$5,616.40 which was paid to the bank as interest, plus a current account interest and exchange of \$172.21." Now this is the part of the letter that I would like to point out, Madam Speaker, that out of a \$14,131 cost for administration, the largest single item of \$5,616.40 was for interest, and it is for this reason that this motion is before us. We have, I understand, 47 divisions and we have remote areas and others.

I would like for a moment to turn to Hansard, page 561, and the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne when he closed his speech, and he says, "Once a school division and school districts are able to build up a reserve to finance their operations for six months, their problem of having to borrow to finance their operations will be over." Well if the Honourable Member from Souris-Lansdowne could let us in on this secret, I think this would answer the problem right away. We all know School Boards are not profit-making organizations or they have no other source of income other than tax money, and if there is an answer I'd certainly be very interested in hearing it. With those few remarks, Madam Speaker, I'll close the debate.

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

MR. GUTTORMSON: Yeas and nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The proposed motion before the House: Whereas the present method of paying school grants is such that School Boards and divisions are forced to borrow money to finance their operations thus adding to school costs and in effect acting as borrowing agents for the government; Therefore be it resolved that the government forthwith pay all school grants at such times as are necessary to avoid unnecessary borrowing by School Boards and divisions.

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

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

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 20; Nays, 33.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Rupertsland in amendment thereto. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Chairman, in speaking in support of the resolution, I feel that we in Manitoba should give more support to the teaching of language in our schools, not only in our high schools and universities but also in our elementary schools. Some effort and some endeavour is being made by various groups in this province to promote language in the various areas, and also other groups on a national scale are trying to concentrate their endeavour and to be more effective in what they're trying to do. Last fall such a meeting was convened in Ottawa where the Canadian Teachers' Federation Seminar on teaching modern languages was being held. This conference was attended by some 85 persons from across Canada and a few from the United States as well. The participants were teachers of modern languages, university professors, superintendents, inspectors, members of school boards and delegates

(Mr. Froese, cont'd)... from the Department of National Defence and Citizenship and Immigration. The sponsors of the delegates were provincial teachers, professional associations and the Canadian Education Association. The Manitoba Teachers' Society also sent two delegates in the persons of Miss E.F. Redmond, Chairman of the French Department of Kelvin Technical High School, and Mr. John Bergen, Principal of the Winkler Collegiate. Mr. Benoit, instructor of methods in French at the Manitoba Teachers' College, was sent by the Canadian Education Association.

I wish to give the House some part of the report as I received it because I feel that it's a very enlightening report. "The purpose of the Seminar was to view the aims of modern language teaching and to consider their current programs in various countries, including Canada; to examine materials available for the instruction of languages and to discuss the obstacles and the needs of modern language teaching. Lectures and addresses were delivered by professors, representatives from other countries and officials of the Canadian Teachers' Federation. Demonstration lessons were staged by teachers of French and German. Exhibits included teaching machines, language laboratories, tapes, texts and program learning materials. The seminar provided ample opportunity for discussion and for the summarizing of the opinions and conclusions formed by the delegates." Then in respect of the significance of modern languages -- "Geographical distances are no longer so great an obstacle. Modern transportation makes it possible for an ever-increasing number of people to travel and to execute personal business in other countries. Long distance telephone conversations have replaced much letter writing. It is essential to be able to understand the spoken word, not only to read the written word. Radio and television make it possible to invite foreign cultures into our very homes. The knowledge of language increases mutual understanding. The knowledge and use of modern languages is no longer a luxury, but has become a necessity. Modern languages must be considered living too."

The report then goes on to give some information on what is being accomplished in the various countries, and I would just like to give a couple of them. For instance, Britain -- "French is the chief foreign language chosen; German is the second. Teachers of these languages are encouraged to study and travel abroad for at least one year in order to absorb the culture of the people of the language. Britain has German language radio broadcasts." It might be interesting to members of the House, the situation in the USSR. "Much emphasis is placed on foreign language teaching. For example, there are English schools in which much of the instruction is in English and in which students spend much of their time conversing in that language." The USA -- "The United States found themselves acutely short of personnel who had a knowledge of foreign language during World War II. After the war, the government introduced an intensive program of foreign language studies. Federal grants were made available. The choice of a foreign language as an option in the high school course became very popular." Then they go on to the European continental countries such as France. "Foreign languages have consistently been an integral part of the school program, two or more modern languages chosen in addition to the study of the national language has not been uncommon." We notice from the agreement that was reached last fall between the two countries that this is going to be more intense than ever before.

Then they also refer to some of the provinces in Canada. British Columbia for instance -- "Good progress is being made in some schools which have introduced French at the elementary level. Emphasis is on all accomplishment. Songs, games, plays, stories and conversation are employed in the learning process. The B.C. experiment emphasizes the importance of the competence, interest and ability of the teacher in order to make the program successful." Then they go over to Ottawa and here the report says, "French instruction was begun at the Grade 2 level in all Ottawa public schools in 1957. The program is to be extended to Grade 1. The school system developed its own course. Classroom teachers instruct French in their own rooms, but receive a visiting specialist, a French teacher who introduces a new phase of work once a week. Specialist teachers instruct French in Grade 7 and 8. Most of the teachers who teach German in Manitoba classrooms would rather they classify as specialists as far as their ability and accomplishment in the language is concerned. Many of them, however, would require more development in methods. French lessons are taught daily. The direct oral approach is used. The oral expression is well learned before the written word is seen. There

(Mr. Froese, cont'd) . . . is much drill and repetition; much use is made of pictures, objects and drawings. The topic is covered thoroughly by all discussions before the reading lesson is taken up. In order not to interrupt oral fluency, writing is not introduced until the seventh grade. Oral tests are used."

These are some of the things that are going on in the other provinces and other countries. They also make reference to Manitoba. Here they say, "French may now be instructed at the elementary level beginning with Grade 4. The program is now in effect in many schools. The aim is to bring this instruction down to the Grade 2 or 1 level eventually. German is being instructed as early as Grade 1 in schools where the population is entirely, or almost entirely Mennonite. Below Grade 7 this instruction is conducted after the official closing hours of the school day. A graded and supervised program is in effect. A designated person, former public and high school teacher, D.K. Derksen, visits schools in order to assist the teachers. In the primary grades the emphasis is oral, question and answer, conversation, German songs, followed by a reading and writing program. Formal grammar is begun at the Grade 5 level." That gives a very good account of what is happening in our province.

Under teacher preparation it has this to say. "Teachers of foreign languages should have a theoretical knowledge of the structure and function of language -- that's linguistics. They should have a good command of the language in the spoken as well as the written form. A degree of idiomatic fluency is desirable. A knowledge of the culture of the people and country of the language is helpful. However, imperfection is not to deter language teaching. No language teacher may be perfect, however, the attitude of the instructor is most important. If the teacher is enthusiastic, so will be his class."

Then they have a summary of some of the seminar inferences, and I would like to read a few of those and then come to my other aspects of what I have to say. First they mention Method. "The audio-lingual approach should be emphasized. There should be more free reading and less translation in grammar in elementary and high school grades. It may be preferable not to have English explanation in foreign language text books. Different levels of courses should dovetail into one another. Instruction would be given almost entirely, if not entirely in the language being instructed. Materials -- there is a need for better textbooks. Program learning materials can be developed; films, tapes and laboratories must be utilized. Textbooks emphasizing the audio-lingual approach are needed. Articulation -- elementary, secondary and university courses must be planned to liaison between the levels one with another. More university instruction should be given in the foreign language and not in English. All children may need some language teaching, though some are definitely more gifted for learning a foreign language than others. Instruction should be begun as early as possible. Daily instruction is most effective. High school and university examinations should include oral and oral testing. Provincial departments must recognize the need for early instruction and authorize or permit schools to introduce instruction in lower grades. Teacher training -- Teacher training should aim for fluency and enthusiasm as well as a knowledge of culture in basic linguistics." Then they go on -- "In the Canadian setting: (1) The main emphasis must be placed on the instruction of French, the bilingual emphasis. (2) Ethnic needs must receive consideration, one-third of our immigrants are of neither French nor British background. (3) The needs of our country, nationally and internationally, must receive some consideration in our provisions for foreign language teaching." Then they go on with certain recommendations as to how this is supposed to be brought about. Madam Chairman I thought the report was very interesting when I first got it and it gives us a good insight as to what is being done and what should be done.

Speaking in support of the motion, I am in support of teaching language in general, be it French or any other language. In our area, in order to raise the level in standards, in the teaching of German an organized attempt was made, and is being made, by the Manitoba Mennonite Trustees Association and the Mennonite Educational Committee, which work jointly on this project, and they have done so with quite a measure of success. This program is being carried on outside of regular school hours. The schools that are participating are setting aside half an hour for this purpose, be it in the morning or afternoon, after school hours or before school hours in the teaching of language. This involves in some cases homework for the pupils, but they take it gladly and it does not detract or deter them from passing in their other subjects.

(Mr. Froese, cont'd) I think it enhances them and that they probably have a better knowledge of what they read and so are in a better position to do their work well.

The program, as such, is being promoted by the school trustees and individuals through the engagement of a director in the person of Reverend D.K. Derksen. Mr. Derksen was already referred to in the report. He's a qualified teacher, a high school teacher at one time, and he has developed a course that is being used by the teachers in our area. This course includes the program of studies with spelling, grammar, composition, song and music. Teachers have welcomed this course and have exhibited a good attitude toward it and also to the whole program in promoting language. It provides them with the means whereby they can conduct this program systematically, and when the director comes around twice a year or so, he provides the teachers with any information they need and give them the necessary encouragement that they also need from time to time. We have provided our own texts. These have been recognized by the department and I feel the texts are good and work out very well.

We had, during the last year, 75 schools participating in this project, which includes some 1,996 pupils and 133 classrooms. The director has also prepared exams on some of the subjects. In spelling, the exams cover the grades 3 to 8, and in grammar it's from grades 7 to 9. The reports of the examinations are very good and could be tabled if desired. Six hundred and twenty-four pupils wrote grammar exams last year and 1,996 participated in the spelling exams. There is also limited facilities available in the way of library books.

We find that this program is definitely filling a need. We want our students to be able to speak the language and not just translate it. We find so often that when our young people in high school, if they haven't got some knowledge of a second language prior to attending high school, that they do very poorly, and this gives them a better chance when they reach that stage. It is also very essential to have a good vocabulary in acquiring any language and by starting this at an early date, it's certainly to their advantage. We also know that university entrance requires a second language, so that we are helping these students for their future life. Many a doctor or professional man has thanked our efforts and what we've done in the past, because they found that later on it was such a big advantage to have learned this language at an early age.

We also know that our world is growing smaller day by day and that Europe is just a couple of hours away, so that we are in need of more language, especially a second language for our people in this province. We also note that the university is providing scholarships for students at the university. On page 64 of the report they mention seven scholarships which total to an amount of \$800.00. I also notice that the Department of German in the university states that their numbers attending courses are constant, so that certainly there is no decline and we hope that this program can be furthered and that it can grow.

Our teachers teaching in these schools are fully qualified and do a marvelous job. We feel, however, that this matter and this project should be promoted and that it should receive some recognition from the Department of Education and the government as a whole. Certainly this is a worthwhile effort that we are making. I also agree that the other languages should be furthered, especially French because French is the second language in Canada. So I am in full accord with the resolution, as such, but I would also like to propose an amendment to the resolution and I herewith quote the amendment. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fisher, to amend the motion as follows: "And consider the teaching of German, a recognized language, as an option where teachers are qualified to do so from Grade I on."

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Churchill, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, before we move on to another matter, might I raise a point of order? Have you decided that the amendment is in order?

MADAM SPEAKER: I believe the wording at the first is not in order, but the balance of it would be considered. Would you like to reword this? I will have to call it out of order for the time being.

MR. FROESE: I'm quite agreeable to reword it if that's the wish of the Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: question of wording, but apart from that that it would be in order, and possibly if you would hold the motion in your hands and allow the privilege be

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd) granted to the mover of the amendment to the amendment to bring it into line, I think that should facilitate the conduct of the House.

MR. EVANS: I think that procedure would be very satisfactory and would allow the motion to be submitted again in proper form.

MADAM SPEAKER: Will the House agree? -- Agreed. The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Member for St. George.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has assured me that my Order for Return will be forthcoming very soon. I'd like to stand the matter pending that return please.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate standing in the name of the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I ask leave of this House to allow this motion to stand. If any other member would like to speak on this motion, I have no objection.

MR. RICHARD SEABORN (Wellington): Madam Speaker, I'd like to speak on this. After such an amazing performance by my honourable friend from Radisson, who attributed some very unkind things to me, I feel I must rise and take part in this debate at this time.

Frankly, I've never seen such a large bunch of sour grapes in my life. The truth of the whole matter is that the much-heralded and the great organizers of the NDP found themselves completely out-organized by the Conservative machine. This he admitted himself when the standard bearer of the NDP came into our Committee rooms and confessed that our organization defeated him at every turn. I want to tell the Leader of the NDP that it will take more than getting your picture in the paper, sending a letter to the constituents and then longingly staring at a map of Wellington, if you want to capture that seat. The Leader of the NDP has himself revealed the amount of work that my supporters and myself are willing to undertake to keep Wellington within the government ranks. Let him have no illusions about Wellington being an NDP stronghold.

Let's touch briefly upon the list of those left off during the enumeration. Our committee rooms were in some ways located in an awkward area. We bordered the Logan and St. Matthew constituencies. Being open all day as well as all evening, voters from these two constituencies, together with those from Wellington, poured in to find out whether they were eligible to vote and on the list. Unlike my honourable friend over there, who is trying to find evil where none exists, I was appalled at the terrible enumeration that took place. We obtained an up-to-date directory and endeavoured to check everything as carefully as possible. I personally visited many of the voters affected and two girls in our committee rooms did nothing else but telephone for over a week. The fact is, Madam Speaker, that we enabled as many NDP supporters to exercise their franchise as we did our own, and I have been told that it proved highly embarrassing to the great NDP organizer to have had the Conservative candidate looking after the welfare of his own supporters. I must say, however, that despite our untiring efforts to counteract the situation in Wellington as far as enumeration was concerned, there were literally hundreds who were unable to vote on election day and I think this is most regrettable.

The NDP Leader has tried to intimate that I felt that I had the divine right to add names to the voters' list. This, of course, is absolute nonsense. The names, after being checked as carefully as we could possibly do, were typed on duplicate sheets and sworn before a Commissioner of Oaths and then given to the Returning Officer for his consideration. I know that he again went over them with a great deal of care before submitting them to Justice Earl Billman of the Court of Appeal. They were checked the third time and given full approval by this learned gentleman. The fact that there were a few names outside the constituency, I learned later, was due to some inaccuracy in the directory we were using. These the NDP Leader has referred to, but I might mention this group of approximately 14 would have all voted in the same poll except the Returning Officer discovered the mistake and alerted the DRO and the Clerk that they were ineligible. I was informed that no one from outside the Wellington area voted, and this I believe.

But let us talk about other things. Let us refer to the seeming kindness of the NDP in Wellington, who apparently assisted me to find scrutineers on election day. They had their credentials too. They had the candidate certificate of authority and signed, "Dick Seaborn", except, Madam Speaker, I do not sign my name that way. "Dick" is just a nickname to me.

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd) I always use my correct name in signed documents of this nature -- "Richard Seaborn". Incidentally, these scrutineers were certainly not looking after my interests. I spent two or three hours on election day chasing them all over the place and finally provided every DRO in my constituency with a true copy of my signature in order to prevent further occurrences of this kind. One of these gentlemen lives in the Logan area and there is the slight inconvenience of jamming my telephones for almost half the morning on election day. I realize this does not constitute a violation of The Election Act, Madam Speaker, but it certainly conflicts with any sense of fair play one may have expected.

Well let us briefly mention a school teacher in my area who took the day off to act as a scrutineer for the NDP in the General Wolfe School. His behaviour was such that he had the lady actually in tears, and they termed his actions incorrigible and boorish. Then perhaps the Leader of the NDP could tell us what the ballot box from Poll 10 was doing in the NDP Committee Rooms from the time the pools closed to some time after 11:00 o'clock, where it was discovered by the workers of another candidate and the Returning Officer advised of its whereabouts. Don't ask me how it got there; we know it was there. Irregularities, Madam Speaker. My workers could tell you some very interesting experiences, but actually what's the use. As I said right at the very beginning, the howl from across the Chambers is nothing else but sour grapes. The NDP thought they had a sure thing. They thought they had a cinch. It must have been a galling experience for the great NDP organizer to have been defeated by a far more efficient and powerful organization; to have the cup of sweet victory snatched away from his lips when he was convinced it was such a certainty.

I submit, however, that the subsequent behaviour of the NDP candidate and now the Leader of the Socialists in this House, can serve no useful purpose. You can never convince me, nor do I believe anyone in my constituency would believe that I did anything wrong. This casting of innuendoes, creating a doubt, a shadow over my character and integrity, is about the lowest level they could possibly reach. Why even the people in the hospital were sick of the NDP. They gave me their majority vote. I'm frankly amazed and disgusted with my honourable friend. He has disillusioned me entirely.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I think that since you have given leave to the last speaker to speak to this resolution, I would like to take about four or five minutes to say a few words in this regard -- (Interjection) -- No, I don't really intend to speak at any length, but I think that first of all it should be pointed out that this House can do without allegations and innuendoes. If you have something to say, then say it. I think that we had just about enough.

Now in the first place, I think the honourable member should tell us whether he believes that our organization in the area took that ballot box into the committee room or not. What does he believe to be the fact of the matter? Secondly, when he suggests that someone was going about his riding on that day forging his signature to scrutineers' slips, he should tell us if he believes that we were in any way connected with that particular act and not leave it up in the air by innuendo, as though we were responsible for that act of forgery. If you read closely through Hansard tomorrow, I am sure you will find that he makes no direct statement in that matter, but the implication is kind of there in a most sickening and disgusting way. He may have something, but if he thinks that this is what happened let him say so, so that we can conduct some investigation into it.

I do not know if there was in that riding some personal vilification of the honourable member. It's possible that there may have been, as you find in many ridings. I rather doubt that there was, but I say it's possible there may have been. I think that all of us in this Chamber, at one time or another, have been in campaigns during which time feeling ran pretty high and during which time comments about opposing candidates weren't exactly what you would want to talk to your mother about, nor in those same words, but I think it is certainly unfair of the Honourable Member from Wellington to suggest that our candidate in that riding or some of his close workers would have stooped, as he put it, to such degrading tactics as to use personal smear and derogatory remarks in a very personal sense about him.

I think it's unfortunate that when we have a resolution introduced which attempts to bring to the attention of this House the need for revising and reviewing our Election Act, I think it is unfortunate that it should be used as a vehicle for unloading oneself of some personal grudge. I believe that when my Leader introduced this resolution, what he had foremost in mind was to

(Mr. Schreyer, cont'd) convince members here that there was need for some review of The Election Act. Secondly, he did bring to the attention of this House, I am sure in a gentlemanly sort of way, what he considered to be some documented evidence of irregularity in that constituency during the election, but I am sure that he did not use the kind of personal vindictiveness that the last speaker used. I'm quite certain of it.

In any case, Madam Speaker, if our actions in that particular constituency were so reprehensible, then the honourable member is justified in bringing it to the attention of this House, but notice that he did not directly say that we were responsible for forgery on the scrutineers' ballot slips. He did not say that. He did not say that we were responsible for taking the ballot box from the presence of the Returning Officer to our committee rooms. He did not say that, leaving it up in the air. I think that when it comes to a matter of sour grapes, I think it's sour grapes on the part of the honourable member who, after sitting for two terms, that he could only win that riding by a couple of hundred votes. I think that's where the sour grapes lie.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I hadn't intended to get into the debate at this stage. However, we have been hearing statements, Madam Speaker, from the NDP regarding certain matters that went on during the election; we've heard statements now from the Member from Wellington making certain allegations about what went on in his constituency; and while there have been some smiles exchanged over this, the matter is actually very serious, Madam Speaker. If, in fact, the statements that have been made here are correct, then I suggest that there should be a complete investigation of this matter, and I suggest that even more than the resolution, that there should be an investigation by some judicial body or by a committee set up specifically for this, because if this is the way elections are being carried on, then we have to make some changes very soon in our machinery. The whole process of elections is becoming admittedly more difficult and more complicated. Our population is growing and if we are going to ensure proper functioning of our system, then it is essential that this very function have around it all the safeguards possible to ensure that the people who go out to vote do in fact have the control over our system that we want them to have. If there are irregularities in election campaigns, then it really means that it is not the people who have the control but the election machine of this party or that party. Surely none of us want this sort of thing to go on.

I recommend, Madam Speaker, that the government immediately undertake an investigation of the statements that have been made in this House by the Leader of the NDP and by the Member from Wellington constituency, and that we get this matter settled once and for all. The resolution that my honourable friend suggests I think is good in other ways. I expect to speak later on during the debate on the subject because I believe there are other changes that should be made in the Act, and I think that the time immediately after an election is the right time to do that, but the statements that have been made here call for more action than that and immediate action. I would ask the government to undertake this investigation at once.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Chairman, if I may be permitted, I'd like to say a few words on this. I will be very brief and I don't intend to speak at any great length of time. I'll say that I do agree with the Leader of the NDP that The Election Act should be reviewed at this time; we should give it more teeth. Pools in any election should be strategically located in such a manner as to make it convenient for every elector in the area to exercise his franchise. Now, I tacked the word "convenient" on that. I would like to place before the House an incident which happened in Emerson constituency where I'm sure that politics were being played with ballot boxes. I'm not going to say that this was sanctioned by the present government, but since the government is in power -- the government which is in power during the election, I feel that the government is responsible for what is being done. I'm not going to accuse the Chief Elector Officer either; he may not have been aware of this.

This case I am referring to happened in Emerson constituency. Immediately after the change of government several years ago -- the government I presume is responsible for this -- there was a change of returning officers. Probably it's a privilege of the Party to do that. In our case, we had a very good experienced returning officer and I'm sure that the Honourable the First Minister knows who I am referring to. This returning officer was replaced by another one who did not have the experience or probably who did not care to serve the people to the best advantage. At Menisino there was a small poll for many years -- I'd say for about 25 years. But as it happened, in the Village of Menisino most of the people -- I'd probably say almost

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd) 100 percent, were supporting the Liberal Party, therefore, the returning officer could not find a DRO to suit him, so what does he do? He takes this polling box out of the Village of Menisino and moves it 5 1/2 miles north into an area where there is an existing poll only a mile and a half away. So he moves the poll from Menisino, five and a half miles north and places it in a private dwelling only a mile and a half where there is already an existing poll. What happened in this particular election? There were several electors who refused to go and vote, and that situation existed through several elections. I don't think it is right. In this forthcoming election it was again brought to the attention of the returning officer and quite a bit more pressure was applied. Also, the candidates heard about this, so for the federal election it is being moved back to Menisino. But I do not think that this was fair; it wasn't in the interests of the people and the interest of the election, regardless where they vote. Therefore, I think that it is time that we review our Election Act, and I'm going to support it.

..... Continued on next page

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

MR. SEABORN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Turtle Mountain. Whereas the smoking of cigarettes has been shown to be a large contributor to lung cancer, other respiratory ailments and coronary thrombosis, and WHEREAS the recruitment of school children to cigarette smoking is increasing at an alarming rate; THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Legislature humbly requests the Minister of Health investigate ways and means to encourage in every possible way, any positive approach designed to reduce the recruitment of children to smoking. AND THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Legislature oppose the use of any advertisements, audio as well as visual, intended to influence our young people to take up cigarette smoking because cigarette smoking has been proven to contribute to lung cancer and other serious diseases.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SEABORN: Madam Speaker, I was very delighted to learn that the Minister of Health is vitally concerned over this problem of cigarette smoking among our very young children and I'm grateful to him for making some facts and figures available to the House. Therefore we only have to consider what we may have to do to remove hindrances to our health program in this direction.

If one would read the current approach by the doctors to the cigarette problem, it becomes apparent that they have reluctantly concluded that the confirmed smoker is a hopeless and corrigible addict and therefore they must concentrate on the person not yet addicted, the adolescent who has not yet smoked. An English doctor, Hugh Payne is reported to have said that "I no longer advise adult patients to quit smoking; apparently life without the burning weed seems purposeless to them, so let them have a short life and a merry one; but for heaven sakes let them keep their children from smoking; let the next generation live." And why are the doctors so pessimistic? I think the answer is to be found in the fact that despite conclusive evidence that cigarette smoking is a leading cause of lung cancer over the past 10 years, cigarette sales in Canada have risen from \$22 Billion to almost \$35 Billion, an increase of more than 50 percent. The population has grown only 18 percent. Now I know that tobacco companies and some doctors maintain that the relationship between smoking and lung cancer has not been conclusively proven, and in a sense Madam Speaker, this is true as anyone who has ever taken sophomore philosophy knows. It is impossible to absolutely prove that the visible world exists at all; but as you also know many a murderer has been hanged on evidence far more open to reasonable doubt than the evidence against cigarettes.

Surveys in the United States, Britain and Canada covering hundreds of thousands of patients through long periods of years has shown that among those who die of lung cancer, smokers outnumber non-smokers by up to 20 to 1, sometimes more. Smokers were also more numerous by 70 percent among deaths from other respiratory ailments and 40 percent among victims of coronary thrombosis. And one American report on 187,783 men that has as controlled samples of smokers and non-smokers in comparable age groups found a death rate from all causes 68 percent higher among smokers. And I must confess that I had always thought that in heavy industrial areas the situation would be exaggerated over other parts where industry was absent, but I learned that in Reykjavik, Iceland for example where the heating of houses is done by natural hot springs and in Finland where industry is very scarce the tests were relatively the same. I also learned that figures in Great Britain are relatively higher because smokers there burn their cigarettes almost to the very end where the heat is greater and the irritants are most highly concentrated. This is most likely due to the great difference in the price of cigarettes.

Madam Speaker, I think it is a tragic fact that more and more youngsters are choosing to run the smoker's terrifying high risk of disease and death. In the book that was handed out the other day to this House the members will note that it was found that 11 to 15 percent of the boys, not infrequently with parental consent or even encouragement, are all ready smoking small numbers of cigarettes by the age of 10. During school days there is a steady recruitment of smoking until at the age of 19 -- this is still in England -- 70 per cent are firmly established in this dangerous habit with a national average of about 20 cigarettes a day. And in face of this evidence the Royal College of Physicians in Great Britain have strongly recommended more education of the public, especially school children concerning the hazards of

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd.) . . . smoking; and secondly that more effective restrictions on the sale of tobacco to children be brought into being. And this could be well considered in our own area.

Now why do boys and girls start smoking anyway? The most important single factor seems to be the example of the parents -- in all this the authorities seem to agree. Young people take up cigarettes not to defy their parents but to imitate them. However, in a study in Portland, Oregon, it was revealed that a mere prohibition by parents is actually not enough. Indeed it was found that in some classes smoking actually became higher when the parents forbade it, and the apparent contradiction here arises from the fact that the child's whole environment conspires to make smoking look manly and mature, adventurous as well as pleasurable. The condemned man in a thriller prefers a cigarette to a blindfold when he faces a firing squad and the proud father passes a box of cigars.

Dr. Maurice Berry of the Mayo Clinic discovered in psychological tests that a cigarette to many young people is a symbol of power, virility and manhood and the harsh parent who forbids smoking is identified with a killjoy who thinks fun is a sin. And to make matters even more complicated, Madam Speaker, there seems to be a breakdown in the relationship between home and school on this question. A generation ago the schools would have forbidden and punished smoking no matter what the parents might have said about it, but now confronted with youngsters whose parents allow them to smoke at home, more and more schools in Canada are installing smoking rooms. A principal in Ontario said, "How can you convince a boy that he shouldn't smoke when his parent says it's all right." So two things have become very obvious: the teenage smoking problem will not solve itself but will get worse if it's left alone, and mere arbitrary prohibition, if it ever worked at all, will never work here. Something more positive and systematic is required. The authorities are glumly agreed, too, Madam Speaker, that it is not much use scaring children with the thought that smoking will shorten their lives or bring them a horrid fate about 30 years hence. Dr. Ross in Montreal says: "You can't scare youngsters by talking of death; it's simply beyond their interest. To a child of 15 the difference of dying at 50 and dying at 80 hardly seems worth bothering about, for both ages are very remote and clothed in antiquity."

However, there is one very important point that reveals itself in all these investigations in Great Britain, in United States and in Canada: there is an astonishing ignorance among children that smoking is an addiction, and the doctors in Eastern Canada are endeavouring to get more parents to admit this to their children and to themselves and perhaps diminish the force of their bad example. If they can enlist the conscience of parents by means of such terrifying facts as that one million of the children now in school in the United States will die of lung cancer, they hope to get the help of parents who smoke themselves.

In the City of Winnipeg investigations held in 1960 revealed that the situation is not much different here than elsewhere. The City Health Department in conjunction with the School Board submitted eight questions to all children from Grade 5 to 12, inclusive, and the doctors found that the boys smoked more than the girls; that 40 percent of the boys and 18 percent of the girls had smoked their first cigarette before leaving Grade 6; that in junior high schools that 25 percent of the boys and 15 percent of the girls smoked regularly; and in high schools nearly half of the boys and over one-quarter of the girls were smoking regularly -- and when I say smoking regularly, I mean 20 or more cigarettes a day. This survey in 1960 showed that some of our children began smoking very early. In fact, it was found that 565 children of the 25,000 students questioned had smoked their first cigarette as early as six years of age; and an additional 975 by the age of eight; and the greatest increase was in the 11 to 16 year old group. Again it was noted that the children were influenced by their parents' smoking habits and it was also observed that smoking is inversely related to academic achievement. And incidentally a kindergarten teacher, a friend of mine, told me the other day that she knew of two children in her school who had smoked before the age of four -- it's unbelievable but apparently true. As I say most of these figures are in 1960, and I was very curious to know what had happened in the interim and what was being done to combat this distressing situation. So to find an answer, Madam Speaker, I went to see Dr. Medovy, who together with Dr. Morrison, has taken such a vital interest in this problem -- and here, Madam Speaker, I would like to praise the work of these two unselfish individuals who have given fully of their time

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd.) . . . and resources to try and educate children away from the dangerous habit.

As I have already mentioned it is apparently no use trying to frighten children about the future which may be 30 to 40 years away, and rightly so, because children live in the future and should have no such fears. Dr. Medovy pointed out to me that the children could be reached through a reasonable approach and he gave very high praise to certain members of our Winnipeg Blue Bombers who appeared with him in his attempts to persuade these children that cigarette smoking did not carry with it the sign of manhood, sophistry or any of the other imaginary connotations associated with this habit. The example of these fine athletes are contributing greatly to the dispelling of these allusions among the children.

The doctor also gave me some very alarming figures. First of all he pointed out that in 1960 — and the Minister of Health has probably got more up-to-date figures than I have -- but in 1960 there were 2,000 male lung cancers caught out of 12,000 cases in Canada. In Winnipeg in the same year there was 80 deaths from lung cancer. It is interesting to note that in 1960 there were 43 fatal traffic accidents, while those succumbing to tuberculosis numbered 12. I was told that 33 percent of the lung cancer cases have had the cancer removed but only 20 percent of this number are alive after five years and only eight out of a hundred can be expected to survive five years. In Toronto it's even less I understand -- only two out of a hundred can expect to survive five years after this operation. In 1962 I have since found out that 182 individuals had lung cancer in Manitoba -- 152 percent increase in the two years.

Dr. Medovy and also a certain member of the School Board feels that the present approach in advertising is leveled a great deal at our teenagers. And a recent article from "The Manitoban" would seem to confirm this opinion. Headed "Smokers fight cancer" an article appeared in the March 3rd edition of "The Manitoban" and said, "The UMSU was approached recently by a well known tobacco firm" -- I won't mention their name -- "with a money-making idea. Coupons are soon to be placed inside their packages of cigarettes which are for sale on the campus which may be redeemed at 10 for 50c through the UMSU. The UMSU will turn them back into the company for a dollar for ten." I think it is to the credit of the student body that they decided to give all this cigarette money to the Canadian Cancer Research Fund. But I think it reveals the endeavours of the manufacturers to recruit our young people into the ranks of the regular smokers. I feel the manufacturers of cigarettes must accept some responsibility in the alarming situation and not aggravate it.

Dr. Medovy also pointed out that approximately 5,000 children each year go into the school system. Fifty percent of these children are regular smokers by the age of 17. This means the tobacco industry through its subtle advertising is recruiting 2,500 new customers each year in Winnipeg. What can actually be done in this field? I really don't know. But I think if the manufacturers could be led to realize that we are concerned and even prepared to do something about it, they would be dissuaded from continuing their present trend of advertising and perhaps co-operate in the success of our health program. I'm not against cigarette advertising, Madam Speaker. It is the appeal to our very young that bothers me a great deal. I will not continue very much longer for it must be apparent that this is a distressing and a most dangerous situation. However, I would like to say that our approach to the school child must be realistic, we must not only start this educational program in the very earliest grades but we must appreciate that the school boy or girl is more concerned about the effects of cigarette smoking on his or her ability to participate effectively in sports, especially competitive sports, than the possibility of hazards in the vague and distant future. As I have observed, the cigarette is often regarded as symbol of growing up and being one of the crowd and this point of view must be argued on a very intelligent basis with the school child.

We can really take pride, Madam Speaker, that we have had one of the most thorough studies of this problem about smoking among school children, right here in Winnipeg, and I'm told there that will be a complete resurvey and the report will be in our hands by about the end of April.

Now my resolution as you know was intended to get the government involved in this serious situation and attempt to have the Health Educational Program supported to the very limit. Dr. Medovy and Dr. Morrison are really doing a wonderful job. They are doing everything in their power. But the program really needs to be expanded. We need more teachers and therefore I was very relieved when the Minister of Health intends to investigate and support

(Mr. Seaborn, cont'd.) . . . those endeavours to reduce the recruitment of our school children in the addiction of cigarette smoking. And I was also very pleased that he shared my concern and would discourage any advertising which has as its motive the influencing of our young people to use cigarettes and consequently interferes with our health programs in our schools.

And now, Madam Speaker, I would be the first to admit that the latter part of my resolution really poses somewhat of a problem. I am not a strong believer in censorship but it would be my hope that the manufacturers would reveal some sense of responsibility and not encourage our young to smoke. The effect of tobacco on children of a very tender age is quite devastating I am told. Perhaps one solution would be to counteract the subtle advertising with an equal number of advertisements intended to educate, not only the children but the parents, to the danger of allowing this addiction to continue. I feel it is the concern of everyone of us, the parents, the municipal bodies, the government and the manufacturers as well in our responsibility to try and find a solution to this pressing problem. I am equally convinced that it is very difficult, if not impossible, to legislate morals, and this actually makes my task even more difficult. However, I now leave my resolution to the consideration of this House and I know they will endeavour to seek some method of supporting those who have already given so much time and resources in trying to save our future citizens from the probable diseases that can now be prevented, Madam Speaker, by a realistic approach to the smoking habits of our children. Thank you.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, (interjection) No, I'm not going to adjourn the debate as the honourable member asks. I didn't intend to speak on this at all but it seems to me that when the honourable member who has just spoken speaks, I'm kind of tempted to follow him, not just because he speaks (interjection) no, that's not enough reason. Maybe I really and truly believe in socialism as much as he does; but this has nothing to do with socialism.

I'm reading this statement re Lung Clinic, I notice that it is -- to me it is alarming to notice that the increase in Manitoba of lung cancer deaths attributed to smoking has risen so excessively -- and it is alarming. According to this, it says that it has risen by about 600 percent. I wonder if it would help if some government official started bombarding the smokers and the children with advertising of their own -- anti-cigarette advertising. I presume it would be very costly and the governments could not afford to spend such large sums of money as the tobacco manufacturers can do. I notice that it says here, "Smoking doctors set a bad example" and that is by the Canadian Medical Association, Dr. MacCharles, who is the president. "Doctors set a bad example." Well I do believe that if the doctors made up their mind, either one way or the other way, and really impressed the people with the danger of smoking it would help considerably. I suppose that the Honourable the Minister of Health, I understand he is not a real smoker, he smokes in spasms, once in a while, so I presume that it would be very very easy for him to set a good example for the people of Manitoba in his capacity as the Minister of Health.

Now I do agree with this, that the doctors -- smoking doctors set a bad example. It should read that "smoking doctors should set a good example." But I do not think that it would be fair to throw the challenge simply to the doctors or the Minister and say that the doctors set a bad example. What about the MLA's -- and now I'm going to be my own opposition, because I do smoke. What about the MLA's? Why not (interjection) that's right, that's what I'm coming to. Why not say that smoking MLA's set a bad example; it applies to MLA's just as well, and I presume it might be pretty hard for the smoking MLA's to desist from smoking. But they could set a good example by quitting smoking. So why stop at the smoking MLA's; why not apply the same thing to smoking teachers set a bad example? The Minister of Education -- I don't think he does smoke -- so he is setting a good example, it doesn't apply. But many teachers do smoke and that would equally apply to the smoking teachers, they should set a good example, instead of a bad example, and see if they have the courage or the aptitude to quit smoking. Now it wouldn't be fair to challenge the teachers. What about the parents? We can go farther than that and say that smoking parents set a bad example. You'll all agree. So let's bring it down to the lower level and say that smoking -- or parents should set a good example by rejecting cigarettes. I think that if we go all the way down this would be the best method of attacking this problem. I think it requires more education, more advertising against the cigarettes -- bring the problem home to the people, because if we pass legislation

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.) . . . here in the House -- I'm not saying that I'm opposing it at the present time, or I'll vote against it, or for it " but if we simply ask them to modify their advertisement, I don't think it's going to help so very much, because most of the children acquire the habit by observation at home -- first of all at home -- and they acquire the habit of smoking. So I think it would be a good thing to look at this and bring the challenge home for everyone concerned; I think it would really help considerably. And I still insist that the medical profession should point out to the people of Manitoba the dangers of smoking, not simply bring it to their attention, but hit them hard. I think it would help considerably.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, no one can oppose

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from St. Boniface to adjourn the debate, but I don't mind.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member from Inkster wish to speak on this?

MR. PATRICK: I don't mind him talking on it.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, no one in this House or anywhere else will oppose any suggestion or any resolution for using less cigarettes by anyone, particularly the young children. I think it is disgusting when you see a boy or a girl 14 or 15, in a restaurant smoking freely, and not only smoking, but throwing her ashes in a cup of coffee that she drinks. But I realize for a long time that prohibition is not the remedy for anything. It's education. We had prohibition in the -- supposed to be prohibition -- the idea was to prohibit actual drinking and still the consumption of liquor in this province or any other province is increasing every year, because we are not prohibiting and we are not educating. So to tell the doctors not to smoke when they already started to smoke when they were 14 or 15, is likely impossible -- it's good wishes, nothing else. Dr. MacCharles may have made a statement, or has made a statement about doctors not smoking, but there's certain habits, that perhaps Dr. MacCharles has that he cannot stop at his age now.

My point is in smoking and in drinking and in any other habit which society does not accept is education and education only. An example because a father smokes at home and probably smokes a pipe or a cigar will not stop it, and he cannot get the father to stop it, because smoking is a opium, a dope. Sometimes people have worries, have hardships, have tragedies and they smoke, not because they want to smoke, but this is the temporary remedy for their nervousness and for their feelings which they have at that particular moment. Maybe somebody is sick in the family, maybe personal trouble, maybe lack of income or lack of something else. So while this resolution is good, to stop advertising is ridiculous. It is already here and we have no right to stop it in America. Most of the people in this Province of Manitoba read more American magazines than they read Canadian. (interjection) Socialist compulsion -- and they read it here. (Interjection) You know that my ability to speak is so impaired, if I'm interrupted it becomes worse. So I feel that this resolution could be supported or could not be supported, because it doesn't mean a thing, not one single thing, except the time that they have spent on it. What we should do is education. If the educational department will take it over and have something -- a lecture -- once a week in the schools or prepare a lecture for the teachers to read to them, that may help some. It won't help altogether; it may help some. Facts -- actually so far I have not read one single case that has definitely proven that you get cancer, throat cancer or lung cancer due to smoking. But, prohibition is more important than cure. If some doctors feel -- and I'm always ready and willing to listen to the man that knows more than I do -- feel that this is harmful, let's eradicate this; because it's not necessary. It's not food; we can live without smoking. But making an alarm about it that so many thousands of people die of this cigarette, I don't think this is important; and if you make an alarm it will still be worse. When liquor could not be obtained they drink more than they do now -- well they do plenty now. So let's (interjection) we, we, we, definitely we, and I'm not an angel and neither are you. (Interjection) I want to tell the honourable member -- I told him once, but I'll tell him again -- you're all being paid and paid well to listen to me and I'm paid to listen to you. Making fun of the other fellow is the easiest thing in the world; you don't have to be a B. A. or graduate from University to make fun of the other fellow.

So Madam Speaker, I feel that a remedy is absolutely useless. If the Department of Education wants to undertake in view of the medical opinion the world over that cigarettes do create lung cancer, it's perfectly all right, but prohibition on advertising makes it much

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.). . . worse -- makes it much worse. If an industry is legally established; if an industry is legally operated, they have a perfect right to advertise their products and no one can stop them. So I really don't know what am I to do now. I am willing to support the preamble, but I'm not willing to suppose the last paragraph, so I feel that if anybody -- the Education Department -- the front benchers could tell them that we will see what we can do by education to eradicate the evil, particularly of small children to smoke, okay. If not, let it go.

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Adjourned debate standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, I wonder if I might enjoy the indulgence of the House and have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading Bill 26. The Honourable the Member for Burrows.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Presented Bill No. 26. An Act to Amend an Act to incorporate the Greater Winnipeg Society for Christian Education for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Madam Speaker, I guess this is one of the many phases of education you get in this House. This is an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Greater Winnipeg Society for Christian Education and I will simply read the Bill: WHEREAS The Greater Winnipeg Society for Christian Education has, by its petition, prayed that it be enacted as hereinafter set forth, and it is expedient to grant the prayer of the petition; THEREFORE HER MAJESTY, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, enacts as follows:

(1) (Interjection) and there are Madam Chairman, nine parts to this Act and it's before all the members and it is self-explanatory.

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

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

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department of Health (Interjection) Item 2 -- Psychiatric Services.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I promised to bring back a couple of answers to the Honourable Member from Inkster. I would say that the in and out revenue re provision of food and so on in the establishments in the province, the policy is in our mental institutions that \$25.00 a month is charged to staff who live on the grounds of the mental hospital or live in, and \$5.00 per meal per month is charged for staff who live uptown, eating in the establishment. This is the policy and this is where the monies as we see in here -- this is in and out as it were in the estimates.

The other question he asked was on the program for patients who are discharged from Selkirk Hospital back into the community. If these patients have their own funds, these funds are utilized for their support if this is needed until a point is reached where they can qualify for extra assistance. I should point out to the honourable members that since the program began of about 200 people who have been averaging 9 years in a mental hospital, of the 200 approximately that have been rehabilitated I passed a note around from the Canadian Mental Association which showed that 60 are either in their own homes or foster homes or supported in some institute by their own funds or by relatives. So there's a combination of resources used. I think this shows the point here that the professional staff with the assistance of the voluntary association using the several resources in the province have effected this wonderful story.

While I'm on my feet, earlier today -- I'm sorry the Leader of the Opposition isn't in the House -- he asked me about the two cases of typhoid fever which had appeared in the press, I just wasn't sure if this was something new. I should explain to the honourable members that

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) . . . about once a week the Division of Preventative Health Services makes a statement to the regular bulletins and to the press concerning any epidemiological problems, typhoid, diphtheria, polio and so on, these are reported regularly. The two cases that are referred to in the article are the two cases that have been known to the department for a little while. About the middle of the month an eighteen month old child was found to have typhoid fever and this was discovered in the Misericordia Hospital where the child was admitted and the diagnosis made. The Portage Health Unit have been into the area where this originated and examined the blood of sixty patients, finding two who are put in isolation. As the honourable members may know typhoid is spread sometimes by carriers and it is important - to find out if anyone is carrying the disease. The other case, is an Eskimo lady who is in the Churchill Hospital and her blood was sent down for examination to the provincial laboratory and it was found that she did have typhoid fever. These cases are reported and known, and of course this is the continuing function of the department, the examination and contact and follow-up of any threatened outbreak such as this.

The other question, I've asked the Commission for a breakdown and I would hope to give it to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the number of beds in each year from '48 to '62 that I have not received as yet. These were the questions that I had lying over from last evening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) (1) passed; (2) passed; (3) passed; (4) passed.

MR. GUTTORMSON: We are now dealing with the Selkirk Mental Hospitals are we not?

A MEMBER: Brandon. . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Psychiatric Services. We're just calling the 1, 2, 3, under (a) (Interjection) 4 is the Manitoba School for Mentally Defective Persons.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Well just tell me which item we're on and then I'll . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I beg your pardon.

MR. GUTTORMSON: You passed 2 didn't you?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, calling 3 and then 4

MR. GUTTORMSON: Well then you're dealing with the Selkirk Mental Hospital, aren't you?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pardon?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Are you not dealing with the Selkirk Hospital for Mental diseases? (Interjection) Mr. Chairman, I'd like to direct some questions to the Minister on this particular hospital. A person has come to me with some serious charges about the running of this hospital. I'm not qualified to know if these allegations are true or not, so I'd like to direct some questions in connection with this hospital to the Minister and he can perhaps advise us what the situation is.

Could the Minister give me answers to the following questions: How many patients are there in the above hospital? How many qualified doctors there are in the hospital? If there isn't any physiotherapy used by the doctors to try and help the patients in this hospital. I am advised that in this hospital that the doctors will not impose treatment on patients against their will. Now it's the contention of this party that if patients are to be treated they should receive treatment that the doctor feels is necessary and not let the patient decide what is good for him. Another question is why there is no recreation provided for the patients in this hospital? Perhaps the Minister could advise us on this matter.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman the questions asked certainly show the ignorance of whoever directed these inquiries to my honourable friend. We have just over -- I think about a thousand and a few more patients in Selkirk as of today -- I think it's about 1,050 at the most. Just two days ago they closed another ward with their progressive staff. The number of fully qualified psychiatrists are four in number fully qualified, and I believe three are about to be certified in that particular facility. And then there's an intern and so on. Against their will. If a patient is psychotic and obviously mentally ill to the point where they need help, the patients are either committed to Selkirk or come voluntarily. To be committed a person must be committed by two physicians; after commitment then we can retain them and detain them for therapy. If the patient is not psychotic and, in the opinion of the psychiatric staff, the objective is of course to get the patient's concurrence in treatment. As I pointed out approximately a third -- it's been growing by five percent a year -- and approximately a third of the

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd.) . . . admissions I believe this year were on a voluntary basis. This is to be much preferred with the new concepts of care with the modern drugs as we've pointed out and with the open-door policy in our hospitals; but certainly patients are detained if they cannot be controlled early in their admission by drugs. But again we have this commitment factor. In this connection we have for the last year been reviewing our whole mental health legislation with -- in fact Mr. Rutherford is helping us with it. It's a tremendous task in bringing it up-to-date, and the hope is to more and more slant it toward the voluntary admission basis.

Recreation: As you know two or three years ago, three years ago the fine new recreational hall at Selkirk was opened. This is something which was delayed for several years, we never did get around to it until 1958 when we got it going. This is where up to a hundred volunteers a night attend and assist with the patients with this idea of share and bringing the community to the hospital, and the Canadian Mental Health Association, Selkirk Division, is an extremely active group and were the spark plugs in this most recent program. Also, in the past year through local participation there the Selkirk Vocational Workshop was opened, where patients are placed down town for working purposes, to be able to work for three months -- are paid. It's not a sheltered workshop, they try and get competitive kind of contracts for them and they see how their work habits are with the idea of giving these people more and more freedom, and possibly seeking employment in the community, or at least placing the patient in the community where he can carry on.

I should point out to the Honourable Member for St. George that this kind of program at Selkirk is looked upon as a most progressive program. I'd be very happy to take the honourable member out there any time after the Session, especially those who came with us a few years ago, just to show you the changes. When you're breaking out with these new concepts of care there are obviously some people who don't understand what you're trying to do, and this is why we have been so happy by the encouragement from the people, the volunteers who were concerned about mental health, and the public generally who concern themselves in this field -- the tremendous work of the Canadian Mental Health Association. I'm happy to report to the House that the Accreditation Committee examining the possibility of accrediting mental hospitals across Canada, including the Deputy Minister of Psychiatric Services for the Province of Ontario, visited here last year and asked to view the Selkirk Hospital. I asked him to meet with me afterwards, at which time he told me that it was just beyond his belief that this kind of program; that this enthusiasm; that this progressiveness could have erupted in a long-term chronic mental hospital such as Selkirk.

This institution is becoming an acute institution. The treatment and the care services there have been revolutionized in the last three to four years. Certainly without understanding and so on it could be interpreted in all fairness by some as possibly too bold a way of going about it, and this has been expressed to me by both volunteers and psychiatrists. I can't speak too highly of the dedication of the staff in that institution and the calibre of care. The superintendent of that institution is the president-elect this year of the Canadian Psychiatric Association.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions to ask the Honourable Minister. The first one is a pretty difficult question to ask, so I hope the Honourable Minister will try to read between the lines and not ask me to explain too much. I'd like to know if he's satisfied with the supervision that they have between the male and female patients in Selkirk during the recreation period and the leisure time. I'm saying this very seriously, I understand that there's been -- maybe the lack of supervision has caused embarrassment in the past, embarrassment not only to people in the institution but also to relatives outside the institution. I think this is an important subject.

There is something else here. I think that last year we had mentioned something about the patient receiving remuneration for the work that was being done on the farm. I think there was some question at the time, it was felt that definitely, and I do believe this, that this is something that helped these patients but it was felt the should receive some remuneration that would be able to give him a little bit of money to take advantage of the canteen and so on.

Now there is another thing that has been coming up pretty often lately. I wonder if the

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . department is authorizing chiropractic treatment in the mental institution. Now I'm talking about this kind of treatment to relieve and to help this mental disease. I understand that in nearly every chiropractor's office there are pamphlets dealing with mental health and the spine and so on, and there is certainly a movement to see that these bills should be covered by the Medical Plan. If this is the fact I think it is very important if this is true. I think that the people are entitled to know. This is information that we get now in different chiropractor's offices, I repeat, and I'd like for the Minister to tell us what he or his department feel about this. I think the people are entitled to have some information on this. I confess that I have no opinion on this. I don't know enough about that; it seems possible but I think we should hear what the expert has to say on this.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, re supervision of patients, certainly we have attendants out when the people are fraternizing in the grounds of the Selkirk Mental Hospital. This is the 'open-door policy', the idea of increasing fraternization on the grounds of the hospital. It's certainly always under the strictest supervision that one can possibly attain without interfering with the patient's sense of freedom which we're trying to promote. In other words, this is where the patient begins to fraternize, for example, after an acute illness and is in the process of treatment. This is most important; the whole concept of group therapy and so on.

Working conditions at Selkirk: we pay the patients in the workshop down town, in the rehab. centre which has developed. The patients are now anxious in turn to get down there. They are paid and they use this money for clothing or whatever they wish. In fact, many of them have been nine years in Selkirk, worked there for a month or two, are going down town shopping and carrying out socialization and becoming accustomed again to being free citizens who are mentally capable of handling themselves and finding their way from here to there.

With respect to the provision of chiropractic services in the treatment of mental illness. This has not been asked for yet by any of my psychiatrists or the provincial psychiatrists -- it hasn't been brought up. I'm not as knowledgeable in this field as my honourable friend and I haven't had any recommendations for same as yet.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, if I understood the Minister correctly he said they had four qualified psychiatrists to look after these 1,050 patients. Does the minister feel that four doctors is sufficient to look after a large number of patients such as that -- to give them the treatment that's required?

MR. JOHNSON: No, my honourable friend, it isn't, but the beefing up of the psychiatric division is a thing in itself compared to the old days. At the hospital at the present time the exact number of psychiatrists -- I asked them to put it in my book here and it isn't here now -- but we have 45 psychiatrists in the division. The exact number are -- you asked for qualified people; fully qualified, we have four in the Selkirk Hospital proper, and I think there are three there about to qualify, junior interns; and on top of this -- we have eight psychiatrists altogether, eight medical doctors in the Selkirk Hospital proper. Then we have our community mental health team of a psychiatrist, psychologist and so on working out of Selkirk in the community. Then we have seven young psychiatrists in training -- I think one or two who are attached to the hospital. But actual doctors working with patients are eight. And as we reduce the load on the qualified people I will admit is extremely heavy. The demand for services has just exploded as I have mentioned. We have the diploma course, which I have told you about previously, two years ago, that was started, using our mental hospitals and the Child Guidance Clinic, Children's Hospital and so on for a well-rounded out course in conjunction with the university. There are seven doctors in that course at the present time. And throughout our service we now have a total of 47 fellows, doctors, medical doctors and psychiatrists, and the provincial psychiatrist advises me this is the highest we have ever attained in our province, with a total in our institutions of 15 fully qualified full-time psychiatrists. In addition to this, of course, we have medical doctors who are in training and so on. But at Selkirk proper there are eight medical officers working with the patients.

You can never get enough psychiatrists. The shortage across Canada is most acute; the shortage everywhere. However, our diploma course that we have started, I'm happy to say there are seven in this course at the present time and we have been more successful in the last year or two in acquiring staff than we have ever been before.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that any member of this

(Mr. Hillhouse, cont'd.) Committee has the right to ask any questions of the Minister, no matter how critical they may appear, and I feel as Member for Selkirk Constituency that I would be lacking in gratitude and courtesy if I did not personally express to the Minister and to Dr. Tavener and the members of the staff of the Selkirk Mental Hospital my thanks and appreciation for the wonderful job that you're doing.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, coming back to this remuneration, I tried to follow the Honourable Minister but I didn't quite understand if he said that the work on the farm was included in this. I don't know if he did or not. Now my question about chiropractic treatment I don't think was answered at all. I think the Honourable Minister is getting touchy again. I think this is a legit question; it is something -- there's pamphlets that are accessible to the public and after all, we're not dealing with my estimates; I never claimed that I knew anything about this. I'm asking a question and if there is a field there open to these people I think we should know. I think this is very important. I'm not suggesting one way or another. I don't know. I don't know. Now these people -- I'm not trying to embarrass anybody, these people are not hiding; they're coming out saying that they're qualified; that there's a new field, and a lot of people believe this. I think that this is serious enough. If it's dangerous we should be told, and if there is a field, or if we're not sure, if we're pioneering in this, I'd like to know this too. Now the Minister's a little touchy when he tells me that he doesn't know as much about this as I do. I don't claim that I know too much about this, that's why I'm asking the question. As I say, these are not my estimates that we're passing; they're the estimates of the Honourable Minister and the estimates on health, so I think that he should try to give me an honest answer to this honest question, and if not, try to endeavour to get the information for us. I think it is very important.

MR. JOHNSON: my honourable friend from St. Boniface, is becoming as somebody said, a little tenacious this Session. That's quite all right with me. I'm glad to debate any aspect and every little and tittle of these estimates if they take from now till the cows come home. But my honourable friend can get up and in his boisterous way impute that I'm trying to avoid something. I'm not avoiding something. I take my recommendations for medical care and treatment at the institutions from the provincial psychiatrist who's been 40 years in the field and he and the Deputy Minister have not brought this particular matter that the honourable member has mentioned, to my attention. I'd be glad to mention it to them and possibly the contribution that my honourable friend has made in this committee in bringing this matter up, will have some bearing in the future, and we'll certainly look into it. I'm not the least bit touchy about it. I'm not trying to avoid it whatsoever. As far as I'm concerned, I know -- I think I know what constitutes the very latest advances in psychiatric care and treatment. However I am just a Minister, I could be a wheat farmer, or like yourself, I could be in that occupation. I just happen to be a physician; I don't attempt to interpret what the experts can do so much better than I ever could in any particular field. I'm just one of those country working general practitioners that sometimes pretends to be an expert in this Committee.

With respect to the

MR. CHAIRMAN: I call it 5:30 and leave the chair until 8:00 o'clock.