

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Thursday, March 18th, 1965.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

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.

MADAM SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions

MR. CLERK: The petition of Clarence Edward Atchison and Others, Praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate United Fund of Greater Winnipeg.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

HONOURABLE STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources), (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Public Utilities and National Resources begs leave to present the following as their first report. Your Committee met for organization and appointed Honourable Mr. Lyon as Chairman. Your Committee recommends that for the remainder of the Session, the Quorum of this Committee shall consist of nine members. Your Committee considered Bill No. 16, an Act to amend The Mineral Taxation Act and has agreed to report the same Without Amendment. Your Committee has examined the Annual Report of the Manitoba Telephone System for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1964, as published. Your Committee received all information desired by any member of the Committee from the officials of The Manitoba Telephone System and their staffs with respect to matters pertaining to the Report and the Business of The Manitoba Telephone System. The fullest opportunity was accorded to all members of the Committee to seek any information desired; all of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills. The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HONOURABLE GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge) introduced Bill No. 6, an Act to amend The Department of Industry and Commerce Act.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 24 grade 6 students from Greenway School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Springman. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for St. Matthews. There are also some 21 grade 6 students from Mulvey School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Marrin. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the First Minister. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you. Orders of the Day.

HONOURABLE MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table of the House a return to an order of the House No. 6, on the motion of the Honourable Member from Brokenhead.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Inkster.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY, (Inkster): Madam Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Is the Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare aware that this is a national health week; and if you are, what is the Department of Health doing to emphasize the importance of the national week?

HONOURABLE CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, I wish to thank the honourable member for giving advance notice of the question. Yes, the Department of Health is aware that this is National Health Week and the Department of Health Education has carried on its annual activity in respect to this particular time of the year. There have been several interviews on Spotlight on CBWT with members of the staff, particularly the Director of Communicable Diseases, and Dr. Krywulak the Medical Director of Kildonan-

(MR. WITNEY, cont'd). . . . . St. Paul Health Unit and East Kildonan public health nurses have held clinics at the schools at which smallpox inoculations were given. Spot announcements have been prepared by the Health Education Section for all TV stations accompanied by slides, and for all radio stations. Press releases have been prepared for distribution to the local newspapers plus some 100 rural newspapers and the week has been drawn to the attention of all the Department of Health personnel through the Departmental Newsletter. And while I am standing Madam Speaker I should like to extend the appreciation of the Department to the press, radio and television people for the publicity and assistance that they have given during National Health Week.

HONOURABLE GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the table a return to an Order of the House No. 5 on a motion from the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead on March 10th.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam la Présidente avant les Ordres du Jour, au nom du Président de la Société St.-Jean Baptiste de St-Boniface il me fait extrêmement plaisir d'inviter tous les députés de cette Chambre ainsi que les journalistes et les rapporteurs de venir passer une soirée, la soirée de la soupe aux pois mercredi le 7 avril à 8:30 p. m. au Collège de St-Boniface.

Madam Speaker there is the annual invitation to the Pea Soup Night, or should I say, what is it, the Manitoba French Pea Soup Night in St. Boniface to be held at 8:30 Wednesday, April 7th at St. Boniface College. All the members are cordially invited as well as the members of the press and radio, and I would ask the Ministers to not to forget their deputy ministers. Thanks very much.

HONOURABLE DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): Madame l'orateur je suis certain que tous les membres de la Chambre acceptent avec grand plaisir la chaleureuse invitation de l'honorable membre de St-Boniface - which means in English, count on us-- we'll be there!

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to direct a question or two to my honourable friend the Attorney-General, I guess --(Interjection)-- Is there an application before the Liquor Commission for a liquor outlet at Clear Lake? And if so, has the Liquor Commission allowed the two weeks within which the opponents of such an application could register their objections?

HONOURABLE STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, while I am the Minister to answer for the Liquor Commission in the Legislature I have no knowledge of the detailed business that comes before the Commission.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well Madam Speaker to whom can I direct this question in the House? --(Interjection)-- Well Madam Speaker, this is a most important question, I believe, because it concerns so many people in the province. I am informed --(Interjection)-- pardon? --(Interjection)-- Well I am informed that an application has been made, an application appeared in the Minnedosa Tribune. There are no residents at Clear Lake at all, therefore who could register objections. When the application was made before it was in the summertime when they were all there. Now I think this should be brought to someone's attention and an answer given.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Has the Honourable Minister or his Department received any request from the construction industry or the house builders to request the Federal Government to extend the dead line for the winter \$500 bonus on construction of houses?

HONOURABLE OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Not to my knowledge Madam Speaker.

HONOURABLE ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the table of the House a return to order of the House No. 12 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Could he indicate to the House whether we will be receiving a Bill to extend crop insurance to the whole of the Province of Manitoba?

MR. HUTTON: We have an Act on the statutes that's enabled us to extend crop insurance to all of Manitoba.

MR. MOLGAT: Well a subsequent question then, Madam Speaker. Is it the intention of the Minister to extend crop insurance to all of Manitoba in view of the federal legislation?

MR. HUTTON: In due course.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Order for return standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker at the request of the Minister I would ask that the four orders for return standing in my name be left standing, I believe until Monday, is it?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Ethelbert Plains that an order of the House do issue for a return showing:

1. the names and addresses of all consulting engineers and architects who have been employed by the various departments of the government and crown corporations each year from 1960 to 1964 inclusive;
2. the particular purpose or project for which they were employed;
3. how much has been paid to each person or company.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 41, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK (Ethelbert Plains): Madam Speaker, I do not intend to be very long on this particular Bill. I can say that I am sorry indeed that the government saw fit to bring in this Bill especially after some of the front benchers know the troubles we used to have, the debates, the divisions in this House when we did not have uniform time in the Province of Manitoba.

I would like to point out to the members who have not sat in this House for too long that for years the question of whether we should have Daylight Saving Time or Standard Time was almost an annual event in this House. The House was sharply divided at all times on this question. In fact it reached the stage where the rift between the City of Winnipeg and rural Manitoba was almost entirely due to the time question. And for this reason last year when the government brought in the bill of uniform time, I believe that all the rural people although disliking the measure very much, felt that the only thing to do was to come to some reasonable compromise with which they could live, and as far as the proponents or the advocates of retaining Standard Time were concerned, they were giving to the support of the Daylight Saving Time something that they stubbornly resisted to give for as I said many, many years. And after deciding to come to a compromise which was considered fair and just, so that we would have uniform time in the province, instead of having a hodgepodge of times throughout the province, where a traveller didn't know whether he was in Standard Time area or Daylight Saving Time area, where it almost made it impossible to carry out business in an efficient manner, those were the reasons Madam Speaker why this compromise was made. And it's with considerable regret that I read the Bill as introduced by this government. It seems to be innocent enough in that all it does is extend the Daylight Saving Time from four months to six months for those areas who want it, but we are actually bringing back the situation that existed prior to the passing of the Bill last year. And I for one, cannot see where in the name of common sense we should revert to the old practice of continuous debates in this House and the hard feelings that were created in the years gone by. I think it's bad faith on the part of the government after the supporters of Standard Time agreed to the extent that they did last year to find themselves in the same position that they were prior to that agreement. That's why this amendment has been brought in and I do think that in fairness to the people of the Province of Manitoba and in fairness to common sense, let's have uniform time. Let's not make it possible to bring about the kind of a situation we had before the Act was passed last year.

I'm not going to talk about the advantages or disadvantages of either of the times. I know that in rural Manitoba the less Daylight Saving Time we have the better insofar as our children are concerned who have to travel in some instances close to 40 miles to get to school, under the present division system. The Daylight Saving Time is just going to be impossible for them to live with. But aside from all these disadvantages, the farm organizations and everybody agreed

(MR. HRYHORCZUK, cont'd). . . . . to a four month period of Daylight Saving Time to be uniform throughout the province and I think that the government is acting in bad faith when it is bringing in what appears to be an innocent enough amendment, could revert the situation in the province to what we had before that act was brought in last year and that is a hodgepodge of times where we have several municipalities belonging to one school division, that could adopt either four months or six months and it will just ball and mix everything up that nobody will know whether they're coming or going. I think this is one instance of where the government should change its mind about that Bill and vote for that amendment of uniform time for the province.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas, and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

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

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Harris, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Schreyer, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

Resolution: Yeas 17; Nays 37.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 41. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I feel sorry that the principle of uniform time has been lost or defeated because it's not too long ago, I think it's only a couple of years, that there was a move under way in the Province of Manitoba for having uniform time throughout the whole province. I think there was great concern in this Assembly by everyone in the way the debates went along, everyone here was concerned about uniform time for the whole Province of Manitoba. I know many, many towns have asked for uniform time so that it would be also the same throughout the whole province. Now this Bill asks for extension, of longer period of Daylight Saving in the city area only. In my opinion, this implementation of legislation by the government should be undertaken only if the government feels that it will benefit most of the people in our province. In my opinion this legislation would benefit most of the people and that it should be extended to six months instead of the present legislation that we have just passed. Most towns within close proximity of Winnipeg will have to follow the City of Winnipeg time because I don't think they can follow any other time because of the business that they do with the larger centre.

I think that uniform time has merit in a province where residents are moving more often and doing business with each other more and more often. Also the tourists are finding it quite difficult stopping in every town that they have to stop and finding the time is different. I know many of us have been concerned about physical fitness in the province and I feel it would be to our advantage to be able to use one more hour of daylight during the summer months for a couple of more months as requested in this legislation for various recreation activities such as swimming, fastball games, baseball, golfing, camping, fishing, picnicking and many other activities which would be beneficial. So I would like to stress to this House that I am for the extension of Daylight Saving Time but I am also for uniformity throughout the whole province.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker will the honourable member permit a question? Do I understand him that he is in favour of uniform time, Daylight Saving Time, six months of the year. Is that the position?

MR. PATRICK: That's right.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I'd just like to say a word. Uniformity is a nice thing in some respects, but I think we've found from our experience in respect to time that uniformity was a strait jacket, was a strait jacket for the people who follow one way of life --I'm speaking of the urban population-- for many of these people it was a strait jacket because it wasn't long enough. For some of the rural people it was a strait jacket because they didn't want it at all. There was a measure of compromise in the four and a half month period, but it certainly did not meet the needs or the desires of the people in the urban community and especially in Greater Winnipeg, in Metropolitan Winnipeg.

(MR. HUTTON, cont'd).....

I can't see that there is any merit in uniformity if people are going to be unhappy about it. Sure it's handy and it's convenient for those who travel back and forth. I'd rather have uniform time right across the province; but at the same time I'd rather have the people of this province happy and satisfied so far as that is possible. We have accomplished, or we used to have six months of chaos. We have achieved four and a half months, roughly four and a half months of uniform time. It has been reasonably well accepted, aside from the urban area, the metropolitan area, and the question is whether we're going to for the sake of uniformity continue to impose four and a half months upon the people of Metropolitan Winnipeg, or on the other hand impose six months on the other people in the province.

Now as far as the tourist industry is concerned, it's pretty well looked after during the period of uniform time, since there will only be a six-week period in the fall of the year in which there will be any variation, and I'll allow that it isn't as good as if we could all agree that it should be four and a half or six months; but my own feeling is that there will be more people in Manitoba who are happy with this arrangement than if we arbitrarily continue to impose four and a half months or arbitrarily impose six months on everybody; and I frankly as a legislator cannot see that this question of time is important enough an issue that we need to impose uniformity on all Manitobans. I think that we can be rather thankful that we have accomplished in a rather short space of time the measure of uniformity that has been achieved, and we can only trust that maybe as time goes by that the people in Manitoba in their wisdom and in their experience will elect to narrow the remaining gap. But I don't think that it's a matter that should even require a division in the House.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker I wonder if I can ask the Minister a question? Does the Bill now provide, as it's written, that there will be a compulsory four to four and a half months Daylight Saving Time in all of the province? Is this correct?

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker would the honourable minister permit a question? If he feels that the uniformity is a strait jacket on the people of Manitoba, why does the government insist or consider keeping a strait jacket on for four and a half months?

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, it seems to me that this is the very basis of the discussion that's before us. The Minister says that we shouldn't put anyone in a strait jacket. Well then if that's the case, let's cancel completely any legislation with regard to time, and let every area go back to the time that they want. I can't --following the minister's argument how can he say that we should not, that this is a strait jacket, we shouldn't impose on people who don't want a specific time the time that they don't want. Well then, follow that through. Why not then instead of having this Act which in my opinion will create even more confusion than we've had in the past, then let people go back to the time that they want to have. If people in the rural parts want to stay on standard time, why should you say to them, "for four months you must be on fast time, but for two months then you can have whatever time you like, and for the rest of the year then you're back on standard time again." We're going to have more confusion that we have now. There's no principle whatever behind the Bill that I can see, except that you're leaving for four months some people who apparently are not satisfied with your enforcing them to do it; you're not satisfying those who want a longer time, and you just don't get anywhere.

One of the reasons that I'm concerned about the uniformity in time is the question of the schools, and it's particularly so for those divisions immediately in the vicinity of Winnipeg, where the centres by and large have been on Daylight Time because of the action of the city area, and the balance of the division may have been on Standard Time --quite obviously once you have that sort of a situation then you have some real problems for the parents, for the children, for the schools. This legislation will in no way assist this; in fact it will make it, in my opinion, much worse, because you will have the months of May and June which are still school months and there they'll be by government legislation uniformity. Then you come along to the fall months of September and October, and you will have no uniformity at all, so at times the school districts will have to make a decision, that is for the four months, what to do; for the spring months there will be something else. I think we'll have more confusion with this Bill than we ever had before. If the government isn't prepared to have uniformity, then I say to them then let the whole thing drop and let people go back and have whatever time they decide. All we're doing now is adding more difficulties for them.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, I cannot follow the reasoning of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, in that truly there is no principle that he is

(MR. SMERCHANSKI, cont'd). . . . . backing up. His remarks that most of the people in the province will be happy is just a matter of remarks. I would like to know where does he get his facts and figures from in order to be able to justify a statement of that nature. I honestly think that if we are permitted to go along with this Act, you're going to simply have a hodgepodge of time zones or areas in the Province of Manitoba; and if you're going to have a hodgepodge of time areas in the province, then let's simply leave it to the discretion of the rural people or the people in Metropolitan Winnipeg and let them have their own time areas.

In other words, Madam Speaker, as mentioned by my leader, why should we have any control on time at all. If it is not that important, then let's simply do away with all control on time in the province. If we are imposing certain conditions on the people in this province today on four and a half months, then is it not true that we're also trying to impose upon them a measure of control for the six months? And yet simply making a statement that we know that the people are going to be happy, that will accept this Act, I can hardly go along with that type of reasoning or thinking, because at most you can talk to a limited number of people within your own group; therefore to speak with such distinct and definite authority on behalf of the people of Manitoba simply does not add up. If we had a referendum, or if we had a cross section of a survey made, then I think I would be inclined to go along with statements of that nature; but to simply come out and say that this will give everybody the right, will give everybody the freedom to select their own time as they want it, this just doesn't add up, because Daylight Saving Time does impose a hardship on those families who have young children. These children have to get up an hour earlier and the extended daylight in the evenings is a distinct disadvantage to the young children.

I would suggest Madam Speaker, that uniformity of time, if we're going to regulate time at all, we must regulate it on a uniform basis so that we would know exactly the time schedule in any part of Manitoba; but if we leave it in a hodgepodge arrangement as this Act is bound to create, nobody will know whether somebody in Dauphin is on Standard Time or Daylight Saving Time, or whether somebody in the West Hawk area is on Standard Time or on Daylight Saving Time, and I think we must and should have uniform time in the province.

MR. S. PETERS(Elmwood): Madam Speaker, I'm very disappointed in the government in bringing in this Bill. I remember the controversy that we had when we had the Official Time Act passed, and how we comprised with the rural members, all the maneuvering that went on behind the scenes. We know that you people in the city want a longer daylight saving period of time, but give us a chance, let us show our people in the rural areas that it can work! Give us a chance to show them that it can work. And we went along with you fellows --I would have never voted for this Act-- but we went along with it on this understanding that in a year or two you would be able to convince your people in the country, and we would have official time right across all of Manitoba and we would have our extended period. Now to come back at this session, Madam Speaker, with a Bill like this and put us into the same hodgepodge that we had before, I'm very very disappointed, and I could use stronger language but it wouldn't be parliamentary.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside 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 second reading of Bill No. 43. The Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, I adjourned this bill for my leader.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, may I first of all thank my colleague to holding the debate in order that I may say a word or two in connection with this Bill having been engaged otherwise as the House knows yesterday afternoon.

May I say first of all, Madam Speaker, that by and large I heartily endorse the provisions of the Bill of the Minister of Health but I have one or two reservations with the Bill itself and it appears to me to be somewhat of a deviation in some respects from the former bills. I think the change in description of those who are unfortunate enough to be afflicted with a mental disease is a step in the right direction, where the words "lunacy" and "imbecile" are taken out completely from the legislation. I think this fitting and proper and compliment the Minister for doing so.

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd). . . . .

I do however wonder whether or not it might be possible for some person who has ill will in their hearts and in their minds toward an individual to allow a situation to develop where in Section 8 Clause (1) a so-called kindly disposed person may take anyone to a hospital and make an application --convey a person to a hospital without violence and there make written application for the admission of the person as a patient therein, and the superintendent may admit such a person. Now I can see a possibility where some person, not kindly disposed, but unkindly disposed, may under certain circumstances do this and then at some future date attempt to have established when dealing with the person in a court of law or otherwise, that at one occasion a person was deposited or taken to a mental institution. I have in mind, and I may be away off base in this, but I have in mind having read a few cases dealing with Wills and endeavours being tried to endeavour the person was considered of unsound mind at the time of the signing of the Will. Now it may not be possible or may not be substantiated but I do suggest that in the Bill that we have before us there is a remote possibility and I'm wondering whether or not this might be considered worthwhile taking a look at the Bill.

I also noticed that within the Bill itself, that it seems to me that where, if memory serves me correctly, it required two justices of the peace to take an action under the former Act in respect of a person who may be of unsound mind to have them committed, it seems that now it will only require one justice of the peace. It's true that the proposed Act refers to a medical practitioner in the singular; I think previously here too, that it was necessary for two persons to be involved before a person could be committed forcibly under compulsory admission to a mental institution. And I don't know what the reasoning is behind that at the present time.

Those are a couple of comments directly on the bill, Madam Speaker, but to me seeing as we are dealing now with a bill setting up procedures dealing with the mental retardates in the Province of Manitoba and whereas in Part 2 of the Act, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council is given considerable powers in the establishment of hospitals for mental retardates, I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister, having this opportunity, of fears and apprehensions which exist at the present time with many people in the Province of Manitoba regarding particularly some of our younger mental retardates. I'm particularly concerned and so are many people that I come in contact with with the situation that is regarding the advancing age of some of the patients who are at the present time in St. Amant Ward over at the old St. Boniface Sanatorium.

I must at this time, Madam Speaker, pay a tribute to the Sisters and the workers at the St. Amant ward. When we see by comparison what it was ten years or so ago it's beyond comprehension that in such a time such advances should be made. But the point is though, Madam Speaker, that at the present time all of the beds at St. Amant ward are filled, there is the age limit as contained within the report of the Department of Health of six years of age. I understand that there is a considerable waiting list for admissions to the St. Amant ward. The next place, as I understand it, that those who are over six years of age, who have to vacate the St. Amant ward is the hospital at Portage la Prairie for mental retardates, and according to the report of the Honourable Minister, the Hospital at Portage la Prairie is over crowded at the present time. The patient population as of December 31st, 1963, was 1,102; as of December 31st, 1964, 1,122, when the established patient count for that hospital is 1100. So at the present time Madam Speaker, whereas the Manitoba School is equipped to handle approximately 1100 patients over the age of six years, it is already in excess of that at the present time. When one reads the report of the Portage la Prairie School for mental retardates, we find in the health report continuous reference in such terminology, "unfortunately present case load extends working space and staff, but satisfactory progress has been made." This was dealing with the straight hospital. But throughout the report Madam Speaker, we find that the Department of Health itself is pinpointing the fact that there isn't sufficient space and there isn't sufficient facilities for the patients now in hospital and particularly as I mention at the present time in respect to the younger unfortunate citizens we have in the age group. And, as I mentioned there is a gradual increase in the number which are desiring admission. It is true that on page 46 of the report of the department, mention is made that the St. Amant ward continued to function at its full capacity of 134 in 1964 and plans are under way to increase this capacity to 175 in '65 and by 1968 to operate the whole sanatoria as a centre for care, treatment and training of the grossly retarded child in the younger age groups and the care and treatment of all retardates. I appreciate this, but I suggest Madam Speaker, that more has to be done. There is the recognition as contained in the report that there will be expansions in the Sanatorium and the St.

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd).....Amant Ward, but this will still leave us with the situation that is presently existing at Portage and this situation must be overcome and overcome rapidly.

I haven't had an opportunity, Madam Speaker, of going to Portage la Prairie myself but I have been informed of a certain number of difficulties that are being experienced. One of the difficulties possibly is the fact of being overcrowded. Now it may be that the Minister will be able to tell us that the dollars of the province have had to be spread around various ways and that the desired hasn't been achieved as yet and that steps are being taken; but if the information that is forwarded to me as to conditions at Portage la Prairie is true, Madam Speaker, I respectfully suggest that we cannot tarry any longer in order to alleviate the situation there. I'm informed that some of the conditions under which the patients are housed at Portage are far far removed from what may even in the most remote way be desirable.

I would suggest, if he hasn't already done it, that the Honourable the Minister may take a trip to Moose Jaw to see the type of installation that they have in the Saskatchewan training school at Moose Jaw --and I would like, Madam Speaker if I may, just to refer to an outline I have of what are the facilities at Moose Jaw, for there there is a modern residential school for the retarded which was completed in 1955 at a cost of some ten millions of dollars. It accommodates about 1109 patients ranging from the age of two months to eighty years, with mental levels of near nil to an I. Q. of 70. The per diem rate is approximately \$7.00 per day. They have five M. D. 's and a dentist, 314 nurses, 4 occupational therapists, one psychologist, a music teacher, work centre teacher, home ec. therapist and others in connection with the installation there. The patients live in one-storey cottages, with 40 to 50 patients in each cottage. These cottages are bright, well furnished and equipped with necessary extras for the needs of the type of resident it accommodates. It's really an education, Madam Speaker, to see what actually is the situation. For instance, mature high level retardates would have a kitchen, TV, radio, Hi Fi, a small dining area; and in the female section a laundry room for their personal needs. Such is not the case, Madam Speaker, here. Smaller children are taken care of in cottages with more of a kindergarten atmosphere. The playrooms are spacious, bright, well equipped with toys and visual aids designed to develop and to teach. I might say, Madam Speaker, the colouring of the wards themselves are like the new look that some of our ministers here have in their offices from the old drab look --bright colours. So that the atmosphere in which these unfortunate people are in, is bright, it's cheery, something after St. Amant yes, but covering the whole area, Madam Speaker, it's really worthwhile. The older patients help the nurses and aides in feeding the younger patients for token pay. Instead of just having to do this, some of these relatively small tasks without any pay at all, for token pay they gladly assist in helping each other out within the hospital itself. Toilet training for the young and sometimes older retardate is always a problem, but at Moose Jaw they have handled the problem thus: All non-toilet trained wear diapers. Routine trips to the bathroom eliminates much unnecessary bathroom cleaning. Flat baths are used for untrained adults. This process eliminates high odors and unpleasant working conditions. My information, Madam Speaker is that such is just the reverse insofar as our institutions at Portage la Prairie.

Now, it's not my purpose, Madam Speaker, to try and belittle what is being done in the Province of Manitoba, but I wanted to use this opportunity in this particular Bill to point out to this House and point out to the government that we must carry on, we must increase our facilities and make them better. I invite the Honourable the Minister of Health to journey with me, and anyone else who is interested on an unannounced visit to the Portage Home for retardates some time --and again I suggest that it be unannounced because I think this may be very advantageous that this be done in this manner.

So, Mr. Minister, while I accept your Bill, I think that it is a step in the right direction, I express to you the thought that so much more has to be done. That the facilities at the St. Amant ward in regard to the children are filled to capacity. We appreciate the fact however that there are many who are desirous of getting in and even though the number of beds in this year does increase to 175, it will only take up the slack of what is there. That the Home at Portage la Prairie or the hospital at Portage la Prairie, Madam Speaker, is already overtaxed. Where are all those children at the St. Amant ward going to go who reach the age of six years? Are they having to go out and still create more overcrowding at the Portage hospital? I appreciate the Minister has great and grave problems, but, these are problems that have to be faced up to on an emergency basis, I respectfully suggest, Madam Speaker, and if we have to cut out some expenditures in order to build or rebuild, to make available more space for these our people who are in dire need, then we must do it.

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd). . . . .

Over the years, I appreciate within the field of mental care, great advancements have been made, but if we take a look at the report of the Department of Health that notwithstanding these great advancements both insofar as medicines and our medical profession are concerned, advancements in cheering up the Selkirk Hospital and Brandon Hospital and others with gymnasia and other facilities, Madam Speaker, the fact is that the overall population while decreasing some, I respectfully suggest on the overall picture is not being reduced very much over what it was say four or five years ago. So there's lots to be done in this field. The new venture of a community home idea is very good, but we still have almost the same overall total number in the institutes for our mental retardates.

But my main purpose today, Madam Speaker --the other aspects will be spoken of course when we come to the minister's estimates-- but my main purpose today in dealing with this Bill was to at least start in this House this year, at this time, drawing to the Minister's attention, particularly in respect of our younger people, the time is now to start, and not two or three years hence, for we can no longer have matters such as this, the points I raised Madam Speaker, under consideration for the future. I well remember, Madam Speaker, the first speech --I think I've mentioned this before in this House-- the first speech that I made in the House was in support of the Honourable the First Minister, dealing with the old Youville Home in Transcona. As I said at the opening of my remarks, so much has been done. It would be a credit to any Department of Health insofar as those people who formerly were the patients at the Youville in Transcona, but I say to the Minister, I say to the government, you've made such a great improvement in respect of that, but we've once more caught up in my opinion, not with the same situation as we had back in the Youville days, because there couldn't be any situation in Manitoba that was as deplorable as that was at that time; but I think, Madam Speaker, insofar as accommodation is concerned by way of numbers we've caught up now, and I enjoin the minister to use every influence that he has to overcome this present situation as rapidly as possible.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL(Lakeside): Madam Speaker, would the honourable gentleman who has just taken his seat permit a question?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'd like to ask him if my understanding of what he said was correct. I understood him to say that he had not visited the Portage la Prairie institution.

MR. PAULLEY: That's correct, Madam Speaker. I simply said, Madam Speaker, if I may, I used the phrase, "according to information that I have received that people who have". I think that is established. . .

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, Madam Speaker, I noted that remark as well, that the honourable gentleman said that he had information from other people. It seems to me that it's an amazing thing that the honourable gentleman would say that he has not visited the institution yet and he still goes on with a comparison so adverse to it in so many ways, not with what obtained before, to prove that he admits that he thinks there's a big improvement since then, but with other institutions, one of them being in Saskatchewan of course, and I gather that he was just reading a report from there. I think that he has not visited that one either. Is that correct?

MR. PAULLEY: I have made a detailed study of the institution at Moose Jaw accompanied by full movies and pictures of the institution itself, Madam Speaker, for the purpose of the record.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, I wasn't sure as to whether --I am glad to hear that he has at least seen the one in Saskatchewan, but he hasn't yet seen the one in Manitoba, and I would suggest. . . .

MR. PAULLEY: What is the point?

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, the point is that before my honourable friend argues about the one in Manitoba, that he should see it as well, and--(Interjection)-- does my honourable friend want to make another speech?

MR. PAULLEY: No, Madam Speaker, but I do want to say to my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside that if --(Interjection)-- Pardon? --(Interjection)-- I believe he was asking me a question insofar as my information on Portage, and if Madam Speaker, you think not, I'll sit down, gladly.

MR. CAMPBELL: I should know a lot better, Madam Speaker, than to ask my honourable friend many questions because he finds an opportunity to make a speech after every one.

MR. PAULLEY: I don't. I think that's most unfair.

MR. CAMPBELL: And particularly I object to his suggestion that he and the Minister shall make a visit to the Portage la Prairie institution "unannounced." I want to tell him that as far as the Portage la Prairie institution is concerned, not only now but in the time before this administration took over, that you didn't need to make any announcement about when you were going there, because it is headed by one of the most dedicated men that we've ever had in the civil service of Manitoba bar none. This is an area --the institutions that look after the mentally retarded is an area that I think is just about the most difficult to serve in that anybody ever had to undertake, and when you can find people as capable, people with all the qualifications, both of training and of heart and of mind to serve in an institution of that kind, when they could be in some other area, I think that those people are entitled to the respect and the admiration and the encouragement of the rest of us and not any suggestion that we had better sneak in on them when they don't know we are coming rather than the word getting around that we will be there. This institution, and I am sure that it applies to others, this institution is ready for inspection at any time. Maybe it is overcrowded. A lot of these institutions are overcrowded. But the people who are working there, the people who head that institution --and it is a difficult one to make look as tidy and as agreeable as people would want-- but the people that head that institution are ready for inspection any time, and the care and attention that they give to their work is something that really is outstanding. And only those people I think who have visited these different institutions, only those who are aware of the difference in working with the mentally retarded people as differentiated from the mental cases as such can have an appreciation of the hard work and endeavour that has to go into a place of this kind.

I'm not worried about my honourable friend's remarks about what obtained before the improvements that have been made. I am sure there have been some improvements made. But in the time that we were the administration the institution at Portage la Prairie was well operated and you didn't need to have an unannounced visit in order to see the conditions there. They are the same all the time that they would be if they knew my honourable friend were coming or the Minister either. I just was greatly disturbed by his suggestion of an unannounced visit by himself and the Minister to this institution where I happen to know the head of the institution personally and have watched him in operation for a great many years, and whom I consider to be one of the most dedicated men I have ever known in public service, and one that's operating in the very most difficult area of public service that I know of --and I just counsel my honourable friend when he is talking to the government, even though he is anxious to convey to the government that they haven't done enough yet, probably there will never be enough done-- don't make the mistake because you want to be critical of the government, of being critical of institutions that are doing as good a job as that one in Portage la Prairie is under tremendously difficult circumstances.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I am sorry that I didn't hear all the remarks of the Honourable Member from Lakeside but I think I heard most of his statement in this connection and I would like to say that I've thought about this problem a good deal under what circumstances is an unannounced type of visitation justified or when is it called for. And it seems to me that there are occasions when those who are in a position of law making and so on, do have, I would say, an obligation to satisfy themselves that the kind of facility being provided by the state is up to certain standards.

Now the honourable member assures us that in the case of the Portage la Prairie facility that we are fortunate in having one of the most dedicated and competent public servants possible, and I certainly take his word for it, not having the occasion or the privilege of having met the person of whom he speaks. But I want to say that when a legislator or anyone in a position of public responsibility does conceive of making an unannounced visitation he can be doing so for any number of reasons, not the least of which is to see the quality of the physical facility that is being provided, and not by any means to be trying to check up on the kind of work, quality of work performed by the staff so, I think the honourable member perhaps misconstrues a bit. In any case I don't mind saying publicly that I feel somewhat of an obligation to attempt to visit the custodial centre referred to as the Vaughan Street Detention Home. I know that honourable members have made an announced visit there and they have looked it over and so on, but I have received reports from three different sources of people who were there, to the effect that on occasion there are being kept in that Vaughan Street Detention or custodial centre young boys under the age of 15 who are non-offenders, and that is hardly the sort of place or hardly the sort of facility where young people, youngsters under 14 should be kept. It's bad enough if they

(MR. SCHREYER, cont'd). . . . . are young offenders but when they are young non-offenders I think that the wrong we do them is compounded. I don't know of my rights in this connection but I know certainly that sometime in the course of the next 12 months I am going to attempt to make an unannounced visit there to see for myself whether or not this is the fact; and if it is, I suggest that this government has been and is guilty of a wrongdoing. The only possible reason there could be for doing this sort of thing is that we have such a complete poverty of receiving home facilities for these young people who are you might say in transit before they are placed in foster home care. In fact, one of the sources which I received this report was from a foster parent who told me that they received a phone call to pick up this young boy. Where was he? He was at the Vaughan Street Detention facility, a young 12 year old. I am sure that if we made announced visits we would never find this. So the point I am making, to make a long story short, is that it seems that upon occasion there is justification for someone holding a position of public responsibility to check, unannounced. And to do so does not mean that you are checking on the staff or the personnel. It could be that you are checking on the administrative procedures, on physical facilities, etcetera in an every day work context.

MR. MOLGAT: I hadn't really intended to get in this debate but the statement made by the Leader of the NDP and his member who tried to defend his position prompt me to get into it. I think the point that was being made by my colleague the Honourable Member for Lakeside was that the Leader of the NDP should not proceed to make a comparison to an institution that he has visited in another province, which he told us later he had visited in great detail with films, pictures and all the rest, to an institution in the Province of Manitoba which he admits he has not visited, and that in fairness to the government and to the people who work at that institution whether the visit is announced or unannounced or what it is, has no bearing on the situation. But if he is going to stand up in this House and make that sort of criticism comparing it to something he has been able to do in Saskatchewan then the least that we can expect is that he visit the institution in Manitoba first.

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak to the second reading of this Bill, I'll close the debate. I might say Madam Speaker, in this matter of visiting the mental hospitals or the mental facilities that we have in this province that any member of this House is welcome to attend at any time, whether they are with me, whether they are not with me, whether they have announced that they are coming or whether they have not announced that they are coming. I know from my own visitations as I'm travelling through the country and going north that the mental hospitals have welcomed me. I suppose you would think that was natural but I have occasionally just called in to say hello and have always been welcomed by them, and the other members of this House will be equally as welcome to travel there and to ask to be shown around any specific area or all of the areas any reasonable hour of the day, and those are within the daylight hours and in the evening if you wish to go at that time. I will be later on inviting this House for a tour if it wishes to go, to the Selkirk Hospital.

I would like to thank the Honourable Member for Lakeside for the kind remarks that he made of the staff at the Portage Hospital for I can reiterate them with all sincerity. I would like to say Madam Speaker in the visit that I have made out to Portage la Prairie that it is not all as grim as perhaps people might think it is because there is a tremendous amount of affection that develops between these mentally retarded people and staff. And there is in fact in many areas of the Portage la Prairie Hospital and of course in the St. Amant ward too, a very warm friendship and I think in terms of a love that develops between these people that are less fortunate than ourselves and there is a reward not only to the mentally retarded person but also to the people who are working with them; and if anybody ever felt that they could have perhaps a satisfying career in their life I would suggest to them that perhaps to work in the field of mental health or mental retardation would be one area where they could obtain the same.

I might say to the Honourable the Leader of the NDP that I was at Moose Jaw and I did tour the facilities there and while I did note at Moose Jaw that the facilities were newer and that the facilities were of a single storey, our facilities here in Manitoba are older, nevertheless I came back with the confidence that what we were trying to achieve is the same as what they are trying to achieve and that the attitude of our people and the care that is being given to the mentally retarded children in Portage la Prairie is equal to that that is being given at the Moose Jaw school. We have recently, in this matter of overcrowding I would like to suggest to him that we will be able to ease the overcrowding at Portage la Prairie and have done so to I consider a degree at any rate, since we opened the three brand new cottages that have 30 in each one of them in Portage, just two or three months ago. The St. Amant ward facilities are

(MR. WITNEY, cont'd) . . . . . being expanded and there is another area which perhaps he has overlooked in the report, and that is the area where we have people coming from the Portage la Prairie facility into the Broadway Home and from the Broadway Home are now being rehabilitated out into the community. In about a year or so I think we had some 24 and now we have somewhere in the neighbourhood of 100 of these people.

The new Act before you will not only make it easier for people to come to our mental facilities for help but it will also provide an easier mechanism for us to discharge people from our mental facilities and the mental facility such as the one at Portage la Prairie. Dealing with some of the pertinent points in the Bill that were mentioned the Honourable Member for St. Boniface enquired about St. Amant ward, whether it was covered by this legislation, and the answer is yes. The Leader of the NDP referred to section 8 (1) and I might advise him that this terminology has been in Mental Health Acts for many a long year and while that may not be any reason for it to be brought forward it is still a form of terminology that is carried on in other mental health acts in other jurisdictions and we have had over the period of years that it was in our present legislation no difficulty with it. He is correct in stating that it would require only one J. P. and the protection with the estate is taken care of in Section 79, subsection 2, the particular portion that he mentions.

I believe, Madam Speaker, that we are making progress with respect to the facilities that we have for mentally retarded children and I am quite satisfied that as the years progress that we will be able to do much more and the problem with mental retardation will be much easier in this province than it is at the present time or than it was several years ago.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The second reading of Bill No. 49. The Honourable the Minister of Labour.

HONOURABLE OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne) presented Bill No. 49 an Act respecting the Safety of Employees in their Employment for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, this Bill is intended to provide an effective framework for the protection from accidents of employees at their place of employment. It places an overall obligation in general terms on employers and employees alike to take all reasonable and necessary safety precautions. The Bill gives inspectors the essential powers of inspection and investigation and authorizes them to issue orders requiring employers and employees to implement specific measures for safety and to correct unsafe working conditions. It sets out an effective procedure for communicating orders of inspectors to whom they are directed. It provides that time limits may be set for compliance with orders. It allows for an appeal to the Workmen's Compensation Board from orders of an inspector. It gives broad regulatory powers to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to implement the intent of the Act. This provides for a desirable degree of flexibility to meet changing conditions and technological improvements. It's obvious Madam Speaker, that it would be impossible to spell out in legislation precise preventative measures covering all situations that might arise.

Stiffer penalties are provided for in violation of the Act and the regulations. These penalties have been increased Madam Speaker from \$50 to \$500 a day and from three months to six months imprisonment. The construction safety regulations which were revised during the current year will be continued in effect. There has been multi-consultation with labour and management representatives concerning this new legislation. You might say that there is practically complete agreement among all those concerned that the safety program provided for by this Bill, that it should be undertaken. Now there are those who feel that enforcement aspects of it should be left with the Department of Labour and we can't concur with this view. Our experience Madam Speaker, has shown that it is necessary to have an effective program; that it must be co-ordinated and managed as a total program; that it is not in the best interests of either parties or the community to fragment it. Just for example, on one occasion recently at a pilot project there arose a situation between one of our engineers and the company that he was consulting with and their engineers and their officials. A hazardous condition was recognized. Now in this particular instance they were able to reach agreement, no one was hurt, workers were withdrawn and everything worked out fine; but had this consultative person not had the powers of enforcement, why it could have caused a serious situation at the time.

We intend to keep moving ahead, Madam Speaker, in this field, until the arrangements have been made to actually transfer the employees safety to The Workmen's Compensation Board. There will be no let up in our efforts and we will continue close liaison with the

(MR. BAIZLEY, cont'd) . . . . . Compensation Board until the program is working effectively and satisfactorily to all concerned.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Bill. I do have some questions that I want to raise under different sections. I may also say that I certainly appreciate the Honourable Minister's placing the unemployment safety under the Workmen's Compensation Board because if he recalls the last two sessions on the labour estimates I did suggest that I think it would be much better and more efficient to have the employment safety under the Workmen's Compensation Board. So it seems that he has taken some of the suggestions that arise on this side of the House.

I do want to raise some questions in this Bill and under Section 3, it excludes mining. There must be some reason for it. There's no doubt that, maybe there is under the Mines Act a procedure set out for inspection of mines and safety. But however there would seem to be no reason why mining could not be included under this Bill. I cannot see why the same inspectors could cover mining as well as the other matters covered in this Bill. I just would like to know the reason why mining is excluded.

Now under Section 8, the Bill under Section 8, provides for the expenses of this Act including inspectors to be paid out of the accident fund provided for under the Workmen's Compensation Act. Under the Workmen's Compensation Act Section 59, the Board makes assessments against employers in each class. Now I would say as an incentive to good safety measures the Workmen's Compensation Act should be amended to give more power to adjust levies for individual employers depending on their safety records in certain industries and it seems that it's not in this Bill.

Under Section 9, dealing with appointment of inspectors, I would say raises a very important point. I think they should be adequate in number, and they should be carefully trained and carefully appointed. They must know their work, I believe they should know it better than the people that are working in certain industries that they're going to inspect. These inspectors should be almost to some extent something like teachers. I think they should all come through the Civil Service after having passed appropriate technical examinations. I think this part of the Act is most important.

Under Section 12, I do find some disagreement under this section because it's where an inspector finds an immediate or impending danger because of unfavourable working conditions, he is empowered to actually stop the work or remove the control of danger. I would say this goes much further than I would like to see it go because I think the inspector should be empowered to stop work and such work to last only until the complaint is reported to the Board. I should say the inspector can make a written report to the Board and at which time the report can be heard. This must be done quickly, and if the Board does not sustain the inspector then naturally the order automatically comes to an end. It seems the inspectors in this instance just have a little too much power. They're almost acting as judges and I would like to see --I'm all in favour for the legislation, but I think that their order should be only to the point where they can get the report to the Board itself and then the Board can sustain their actions or not. The way we have it in this Act it's just the other way around. The Act makes an order, and as you see from Section 15 it is up to the person against whom the order was made to appeal to the Board, so I would say we should not probably give the inspectors full authority of the final decision.

Under Section 16, you will note that the Board has power to set up employers' organizations or employees' organizations to carry out various programs, which I see from the Canadian Labour Law Reports, it seems it's almost the same policy as set out in Ontario, and I would say these industry organizations can be very important as they are important in the other provinces in eastern Canada. Whether or not to have such organizations who in fact police much of the safety and accident prevention is a big policy matter and I feel that it should be decided upon by the government and not left to the decision of the Workmen's Compensation Board alone.

Section 20 gives the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council power to make regulations on a very broad variety of subjects. They include appropriate safety codes, certain safety measures for certain hazards, safety in excavations and so on. These are important matters and in fact are as important as putting the whole matter under the Workmen's Compensation Board. These matters I feel should not be left to the regulations but should be spelled out in some detail in the Act.

A little of this is done in Section 4. However, Section 4 should be enlarged to specifically deal among other things such as conditions of working on high buildings, scaffolding, underground

(MR. PATRICK, cont'd).....and other certain employees. I'll probably raise some more questions in Committee when we will have more opportunity to study the Bill a little more carefully.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Madam Speaker, I'd like to make a few observations on Bill No. 49, and in particular under Section 2 (c) Excavation and Tunnels. I feel that this is the most important part of this Bill in view of the fact that there have been several losses of life over the last few years and undoubtedly was the reason for bringing in an Act of this nature and I think that the prime purpose of this Bill should be safety, irrespective of the type of fines or legislation that might be brought in because in the final analysis it is a matter of life and death in connection with excavation and I do think that this is most important to preserve the safety of the workmen.

And I am just wondering if consideration has been given to cover this phase of excavation and/or tunnelling to be covered under The Mining Act. I think that our Mining Act and its good safety record is a credit to the high inspection standards that our Mines Branch has maintained. They are dealing with this continuously and I can think of no other personnel more capable, more competent to supervise and inspect excavations and tunnellings. This is done by experienced engineers and I think that consideration should be given to remove this phase of the work out of this Bill and out of the jurisdiction of the Workmen's Compensation and place it properly under The Mining Act. These people are trained in excavation; these people are trained to know the soil technology; also to know the engineering conditions of an excavation, whether it should be left open for 12 hours with a certain factor of safety, or whether it is unsafe in a matter of six hours of excavation.

We hear much in the way injuries and the loss of life in gravel pits and cave-ins and I think that this bill will have a tendency to cover this phase of it by inspectors under the Workmen's Compensation section, and here again I suggest that consideration should be given to place this under the inspection of The Mining Act. As mentioned, the people who are inspectors in the mining section not only are they qualified in this work but they are experienced in the study and responsibility of the stresses, the condition of the soil, whether this condition is wet, whether this condition is frozen and they can fairly well predict whether you are going to have any caving and whether you are endangering the lives of the people undertaking this excavation.

I for one do not condone the sloppy construction work in excavations and I think that most of us in our discussion with the contractors who are engaged in this type of work can appreciate the concern of the average contractor in Manitoba in reference to the possibility of cave-ins in excavation. Some of these accidents are brought on by the workmen themselves; brought on by themselves because of their ignorance of the conditions under which they are working. There is such a thing as shoring the excavation completely or partially, and there is a tendency on some of the workmen to try and get away with a minimum amount of work in order to try and achieve what may in their own mind appear to be a maximum amount of work performed.

But the principle involved is a matter of the safety of the workmen during excavation and you can still achieve the utmost amount of efficiency and production per man hour in excavation and still be able to do it under a proper and safe condition without endangering the lives of the people who are engaged in the excavation. This is nothing new. I know that over the last two years we in this province have been much concerned by the headlines that have appeared in our papers of the loss of life in connection with excavations. But let me tell you that much research has been done in this field, Madam Speaker. Our National Research Council has done much in this field, and it is a very definite and exacting science as far as safe excavation is concerned and I would recommend to this government, and certainly to the Honourable Minister of Labour, that consideration be given to place all excavations, all tunnelling work, all gravel pits under the jurisdiction and inspection of the Mines Branch, and I think that we can rest assured that with their splendid record of safety standard that we have enjoyed in our underground mines in the Province of Manitoba, I think that they will not only duplicate that record, they will improve on it. Because these people are knowledgeable in the form of engineering and safety that is required in this type of work. To appoint inspectors who are not qualified, and who are simply inspectors in terms of trying to determine what is right and wrong, without having the technical and engineering background with which to make the proper assessment of whether an excavation is safe or unsafe, I think it's placing a responsibility on the shoulders of the inspectors who have to make a decision on the safety of the life of a workman in which they are not qualified and in which they are not trained to do, so that it is unfair to the inspector in this instance and it is unfair to the workmen that is working in this excavation, and I strongly recommend that

March 18th, 1965

**713**

(MR. SMERCHANSKI, cont'd). . . . . serious consideration be given to take the matter of all excavation and tunnelling work and place it under the inspection of our Mines Branch and under their competent engineers and inspectors.

. . . . . Continued on next page

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, I'd like to say a few words on this Bill. At the outset I'd like to congratulate the government for bringing in this bill because it certainly is a step in the right direction and in my opinion long overdue.

What I have to say is born out of some 41 years working for my company, 20 of which have been in a supervisory capacity, and when we saw the tragic note of death that we had in this province last year in regard to the excavation mishaps I was much disturbed, because in my opinion much of this is unnecessary. I was so concerned that I was disposed to give vent to my feelings by more or less talking to the press, but on second thought I didn't do that. I went to see a friend of mine who was concerned and who I know has a company which he runs with a very ethical system of doing business, and he was much concerned too. I found out that this company had employed a safety engineer. They had done everything possible, I am convinced of that, but the very thing that I want to recommend, because colorful posters, hard hats and safety shoes are fine, but they will not solve the problem. Accidents are born out of the saying "familiarity breeds contempt" and nearly every one of us will take a chance on doing something which we know is hazardous.

I had the good fortune to attend university evening classes, was sent there by my company some few years ago when the late Trevor Davies was giving lectures under the Department of Labour, and I consider this to be very important, because although I am a supervisor in industry I want to lay the blame for most of these things at the doorstep of supervisors in industry because these are the people who have the know-how. While the Honourable Member for Burrows is probably right in that if we placed this under the Department of Mines, under the Mines Branch, much good work probably would be done, just as I believe that placing it under the Compensation Board will result in much good because we are throwing some new light on it. This in itself is a good thing. But I believe that we should be taking the key people in industry, the supervisor, the man that has the know-how and has years of experience, he knows whether it's safe -- and I don't for a minute doubt that these inspectors of the Department of Labour are doing a good job and that they do go around and make suggestions -- but I suggest, Madam Speaker, that there isn't enough follow-up. They can't be there every minute of the day.

So once again I have to come back to the importance of the supervisor in industry. There are times when a supervisor must go to his superior and say that we can't do this because -- and just because he is working in a subordinate position is no reason to assume that his superior will not welcome this because he is the man who has the technical know-how as to whether a thing is safe. I would have liked to have seen something here which would make it mandatory that industry should submit its supervisors to suggestions from the Department of Labour because there is no doubt about it that the Department of Labour can get people with the technical know-how to give this information to supervisors. I would like to see these classes resumed once again because I think the Minister will find that the supervisor in industry is desirous of having his men work safely and will welcome the opportunity to attend these classes.

As I said before, all the publicity and all the posters that you put around the place will not completely solve the problem. It's when you have dedicated people working on the job who take a pride in their work and who have good safety records and who, when they become properly imbued with this idea of safety, are not hesitant in telling their superiors when and whether a thing is not safe. So I think that the Minister of Labour should consider this.

As I say, this bill is a good bill. You can have inspectors making examinations, but as I said before I don't believe it's possible to carry across all the follow-ups necessary to ensure 100 percent safety unless you get people on the spot who are in a supervisory capacity who are entrusted with the safety of their people who will stand up and be counted in this matter of safety, and I would suggest that in all sincerity to the Minister of Labour that he consider this because I think we have forgotten the key person in industry, the supervisor.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I would like to join in the comments made by the members and congratulate the Minister for bringing forward this legislation. Our group, as mentioned by the Member for Assiniboia, has been pressing for this change for some two years now. It was our conclusion, after looking at the whole matter of safety, that it would be better if this was administered by the group who have to pay off the accidents if there is an accident, the Workmen's Compensation Board, and my colleague the member for Assiniboia did mention this previously in the House.

We had intended to bring in a resolution as a matter of fact at this session and had the resolution prepared. So I am happy to see that the Minister is proceeding. The rash of accidents

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) . . . . that occurred in Manitoba in the past two years in particular certainly has made Manitobans safety conscious, and I think that the fact that this will now be in the hands of the Workmen's Compensation Board, who will be putting I think possibly more stress on the safety factors, will be beneficial to everyone.

I would like to suggest to the Minister that there could be some other matters looked at in this field. That is, possibly some simplification of the language in which the instructions are issued and the issuing of the instructions in other than English. We have to face the fact that a good number of accidents that occurred are at the labouring level and that frequently the people who are employed there are people who are new Canadians. They have come to this country from Portugal, from Central Europe, from many other lands, have arrived here and they take, as is normal, the first job that they can get. Frequently this is a labouring job that they have no qualifications, and it's important that the safety regulations be printed in their own language and in such a form that they can readily understand them. They may not be accustomed to the same working conditions as we have here, the same techniques that we use, and in order to permit them to fully understand the regulations established, the rules I think should be printed in the language that they can understand and very simply in forms of "dos" and "don'ts", and very clearly spelled out so there can be no possible confusion for someone who may not have a great deal of education. But insofar as the general principles of the bill, Madam Speaker, we are in agreement with it and are happy to see the government proceeding.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I would just like to say a word or two in connection with this bill. I'm glad to hear the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition once again admit that he and his party are "johnny-come-latelies," because he mentioned that we have, the Liberal Party, thought of this two years ago. If he hasn't forgotten, I want him to be reminded that when the Liberals were in power in the Province of Manitoba, after I joined this Assembly in '54, this matter was raised on a number of occasions and rejected by the johnny-come-latelies -- (Interjection) -- oh, I can prove it, I can prove it. The unfortunate part is that my honourable friend from Ethelbert-Plains knows that I can prove it.

However, in respect of the bill itself, Madam Chairman, I said when the bill was being introduced that we welcomed this new venture. I had one or two comments to make at that time, and one of them was as to the additional coverage insofar as those industries that are under Dominion jurisdiction in the Dominion labour code and for which the Manitoba Workmen's Compensation Board handles compensation.

Now I would like to ask the Honourable the Minister whether he intends or does he know if the Workmen's Compensation Board intends to ask Ottawa for companion legislation in respect of inspection for safety in order that similar inspections for safety may be made in those industries under federal jurisdiction. I want to say to him, and I'm sure that he is aware of this, that insofar as the railroads are concerned they have within there fairly reasonable organizations set up for safety inspections, but there are many others also under federal jurisdiction that won't be covered with this Act. I'm thinking offhand, Madam Speaker, of one, the banking institutions in the Province of Manitoba which are not covered -- will not be covered insofar as this Act is concerned unless there is formal approval by the federal authorities some way or other.

I also note in the bill, Madam Speaker, reference is made to the municipalities insofar as their permits are concerned, that they have to report once a week as to the projects that are being undertaken, that is permits taken out in the municipalities. I can appreciate the reason behind this would be so that the board would be in a position of knowing what's going on in the municipalities, but I would suggest though, Madam Speaker, that this might be rather complicated with the reports only having to be made every week as to the permit that is issued, because a job could be undertaken of major proportions and the notification to the Compensation Board not being made until after construction has started. I'd suggest that the Minister take a look at this particular section of the Act.

Also I notice, Madam Speaker, that the Minister on the introduction of this bill for second reading drew to our attention that the fines had been increased tenfold from \$50 as a maximum to now \$500 as a maximum. When the bill was introduced, Madam Speaker, I mentioned that \$50 for a life was pretty cheap and that it could conceivably be that some irresponsible individuals would think nothing of the \$50 in relation to the loss of limb. I suggest, Madam Speaker, that the same could hold true in respect of the new provision of the \$500.00. I would suggest to the Minister that consideration might be given to prohibiting any company who violates either the act or the regulations from engaging in business for a certain period of

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . time rather than just a mere fine, the maximum of \$500.00. I think that if there was an alternative to this, suspension of license or suspension of opportunity, or even may I suggest, Madam Speaker, consideration might be given to displacement of ownership for a period as a penalty in order that the fact is driven home to the individuals who may violate the provisions of this act and only be penalized at a maximum figure.

So I finish by saying, Madam Speaker, we welcome the new departure in this bill and I raise these points, and those that were raised by my colleagues for the consideration of the Minister. I think that they would strengthen the bill that we have before us at the present time.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Madam Speaker, I have spoken on this safety business many a time through the years and drew to the attention of the House that I was appalled at what fines were levied against these contractors. I'm quite in agreement to say that there should be inspection, but I wonder, as my friend to my right here said, whether some of these people have enough knowledge to go ahead and inspect these various places. I can't blame the workmen too much because the workman is trying to earn his living. He has supervisors over him and they should be there to see that this thing is conducted out in a proper manner.

Now when I was a young lad in the old country, I was just about 14 years at the time, I worked in the coal mines. There was around about 1500 people working there and before we went down in the morning there was a man, an inspector had gone around the whole shebang and seen that it was ready for the workmen to come down, was in a proper manner. Whatever was there that wasn't right, he brought that report up.

Now where we were working it was like a gasoline vapour you might say, that's the way it was, and if there was any spark or anything come in any particular time, that thing exploded with such violence that it is known that two or three hundred men at a time lost their lives. So through the years they've had to take these precautions.

When I came here and I seen these various things, these excavations and cave-ins and everything else, I often wondered to myself, well what is the matter? Why are these things allowed to be carried on like this? I put my voice up to protest too and I'm glad to see now that this bill is starting to get teeth into it, but as my leader said, we shouldn't just penalize these people by fining them alone, as you do with a man with a car, you take his license away from him and he can't drive that car. That's a big lesson to that man, by gosh he can't go any place, he hasn't got a car. If you go ahead and take this man's livelihood away from him for awhile, he's going to make pretty good and sure after that that he's going to follow the laws and follow them right.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, I think I should try and answer a couple of these questions. I appreciate very much the kind comments of some of the honourable members opposite and I must remind them that they have pointed out that they have asked for this at different times, at different length of time, but, Madam Speaker, I must remind them that it is we the government bringing these measures in and I would hate to think that I couldn't have that credit.

The other thing in mining, that area has been pretty well covered. It's under The Mines Act and it's going to be left there at least at the present time.

The Honourable Member from Assiniboia was concerned about the powers of an inspector and felt that there might be undue delays, that he should have to have the power vested in the board and have the appeal that way. I think as he thinks about this proposition, he'll see the necessity for the inspector to have these powers with appeal to the board and there shouldn't be any need for delay at all.

The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party was worried about the permit system. I might tell him that this is the system that has worked for some time and is working quite well in reporting the permits for construction jobs and so on to the department. This is a necessity and they have been doing it. --(Interjection) -- I beg your pardon?

MR. PAULLEY: . . . a week too late.

MR. BAIZLEY: The other point the Honourable Member from Burrows had concerning the excavation part of the construction industry being under The Mines Act, we wouldn't consider that at this time. We have completed lengthy consultations with the engineers and construction people and we feel that we have devised a good set of construction safety regulations and they would appear to be working quite well. I'd tell him though that gravel pits are under The Mines Act at the present time.

As the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks has pointed out, Madam Speaker, you get in this area of safety, it is not any one person's responsibility at all. You find that this

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd) . . . . responsibility has to be shared, that if the employer or the incorporate structure is not interested in the safety and well-being of their employees, as a rule their safety records are very poor. I appreciate his remarks and thought of encouraging supervisors to take part in the consultative work with the board, and I'm sure that these are measures and projects that will be continued as this program is expanded.

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

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, that Bill No. 51, an Act to amend The Employment Standards Act, be now read a second time.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, I might tell the honourable members that this is a companion piece of legislation removing the safety parts that existed under The Employment Standards Act from that act at the present time.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask one question under Section 4-33, which replaces I believe the Section 35 in the old bill, or 35 grouping starting at 35 on, and it was explained under Section (1), No child shall be employed in any factory; (2) No adolescent boy or girl shall be employed in a place of employment unless the employer has secured from that person a certificate of birth or from his parents a signed statement in writing; and in Section 2 of The Employment Standards Act, it defines a child as under the age of 15 years, and an adolescent a boy or girl who has reached his fifteenth birthday. Now in the new bill it seems that the amendment would appear to strike out the protection of the adolescent.

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, we'll take a look at that point in the committee stage. I'm sure my honourable friend is wrong. It is my understanding that it doesn't remove anything from The Employment Standards Act that was there before. However, we can look at in committee.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I would like to speak to the amendment here before us. I have checked a good number of articles on the report itself but I haven't completed it, so I'll confine my remarks more or less just to the amendment before us which is dealing with the matter of referring the report back to committee for study and for consideration of the three items as listed on the order sheet.

One of these is the reduction of the voting age from 21 to 18. In my opinion, we've heard the pros and cons on this matter, not only this year but in years previous, and you can argue the matter both ways. You will have a good number of people who are well qualified and stable enough to vote at 18; you will also have on the other side people when they reach the age of 21 that will not be fully matured, and as a result they are not fit to vote, although we give them the right and as they are of age they're entitled to it.

I would like to see some uniformity in Canada and the various provinces on this matter. Why should we have the voting age in one province at 18, another at 19, another at 21. I think we should try and have uniformity in this matter, and since I think it's both Alberta and B. C. that have the voting age of 19, I would like to see it come down to that figure.

We know that the younger people are more easily influenced. We see when demonstrations take place that generally you have the university groups and people of younger age that will take part in these activities, and that they are more readily to do things of that nature. I wouldn't say that this is always bad in itself, because sometimes it might serve a purpose to bring a matter more to the attention of the authorities that they want certain action taken place or done. So I would support the amendment so that this thing would go back to committee, and now that I'll be a member of the committee, I might have a chance to discuss it.

On the other item calling for two enumerators, apparently this is a fact as far as federal elections are concerned. I think I'd like to see an independent commission or registrar who would appoint these and that this would not become a political matter. Apparently from what I'm told, they already have some legislation where some of the DROs or Returning Officers are now permanent members as far as the Federal Election Act is concerned. Certainly I feel that this should be taken out of the realm of politics.

On the matter of the 48-hour blackout, I don't think I can support it. I'd like to leave it as it is because this would give the people a chance, after having heard all this election talk for the weeks ahead, a time to cool down and do some real serious thinking which I think is all

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . .to the good. And it also -- (Interjection) -- And it saves money, that's right. That's the other point I was going to make. Also, the parties that have more funds on their hands, well naturally they would like to use it to the last hour on the last day, but for those that are in a less fortunate position I am sure that the 48-hour blackout has its place and I would certainly support the act as it's presently constituted in that regard.

I would have liked to have seen some further amendments made though in connection with the matters referred back, and this one would have to do with the deposit. I think we should do away with the deposit completely. After all, we're a democracy. Everyone should have the right to stand for election even if he hasn't got the money. Certainly just because he is poor doesn't mean that he shouldn't be entitled to run, and that if he wants to run as an independent let him do so. I feel that we're depriving some people from entering into an election, so I would feel that this section should be deleted and that we do not charge a deposit or not have a candidate put up a deposit.

These were some of the matters I would bring up at this particular time. I will have some more things to say when we deal with the report itself. By that time, I hope to have made a thorough study and finish all the 50-odd sections that are in the report. Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, I would like to say a few words on the amendment. It seems, Madam Speaker, that the whole debate is centered around the No. 1 item of the amendment, that is the one that refers to reducing the voting age to 18 years. About 13 months ago there was a resolution on the Order Paper, as you well recall, on this very same subject, and I don't suppose that any member of the House has changed his opinion since that time. We will probably know in about ten minutes hence. I spoke in support of lowering the voting age then, and I certainly want to say nearly the same thing at this time.

I well remember what my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture said thirteen years ago on this subject matter -- (Interjection) -- thirteen months ago. Madam Speaker, if I said thirteen years ago, that certainly is in error. He may have said something at that time but I was referring to thirteen months ago, because I have before me -- I just happen to have The Tribune, February 26, 1964, with two fine -- I was going to say two fine looking gentlemen. One happens to be a fine looking gentleman and a fine looking lady on it. It's headed: "The Tories Oppose Younger Voters," and Mr. Hutton said then and I suppose that he is still in agreement with it, it said: "Supporters of the lower voting age, said Mr. Hutton, ignores what I consider the most important fact. Young people don't want it." That's what he said, and I suppose he still agrees with that, and he said this was the reason we shouldn't lower it because they didn't want it.

He is suggesting here, Madam Speaker, that by giving it to them, giving them the franchise that we would force them to vote. Lowering the voting age doesn't necessarily mean that we're going to lasso them all and bring them into the polling booths. The opportunity to vote still rests with them. I'm sure that every municipal official and every member of this House is rather disgusted with the apathy that seems inherent in the populace at nearly every election, whether it's a money bylaw, a school matter or provincial politics. Just every year you can pick up a paper, every time there's a money bylaw in the City of Winnipeg, and you will find that 29, 30 percent of the possible electors turned out to vote for or against probably a Four or Five Million Dollar project. So this points out that just by giving, extending the voting age to the young people does not force them to vote.

Now I recall what the Honourable Member for Hamiota had to say at that time. I'm quoting again, and he said: "Young people," he said, "shouldn't be allowed to associate themselves with any political party." Well that doesn't speak very well for us fellows in the House here, Madam Speaker, particularly his group, but I guess that he knows from experience that it wouldn't be well to have young people gather at their conventions and get to know at an early age what they are doing in their ranks, but in our ranks we would always welcome them and we intend to set a good example here by extending the voting age to them.

Madam Speaker, my honourable friend from Morris said, "What about Ottawa?" I think he said that.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I think the speaker should be paying attention to who is making these remarks.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well it was, Madam Speaker, someone over here who suggested "what about Ottawa." Well I don't mind talking about Ottawa on this subject, because if I recall, and someone can correct me if I am wrong, I think a committee of the House of Commons

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) . . . . was set up about a year or so ago on this very subject of lowering the voting age, and as my honourable friends opposite know, when a committee is set up the House of Commons or this House, it is made up of all political parties with one exception, in this House, and that's the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

Now if I recall, the outcome of that committee at Ottawa I believe they were unanimous in their decision that the voting age should be lowered. If anyone wants to correct me on that statement, Madam Speaker, I would be quite willing to debate that point in or out of the House.

Now, Madam Speaker, the late President Kennedy, about a year ago -- about 18 months ago, he made recommendations that they should lower the voting age in every state in United States. I believe that presently three or four of the states in the union have a voting age of 18. He recommended that it should be nation-wide. This doesn't say that it should be so in Canada but I think it points up that this is the trend. They are thinking about it in the House of Commons, they appointed this committee; they are certainly thinking about it in United States; and sooner or later, and probably a lot sooner than we think, the voting age will be lowered.

Now in regard to the other recommendation of this amendment, the advisability of following the practice of the Federal Election Act providing for two enumerators to be used in urban voting divisions, the Honourable Member for Rhineland suggested that he thought that one of the last pieces of legislation I guess that the former Prime Minister implemented was the one that had to do with making the returning officers permanent fixtures -- I believe I am correct on that one too -- and some months ago the returning officer in the Portage-Neepawa constituency has already sent out notices to the enumerators in some 130 polls asking them if they wish to act again in the forthcoming Federal election if and when it is called.

Now of course you will understand, Madam Speaker, that what the political affiliations will be of most of those enumerators, despite the fact that you have a change in government at Ottawa. I think I am correct on this. Now if, and I said, Madam Speaker, if, the provincial government intends to follow this same practice in Manitoba, if they have the authority of appointing permanent returning officers, then it points up all the more necessity of having two enumerators in every poll.

As regards Item No. 3 with the 48-hour blackout, I must confess that I am not too familiar with this, but I think the purpose of this was that whereas presently there is a 48-hour blackout restriction in regard to advertising elections or the candidates being on TV 48 hours prior to the election hour, and this applies to radio and I don't know what other media, but apparently it does not apply to the press. Then I think there are certain other regulations that say that you can even have your picture and the accompanying propaganda on a telephone pole on election day, or 10 years after for that matter so long as it is so many feet from the polling booth on election day. Now I think the whole point here is that it should be uniform. That is, why allow one media of advertising on the one hand and then saying on the other hand well, oh yes, that's fine and dandy but you can't have it the other way, and I think what we are saying here is that at least it should be uniform.

So, Madam Speaker, as I said when I started, I don't expect that we have changed the minds of any of the members opposite, but I certainly do expect that everyone that voted for the lowering of the vote will vote with the amendment again this year.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Carillon, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. ROBLIN: I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, 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 the Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Education 1 (a) -- The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the Honourable Minister of Education for his introductory remarks. He made a good presentation and could not emphasize more strongly the crying need for education, but the solutions he has proposed are not equal to the

(MR. HARRIS cont'd) . . . problems. The Liberals to my right were to some extent limited in what they could do by circumstances and the times, but it is also true to say that they lacked vision in matters of education and now all Manitobans have to pay for the Liberals' lack of vision. Today, if a man has little education he is handicapped. Our education system has grown larger and changed with the years.

Our economic system is changing too. Capital is declining in influence and prestige and power is being transferred to professional managers. These managers are active in business, in industry, and in the labour movement. They are active in the church, in the government, and in the universities. They represent a development which curiously enough gives our system a surface similarity to the present Russian managerial system. Capital is now in fact less important than ability, knowledge and brains.

Certainly money is easier to find if one follows the approved procedures than are talented and trained men. In many business firms today expansion is limited, not by lack of capital but by lack of top quality manpower. In the same way investment in physical capital is less dependent on and less important than investment in improvement of men. We need trained and educated men today and we will need them still more tomorrow. Money spent on education has thus become an investment, an opportunity not an expense.

More importantly, education is an investment not only in the well-being of the future of the individual, it has become an investment in the well-being of the community. Contributions made to education in energy and time and money will of course bring personal benefits to every member of the community, but, more than that, such contributions have become a social obligation. Lack of education is a social ill, as tuberculosis is a social sickness.

We have nibbled at this problem. We have tackled it from various angles, some of them extremely important but none of them going to the core of the difficulty. Let me remind you however that almost three-quarters of all those presently unemployed have not gone beyond the grade of 8 in their schooling. Moreover, a depressingly larger number of those people who are now out of work simply do not have the basic education to absorb a suitable and constructive retraining program.

What is more serious however is that among the hourly and weekly employed people now working in factories and offices, close to 50 percent have the same low educational standards, and if thrown out of work by mechanization and automation, would also be incapable of absorbing constructive retraining program. These are the recruits of the future army of unemployed. These are the forgotten generation.

Before I go on I would like to ask the Minister these two questions. Has the Minister given consideration to the recent request of the Winnipeg School Division No. 1 regarding increased grants to the school divisions of Manitoba as recommended by the Michener Commission Report? The Winnipeg Tribune -- the second one -- the Winnipeg Tribune of Friday, March 12th reported that the evening school certificates were not recognized outside the school. Mr. Martin, Assistant Director of Industrial Arts, confirmed this statement and said the school board was presently studying the problem. It is my understanding that the certificates issued from evening school technical subjects at both the Winnipeg Technical School and the Manitoba Institute of Technology are not recognized by either the Department of Education or the Department of Labour at the present time. Will the Minister please confirm or deny this statement, and if the statement is true, what steps are being taken to rectify this situation?

Now I have a mass of figures here so I will try to give them as I have them. Five hundred thousand Canadians have skills below Grade 4 level, that is going down further yet. Seven million others have not finished high school levels of education of Canada's labour force of 1961, but this has been brought up right to this present day. Less than Grade 5, 397,860 with a percentage of 6.1; higher than Grade 5, 2,219,703, 34.3 percent; grade 9 or 10, 1,460,885, 22.6; Junior matriculation, 638,410, 9.9; Senior matriculation, 1,184,489 for a total of 6,471,848. Data from Table 35, Dominion Bureau of Statistics of Education. This is of August '64 and publication number is 7001512 if anyone wants to know that.

Although these figures are for Canada as a whole, it has been found that Manitoba usually stands about the average. This data shows that over 40 percent of the labour force has no more than Grade 5 education. Broadly interpreted, an additional 22.6 have only the first or second year of high school; 9.9 are Grade 9; and 18.3 senior matriculation. Over 60 percent of the labour force has a level of education less than Grade 9 or Grade 10.

Now to break this up into provinces, per pupil expenditure on public, elementary, secondary education by provinces: 1961, Alberta, \$378 per pupil; B. C., \$373; Saskatchewan, \$327;

(MR. HARRIS cont'd) . . . . Ontario, \$307; Manitoba, \$284 -- Manitoba is in the middle -- Quebec, \$249; Nova Scotia, \$202; New Brunswick, \$191; Prince Edward Island, \$162; and Newfoundland, \$141.00. So you can see that is the way it is broke up. You could go along here on percentages, I'll give you the percentage: British Columbia, 37.4 -- proportion of elementary, this is a little different, pardon me. Proportion of elementary and secondary teachers with university degrees by provinces 1961-1962: British Columbia, 37.4 percent; Ontario, 32 percent; Alberta, 29.6 percent; Nova Scotia, 24.7 percent; Manitoba, 24.5 percent; Saskatchewan, 18 percent; New Brunswick, 14.5 percent; Newfoundland, 11.3 percent; and Prince Edward Island, 7.7 percent. Average for nine provinces, 28.2 percent. Source, the same one, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Educational Division.

Manitoba stands in fifth position with an average pupil expenditure of \$284, including Winnipeg and suburban municipalities that spend more than Manitoba average. Winnipeg spends more than \$400 per pupil on education. I thank you very much.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I was prompted to get up simply by reason of the fact that the former Minister of Education got up yesterday in defence of his Minister, and I'm glad that both the former Minister and the present one are in their seats at the moment because the question that I would like to direct may call for an answer from both of them.

I have before me, Mr. Chairman, a Hansard that my honourable friend referred to the other day and I think he even mentioned the page number and the paragraph number and the Hansard number -- (Interjection) -- You'll never forget it, he says, Mr. Chairman, Well if he doesn't forget it, he probably knows it off by heart, but for the benefit of some of the members present it certainly makes interesting reading, and I would refer you to Hansard No. 5, March 18, 1959, Page 95.

The Honourable the Minister of Education speaking: "Now this plan" -- and you know what that plan was, Mr. Chairman -- "this plan will provide equal educational opportunities for children throughout the Province of Manitoba, particularly with respect to high school education. It will relieve in large measure the real property from the burden of school finance, transferring a larger share to the tax base which we have as the Province of Manitoba."

Now, Mr. Chairman, this seems to be the whole purpose of this \$10 million rebate. The whole purpose of the Michener Commission Report was that it wasn't transferred. This is what the government is saying, that it didn't do it. They didn't transfer it, although my honourable friend said back in 1959 the whole purpose of the plan was to transfer it. Michener said it didn't work at all. I suppose my honourable friends opposite now agree with Michener in this respect.

Now about -- Mr. Chairman, if the members opposite wish to interject, I don't mind at all but I wish that they would speak up enough so that I can hear them. I have difficulty.

Now on the subject matter of taxes, the Honourable Member for Roblin said the following year, the following year in 1960, that his taxes had gone down as a result of the new jet age plan that was put in in '59, and I refer you to Page 465, 1960. He says: "not in the least" -- he's answering my friend from St. George on taxes -- "because those districts were paying for the high cost of school education before and their taxes have gone down, definitely gone down and they've stayed down," he says -- they're going to stay down, they've gone down and they've stayed down. Well I'd like to ask my honourable friend if they stayed down. What is the comparison now to what they were when he made that earth-shaking speech back 1960.

Now my honourable friend the present Attorney-General in the same Hansard -- and Mr. Chairman, I had some reservations about Hansard when they first were introduced, the year that I first came into the House, but I'm glad they have them and I was surprised how quickly that I was able to find what I was looking for today. Not by reason of the fact that they've got a good index because they've got a terrible index, and I might have more to say about that later on. But the present Attorney-General and the former Minister of Education said on Page 468, and he's talking about taxes and school plans. "Now here's what I said at the meetings," he said, at the meetings -- that was the 900 meetings that was held prior to the implementation of this school plan. He said, "I pointed out on every occasion that the extent of taxation in the local districts or in the divisions concerned would be solely dependent upon the way in which the trustees, the local school district trustees, or local division trustees arrange their business and financial affairs. But I want to make this point, that in a large number of cases in the Province of Manitoba the cost to the local taxpayer, and I'm speaking of municipalities, not school districts, but municipalities, towns and villages, that the cost did in fact go down in 1959." That's on page 468 of the same Hansard.

Well my honourable friend is saying to the House that if taxes go up it's not his fault,

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) . . . . because he said, "I want to make it quite clear that the extent to which taxes go up is entirely dependent on what the newly elected trustees or boards say." He said it is through no fault of theirs opposite.

Now about the same time, Mr. Chairman, I questioned my honourable friend as to what happened in the Dauphin-Ochre larger area, that is the area that he represents, and I asked him why in that particular part of the province they delayed the referendum on the larger area until about November I believe of that year, whereas the rest of the province we voted in February or March. Of course the whole truth of the matter was that in the Dauphin-Ochre area they had implemented about 1946 I believe the only larger school area in the Province of Manitoba and apparently the people up there were quite satisfied with it, and so he said that they had delayed the vote because the people in his own constituency wanted to observe how well that these new divisions were going to be accepted by the people, and then having done that his own constituents could decide whether or not they wanted to vote for or against the plan, his plan.

I read at that time, or I made the statement at that time that that may be understandable because everyone was working for their own constituents, doing everything for them that they could, but I said my honourable friend went out prior to the referendum up in the Dauphin-Ochre area and advised them they would be better off to remain as a larger school area than to vote for his jet aged plan -- I think that's what I said then. He got up and said that was not so at all, and then I read back to him the Free Press of October 28, 1959, headed: "School Area Plan is the Best The Minister Tells Dauphin", and I think he said that he had been misquoted on that occasion as well as the other day when he was misquoted.

But I am going to read just in part what the Free Press said about that meeting. Mr. Chairman, I know my honourable friend the Attorney-General will be getting kind of provoked with the Free Press reporters, but my guess is that since 1959 they have a new bunch of reporters and they are not such a bad bunch of fellows at times. I am reading: "Addressing a public meeting in Dauphin, he said" -- and they are talking about the Minister -- "he said the area plan which has been operating in Dauphin and district for the past 12 years was better than the division system in two ways, for educational services that can be provided and for financing those services by the local taxpayer."

Well, Mr. Chairman, if it is better in those two ways, the one is it's better for providing educational facilities and the other one is they are better off financially, well what way isn't it better then? It seems to me that those two ways pretty well cover the waterfront -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? Well I said at that time, and I don't mind repeating it now, that I can understand my honourable friend saying those things because I think it still has advantages over the present plan. Why? Because it embraces elementary education.

I asked my honourable friend five years ago, inasmuch as he himself had admitted that the plan introduced by the former government nearly 20 years ago was a better plan than this one, what plans did he have for extending this plan province-wide, making it province-wide, and he said he had no plans at all then. The Honourable the Leader of the NDP asked the same question -- right? And here we are on page 477, February 11, 1960, and the Honourable the Leader of the NDP speaking: "What program, if any" -- this is what Mr. Paulley says -- "What program, if any, has the government to induce or to sell the larger area school administration to the divisions now?" "Mr. McLean: Mr. Chairman, we have no program and have not considered that aspect at all."

Well I would like now to direct a question to my honourable friend the present Minister of Education. Has he any plans or does he agree with the former Minister of Education that this larger Dauphin-Ochre area is working well yet? Is it working better than the divisions? Is it a better plan than the divisions? If it is, then what program has he got to extend it to the remainder of the province? I think that this is something that we should be told now. I think this is something that we must have the answer to.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know and I agree with what has been said that the former -- the present Minister of Education is a diplomat. I have said that all the time. He is the most diplomatic fellow that sits opposite in my opinion. I enjoy his talks in and out of the House, but I was disappointed that he made no mention when he was commending his staff -- and I want to join with him in this regard because I think that we have very efficient employees, and certainly in his department he has a number of them, he and the Minister of Welfare and Health combined I suppose they have 50 percent of the civil servants under these two departments -- but I was disappointed that he made no mention at all of the former Minister of Education, Mr.

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) . . . Bend.

I said on the Throne Speech that I had enjoyed very much a couple of speeches that Mr. Bend had made this year, this year, before Chambers of Commerce, and I was delighted with what he had to say. In fact I wish I had said it. I don't know who said that but I often say to myself, now I wish I had said that. Following the meeting at Neepawa there was dozens that come to me and said I want to shake Mr. Bend's hand because he has just said what I have been thinking for a long long time, and he spoke in regard to setting the qualifications for entrance to MIT too high. He thought it was absolutely unnecessary and he cited -- (Interjection) -- I haven't got the speech. I couldn't obtain the speech. Mr. Chairman, I will say this, that I immediately went up to him after the meeting and said, "Bobby I don't suppose you happen to have a copy of your speech with you," and he said, "You know me better than that. I speak off the cuff."

But he did say this -- (Interjection) -- my honourable friend has raised this question now and it's nearly 5:30 -- he did say this, "I think you can get a copy of that from CKY." I wrote to CKY the next day and haven't heard from them since. I neglected I guess, Mr. Chairman, to send a stamped addressed envelope -- a return one.

But, Mr. Chairman, you heard me say if you were in your seat I suppose, that I would have more to say on this subject matter when we come to the education estimates, and I said then and I'll say it now, what are my honourable friends doing about carrying out some of the recommendations that are made by Mr. Bend? What are they going to do about it? Now I suppose that my honourable friend will tell us what he has in mind, and Mr. Bend I think has an excellent point here, an excellent point.

We have in Neepawa two or three people, in fact there's a chap that lives just next door but one to me in Neepawa who graduated as a barber and -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Chairman, I must be getting a little deaf, I couldn't hear that remark. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I was half right as usual, and I suppose if we took -- if that were a motion and we took a vote on it right now most of the members opposite -- it would be unanimous with that bunch that I was rather dense, but it might not carry.

But what Bobby Bend pointed up was this, why is it necessary for a farmer to have a grade 12 education say? Why is it necessary? He went on to say, and you people must have heard him say this, that if a barber can cut hair to the satisfaction of the public and if he can change a dollar bill, that's all he needs to do. In fact he went on to say and he doesn't even need to do that because where can you get a haircut for less than a dollar in this day and age? Now I agree with this and he has lots of other-- he talked about repairing automobiles and so on and so forth.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): I'll try and help you understand.

MR. SHOEMAKER: There was one other matter, Mr. Chairman -- while I appreciate what my honourable friend the Minister is saying, I didn't hear what he said but it must have been all right. He'll show it to me when he gets up anyway.

MR. JOHNSON: I'll say it again.

MR. SHOEMAKER: The other matter that I want to touch on now briefly, because I will be forced to be brief -- (Interjection) -- Yes, well Mr. Chairman, I intend to have something to say come eight o'clock, I will warn the Assembly of that right now.

The other matter that I want to mention right now though is one of vocational guidance. Now I don't know who should give vocational guidance, whether it should be the parents, whether it should be the teacher, whether it should be your Minister, or whether it should be all three; but I do know this, that there are many many parents today complaining that they don't know what little Johnny should be when he grows up; they don't know what to advise their children to be, with these general courses and MIT and all of the other facilities that are presently available, all of your learning institutions. Who is supposed to give this guidance? I would like to have my honourable friend the Minister of Education tell the Assembly if he has any program in this line. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will adjourn my speech for the time being.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1 (a) --

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, on 1 (a), I don't think that we're quite ready to let this thing pass. I think that I'd like to hear before we leave this, I'd like to hear more about television, the use of television in this department. A few years ago, thinking back again, the former Minister of Education was kind of insulted and mad when the member for Emerson and myself brought in a motion suggesting that we look into this; we should try to have more use of television in this field of education. At the time he told us that this wasn't very important. He

March 18th, 1965

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . . . didn't like television. I think he only had -- somebody gave him a present about two months before and he had never put it on, but anyway he didn't go for television and he didn't think that this was a good idea at all.

Now I'm very pleased to see that the present Minister of Education did not follow the recommendation of the former Minister of Education and I understand that we are finally doing quite a bit on this field. In fact, I would like to take this occasion to ask the Minister of Education if he would maybe invite us again at the old Ford plant. I missed this chance. I understand it was very very interesting and I for one would like to have a chance to go and visit this place. I hope that the Minister will tell us a little more about the education that's used in this department now, and if there's any program, or projective program for the coming year. I understand that some of the provinces have used the facilities of CBC. I think that it was Nova Scotia or that CBC have given them the value of a million dollars there over the year. So -- is it 5:30?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I call it 5:30 and I'm leaving the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.