

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, April 30, 1965.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Minister, I present the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg leave to present the following as their eighth report. Your Committee has considered the following Bills: No. 96, an Act to amend The Manitoba Hydro Act; No. 106, an Act to amend The Real Estate Brokers Act; No. 107, an Act to amend The Mortgage Brokers Act; No. 109, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Virden and District Elderly Persons Housing Corporation; No. 113, an Act to amend The Crop Insurance Test Areas Act; No. 115, an Act respecting The Registration of Business Names and Partnerships; and has agreed to report the same without amendment. Your Committee has also considered Bills: No. 103, an Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956, and to validate By-laws Nos. 18929, 18930, 18931, 19016, 19051 and 19061 of the City of Winnipeg; Bill No. 105, an Act to amend The St. Boniface Charter 1953; No. 108, an Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act; No. 111, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act (3), No. 114, an Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act; and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments, all of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Orders of the Day

MR. ROBLIN: Before the Orders of the Day, Madam Speaker, I would like to table a Return to an Address for Papers on the motion of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party respecting the Canada Pension Plan. May I also have permission to read to the House the text of the telegram received this morning from the Prime Minister of Canada respecting the Air Canada transfers and about which I asked them. It reads as follows: "Honourable Duff Roblin, Premier of Manitoba" etc.: "Your telegram regarding transfers of Air Canada personnel received. You suggest transfers are felt to be violation of my promise to freeze situation pending receipt of Thompson Commission Report. You surely recall the answers I gave you on March 21st, 1964, to the question put to me by you about employment at Air Canada maintenance base. The question was as follows: 'Question - In terms of your statements in Parliament, what undertakings do you consider you have given about the maintenance employment at the Winnipeg TCA Overhaul Base? Answer: - I said in Parliament on December 17th last year, it is the policy of the government to do everything possible to maintain employment at the TCA Base in Winnipeg and, if possible, to increase it. So far as TCA is concerned this means that the base will continue to be used for the overhaul of Viscount aircraft as long as these aircraft are in service. As far as the government is concerned, it means further that we will do everything we can to ensure that other aircraft work is available in Winnipeg so that the eventual withdrawal of the Viscount is at least balanced by new activities. This policy should not be interpreted as a guarantee that each particular job now filled in Winnipeg will continue indefinitely. Normal changes in technology and work methods and the provision of seniority rules between employer and employee may lead to the disappearance or transfer of particular jobs. Economic industry cannot be frozen into a particular employment pattern. My undertakings mean that there will be no transfers of work from Winnipeg by deliberate policy, on the contrary the policy is to do our utmost to secure enough aircraft work to maintain or improve the present employment levels'. The telegram continues, "Information provided by Air Canada indicates that all transfers made or in contemplation are being made pursuant to collective agreement in strict accord with my answer given to you and with all subsequent statements made on behalf of this government. Signed L. B. Pearson."

This telegram is now receiving consideration, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to ask just a question of the Minister of Agriculture. I asked him yesterday regarding an application to the department for marketing board broiler industry and he said that he would get the information. I wonder if he has it yet.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): The delegation representing the broiler industry association called on me on January 11th.

MR. MOLGAT: I wonder if the Minister could indicate when decision will be taken as to whether or not a marketing plan will be set up.

MR. HUTTON: I cannot give an answer to that question.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, as a special privilege I want to read a very brief statement to the House.

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the honourable member the privilege of the House? Agreed.

MR. GRAY: His Worship the Mayor of Winnipeg has issued a proclamation designating this week as Warsaw Ghetto Memorial Week, commemorating the heroic uprising of this small poorly equipped group of Warsaw Jews against the modern ruthless led army of the oppressors during the Hitler regime. I want to take this special opportunity of commending the Mayor of Winnipeg for this action. What the Jews of Warsaw did in 1943 is of more than purely national and sectional importance. We think of their heroism as a symbol, a memorial for the 6 million victims of a ruthless and insane extermination policy of a mad dictator. But also as a tribute of the spirit of freedom itself, which cannot be extinguished even by the most brutal methods of oppression. May the memory of those brave fighters continue to be a beacon of all those who will serve the cause of freedom. Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The second reading of Bill No. 127. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, my honourable friend is not here and I'm just wondering if I'm bold enough to move this motion myself and get the debate started on it. And I think that if the Clerk would . . . Oh, fine. I'm saved from this painful dilemma.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Attorney-General) (Dauphin) presented Bill No. 127. an Act to amend The Bills of Sale Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, this is a technical amendment to The Bills of Sale Act made necessary by reason of the creation of a new county court district at Thompson, which was carved out of the former or the present county court district of The Pas. And formerly bill of sale and similar documents were registered in the county court at The Pas and there's provision respecting the registration of them and inasmuch as it is not possible to actually transfer all of the existing bills of sale and reregister those that should be registered in the county court at Thompson, it was considered advisable to propose this amendment to The Bills of Sale Act which will have the effect of preserving the legal rights of those who properly filed their documents, registered their documents in the county court at The Pas previous to the creation of the new county court district, and I would recommend the bill to the members.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, would you be good enough to call the resolution on the Constitution.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Attorney-General and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I'm not prepared to speak on this particular resolution this afternoon. However, I'll be prepared to speak on the other one, on shared services.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, perhaps the House would be willing to let this matter stand in that case. The Leader of the Opposition tells me he's not prepared yet to proceed with the resolution on individual rights, so I will not ask you to call that. But if you would be kind enough to call the resolution on shared services, we'd appreciate it.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Education. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I was quite interested to see the report that came out of the shared services committee as we find it on Votes and Proceedings of April 8th. We've already heard two honourable members speak in connection with this report and, while I listened with great interest, I'm not sure whether we've come to the same conclusions.

(MR. FROESE cont'd)

First of all, if I'm going to speak on this report and probably favouring private schools I want it understood that I'm not completely condemning our public school system. This is far from my mind. However, in coming to the report itself, I still have trouble with reconciling myself to the original principles outlined in the committee's report and also in the original resolution setting up the committee. I think the first principle, separation of church and state, as that expression is understood in Manitoba, can be and is subject to interpretation in various ways by different people. So it would not mean the same thing to all of us, if we interpreted it in our own way. But I cannot accept the second principle in that it states that the dedication of public funds to the support of a single public school system open to all school children. I'm not so sure whether the funds should just go to a single system and I take it that this includes our present public school system or is meant to be the present public school system, and I'm not so sure whether this will hold through indefinitely for any length of time that we will only have one system.

Already I think we have reached the stage here in Manitoba where we might consider splitting the Department of Education and separating the vocational and technical schools from our present school system and I think they could then also take on the matter of automation. I think this would go well hand-in-hand and go together. We will have to put more emphasis on vocational and technical training and also in the training and re-training of our workers to have them get more skills and I think this is also brought out in the consultative report that was distributed some time ago in this session. On Page 6 of that report, the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board Report, this committee makes two recommendations and the second one says here and I quote, "A second area of immediate concern to the committee is the likely effects of automation on the provincial economy. It is proposed that a case study be undertaken of the impact of automation on the white collar worker in the coming year as the first depth study into the effects of automation on manpower in this province."

I think this just goes to show that the people are concerned in this connection and I feel the Department of Education is getting to be a very large department. After all, we spent better than a week in considering the estimates of that one department only and its programs are many and diversified so that sometime in the future we might have to have a separate department taking care of the vocational and technical and those aspects of education and training.

Another reason why I am saying this is that our present school system in Manitoba has a monopoly on the education of our children. Whether this is good -- I think competition is always healthy and that we should have some other schools than just the public schools in order to see how we're faring. For one thing our costs are getting very high in the Department of Education. We have continual rises from year to year and we have quite a few taxpayers who feel that we have already too many frills in some of our -- especially in the larger centres -- connected to the Education Department which are in their opinion non-essential. We know that when some of these programs get so very large that they get sluggish and, for instance, I just need to refer to the CBC which is getting a large subsidy every year. People sure feel that there is a Crown agency which should be trimmed and I for one would not like to see our Department of Education get to that point where this should be necessary.

At any rate we would not want to do away with all competition. We would like to see our private schools remain and serve as a measuring stick or as a criteria to compare our present school system with. This is something we will need in the future and I think as a result of that we should be prepared to underwrite some of the costs of our private schools so that they at least will be able to remain in existence. Another reason I have for saying this is that we've heard so much in the last number of years of equality of opportunity but this seems to be diminishing and disappearing. This is not as prevalent as it used to be three, four years ago when the cry was for equality of opportunity and I think this is partly because of the government's new program where the state will tell the child what program to take, and I think we will see much more of this in the coming years. This is also another reason why the need for more private schools to give the parents and the pupils a chance to choose what course to take and vocation and profession to enter, although here at the same time the state is also fast closing these avenues to students to take on the profession of their choice through their selection process of committees who rule on who may enter. So this is one more reason I feel that our private schools are serving a purpose and will serve a purpose in the future.

We know that today in this province we have more than ten thousand pupils who are

(MR. FROESE cont'd) attending these private and parochial schools and which means that we have a large saving as far as the taxpayers (and I wish he would) - of this province are concerned. If we multiply the 10,000 by the amount that it costs to educate a child in a given year this would mean that we would probably be saving 2 millions or more to the taxpayer of this province. Now I feel that these schools, while they are good, the alternative that we offer through our shared services does not and will not satisfy the needs that they have. And these people that are supporting the private schools in addition to supporting them they also support the public school system as well, equally with other taxpayers in this province. They have a double burden.

Now what are some of the values or the good points of private schools? What are they attempting to do, and what have they been doing and so on? I think I could name a good number of points in favour of the private schools. For one, as far as I know them, the one that I am most closely associated with and know of, they instill a proper sense of value in their student and this I think is very important. If the teacher in the public school does not do this or oppositely he can destroy what was taught in the home. Now I'm not saying that this is the case in too many schools but when we send our children to our private schools we know what kind of teachers they have, we know that they will be furthering this and that we can rest assured that this will not be to the disadvantage of the child or that he will be robbed in any way.

Secondly these pupils are taught the respect of the law and property rights. This is also very important. I have yet to hear of mobs emanating from a private school in our country and I think this is a true statement. Thirdly, I think we have a very good enforcement of measures of discipline in our private schools. By and large the students coming from these schools are well disciplined and I think these schools can more readily take measures of discipline because they are a private school.

Then another point, and which is probably one of the most important points, has to do with the religious influence that is being provided if it is a denominational or parochial school. We can be assured that the child will not be robbed of his faith but rather will receive a deepening and grounding of the student's beliefs, especially during his high school years, rather than the student be subjected to probably an agnostic that might destroy or be instrumental in neutralizing his stand and as a result make the individual ineffective in his future life as a witness for God and Christ. This is considered very important by many of our people, especially those that support the private schools.

Then also, private schools in Manitoba have been doing a very good job. I have yet to hear a complaint from the department on any of our private schools. None have been brought to our attention through any of the department's reports in the years that I have been in the House. They are following the curriculum as laid down by the department and here too we have had no complaints.

I think for these very reasons we should go further than what the committee recommends in connection with shared services. I feel they should be prepared to contribute to the operational or the instructional costs of our private schools.

Now when I come to the recommendations and the conclusions arrived at by the committee itself, as far as the shared services are concerned, I have no quarrel with the recommendations made. I can agree with the first one, with (a), that shared services where they now are offered should be allowed to continue. I think this is a good recommendation. I think they should continue. In connection with (b), and here we have some sub-sections under (b), I don't think they need be as stiff as they have listed them here. They require 200 pupils in an elementary school and 65 in the secondary schools. I don't think they need be quite as high, especially in the elementary; the secondary might be closer to it. But when we come to the sub-item (4) which refers to a school population of not less than 5,000. I fail to understand just why they arrived at this particular number and maybe later on in the debate someone will provide us with the necessary answers to that. It probably doesn't present a problem or a difficulty at the present time, but it might in the future because we find a declining population in the rural area. This might present a problem in years to come. Then also I cannot see the reasoning back of this provision as a private school might draw its enrolment from a number of divisions. Certainly that is the case at the present time, especially in connection with high schools, and that they might not wish to locate, or have located in connection with the future, in a less populated division. Certainly this should not bar them from service because we find today that the surrounding divisions might give the school the necessary enrolment yet the central division might not have the necessary population and if they located the school in that particular

(MR. FROESE cont'd) division it would not be entitled to the services under this provision and I fail to see the reasoning behind this.

I think as far as the other items (c) transportation, this should work out quite well as far as my own area is concerned. It might not be the case with some other areas. I definitely concur with the textbooks. I think this is an injustice that has been carried on for too long, that we did not provide the necessary textbooks for these pupils.

Then I have no quarrel with (e) either but I was just wondering under (b) what it would all include? Would, for instance, scholarships come under (b)? Could we have scholarships apply to private schools under (b)? I think this provision should be made, if it's not there, it should be made, so that the scholarships for high school students should be made applicable to our private schools as well.

So Madam Speaker, I find the recommendations -- I don't have too much quarrel with the recommendations. I cannot agree with all the principles enunciated and I would have to qualify my vote either way. If I voted for it I would still have to maintain that I would not subscribe and agree to the principles as set forth and on the other hand, if I opposed it, I would have to qualify my vote as well. But as I can see it at the present time, I intend to vote for it, but as I already said, that I do not subscribe to the principles completely as they are set out.

I was quite impressed by the honourable member who spoke yesterday on this resolution, the Member for La Verendrye. I think he made a very worthwhile contribution. He already stated a number of things that I would have included but are not necessary to have them repeated. So this is all I have to say at the present time and I will support the report.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Wellington.

MR. RICHARD SEABORN (Wellington): Madam Speaker, as I rise to take part in this debate, I am fully aware of the importance of the matter before us, not only for the Members of this Assembly but for all the people of Manitoba.

I would like it to be understood, first of all, that I speak only for myself, and I sincerely trust that all interested parties will appreciate that I have endeavoured to approach this subject without prejudice and without fear--doing my level best to be fair in my analysis of this great problem.

I must confess that when the question of shared services was first presented to us, I had absolutely no idea of what was involved either in principle or in practice. I refused to commit myself to an opinion until I had an opportunity to find out all I could, and I therefore set out upon my task with the greatest diligence and singleness of purpose.

I admit that I was greatly bothered by the adamant stand taken by two honourable members in this House and I feared, as others must have feared, that we were perhaps face to face with an issue in which emotion would over-ride all attempts to resort to reason, and I consequently approached my task with great anxiety as well.

It was not long before I discovered that the extremely rigid position taken by these honourable members did not represent the general approach to this question. I was particularly fortunate in contacting an influential member of the United States Congress who was also a member of the Committee in Washington inquiring into exactly the same question with which our committee was entrusted, namely whether the principle of shared services was practical and was a legitimate compromise for a long lasting dispute. This gentleman kept me very well informed, and I must express my gratitude to him. He has, however, but one of many who conscientiously explored the possibilities of shared services and many eagerly hoped that a program of this nature would, indeed, alleviate a very distressing situation.

To reveal the general approach to this question, Madam Speaker, I would like to quote from a letter I received from the Right Reverend George W. Casey of Saint Brigid's Church in Lexington, Massachusetts, and I quote: "I certainly would wish that governments would aid Catholic schools but, in concert with many other churchmen - not the majority however - I feel that if such aid were to create animosities and divisions that were too great, it were better forgotten. Catholic schools were established when the Catholic population was much poorer by far than they are now. They can survive the high expenses of the present times. They can go along as they have been, if they must."

One cannot help but sympathize with such an expression of goodwill in the face of rising school costs, not only in the public school area, but in the maintenance of the private and parochial schools as well.

We must not believe that the idea of shared services is new, for it is not. Shared

(MR. SEABORN cont'd) services can be traced right back to the time of Thomas Jefferson who, in opposing the establishment of a theological school at the University of Virginia, suggested that the various denominations should found schools near the University so that the students could attend the University for secular subjects and the divinity schools for theological studies. In Hartford, Connecticut, the authorities have engaged on a shared time program for over 40 years. The idea gained prominence when the Washington authorities desperately sought for a compromise that would neutralize the Catholic opposition against the proposed federal aid program for education. It was not the only proposal, by any means. There was also the suggestion that perhaps the secular subjects of the parochial schools could be subsidized by the state, and this won quite a bit of support from both sides.

These proposals, it seems to me, reveal a basic misunderstanding of the parochial school system itself. I can perhaps give no better explanation than to quote from the various religious authorities at my disposal. During my investigation, I received a Lutheran pamphlet which stated that, "A Lutheran school teacher will insist that all areas of the curriculum reflect an adequate philosophy of Christian education," and I also obtained a booklet entitled "The Philosophy of Seventh-Day Adventist Education" by Richard Hammill, in which he expresses the view that "we do not rest content with offering courses in Bible and religion, but also endeavour to permeate all branches of learning with a spiritual outlook". Pope Pius XI observed that "it is necessary that all teaching and the whole organization of the school, and its teachers, syllabus and the textbooks in every branch, be regulated by the Christian spirit," and I would like to quote from one more for I believe this summarizes all that I have pointed out in this regard. The writer of this article is a prominent Protestant educator by the name of Graham Machen and he states that "a Christian boy or girl can learn mathematics, for example, from a teacher who is not a Christian, and truth is truth however learned. But while truth is truth, however learned, the bearings of truth, the meaning of truth, the purpose of truth, even in the sphere of mathematics, seems entirely different to the Christian from that which they seem to the non-Christian; and that is why a truly Christian education is possible only when Christian education underlies not a part, but all, of the curriculum of the school." He goes on to say that "true learning and true piety go hand in hand and Christianity embraces the whole of life. Those are great central convictions that underlie the Christian school."

For an extremely religious man like myself, all these statements struck a most responsive chord within my heart, but my reason warned me to be very careful for we cannot ignore the fact that parochial schools are centres for evangelism and proselytizing for the church which controls them. I discovered that in Chicago, for example, some parochial schools apparently require that non-students and parents must attend mass and take instructions in the Catholic faith as a condition of admission, and I understand many Protestant parochial schools have similar requirements. The Seventh Day Adventists have declared, and I quote, "The Adventist School makes Adventists, attracts Adventists, and when properly utilized, the Christian school is the greatest evangelizing agent in the church."

No one can quarrel with any of these activities for they are entirely legitimate when the parochial schools are supported by their own adherents. But I believe it would violate every principle of religious freedom and justice if members of other faiths, and even non-believers, were compelled to pay taxes in some form or other to support these efforts. In my opinion this would be a true case of double taxation. And this it seems to me is the nub of the whole problem before us. This I believe is the basic reason why this question is so difficult to consider. To intrude a proposal of shared services into such a situation can only aggravate and create a greater problem that we now have, for I am fully persuaded that if the principle of shared services is proceeded with we will not only endanger the private and parochial schools but our public school system as well, without solving the basic problem before us.

Here if I may I would like to read a paragraph from a letter I received from the history department of the Columbia University. The writer is Norman Cantor, an outstanding Canadian educator, who is employed by that great New York institution. I wrote to him seeking knowledge about shared services plans that may have been tried in the State of New York, and in reply he expressed his view of the situation in our province. And here is what he wrote: "I should like to state my personal opinion on the question now being discussed in Manitoba. It seems to me that state aid for parochial schools is a step towards the undermining of democracy in Canada. The public schools have traditionally been the great agency of unity and nationalism in Canada and the United States and I would regret to see their decline. In this country," and he is referring to the United States, "however, their effectiveness in urban areas has undergone a great

(MR. SEABORN cont'd) decline because of the integration question, and large numbers of middle-class people have removed their children from public schools and sent them to non-sectarian private schools. It appears, in Canada, a somewhat similar movement is underway with the increasing importance of parochial school systems. The effect is likely to be a decline of consensus in society and an increase of religious and racial fractionalism. I think it would be best to avoid this, if possible. On the other hand, I must say, as a historian, that it does appear that, for a variety of reasons, the public school in English speaking North America seems to be a doomed situation."

It was the last sentence that startled me, Madam Speaker, for I had never been brought face to face with the distinct possibility that our public school system could disintegrate. I would have been tempted to discount this gloomy picture if I had not received a micro-filmed copy of a brilliant thesis on education, both in Canada and the United States, by a young University graduate who prepared this documentary for his doctorate degree in Chicago. He supported Mr. Cantor's view in even stronger and alarming terms, so it becomes evident that there must be a real danger facing our public school system.

I do not propose to retrace all my steps over the points made in my brief to the shared services committee, but I would like to deal with the suggestion that the President of the United States has embraced the principle of shared services for I do not believe that this is the case. When one carefully considers the massive program of federal aid, which President Johnson calls for, one will soon realize that any improvement in the position of the parochial schools has received a very low priority indeed.

The program advocated by the President is directed, in the main, to assist the children of low income families to obtain the same opportunities in education as their more affluent neighbours. Out of some 1.25 billion of dollars the President is asking that one billion go directly to help the children of the poor - to assist those families whose annual incomes are less than \$2,000.00. And for each such child a school district would receive a payment equal to half the average per pupil expenditure in the State. I believe it is interesting to note that under this formula Mississippi, for example, would be able to increase its current school expenditures by about 20 percent, while a State like California could spend only about 3 percent more.

The administration in Washington has always been very aware of the Roman Catholic opposition to any federal plan to assist education which does not help their parochial school system, and it is plain that it is intended to do enough for the parochial schools to offset this opposition and win at least neutrality from the Catholic hierarchy. As the current U. S. News and World Report of May 3rd observes, "the Catholic educators do not look upon this new federal aid as an answer to their financial problems -- or even a major help with those problems". And commenting on this phase of the President's program, the New Republic of February 6th states, and I quote from the article. "While these proposals are constitutionally and politically sound, they will probably not do as much to narrow the gap between Catholic and non-Catholic as Mr. Johnson hopes to do in narrowing the gap between the rich and the poor. It is true that Catholics often resent paying ever higher property taxes to support public schools their children do not attend, that such resentment among voters has made improvements in public education increasingly difficult in some communities, and that "shared time" might be and sometimes admittedly has been a way around this dilemma. This would be especially true if the principle were extended so that, for example, a remedial reading teacher on the public payroll could spend two mornings a week working in the parochial school, instead of requiring each slow reader in the parochial school to go to the public school for such instruction. But will the proposed federal program, confined as it is to low-income children, provide enough incentive to force co-operation on public and parochial schools which largely serve middle-class families? In many cases the answer will probably be no. If Washington is going to lead the local educator out of their present impasse, it will probably have to go further than it has so far in promoting co-operation."

So it's obvious from this, Madam Speaker, that President Johnson is more anxious to equalize opportunities between the rich and the poor, rather than on religious grounds. And any inclusion of the shared services principle cannot be considered as anything else but a very minor part of his educational program and, I would suggest, it is prompted more as a matter of expediency than anything else.

As I said before that I personally am satisfied that any venture into shared services is not only wrong in principle but could, if encouraged, result in the weakening of our public school system and endanger our private and parochial schools. During an interchange with

(MR. SEABORN cont'd) Monsignor Hochwalt, before the Washington Committee, the Honourable Peter Frelinghuysen, the Congressman for New Jersey stated: "Let us look twice before we join in advocating such a program because I would assume everybody is interested in maintaining the strength and adequacy of both our public school system - certainly I would advocate that - and our non-public school system.

"I do not want to see a transformation which leads to too rapid a withering away, or degeneration, as you put it, of the problem of adequate supply of teachers, or an adequate supply of students, unless we know it is the direction in which we want to move, and it seems to me that by encouraging these shared time concepts we may be transforming the whole system. We may be putting a tremendous financial load on our public school system, which the taxpayers may or may not be willing to respond to and we may lead to a further and perhaps unwise weakening of the parochial school system."

I think that the reply of the Monsignor to the Committee, Madam Speaker, is of particular significance for he is the director of the department of education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. And this is what he said: "This is a very real fear, and it has been expressed to me by our constituents, especially by members of my own staff, and by a number of superintendents who are now engaged in the experiment, even though they see this as a great danger. This is why we say we would like to walk very softly to see how far we can go with it, for it may not be the solution at all."

So I find myself in the regrettable position of having to vote against the motion before us, fully realizing the desperate position of many of our private and parochial schools and also in full appreciation of the sincere attempts of this government to find at least a partial solution to this aggravating problem. I do stress once again that I only do so because I am convinced that the proposed implementation and broadening of shared services will only prove to be detrimental to the very institutions we may wish to help and, at the same time, may injure the public school system.

And I share the earnest hope, expressed by the Honourable Member for Radisson, that perhaps the changing thoughts and changing attitudes among people of goodwill, to use his words, may resolve the situation in the foreseeable future. And I, Madam Speaker, for one, certainly will pray for that day to dawn in Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, since my election to this House, in 1959, one of my main interests has been this Manitoba school question. My speeches, my strategy on this subject have been questioned and attacked by some of the members of this House and no doubt by people outside of this House. At this time I think it would only be appropriate if I should try to correct certain misunderstandings and explain my questioned behaviour.

First let me say that since I've been actively interested in politics, I have tried to live by two rules in this House as well as outside this House. The first one is never to attack anyone because of his religion, his nationality, his racial origin, his financial position or his I. Q., and I challenge, Madam Speaker, anyone here to quote anywhere from Hansard where I didn't live up to this rule. I don't think that anyone can, but if so, I'll be the first one to apologize. Madam, if you ever hear me follow the example of the Honourable Member from St. Vital who attacked and made wild accusations against the Archbishop of St. Boniface, priests, nuns, private schools graduates, Roman Catholics, French Canadians, well I wish that you would stop me because then you certainly would be doing me a good turn.

Now I wanted to make sure, and I looked at all the speeches that I have ever made in this House or outside this House on this subject, and this is the worst that I've found. This was a speech made on February 21, 1961 and I quote: "I have said, Sir, and I still feel that those that are opposed to state aid fall into three categories. One yes, a very small part fortunately, but some are out and out bigots and fanatics who are not interested in listening to reason and who do not want justice. Sir, we should not knock them, we should pity this group. Then the second group, they are those who favour some help at least to these schools, who think that maybe there's an injustice, or who never even bothered reading the report at all, but nevertheless some - some whose only guide would be the political and material advantage to them. I hope that we will not find too many in this House. Now the third group and definitely the largest, composed of well-intentioned, honest people, but people that are uninformed. And before I am accused again of mud-slinging, let me say that when I say uninformed or ignorant, I don't mean people who are without education, people that are stupid, but people who are unaware of the truths, of the facts, who haven't bothered to read the report, who do not understand the Catholic religion,

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) but in this group there are very many honest and sincere people and today I would like to appeal to the members of the last two groups.

"But there are also the newspapers, and if not careful, like segregationist newspapers of the south they can render their province and the people of this province a great disservice. I feel that one of our newspapers in its editorial has done just that, and I can only hope that soon it will realize its great responsibility, realize how much influence it has on its readers and how easy it is to play on their emotions. I know very well how vital a part of society, of democratic society, newspapers are. But because of this great power they should be very just, very charitable, very open-minded, and I don't feel that their main object should be selling newspapers. Sir, it would be so nice if this motto, 'Liberty of Religion, Equality of Civil Rights' was not empty words for the Free Press but that this important daily would start defending the principles of democracy."

Now a few weeks ago I also stated that I felt that one of the members had been blinded by prejudice. I can assure you that I do not mean for a minute that this person was a bigot. I've used this word "prejudice" quite often in this House and I would like to give you this definition of the way I look at the word "prejudice". This is the definition that you will find in a booklet put out by The National Conference of Christians and Jews. "What is prejudice? A prejudice is an attitude we have towards a specific situation that we reach without sufficient consideration of the facts. It differs from an attitude founded on science and knowledge, for in the case of a prejudice we form a judgment without the help of science or of our own thinking capacities. We frequently do not know how a prejudice arose or when it first began. We may not even be aware that we have any. But whether or not we are aware of prejudices, they influence our behaviour. They may influence us even more if we are unaware of them."

Now, Madam Speaker, I'm sure that every single one of us here has prejudices. I know I have and I've been doing my best to try to eradicate them. There's one especially that I have, but I always try not to be guided by these prejudices and I think this is the important thing.

Now in the past I have admitted that some members of the certain groups whose cause I've been fostering have been wrong. I have admitted this in this House. In this session you've heard me condemn these French Canadian separatists. Haven't you heard me say that a lot of this fear of aid to private schools was because of this fear of the Church of Rome? I also stated that this was partly the church's fault and I also expressed hope that the Ecumenical Council and the ecumenical spirit would probably do away with this.

Madam Speaker, no churches are bad - not the Catholic Church, not the Anglican Church, not the United Church, not the Lutheran Church; but some of the people are unfair, some of the people of the Anglican Church, some of the people of the United Church, some of the people of the Lutheran Church, and yes, some of the people of the Catholic Church. But to read articles such as the Honourable Member for St. Vital did condemn -- reading the article about Catholics of Spain, well this is bad because this is condemning all the Catholics. Now the first reaction of any Roman Catholic listening to this is to turn around and point out the weakness of the group represented by the honourable member, and then the fight is on and you have a religious war on your hands.

It was suggested that I very conveniently forgot to mention the French Protestant minority of Quebec. Did I forget purposely? Purposely, yes; but forget, no. Why? Because I did not wish to antagonize, not the French Catholic of the Province of Quebec but rather the English Protestants of the Province of Quebec, because in Quebec there are two school divisions - one is Roman Catholic and one is Protestant. If the English Catholic minority seeks something, they must go to the Catholic division; and if the French Protestant minority seek something then they must go to the Protestant division. So this was a quite unfair accusation. By the way, I never suggested and I don't suggest that it is perfect in Quebec, but I think that they are more advanced and they are more fair than we are here, and I think that Bill No. 50 that we've heard so much will help this even more, especially in the case of other groups that do not fit in these two divisions such as the Jewish people.

Now the second rule, Madam Speaker, has been to try to let my conscience guide me. I understand that there are two accepted methods to guide the elected representative. One is to follow what the greater percentage of constituents want. After all, we are supposed to be a voice in representing them, therefore we should do what most of them want us to do. The other one is to try to learn the facts and try to use our own judgment before we vote, before we do anything.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)

Now I understand that both are acceptable but I've always chosen the second method, though I know that this is not the most popular one. I have never tried to wrap myself in cotton batten nor stand on the fence just to be safe. Do you think for a minute, Madam Speaker, that it always has been easy? I can assure you that I understood how the Honourable Member for St. Vital felt when he read a certain editorial, because I've experienced the sad feeling many times and I daresay that I'll experience it again.

On this question I would like to emphasize that today I am dealing with state aid only. It is not the question of the French language. This is not a debate on Bill 112. If anyone, someone here tries to mix the two up, both subjects, either to get at me personally, to play politics, to silence me or blackmail me, I would say that this should be considered quite unfair and quite unjust. I for one will treat these as two different subjects, I assure you, and I will not necessarily speak on the same tone in both debates. So far I see no reason why I should handle the question of French language as I have the question of the private school issue.

This is how I think the private school issue should be handled and this is what I said on April 22, 1963, on Page 1464 of Hansard. "I have learned that while speaking on this subject two different points should be discussed separately; one point is the principle involved in state aid for private schools. It is in studying this point especially that we should be tolerant and free of all prejudice. Our main approach to the subject should not be as Protestant, Catholic or Jew; as Liberal, Conservative, NDP or Social Credit; as Christian or atheist, but rather as free man living in a free world and believing in the freedom of the individual.

"Then of course there is a second point: the lack of leadership of the government who has received the unanimous report from a Royal Commission, four years ago, and has yet to act on its recommendation. It is important, not only for the members of this House but mostly for the reporters that I give the following explanation at this time, and I think these gentlemen of the press and radio should set the records straight. In the past, the impression has been left with many that I was bitterly opposed to all those who did not agree with me. This is completely false; I have always recognized the right of everyone to make up his or her own mind. But it is true that I've had little patience and that I've criticized those whose duty it is to decide one way or another - but to decide - and have delayed, while thousands of Manitobans wait for the promised decision."

At this time, Madam Speaker, I would like to review briefly what has happened in regards to this question. I did not intend to go into all the details or the intrigues that happen outside of this House on this subject, but I do want to show you the reasons for my actions.

I was first elected to this House on May 14, 1959. The Interim Report of the MacFarlane Commission had already been received. In fact the government had started to act on its recommendations, but the chapter dealing with state aid amongst others was yet to come.

Many of those who had urged me to run for office were vitally interested in this question. I must confess that I felt that soon the Legislative Assembly of this province would be in a position and have the means to remove a blot from the history of our province and rectify a gross injustice. I attended my first session in the summer of 1959. Now during the session I asked but two questions which the Minister answered, and on Page 453 of Hansard of July 1st you will find this:

"MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Honourable Minister of Education if there is any provision for grants to Separate Schools at this time?"

"MR. McLEAN: No, Mr. Chairman, there is no provision for grants to separate schools in these estimates."

"MR. DESJARDINS: Can I ask then if there is any proposed grants, or at least is the Government keeping an open mind until they get the final report from the Royal Commission on Education?"

"MR. McLEAN: An open mind until we see the final report."

Now had I been unfair at this time? Well the final report was received on December 1, 1959, and in January of 1960 the Premier appeared on a television program, and let me read the following report from the Free Press dated January 30, 1960, entitled: "No Free Vote on Schools - Premier says Government Will Take a Stand; Liberals Must Too."

"Premier Duff Roblin said Friday night that his government would take a stand as a government on the private school question, and he expected the Liberals to take a stand as a

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) . . . party. Liberal leader D. L. Campbell has said the government should take such a stand, but the Liberals don't have to. The Premier was speaking in a radio interview on the CBC program 'Legislature in Review'. He was asked what was his personal position on the question of private school aid. He answered that as Premier he could have no private opinion. His opinion would be assumed to be that of the government.

"No Policy Yet. 'I must tell you frankly that the government is not prepared at this time to state its policy in this matter,' he said. 'We recognize our responsibility to do so and this is what we will do in due course,' -- and I want to underline this -- 'in due course', he added. Had the matter been discussed in cabinet or caucus, he was asked. He replied: 'I must say we have had a number of discussions to see how we will chart our course in the next little while.' He was asked: Did he agree with Mr. Campbell's contention that the government could not deal with the matter as a private vote? 'We have no wish to shirk our responsibility but I would add that the same responsibility holds good for the other political parties as well'."

Now, the 1960 session. First, in the Throne Speech - this is what was said on the subject: "My government has received the final and completed report of the Manitoba Royal Commission on Education and desires to acknowledge the faithful discharge of their duties by the members of the commission. The report makes a number of recommendations for education in Manitoba. My government is studying the extent to which, and the ways and means by which, the recommendations of the commission might be implemented in the public interest, and policy on all" -- and I wish to underline the word all -- "these matters will be announced in due course."

We're told today that the government is placing the onus of acting on the opposition. Now the only comments that I made on this subject during this session can be found on Page 466 of Hansard of February 11, 1960, and I quote: "Last year the government stated that it was going to pay for all the school books for all the children of Manitoba. I think that the Minister meant well. He wasn't trying to fool people when he said that but I don't think that this is true at all." Had I been unfair up to then, Madam Speaker?

Until that time, the supporters of aid to private schools had good reason to believe that they would receive at least some measure of help. They were very optimistic. I do not intend to give the reasons now, but I'm sure that the Premier - if he was in his seat - I'm sure that he'd understand and also most of his members, members of his Cabinet would know these reasons.

Shortly after the session things started to change somewhat, and I will quote the first paragraphs from an article in the Free Press of March 31, 1960, entitled: "Roblin Faces Big Decision," and I quote: "Eighty percent of the members of the Conservative caucus have made it known that they are opposed to government grants to private schools, it was learned this week. At the same time, the Cabinet has generally agreed that it is in favour of the grants. It was prepared to approve them until the crisis arose in the caucus. Where they go from here is up to the Premier to decide. He left Wednesday on his annual vacation in Jamaica, determined to have some course of action resolved in his own mind when he returns."

As I previously stated in this House, two Cabinet Ministers substantiated this report in private conversations that they had with me, each one of them unaware of what the other had told me. They both expressed the opinion that some measure of help should and would be given. Well I guess we have to wait for "in due course".

Early in 1961, the supporters of state aid held public meetings with different MLAs. I was invited to one of these meetings in the north end of Winnipeg. One of the speakers charged the Conservative members of dodging the issue. My reaction? Well let me quote from the Free Press of March 4, 1961. "Liberal MLA Larry Desjardins came to the defense of his political opponents. 'They are not evading this,' he said. 'In two weeks the House opens and if they don't say anything at that time, then accuse them. It was easy' he said, 'for opposition members to express an opinion now, but government members have a big responsibility and obviously have orders not to commit themselves at the moment'." Was I being unfair, Madam Speaker?

Now in 1961, the session of 1961. The heading of the Free Press of February 14, 1961, the day of the opening of the session: "No government school aid action seen - Throne Speech omits mention of province's hottest issue." "Tell Catholics that patience best strategy." -- in due course. I was interviewed at that time and I was reported as saying: "He said that he will speak on the subject during the Throne Speech debate but has decided a resolution would

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). serve no useful purpose." At that time the supporters of aid were informed by advisors of the Premier that if the government was pressed too much at this time, the Premier would call for a referendum. I was advised to give the Premier more time and not to bring in a resolution. In order not to bring politics into the issue, I agreed to this again. Was I being unfair?

On February 21st, I made my first speech on this subject. Those who are interested will find it on Page 129 of Hansard of that year. Many members of the House as well as the First Minister himself offered warm congratulation. The newspaper reports of the speech were flattering. An editorial written by Don McGillivray of the Winnipeg Tribune was very complimentary to me. But still nothing from the government.

On March 21st, I asked the Minister of Education the following question: Was he in favour of state aid to private and parochial schools? As I received no reply. I got up on a point of privilege and asked the Minister if he would favour me with a reply on the question, and this was his answer. "Mr. McLean: "I have nothing to add to what was said on this subject on two earlier occasions by the First Minister." This was the famous "in due course". I insisted again and told him that nothing had been said. I wasn't necessarily asking him for a government policy but I wanted to know about his philosophy on education. He had been talking about his philosophy of education. But again he refused to answer. I asked him if he still refused to answer my question, and if so, I felt that the First Minister should replace the Minister of Education by a man whose philosophy on education included everybody. If he was against this, then he should state his position. After all, he was the Minister of Education.

During that same session, Mr. Prefontaine, the then Member for Carillon, asked the Minister if any of the money included in the education estimates was earmarked for children attending private schools. The answer: "Mr. McLean: I think the best way to answer that question is simply to say that there has been no change in the legislation in the Province of Manitoba dealing with schools or school grants." I guess he wasn't "in due course" yet.

Madam Speaker, let me read some of the newspaper headings of that session as well as the 1962 session. "Government Hit For Not Stating School Stand"; "Silence On Issue Is Derelict - Ion Of Duty, Campbell Says"; "No Policy On School Aid Yet" - Roblin - "Says Tories Are Still Searching"; "School Aids Serious Point But Roblin Has No Answer"; "Government Hit On Lack Of Policy"; "McLean Keeps Mum"; "Take No Stand"; "Private Schools Need Help - Grit"; "Roblin - McLean Are Mum"; "Schools? Roblin On Fence". Well, still it wasn't "in due course".

Well, Madam Speaker, wasn't this enough for the people who had been discriminated against for so many years, and then when a Royal Commission had unanimously recommended redress and they had waited again for action, wasn't this enough for them to be disappointed just a little bit and to start losing patience? But still I hoped, and apart from insisting on some answers, I did nothing else at the time.

Now the 1962 session. Again nothing in the Throne Speech -- "in due course". On February 22, 1962, the Premier while taking part in the debate on the Speech from the Throne gave us quite a tirade, and commenting on the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition had this to say -- and you will find this on Page 119 of Hansard. This was not a speech on aid to private schools. "In listening" - I'm quoting the Premier - "In listening to his remarks tonight, I must say that I can hardly recall an occasion in which I heard a more hypocritical - or perhaps I shouldn't use that word. . ." You use the word, then you say "perhaps I shouldn't", and it's all right apparently. He went on to lecture the members of our party and our leader for a lack of action, lack of platform. He stated that we were being dragged kicking and screaming into the second half of the 20th Century. He was quite incensed that with all the energy and leadership that he was showing, we dared criticize him.

Well, Madam Speaker, this was a little too much for me, for the leader of this House to remind me of my duties and my responsibilities when he was forgetting his own, and I told him so. I reminded him that he wasn't showing leadership on many occasions. In a three page speech, I used at the most a quarter of a page to remind him and his Minister of Education that they weren't showing much leadership in deciding what should be done about certain recommendations of the Royal Commission on Education. I accused them of lack of leadership but I did not even attempt on this occasion to discuss the pros and cons of state aid. Was this wrong? Was I being that unfair?

The First Minister came back at me a few days later. He criticized me as being unfair because I talked about his lack of leadership on this question. After all, he has promised that in

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).....due course he would do something. On February 27th, again I criticized him. I did not feel that he was right in begging that the government be left alone on this issue. Why? I felt that it was his responsibility even though it was a touchy problem. I felt that if he wanted to ask for charity, he should remember to have some charity for those who had been denied their rights for years. I did accuse him of lack of courage. This was the first occasion on which the then Attorney-General interrupted me with interjections like he did today. But then I did not - I must admit that this wasn't the last time that he did so and I must also admit that on these occasions I gave him back as much as I received, and that these asides received much more publicity than they deserved.

Then on March 29th I tried to remove any bitterness from this debate, if there had been any. Let me read the report of this speech from the Tribune of March 30th. "Private School Issue Revived - Desjardins Makes Emotion Plea For Government Consideration. The politically-explosive question of aid to private schools was revived in the Legislature Thursday as Liberal backbencher Larry Desjardins made an emotional 15-minute plea for government action. 'I hope this year the government will deem the subject important enough to give some consideration to the 10,000 children in private schools', the Member for St. Boniface said. 'Politically, it is a very difficult decision to make', Mr. Desjardins admitted. But he felt that government has had enough time to come up with a policy. The MLA suggested many persons would like it better if he remained silent. 'I'm told it's not fair to embarrass anyone this way', he said. 'But what are we here for? Because it is a difficult question, does it mean that we should forget about it?' He continued: 'I've been shaking and sweating for an hour, wondering whether I should stand up I'm afraid to open my mouth because it may hurt the cause I think is so important.'

"Mr. Desjardins disclosed he has had many unpleasant moments since he first came out in favour of aid to private schools, including telephone calls from persons who told him: 'The majority rules and if you Catholics don't like it, get out of here.' The MLA said he is accused of being a fanatic every time he speaks on the question. 'Do you think it's easy for me?' He asked. 'I don't want to be branded a fanatic because I stand up for what I believe in.' Mr. Desjardins requested the government to give some indication that something will be done and wanted assurance that the children in private schools 'are not going to be sacrificed because we want to stay in power.' He said Premier Duff Roblin has made great progress since his government was elected in 1958. 'Why must the First Minister's progress be tarnished?' The MLA added: 'I beseech you to help them. Would it be so difficult to bring in a bill to say something on this question?'"

Now 1963. In the Throne Speech, nothing again. At this session I made one speech on the question on April 22nd. I made sure that it would not be partisan in any way. I appealed to all the parties, including my own, that on this occasion I was talking on the principle of state aid and the tone of my speech was very subdued. I surprised everyone in the House, especially those of my own party, by stating that in order that this question was discussed properly, I would bring in a resolution at the next session if the government did not act.

Shortly before the 1964 session I informed the Press that I still intended to go through with my motion, and again I explained the reasons why. I turned over the motion to the Clerk of the House. Now the Throne Speech had this ambiguous paragraph: "My Ministers also inform me that they will present a statement dealing with the relationship between the Public School System and the Private Schools and the principles which, in their view, underlie sound education policy in Manitoba." On February 10th the Premier made a statement in the House which he called "sound public school policy". He was introducing Shared Services.

The Premier's speech was delivered on the Throne Speech debate. I spoke immediately after him and I can assure you that I was never more sincere than on that occasion. I did my utmost to explain even my most personal feelings to this House. I did not comment on the Premier's speech as I wanted more time to study it carefully.

On February 12th, Madam Speaker, you ruled my proposed resolution out of order. To this day I have yet to understand the reason why. I did study the First Minister's statement. I admit that I was shocked. We had finally reached the "in due course". This was the promised land. He had decided that separation of Church and State, as he saw it, did not permit state aid. We were asked to negate principles that we had always believed in, and this without debate, and in return we would receive a few crumbs.

Now that the government has made the ground rules, the Minister of Education begs us to look at this proposal in a calm and dispassionate way. Mind you, this was not a simple study

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). of a certain plan, rather a promise of a few crumbs. That is all that it is, and this only if we turn our backs on what we believed.

Madam Speaker, to add insult to injury these principles that we could never accept were later to become the terms of reference for this Committee on Shared Services. On February 17th, with all the strength and indignation brought about by these long years of waiting, frustration, promises not kept and what have you, I refuted, not the simple study of a proposed shared services program but rather the negation of our rights, my rights, and the complete disregard of the recommendations of a unanimous Royal Commission report - and this without debate.

I do not regret one word that I said at the time. I would like to quote a few excerpts, that certainly have proven to be right, from the Hansard of February 17th, page 165, and I quote. "Madam Speaker, we know that starving people are tempted by left-overs. We know that even the crumbs under the table appeal to these people and it is difficult for them to say: 'No, I will not crawl; I have my rights and my dignity of man and I will insist on these rights', when they know that the situation is cut and dried and that it is crumbs or nothing. The Premier knew this. He knew that the parents of these children forming these minorities would be tempted to accept. Perhaps they might have free textbooks, free bus rides and perhaps some other minor benefits, when at the moment they weren't receiving any help at all. He was counting on them thinking of their four, six or ten children. Maybe they would be forced to accept and then maybe they would not carry the fight for their principles for a few years." Well, Madam Speaker, some are crawling, some need it that bad.

And then: "Without giving good reasons for rejecting direct aid, the Premier insults the intelligence of the Catholics of this province and many others by asking us to step off the solid ground of our principles to follow him into what might as well be the blue yonder of his shared services plan, or should I say to follow him up the well known garden path. I say to him, "Sir until you offer us a good reason for rejecting the solution offered by the Royal Commission, we must doubt the sincerity of your government's purpose to help us with your shared services plan."

Further on, "Earlier he had made the statement: 'Few of us wish this question to become a matter of issue between political parties'. He rejects the recommendations of the MacFarlane Commission - five experts who studied the problem through three years of careful investigation and now, without offering a good reason puts the thorny problem into the hands of a Legislative Committee, politicians who more than most men are subject to pressures which make fair and objective solutions difficult to say the least. In fact, Madam Speaker, we have every reason to suspect that this committee will give only as much help to the private schools in this shared services plan as the Premier and his Ministers have already decided they will give." Isn't that the cake! "The prospects for aid to separate schools would seem to rise and fall in this province, not out of religious or educational, but out of political considerations."

Madam Speaker, I rejected the Premier's statement. I voted against setting up a committee. On April 13th of last year I made this statement: "As a Christian, I say to the government, your plan does not help me to meet the obligations which I have before God to see to the Christian education of my children, and I reject the resolution which asks this House for a committee to study it. As the Members of the Committee would be required to adhere to principles that I consider unjust, it would be impossible for me to sit on this Committee."

Madam Speaker, for these same reasons I cannot vote concurrence in the report. Because of the reasons given by the Honourable Member from Lakeside, I cannot accept this report. This is not a report of the committee but a report of the Conservative caucus finalized before proper, before any discussion with all the members of committee.

The Premier is making an effort to place the responsibility of governing on members of the Opposition and this he does after he has called all the shots. I cannot accept this. His behaviour outside this House even prior to the last meeting of the committee - and there is no need for me to elaborate, he knows what I mean - makes it impossible for me to vote for this resolution. I stated that there should be no partisan politics when dealing with this subject and I still believe this, and let me quote from the Tribune of February 24th, 1965, an article by Mr. Duart Farquharson. "A Conservative MLA who asked not to be named said he ruled out any possibility of the committee report winning a consensus from all sides of the House. He said that at least two Conservatives, Fred Groves of St. Vital and Richard Seaborn of Wellington, would oppose the Premier's stand in keeping with their previously stated positions."

Madam Speaker this last paragraph. . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has five minutes left of his time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thank you. This last paragraph, "Some other members of the Conservative caucus would only vote concurrence if they were sure that the opposition had already killed the plan."

It stands to reason that I think we are entitled to anything that this government might give us, not by privilege but by a question of right. If and when legislation is brought in, providing of course that there are no strings attached that will give crumbs to the adherents of private schools, I certainly will vote in favor. So I say to the Premier: Sir, don't try to use my rejection of the action of your government in this matter as an excuse to refuse even these crumbs that you have offered. I will vote in favor of any favorable legislation providing of course, and I repeat, there are no strings attached.

My style might be wrong, Madam Speaker. I admitted that in the past and I have tried to correct this. Then why do I attack and why do I attack so forcefully? It is because I have tried everything else. Sometimes politically I'm wrong, I give the wrong impression, by my conscience has never bothered me. Why do I attack? How do I attack? I attack only the lack of leadership because there were no discussions; the lack of courage; the dictatorship; and I mentioned that they were gutless wonders in the past. Sure I do this, because I am sure that the Premier would like to help and most of the members in this House would like to help, but I feel that they have no courage. But if I attack, I am also attacked. I have been attacked because of my weight, my profession, my party, my religion, my racial origin, and because I am a would-be defender of the minority it was stated.

The First Minister last year in a TV appearance called the Leader of the Opposition every possible name under the sun, but that was all right. The member from Selkirk stands up and tells them about how weasly they are, and about eviscerating the motions and resolutions. This is accepted. The Member from St. Vital - I don't have to say anything about him, nor the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. We have been accused of Mafia, of McCarthyism, of being liars, rumor-mongers, stupid and heartless, but nobody has asked for help. I have fought my own battles.

It's permissible to talk like this about Metro, about the heat tax and the denturists - we have the two, the Honourable Member for St. Vital and the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources going at it real good - but on this subject it is impossible to discuss. Everything is unfair on this. Am I that unfair because I embarrass the government, because I embarrass my caucus, because I embarrass maybe all the members of this House? What about the 10,000 students who have been waiting, who cannot wait any longer -- in due course.

If I am unfair, Madam Speaker, I say that I am unfair to myself. The Honourable Member from St. Vital was right when he said that many do not agree with me; many Catholics outside of this House do not agree with me; many of my friends. I don't enjoy fighting all the time. I don't enjoy being branded a fanatic, and often I can tell you that I feel very alone. Do you think it was easy for me? I try to do my duty - this is all. Do you think it has been easy for me to criticise lawyers, some lawyers not long ago, when two of my colleagues are lawyers and people that I respect very much? When many members of our party, many of my friends are lawyers? When I was afraid of being misquoted in the Press? Do you think it was easy to discuss Metro alone or give them my stand on divorce when I felt some of the hierarchy, some of the clergy in my church would criticize me? I can tell you that the French Catholic paper mentioned four times in a row that I had voted in favor of liberalizing divorce laws.

Now I'm always afraid also of the picture that I might give of the press reports. This can be unfair to my family and associates in my business. I know what's going on. I would like to be popular, Madam Speaker. I'd like to be a good guy and make good speeches like I did a few years ago, I would be a real hero then. I'd have good press and everybody would be happy. I could say I've tried and the other side would say he's a good fellow. There would be no soul-searching, but according to my conscience this would be wrong.

I don't mind discussing dogma with my Archbishop. When it's time to act, my conscience alone will tell me how to act; not even the officials of the executive of the MAEE - they might differ with me; not even the editor of the French Catholic Paper. He has his conscience and I have mine, but I say that we are given certain talents -- Madam Speaker, I have two minutes, if I may be permitted -- given certain talents and it is up to us to develop these talents, to use what we are best qualified for. Some are diplomats, organizers, leaders, arbitrators, negotiators, fighters; some can only help with more support or by praying or suffering.

Well personally I have been given some qualities but many handicaps. Even my build,

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). because of my big frame I'm considered rough and loud, rather excitable, crude, undiplomatic and a poor speaker. Well I try to impose, I try to correct it, but I am convinced that I must do what I think is right and what I am best suited for. I have no illusions. I know that it's up to the people and I know that they might want to get rid of me for rocking the boat. Maybe they'll never have the chance, but at this time I would be inclined to say they might not have the chance. I know that I'll make mistakes; I know that they will be very happy on the other side; I know that there will be soul-searching and it will hurt; and I might have bad press notices also.

A while ago I said that when it was time to act I would not listen to the Archbishop but to my conscience. Tomorrow we might have in the newspaper, "Desjardins Challenges Archbishop." That wouldn't be too good. Now I would like to see something like this maybe, "St. Boniface member proves to satisfaction of all that he is not fanatic, that he is attacking the lack of courage of the government." But it might well be, "Other emotional outbursts by Desjardins".

Well I'll be sad, but I only hope that I can find the courage to keep on. It is not my intention to hurt anyone in this House, but if it's the only way to keep the hope of minority, to stop discrimination, well then I have no choice, and I repeat that this is the only way, to forcefully draw this injustice to the attention of the public. I understand that the majority have rights, but never the right to oppress. I have enough handicaps, as I said, but I will continue to fight for the cause that I figure is just. I'll beg, I'll pray, I'll cajole, I'll do anything, because I believe as the Honourable Member from Selkirk advised the Member from East Kildonan in the divorce debate, that everyone has a right to an opinion but not the right to force his conscience on others. The truth, I believe that truth and justice would prevail and I feel that this is the best way that I can help, by bringing it to the attention of Manitobans, and I believe that sooner or later that, as I say, justice will prevail.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): I beg to move, seconded by the Attorney-General, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, if the Minister speaks he closes the debate, is that correct? Madam Speaker, in that case I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that the debate be adjourned.

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

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department of Municipal Affairs, Resolution No. 79. (1) (a) -- The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): . . . Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I did not have an opportunity to participate this morning in this debate and I would like to make a few comments under the Minister's salary. I think it's fitting that I should comment under his salary because I feel that he has been saddled with a pretty difficult task which is not really related to the function of Municipal Affairs, and that is the matter of providing for the mechanics of the school tax rebate, and I certainly would want him to get his salary and enough sustenance and strength to continue with this difficult chore.

I had an opportunity to speak to him and to learn from him something which I did not know up to now, and that is to make sure that the rebate will be available to persons in future years if they are unable to pay the taxes this year. In other words, if their 1965 taxes are paid in 1966, they will still be entitled to the rebate. This has not been clear to me until now and I thank him for making it clear to me at this stage.

Next, Mr. Chairman, I would like to invite the Honourable Minister now, or at a later date, to make clear to this House and indeed to all persons interested in this province as to the manner in which one will become entitled to arrange to split the assessment rolls so that he could obtain separate bills for separate properties. It has been discussed time and again and we

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd). needn't repeat it that there are many occasions where separate properties, separate buildings appear on one title and therefore on one assessment roll, and this is only an accident of the way it was designed originally when no thought of this school tax rebate was contemplated. Therefore it is clear that the government - at least I think it is clear that the government would not want to refuse the right to persons who would otherwise qualify, and therefore, I think it should be made clear as to how this is to be accomplished.

I believe that to date this is not clear to people who are anxious to do it. As a matter of fact I discussed the problem with one of the officials in the Land Titles Office and he informed me firstly, that he was not clear on it; secondly, there were a great deal of transfers being registered in order to accomplish this purpose; and now I am learning that it is not necessary to do it. So again I invite the Minister either now or before this session ends to make clear publicly just what procedure needs to be followed to accomplish this purpose.

Next, Mr. Chairman, I want to point out in no uncertain terms that the government has I believe failed to look after a right which I think exists in all moral sense to those people who are planning to become members of the Co-operative Housing Association. It seems to me -- and I am not now debating the questions which have been debated in the past dealing with what we thought was the right that tenants ought to have to participate. I don't intend to review this debate; it has had ample airing and the position of the government is very clear and no need to again challenge them on it, but it seems to me that because of the accident of the mechanism provided for the rebate, that a group of people who will definitely have an equity in their homes will be denied the right to participate because of the nature in which their title will be made available to them.

It seems to me that the government should make it clear that this method of holding ownership to land and dwelling is either favourable or otherwise. It seems to me that the people who are doing this, who are sponsoring this, are people who are very well motivated. No profit motive involved in this, but rather the desire to provide good housing, or adequate housing to people who could not be looked after by other available means such as National Housing Act methods nor subsidized housing and who fall in between the two and who need to feel a sense of participation and ownership in real property and are able to do so only by becoming members of this co-op housing group.

Therefore, this group of people are left out of the thinking or plans of the government, I believe wrongly, and I believe contrary to what is the over-all principle behind the government's plan in this respect. I am sure that ways could be found and I am sure that the government ought to be looking for those ways, and I am also sure that the government is not looking for those ways. We have heard discussions on condominium holdings and yet the government knows very clearly I believe, or ought to know by now, that the co-op housing set-up is such that does not relate to condominiums at all.

Therefore, I feel that the government ought to encourage the co-operative movement in its plans in this respect, and until it can arrange a mechanism, provide a mechanism or change the existing mechanism, I think it would be well advised to make grants in lieu of this shortage in the mechanism or this ineffective mechanism as it applies in this respect. I urge the Minister to explore this means or any other means which will make possible to the people who I believe are entitled according to the principle involved in it, to make it available to them to share in this rebate.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, when we speak of this rebate we are speaking again of the monies that were raised due to the special taxes imposed last summer, and I want to refer to the calculations I have made of an income or a revenue of 24 million and disbursements that I have found of something under 20 million - 19 to 20 million - and therefore I would ask the Minister to indicate to the House those portions of his estimates which would be monies that are rebatable, refundable, or in some way used for the reduction of taxes on real property as was planned by the Honourable the First Minister in his review of the program of rebates. I think the Minister knows what I am looking for and I would like to see whether he has the answer in his estimates.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE Q. C., (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. John's, if he had been here this morning to hear my opening remarks he would have heard me say that contained within my estimates there is the figure of \$1,274,000, which is the increase in grants in lieu of taxes to municipalities. This is the only item that will appear in the estimates of the Department of Municipal Affairs that indicates an increased expenditure as a result of the changes made last year.

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

I think that in all fairness I should also say that under municipal assessments there would be a greater recovery from the municipalities for the cost of assessment as a result of the change made last summer whereby municipalities will now be required to pay the full cost of assessment. The recovery last year from municipalities was \$211,718.00.

Insofar as the co-op housing is concerned, we've explored this situation at some length and we could find no way under our present scheme by which we could include the individual shareholders in co-op housing as recipients of school tax rebates. These people are in effect shareholders in a corporation, and if you were to extend this privilege to shareholders in this type of corporation, then surely there would be other problems which would arise out of it and there would be other types of corporations that would be entitled to the same sort of consideration.

I think of, for example, some farmers co-operatives that have gone into other types of business such as feed mills, eviscerating plants and so on. Why shouldn't the members of that co-operative corporation by the same token be entitled to individual school tax rebates? At the moment I can see no way in which we can include the participants in co-op housing for school tax rebates, and as title is held in the name of the corporation, the rebate will be allowed to the corporation and that will be the only one.

On the question of how assessment rolls can be split, that is the individual items on the Assessment Roll, Section 1023 of The Municipal Act covers this situation for all the municipalities of the province, to my knowledge, except the City of Winnipeg and the City of St. Boniface which are covered under their own charters. Under Section 1023 the Council of a municipality is empowered, and in fact required if requested to do so, to hold a Court of Revision at any time up to the 31st day of May in the year for which taxes are to be levied to revise the general and personal property assessment roll.

Subsection (3) of that section reads as follows: "The Court of Revision in addition to its regular annual sitting for which provision is hereinbefore made, from time to time up to the 31st day of May in the year in which taxes are to be levied on the assessment may, and if there are any applications to be heard shall sit as a Court of Revision for the purpose of considering applications by real owners to have their names placed on the assessment roll and tax roll, or applications for a change in the name of the registered owner of land on the assessment roll and tax roll, and may order the necessary changes to be made in the rolls including the changing of assessment values from the exempt to the taxable column of the roll.

Under this section, under a broad interpretation of it, I believe that the owner of a property assessed as one property but which is in fact two or more properties, for example two houses on adjoining lots which have no connection one with the other could be assessed separately if the properties could be separately described. I would think the municipality might require the applicant to produce a surveyor's certificate or something of that nature to indicate the description of the two separate properties and also that there is no encroachment of the one upon the other. This assessment change could be made.

Now at the present time there is no provision for the doing of this in the City of Winnipeg or the City of St. Boniface. It is my intention to introduce as soon as possible a further amendment to The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act which would allow the Board of Revision to make the same sort of changes in the assessment roll and tax roll of the City of Winnipeg and the City of St. Boniface up to the 31st day of May in each year, so that the same thing would apply in those municipalities as would apply in all the other municipalities of the province.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'd like to thank the Honourable Minister for the explanation he has given.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Before we get off the Minister's salary, I would like to ask him a question in connection with the Grand Beach summer cottage owners. I have received approximately 20 letters from people that live in my constituency and they feel that they are arbitrarily being taxed by the Municipality of St. Clements. If the Honourable Minister is aware of this and knows something, I would like to have an explanation. Is he doing anything about it or what is the circumstances of this particular case? If not, I could read the letter into the records and have it filed.

MR. SMELLIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have seen quite a number of these letters as the Honourable Member for Assiniboia is not the only one who received them.

The situation is simply this: the cottage owners at Grand Beach are the occupiers of Crown Land. They occupy the land under a lease. The Municipal Act provides that the occupiers

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd). of Crown lands are liable for assessment and taxation by the municipality. The people at Grand Beach have come to see me and I have explained the matter to them in detail, that they are part of a municipality and part of a school district and, as such, they are required to pay taxes on these properties. Incidentally, on the summer cottage that I own myself, which is another municipality, I'm in the same position where I must pay a ground rent to the owner of the property - in this case it's not the Crown but it is a private owner - and in addition I must pay a tax on the cottage which I own to the municipality.

Some of their argument is that they are not able to use the schools because they are only there in the summertime, but of course taxation is not based upon the use to which the owner of property puts the services for which the taxes are collected. If such were the case we wouldn't charge school taxes to any people who didn't have children or we wouldn't charge school taxes to corporations, so that the taxation is based merely upon the ownership of property. In this case these people own cottages which sit on land owned by the government and which they lease annually from the Crown, and as the occupiers of Crown land they are properly assessed and taxed under The Municipal Act.

MR. PATRICK: Also, one of their points here is they said they cannot, on any levies or anything, that they cannot have a vote. Is this correct? They still have to pay school tax but they cannot have a vote in any matters?

MR. SMELLIE: The vote on capital expenditures for school purposes is afforded to all persons who are resident electors of the school district. Because the cottage owners are not residents of that school district, they have no vote. Insofar as capital expenditures of the municipality are concerned they are in a different position, because there they are ratepayers and as ratepayers they are entitled to vote on any money by-law proposed by the municipality or expenditures not within the current year.

. Continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 79 -- passed; 80 -- passed; 81 -- passed; 82 -- passed; 83 -- passed; 84 -- passed. Department of Labour. The Minister of Labour.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): This is a pleasant surprise. If I can have the same co-operation I might be able to enjoy an anniversary date with my good lady this evening.

Mr. Chairman, it's quite usual in the opening statement that you would expect me to pay respects to the staff of the Labour Department, which I do most sincerely. I really don't feel that it is necessary that I pay this tribute to them because they know the appreciation that I have for the efforts that they put forth on behalf of the people of Manitoba. I would like to say a word of thanks to members on all sides of this House for the interest that they have shown in our work and in the contributions they have made to the debates on labour matters in this House.

I am of course pleased that the House has reached, and I trust that I am not being premature, but I have reason to believe that we have reached a consensus on the principle of a continuous review of labour management problems by labour and management themselves with the assistance of universities.

Mr. Chairman, I assure you that the wishes of the House in this regard will be carried out with all the possible vigour and despatch. We are fortunate in Manitoba to have a good base to work from insofar as labour-management relations are concerned. It is true in Manitoba in years gone by we have had and we still have vigorous collective bargaining, but we have very few serious strikes. We have a strong labour group which works continually for the good of their membership and for the good of the community. We also have strong management groups who work to protect their interests and they also show due regard to the general welfare.

Now being in the middle as I am, Mr. Chairman, is always a challenging position. It is usually uncomfortable, and I might say that it is sometimes rewarding. But I would like again to pay tribute to both labour and management groups for their co-operation and assistance.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege to attend the International Labour Conference in Geneva. Here I participated in tripartite discussions with representatives of labour, management and government from 110 countries of the world. Many of the delegates are trying in their own countries to cope with problems of poverty on a scale which is very difficult for we in our community to comprehend. I was struck by the strength of character and the perseverance which this organization continues to show in light of what seems to a lot of us almost insurmountable problems.

Mr. Chairman, from my brief experience of association with the ILO, I have developed a firm belief in the value of tripartite consultation as the most desirable approach to the solutions of the problems in the field of labour-management relations. It can certainly be said as a matter of fact that compared with other parts of the world that we in Canada are living in a favoured land; and we in Manitoba, by comparison with other regions of Canada, have much to be thankful for. We have had for the last few years at least a very favourable employment situation, one of the best in Canada. Jobs have been available for a very high percentage of those capable and willing to work, and in spite of this we are fast reaching a stage where a substantial number of jobs are going unfilled for the want of people capable and willing to fill them, and I would certainly rather try to cope with this kind of problem than to have large numbers of qualified people unable to find work.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we recognize that we must continue to improve our training facilities and take other steps where necessary to meet the skill shortages that develop and I shall deal with this more fully a little later. But I want at the outset, Mr. Chairman, to emphasize as a fact and certainly not as an accomplishment of mine, that we do enjoy good labour management relations, a high level of employment and a good educational system and training facilities, both of which we are expanding as rapidly as is possible. Now these things I think, Mr. Chairman, are of basic importance and we can be extremely grateful for them. I want also to say most emphatically that we do have problems and I have no desire to create any other impression and now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak about some of the problems we have identified during the past year and which we feel are of major importance, and how we have tried to deal with them.

First, Mr. Chairman, we recognize that we had a major problem in the field of employment safety. Far too many accidents in relation to employment were occurring. Now the monetary loss alone was sufficient to warrant attention and action but of much greater

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd) importance was the needless human suffering and these demanded remedial measures. So we set about to systematically examine our safety programs. We analyzed the program of our department, we gathered information on safety programs operated by and within industrial undertakings. We studied the experience and approach of other jurisdictions and of other countries. We consulted with our labour and management groups and we found them very responsive and very helpful. We strengthened our inspection staff and we adopted a firmer enforcement policy. We were impressed, Mr. Chairman, by a technique effectively applied elsewhere and it is called the consultative approach. Now it simply means actually getting the active co-operation of labour and management in the development of on-the-job and on-the-site safety programs. We established a small technical group consisting of one construction contractor, one construction union man and an engineer from the university and I had the privilege of acting as chairman of this group. A building project was selected to experiment with the consultative approach. We had the enthusiastic support of the contractor, his supervisory staff and his employees, and I might say, Mr. Chairman, that this particular job, operating under almost as bad or as poor conditions as could be imagined, has had a very good safety record. And after some experience with this project we moved to others, again experimenting with the consultative approach and at the moment we are involved specifically with this approach in four building projects and so far the results are most encouraging.

Now the direct result of our study and experimenting was a new Employment Safety Act which has received the unanimous consent of this House. This Act will be implemented under the direction of the Workmen's Compensation Board which will combine its traditional responsibilities for the payment of compensation after accidents have occurred with its new related responsibility of working towards the prevention of accidents.

Another problem which we recognize as being of vital importance in the development of the provincial economy is that of providing our workers and prospective workers with the best possible opportunity to become qualified for available jobs. As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Chairman, we are faced with the situation where there are a growing number of jobs available and not enough available workers with the necessary qualifications. Ad hoc programs are being developed to deal with the current manpower shortages as they appear. The longer term job of improving training opportunities however, must be based on programs developed after careful appraisal of employment opportunities likely to be available and of the educational and training requirements that will be involved. This in our view can best be done by combining the statistical evidence of recorded past experience with the knowledge and insight of the practical people who operate the labour market. Statistical data concerning occupational trends and the changing labour market requirements has been gathered and is being analyzed. Mr. Chairman, this will help to identify both the kinds of occupations where the opportunities for employment are contracting and the kinds of occupations where employment opportunities are expanding. Technically, findings of this nature are called labour force projections but the weight of professional and informed opinion is that it is impossible to make worthwhile labour force projections on the basis of statistical data alone. Such projections must be tested thoroughly against the actual and current experience of management and labour and their aspirations and future plans.

Our task, Mr. Chairman, is magnified by the fact that in the labour market in a free society like ours there is a high degree of freedom of choice. It is not simply a matter of sorting out the statistics and determining arbitrarily what the manpower needs of the economy are and filling these needs by providing a properly trained supply of labour. There are all kinds of variables, and workers and prospective workers are entitled to choose the kinds of education and training, or jobs, they want. Wage levels, working conditions, geographic location of the work place, fringe benefits, security, continuity of employment, they're all factors which influence where the available supply of labour will work and how long it will stay in one job or in one place. The point is, Mr. Chairman, that we are not working with a controlled and regimented labour market nor would we want to be. Therefore, our role as we see it, is to gather on a continuing basis as much knowledge as possible about the free behaviour of workers and prospective workers and as much knowledge as possible about the known and anticipated requirements of the labour market.

Our work so far has brought us to some conclusions which are helpful in understanding this situation. There is continuing strong demand for people who have graduated from university in almost any field. There is a strong demand for people with post high school training in the technologies. There is a strong demand for people with training and experience in the

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd).skilled trades. In all these areas, Mr. Chairman, we can therefore proceed with certainty with the expansion of our educational and training facilities and, where necessary, accelerated training can be produced to meet specific skill shortages, and we are doing that.

Now in the area below the level of highly skilled we are less certain about the specific demand and therefore about the provision of specific facilities for meeting the demand. Our studies to date have, however, led us to some conclusions and our programs we feel are soundly based. Updating of the unemployed or under-employed in the matter of general education, together with living allowances, is now available. Here we can proceed with certainty. There is general agreement that the labour market is showing a continuing strong demand for people with the flexibility and adaptability that only a good general education can provide. There is also the problem of retraining of workers whose jobs are changed or disappear as a result of technological change. Here there are facilities within industry itself and in public institutions that can take care of this problem. Training in industry programs are evolving in co-operation with various government departments to meet the various kinds of ad hoc needs.

Mr. Chairman, we have I think, as indicated by our programs and our high level of employment, made some pretty commendable progress. Now we shall continue to search for better insights into labour market conditions and manpower needs. We shall adjust our programs and add to them as we go along. We know that meaningful findings in the field of manpower training can be achieved only on the basis of sustained and continued effort and we intend to expand and intensify our research in this field. In the matter of labour force training, I would like to give full credit to the role the federal government has played by providing technical advice, research and financial assistance. Now there are other important services covered in our estimates which we feel are functioning quite well but about which there will no doubt be questions and comment. And we intend, Mr. Chairman, as we did with our safety program last year, and as we are doing in the labour management field through the Woods Committee, as we are doing in the field of manpower training, to examine all of our programs and to make such improvements from time to time as we feel are in the public interest. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am certain that the debate which will now follow will lead to many constructive suggestions which will help us in attaining the over-all objectives which we desire. Thank you.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to extend my sincere thanks to the Minister of Education, also to the members of his staff and to the management and labour committee that is studying the labour-management matters. For the past few years I have made my remarks in respect to safety, industrial safety, secret strike votes and certification and automation and some other matters. This session we've had so much debate on labour matters through the resolutions that were presented to the House and much has been said so I don't want to repeat what we have debated in matters of safety, or certification or the resolutions we had on the standing and continuing committee for which, may I say, the Minister has amended the resolution of the Honourable Member from Portage, as a continuing committee to study the labour and management matters. And the Member from Logan had his resolution on vacations with pay which certainly I would say was a good one, so we did have a considerable amount of debate in many fields as far as labour is concerned. But I am somewhat concerned. It seems that the Minister has to be prodded along to bring some of the programs forward and to bring some of these matters to the House before we have to prod him along the way we had to these last few years. So I wouldn't want to repeat what we were saying before, but I would like to just go through the report that has been presented by the Minister to this House and just see what is his department doing. And if we go through the report, we start with the first page -- it's certainly nicely laid out and on Page No. 2 it lists all the departments of labour, safety, training and welfare. Page No. 3, contents. Page No. 4, there's a real good picture of the Honourable Minister, and Page 5, just one line - "I have the honour to submit to you the report of the Department of Labour." Page No. 6 is a complete blank and Page No. 7 it says Part 1 -- there's nothing on Page 7 as well. So it means, we don't get into the meat of the report until we get into somewhere on Page 8 or 9. And on Page 9, when we finally arrive at some of the problems of labour - and I would like to quote the first part: "Much of the department's efforts during the year were concentrated, as it had to be, on problems calling for immediate solutions. There the results were tangible and certain. These are summarized in this part and spelled out in comprehensive detail in

(MR. PATRICK cont'd). the statistical section which forms the second part of this report. " Now perhaps I would say the most immediate problem for the wage earner and the wages, would be the minimum wage, yet in Part 1 of the report, I don't see any mention of the minimum wage or steps taken in '64 by this government to do anything about the minimum wage.

Now when we get into the second part of the report, where it's spelled out and says it's comprehensive details about wage rates and so on, is in Page 2. We finally get into collective bargaining which was given about a page and a half, and of that, three lines on Page 13 with a discussion of strikes in Manitoba in 1964, including the International Nickel strike at Thompson. I think we all know how significant the strike was and the impact it had on the community of Thompson. Perhaps if we look at Part 2, we should see some comprehensive detail of the whole matter, but the only reference that we have in here is just what it shows on Table 8 and this table shows that in '63, for instance, there were 4,742 man days lost because of strikes and walk-outs; in 1964 we had 46,379 man days lost because of strikes or walk-outs. Where is the report of the strikes, and in particular, of the Thompson strike itself? There's nothing of it here. I think there should be some causes mentioned in this report of the Thompson strike. What was the result of it? What part did the Manitoba Government play in it? I know there was even discussion last year in the session here about the strike. I would like to know what did the government do during the strike, during the time of the strike. And the other matter that was concerning everybody, the government was going to take some immediate steps to make a study of the cost of living in Thompson. And I would like to know what has happened in this respect; if anything has been done. Some of these facts, I believe, should have been in this report and there's nothing in it in respect to that.

Another of the problems calling for immediate solution was safety on jobs and accident prevention which is discussed on Page 14 and 15 of the Labour report and on Pages 33 and 34, give a summary of the accidents. But they certainly do not give us any comprehensive detail of the provincial government and what it has done in the field of accident prevention. All it is, is just a table of accidents. I think we should have been told, for instance, how many safety inspectors there were on the job; how many new inspectors were appointed; what was their training and something in that respect.

As to the problems -- long-range problems mentioned on Page 9. One would have expected something to have been said about how the government-conducted strike vote procedure was working, or how the procedure for prosecutions of unfair labour practices was working; something on workings of the Labour Board, particularly the average length of time between filing of an application and certification; and there's nothing of that in this report, as well.

One could go on in various sections of this report and find the same. General comments say very little referring to statistics which either do not deal with the subject matter of the general comments at all, or if they do, are no usable information as far as the report is concerned. There was not a word said about the key to labour-management relations and that is making meaningful the rights set out in The Labour Relations Act for unions to become certified as bargaining agents. The key of course is the effective prosecution of unfair labour practices.

All I can add, Mr. Chairman, the report was nicely written, prepared in a very intelligent way but it certainly does not give us any information as far as the labour matters are concerned. So, we can go through the whole thing, there's nothing in it and I would say it was a waste of time in preparing the report itself.

I would like to ask the Minister some other problems and I'd like to raise them at this time. It has been brought to my attention about Manpower Services and, as far as I understand, there's many industries and stores hiring people through the Manpower Services and these people are employees that have to work side by side with other employees, are not receiving the same pay for doing the same job. Now I have nothing against the Manpower Services or Office Overload, because I have used them myself and they provide a real good service because at a minute's notice you can get help, which is good. But I don't think it's fair to have some of the big stores getting their personnel through the Manpower Services or some of these places, and when they do get their pay they have to be deducted and not be paid as much as the person they are working beside and doing the same kind of a job. I wish the Honourable Minister would look into this.

I think that there's another problem. I think we will have to start looking into a long-

(MR. PATRICK cont'd). range plan for off or seasonal employment. I know it has been pretty good in the last couple of years because of our winter works projects and the great construction that has been going on. But who knows how long this will continue. And I think the Minister would be well advised if he would just look into this matter because I think some long-range plans have to be done and studies made into what percentage, how much of our labour force is comprised of seasonal employment. We had a good resolution which was debated at some length, on challenge of automation. I think it certainly was a good resolution. The other cities throughout Canada have been quite concerned about it because they have -- for instance at the universities at McGill, Toronto, Western and UBC -- they have set up a Department of Labour Relations to study automations and other labour matters pertaining to -- anything pertaining to labour. So I think that we should not take automation too lightly. It seems that most cities are quite concerned about it so I would like to see the Honourable Minister look and check into what's happening in some of the other areas and see if we could not prosper or gain something from what is going on in some of the other cities.

I would also like to ask him about the rule board -- the Fair Wage Board -- what's been happening because the information that I have is the setting of wage scale is going to be grouped, a minimum wage, and for instance it's not going to be so much for different type of works, be it plumbing or carpentry; it'll be just one set, and I think if this is the case, I wonder if there's any danger because most of your young people trying to take a trade, might be reluctant to do so if they'll feel, well I don't need to take a trade, I'm still going to be guaranteed a minimum wage of \$1.45, it doesn't matter what I do. And I think this should be looked into as well and I wish the Minister could reply and tell us something about it.

Some time ago, I brought to the Minister's attention about a person that came to see me in connection with the Workmen's Compensation Board. I served him notice on it and I'll just be very brief. I'm not going to read the whole report but I wish he would advise us what happened. This has to do with a man named William Thomas. In September of 1962, he strained his back while on the job at Labatt's Brewery. He was paid compensation for the injury at the time. And then some ten months later, because of further examinations taken in response to his pain and complaints, a surgical fusion of the third and fourth lumbar vertebrae was carried out by Dr. T. J. Mills. Mr. Thomas claims that this necessary surgery was attributable to the first injury in September of 1962. However, the Workmen's Compensation Board refused to allow him any compensation for the time he was off work and for the expense of operation of July of 1963. Since the board refused him compensation for the time during which he was off work as a result of surgery in 1963, he informs me that as a result of not being able to receive compensation for the time he was off, he lost his house, his car and had to go on welfare.

Mr. Thomas does not appear to be a loafer because he went to work shortly after the plaster jacket was removed in the late fall of 1963 -- that was after his second operation. So I want to inform the House that Dr. Doel who was Mr. Thomas' physician and Dr. Mills was his specialist, that if you look at the letter which I believe the Minister probably has by now, and note on Page 2, third paragraph, it contains the following -- Dr. Mills' opinion: "I believe his present condition is directly attributable to his accident in September 1962." This is the remarks of Dr. Mills. One matter came forcibly to my mind from reading the Board's letter to Mr. Thomas in which they say, "there is no provision in the Act which states that you, as an injured workman, are entitled to be supplied with copies of correspondence relating to your file, medical or otherwise, and we cannot undertake to supply copies of the material requested." It appears that the Board takes the position that the injured workman may not know what the Board has on file which is against his case if anything. I feel that this is wrong. If the Minister hasn't got a copy of the file I could give him this copy, but I believe he has, because I have given him notice quite some time ago.

Mr. Chairman, that's about all the remarks I would like to make at this time. It seems that the government and the Honourable Ministers seem to be quite satisfied, or seem to have been quite satisfied for the past few years as far as labour matters were concerned, and it takes quite a bit of convincing on this side to get some action and I believe we are getting some action.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. John's): Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister convinces that he makes a real effort to work with his department and with his Acts in order to create an atmosphere of good relations between labour and management, and I must say that he impresses with his sincerity and his desire in this respect. I must also say that his staff, all of it that I

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) have had occasion to deal with, impresses the same way, that they have a real sincere desire to provide a good atmosphere of working relationship between management and labour, but I must agree with the last speaker when he indicates that they have a pretty tough road to hoe with the design and fabrication of the land on which they are working.

I want first to pay tribute to Mr. Cochrane and Mr. King and other members of the department, because I feel that they have always shown their sincerity in this work. But when I look at the last two years of this Minister's service in the department, I question very much whether he has taken the courage to face up to the problems which do confront him, and this I think is brought forcibly to our attention by the farce which has recently ended called the Canadian Brown Steel Tank Company Limited, and I call it a farce because one could see from the beginning what the end would be.

I have before me a document which has been in the hands of all people concerned for some lengthy period of time. It is dated December 18, 1962. It is signed by W. J. Lindal Industrial Inquiry Commission, dealing with the complaint that was made about Canadian Brown Steel Tank, and on Page 20 of the report he points out that the alleged violations, if established, took place between November 17th and December 16th, 1961. The Industrial Inquiry Commission was appointed May 18, 1962 - six months and one day after the first alleged violation took place, and the Commissioner makes it clear that proceedings under Sections 42 and 43 of the Act must be instituted within six months after the alleged violation, so that one day after it would be possible to commence a proceeding under the Act the Commission was appointed - one day after something could have been done.

The Commission dealt with the problem at length, made its report on December 18, 1962, and made certain recommendations. One was that there be an investigation by the Attorney-General as to whether or not there had been a continuing violation - that's a very important phrase - continuing violation, because it was apparent from the face of it that if there was not a continuing violation then obviously there couldn't be any success in launching a prosecution some year and more after it was possible to launch it. Was it last year that this House spent so much time on the question of limitations of action? Is it only this last week when the Law Amendments Committee was considering an Act brought by the Honourable the Attorney-General which contains a clause which reads: "This section shall be conclusively deemed to have always been the law." We have discussed, both here and in Law Amendments, the fact that one must look back and say, "Now, is there some way we can correct the situation where an injustice has occurred?" But here a Commissioner appointed by this government, making report in December 1962, pointed out a really serious defect in the mechanics of the Labour Relations Act, and as far as I am aware, in April and almost in May of 1965, this defect still exists.

I called it a farce because we now have an Order for a Return No. 32 where a question was asked why the Brown Steel Tank case was not referred to the Labour Board for settlement, and if it was not done because the Board lacks the necessary power, then what powers would have to be delegated to the Board to make recourse to courts unnecessary? The answer is that the Department of Labour referred to the Attorney-General the report of the Industrial Inquiry Commission which I have just cited, and goes on to state: "Where it is deemed advisable to take some action because of an alleged violation, a proper course of action is to institute prosecutions. This is contemplated by Section 47 of the Act. The matter was accordingly referred to the Attorney-General for action and prosecution conducted."

Now it should not take very much experience in Labour Relations matters to know that when one deals with an unfair labour practice it is an accusation made against Management for having unfairly dealt with the position of labour at a time when labour is attempting to organize and is attempting to make ready an application for certification. The danger signals to the employer are out. Everybody in the plant knows what's cooking. Everybody knows what is in prospect, and the employer, wishing very much to prevent any attempt for labour to organize, because he would much rather deal with individual employees rather than a group of employees, then starts to sit back and think, now how am I going to prevent this from happening? Obviously I don't mean all employers, but obviously by the same token I do mean all employers who carry on unfair labour practices, so let us now realize that I'm speaking of, let us hope, a minority of employers, and I'm speaking now about those who are or will conduct unfair labour practices, so let us not confuse what I say with any accusation against the mass of employers. I don't believe that what I am about to say applies to a very large number

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd). of employers, but I'm dealing now with a section of the Labour Relations Act which contemplates an unfair labour practice, and I draw to the attention of this committee that when an employer decides to embark on an unfair labour practice, he obviously looks for a means of conducting this unfair practice in such a way that it won't be apparent, because if it were apparent he would lay himself open to prosecution providing it didn't take six months to decide to prosecute. Well what he then does is to look for some way, and he ends up with some sort of a penalty which usually involves a discharge. Now at this stage only the employer or persons in management position know the reason for discharge. They are the only ones who actually know why it is that a discharge is about to take place, and they then proceed to carry out their action using a reason which need not necessarily be the correct reason, the real reason, and obviously if the real reason is to break any attempt to organize then they are the only ones who know the real reason.

Then the Act contemplates that a complaint will be made that there was an unfair labour practice, and it says no, no, you can't go to the courts immediately to have this assessed; you can only do it with the consent of the Labour Relations Board or the Minister or after an investigation by the Minister, but you cannot take your chances going to court on your own. We must know that we have to go through the Criminal Code if we want to do that. But supposing we go along with the Labour Relations Act and we do get Ministerial consent, or indeed the Minister decides to instruct the Attorney-General to proceed, then we know that they are proceeding in a criminal court where proof must be beyond any shadow of a doubt. Now we are required to prove something which is within the knowledge of the accused, and whereas we have onus provisions in the Highway Traffic Act and in other Acts, in the Liquor Control Act, we do not have an onus provision here where it really ought to be, because since only management knows why a firing takes place, then only management could be in a position to disprove an allegation of unfair labour practices, and it seems to me that if it could be set out that after a superficial case is made out to show that there is a suspicion that there is an unfair labour practice -- and let us remember that the Attorney-General would surely not proceed, nor would he receive instructions from the Minister of Labour to proceed to prosecute unless he was pretty sure that there was an unfair labour practice - well, once he is pretty sure and establishes to a court that he has justification, then I submit the onus to prove that it was not an unfair labour practice should shift, should pass over to the employer, because he would then be in a position to prove really that there was some other legitimate proper reason.

So when I raise this point, I don't - it's nothing I've thought up; it's nothing that's original. The Province of Quebec - it's not a famous province in terms of progressive labour relations - the Province of Quebec has had a provision of onus on the part of the employer for quite some time. The Province of Saskatchewan which has had a good record of progressive attitudes to labour has had onus provision for a long time. The Province of Ontario has power and strength in the Labour Relations Board, and indeed in the Department of Labour, which is meant to deal with this problem, and I would suggest that it is high time that this Minister, who has had this job now for two years - or is it three years - two years; has had it long enough to be able to assert himself and say "Now, these are faults; these are deficiencies in the Act. Let's get cracking and let's correct them." And I urge him, in the light of what he now knows and has learned, and in the light of the experience of Canadian Brown Steel Tank, that he do something about the onus provisions and about the six-months delay, because when one reads the judgments in this case, one I think cannot be too harsh, cannot criticize harshly the judge's opinions, because the judge said, "All I'm allowed to deal with was the question, should Mr. X" - Mr. Anderson, I think it was - "should he have been re-hired at a certain date." He was not allowed to deal with the question as to why was Mr. X or Mr. Anderson fired. That was not before him at all. He was not allowed to do it because the Attorney-General's Department, or the Prosecutor - this was a prosecutor engaged for that purpose - because he said to the judge, "I am only dealing with, I am only alleging an unfair labour practice on the basis that when they were re-hiring, they should have re-hired Anderson," and for all we know this man had another job, or didn't want to apply for this job any more.

Now the reason he said it is not that he didn't know what he was doing. The reason he said it is that he was bound by a six-month limitation, and therefore the real heart of the question was not dealt with. It was not dealt with because of the deficiency in The Labour Relations Act, and I say that the Minister should have by now, and if not by now should immediately proceed to make the corrections which are necessary to create an aura or create

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)..... a law, rather, that will provide justice in the circumstances and which would be simply in line with this report of the Industrial Inquiry Commission which was submitted to the Honourable the Minister of Labour on the 18th day of December, 1962, almost 2-1/2 years ago - three sessions ago, as was pointed out by my Leader.

Now, Mr. Chairman, actually this kind of a matter does not lie in a police court. This kind of a matter lies in the atmosphere of an attempt to bring about good relations between management and labour. This belongs in that forum which has been provided by The Labour Relations Act and that is the Labour Relations Board, where you have people of both sides who understand the problem and who are well motivated, not necessarily to punish, not necessarily to call names, but properly to assess a problem and attempt to bring a solution. That is where this problem lies; that is where the forum should be for a readjustment, for let us remember that when a breach takes place it must be remedied in that type of atmosphere which will lead to future good relations, because negotiations continue between management and labour all the time and every attempt should be made to keep a matter like this out of an open fight but rather in a conciliatory atmosphere, and I would like to at this moment pay tribute to our Labour Relations Board here, which does work in that atmosphere, which does attempt always to bring about a conciliatory approach between the parties.

I would urge this Minister and this government to seriously consider the proposal which has been made, and that is to turn this matter over to the jurisdiction of the Labour Relations Board. Let the Labour Relations Board consider whether or not there has been an unfair labour practice. Let the Labour Relations Board have the power, not only just to authorize a prosecution in the Police Court but indeed to issue an order, to issue an order to employer: "You shall cease and desist from this type of action," and shall have the power to say to the employer, "You shall re-engage this person, re-instate him. You shall pay him his lost earnings during the period of time that we have been considering this matter," and in that way, with management and labour in the same room, hearing the decision, to make sure that the next time around when these two meet in another room they will have a feeling of co-operation and working together.

I urge the Honourable Minister to deal with this question during his estimates, justify his salary for last year and for the future by showing that he proposes to deal with this in this line. Let us remember that under the Labour Relations Act, under Section 19, today, after an agreement has been signed, there shall be, there shall be a machinery available to make it possible for management and labour to solve problems which arise during the term of any contract. Let us therefore bring the purpose, the purport of Section 19, into that period of time between the date of commencement of organization and the date of signing of the agreement. Then the individual employee will be protected just as it is planned to protect him after the agreement is signed. And let me suggest to the Minister that once an agreement is signed, once certification has been granted, then there is already protection to an employee because he is a member of an organized group, but before certification is obtained he stands alone. He and all the others are merely individuals, and the power of one single employee in a plant is a very meagre power and one which is constantly under the threat of dismissal, and dismissal to an employee is akin to capital punishment in any field of criminal law, because if you take away his job you take away his livelihood and his ability to support his family. So that I urge strongly that consideration be given to giving the protection contemplated under Section 19, to give that prior to the first agreement.

Now let me just touch on a few other points. One is the application for certification. Now the application for certification is made at a time when the bargaining unit feels that it is now representative of the majority of employees, and as such it wishes to have recognition that it has a right to bargain on behalf of these employees. Who is involved in deciding whether or not a certain bargaining agent has the right to speak? The employees are the ones concerned. They are the ones who pay the dues; they pay the shot; they are entitled to make sure that their representation is brought about in a democratic manner and so as to represent the group.

Now, the employees should have every right to be heard, should have every right to be represented. What is the interest of the employer at this stage, at the application for certification? The interest of a good employer is to make sure that his employees have the right to speak before the Board, the Labour Board. The motivation of an adverse employer is to smash all attempts to organize a bargaining unit, and when he is motivated in that way, I submit, Mr. Chairman, he has no right to be heard, he has no right to be represented. If his

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd). desire, if his motivation is to smash an attempt of any organization, then I think he has automatically lost the right to be heard by the Labour Board and I think that his rights should be very carefully curtailed under those circumstances and the Board should have the power to do so.

I believe the same applies to de-certification. If a bargaining agent has lost the support of the membership of the union and of the employees of a plant, then the employees should have every right in the world to apply for de-certification. I don't understand how it is justified that management should have the right to apply for de-certification because management does not have a right to speak on behalf of the employees. I think the same applies to the strike vote and I won't dwell on it because we have in our dealing with the question of the strike vote. The employees have the right to make sure that their decision is one made after they have had a right to express themselves. I do not believe that management has any right whatsoever to debate, discuss whether or not there should be a strike vote or how the vote shall be conducted. I think it is an affront to the employees and their bargaining unit to have management discuss what the method should be of conducting a strike vote and indeed whether or not there shall be a strike vote.

I want to step now to the question that I know the Minister is aware of and which I know he has not solved or even approached a solution, and that is the problem of runaway shops. In the United States there has been legislation, and effective legislation, controlling the employer who decides to move from City A and go to City B in the hopes that he will leave the union behind him and start afresh in an unorganized territory. In United States they have taken care of the problem; I don't think the problem has been taken care of here in Manitoba. The question has arisen, and the Minister is aware of it, that it is possible for an employer, for the shareholders or directors of an employer limited company, to incorporate a new company, a fresh company, and gradually switch the work from Company A which is organized, to new Company B which is unorganized, and in that way defeat the strength of a union. This is the type of problem that is going to occur more and more and I suggest it is made even more difficult because of the efforts made by another department of this government which wants to build up the outlying areas of Manitoba by encouraging industry to move out there. If the motivation for industry is to move to small towns because they can get cheap labour, that is bad motivation and should not be encouraged by the government. If the motivation is to create life in small towns, if the motivation is to build up the small towns, the economic development, that's good, but the motivation is important, and the ability to move and desert a union in order to get cheap labour should be questioned carefully and if that is the real motivation it should be stamped down on hard; and I hope the government will assure us that it is conducting its operations with that in mind.

The final point I'd like to make, Mr. Chairman, is that I would like clarification from the Honourable Minister as to why it is that The Employment Standards Act seems to apply to some parts of the province and not to others. I can well understand that -- I don't agree, but I can understand why there is an idea that there should be a differential in minimum wage -- we've heard that. But why should employment standards, proper standards, good working conditions, recognition of the rights to vacation pay, to holiday pay, to overtime pay, why should they be separated as between different areas, geographic areas of this province. It seems to me the people who live in -- I don't know; I won't name the places lest I give the wrong example; but people in this province should have the same rights or the same protection of The Employment Standards Act wherever they live. I think it's time for me to.

MR. ROBLIN: If my honourable friend would permit, perhaps he could continue his contribution when we next resume the Committee. I move the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Speaker, the Committee has adopted certain resolutions and requests leave to sit again.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina that the report of the Committee be received.

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

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

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