

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. D. Watt	Reston, Manitoba
ASSINIBOIA	Steve Patrick	189 Harris Blvd., Winnipeg 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Hon. Robert G. Smellie, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	E. R. Schreyer	2 - 1177 Henderson Hwy., Winnipeg 16
BURROWS	Mark G. Smerchanski	102 Handsart Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARILLON	Leonard A. Barkman	Steinbach, Man.
CHURCHILL	Gordon W. Beard	Thompson, Man.
CYPRESS	Hon. Thelma Forbes	Rathwell, Man.
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	William Homer Hamilton	Sperling, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Kimberly St., Winnipeg 15
EMERSON	John P. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT-PLAINS	M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q. C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	Emil Moeller	Teulon, Man.
FLIN FLON	Hon. Charles H. Witney	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	Nelson Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	Morris A. Gray	406 - 365 Hargrave St., Winnipeg 2
KILDONAN	James T. Mills	142 Larchdale Crescent, Winnipeg 15
LAC DU BONNET	Oscar F. Bjornson	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
LA VERENDRYE	Albert Vielfaure	La Broquerie, Man.
LOGAN	Lemuel Harris	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEDOSA	Hon. Walter Weir	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MORRIS	Harry P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Hon. Obie Baizley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
PEMBINA	Mrs. Carolyne Morrison	Manitou, Man.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	Gordon E. Johnston	7 Massey Drive, Portage la Prairie
RADISSON	Russell Paulley	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
RHINELAND	J. M. Froese	Winkler, Man.
RIVER HEIGHTS	Hon. Maitland B. Steinkopf, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROBLIN	Keith Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	Hon. Abram W. Harrison	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	Hon. George Hutton	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	J. E. Jeannotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent Desjardins	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
ST. GEORGE	Elman Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guildford St., St. James, Winnipeg 12
ST. JOHN'S	Saul Cherniack, Q. C.	333 St. John's Ave., Winnipeg 4
ST. MATTHEWS	W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Fred Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	Room 250, Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q. C.	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	Arthur E. Wright	168 Burrin Ave., Winnipeg 17
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	Fred T. Klym	Beausejour, Man.
SWAN RIVER	James H. Bilton	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	P. J. McDonald	Killarney, Man.
VIRDEN	Donald Morris McGregor	Kenton, Man.
WELLINGTON	Richard Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	James Cowan, Q. C.	412 Paris Bldg., Winnipeg 2
WOLSELEY	Hon. Duff Roblin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, February 14th, 1964.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

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

The Honourable the Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL CHERNIAK, Q. C. (St. John's) introduced Bill No. 4, An Act to amend The Change of Name Act.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Secretary, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions standing in my name.

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

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, His Honour The Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions recommends them to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 1. Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure respecting the provision of planning services to municipalities and agencies of the government and the preparation of planning schemes for regulating the use and development of lands and buildings and providing, among other matters, for the payment of the costs of administering the Act, including fees, salaries, and expenses for staff, experts, and boards, from and out of the Consolidated Fund.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, this really introduces very little that is new. It is really a consolidation of The Planning Services Act and The Town Planning Act in one statute, with a few very minor amendments of an administrative nature.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, there'll be no compulsion here on any municipalities. This is simply a service that will be available to them as in the past for those who want to have these services. Is this correct?

MR. SMELLIE: There is no change in the policy regarding the service available to municipalities. They will be available to them on the same basis as in the past and is completely voluntary.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I presume the Minister means at the same price as in the past.

MR. SMELLIE: The price per planning service is 30¢ per capita for a year.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Chairman, last Tuesday the Minister took us on a tour of the housing at Burrows and Keewatin. It was a very enjoyable tour but when we got out there we found out quite a few mistakes had been made in the planning of these buildings. They had no storm doors on the buildings; they had tile in the living rooms and hardwood floors in the bedrooms -- just the opposite to what should have been. They were not supplied with stoves and fridges and people moving into these units had the old style stoves and they will not fit into the receptacles provided for them.

Another thing is that we found out that the rental on these housing projects is just on income alone, not on income and the size of your family. I know that the Minister's attention was brought to some of these points and I hope that -- I know that this is the first project of this kind that the government has taken part in and I hope that in future that they will insist from the CMHC that these mistakes are not made again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution be adopted? -- Passed.

Resolution No. 2. Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Winter Employment Act by providing, among other matters, for the payment from and out of the Consolidated Fund towards the costs of carrying out certain projects approved under the

(Mr. Chairman cont'd) Act and for the guaranteeing by the government of the payment of principal and interest of debts incurred by municipalities in carrying out certain projects approved under the Act.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, this bill is really an amendment of The Winter Employment Act to eliminate the present agreements that are completed between municipalities and the province. The agreements under the present Act cannot be completed until the work has all been done and the municipality is making application for payment by the province of the province's contribution towards the project.

Just about six weeks ago I signed the last of the agreements for the work which was done in the 1962-63 winter employment period. In other words, the agreements are signed long after the fact and they are only signed a matter of days before the cheque is sent to the municipality. The agreement really serves no useful purpose and to all intents and purposes the agreement is completed when the project is proposed and is approved in principle by the province. This amendment will eliminate the need for this useless agreement.

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

Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have adopted certain resolutions, directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that the Report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SMELLIE introduced Bill No. 19, An Act to amend The Winter Employment Act.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, there seems to be something wrong with the motion that's placed before me. I wonder if I could speak to the Clerk for a moment.

MR. SMELLIE introduced a Bill -- (Number not known)-- The Planning Act.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery on my right where there are seated some 52 Grade IX and XI students from St. Pierre Collegiate under the guidance of their teacher, Sister Antoine. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Carillon.

Nous vous souhaitons la bienvenue ici cette après-midi. Nous espérons que tout ce que vous avez vu et entendu à l'assemblée législative vous sera utile dans vos études. Puisse cette visite vous inspirer et stimuler votre intérêt dans les affaires de la province. Revenez encore nous visiter.

Translation: We welcome you here this afternoon. We hope that all that you see and hear in this Legislative Assembly will be of help to you in your studies. May this visit be an inspiration to you and stimulate your interest in provincial affairs. Come back and visit us again.

Orders of the Day.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, if my honourable friends will permit me, before the Orders of the Day I would like to make a couple of statements. First, to advise the House that having taken notice of the press report of last night respecting a statement attributed to Mr. Gordon McGregor of the Trans Canada Airlines Limited that his company has received no directive from the Federal Government to refrain from phasing out his Winnipeg overhaul base before 1973, I have sent a telegram to the Prime Minister asking for immediate remedial action

I should also like to say that other things being equal and if the government is sustained on the Throne Speech debate which has yet to conclude, and if that debate concludes as it should, according to the rules of our House, then I propose to introduce the resolution to go into Committee of Ways and Means on Wednesday next. Members will recognize that the Committee of Ways and Means is the budget debate and I hope to be able to deliver the budget on that occasion. As soon as the resolution on Ways and Means has been dealt with, I have no doubt that it will be adjourned. I will then introduce the motion for the Committee of Supply in the usual way and we will proceed with the estimates. I thought that members opposite would wish to have some notice of this change from our usual procedure.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wish to thank the First Minister for his notice on the budget speech in particular. I had always expected that his financial troubles would come upon

(Mr. Molgat cont'd) him more suddenly than he was advising the people of Manitoba and I'm not too surprised that he is forced to bring in the budget at this early stage, but I thank him for the notice.

I also want to say in the matter of the wire that he sent to the Prime Minister that I concur in the action taken by the government of Manitoba. I had understood, as I believe all other members who had been to Ottawa, that we had a definite assurance in this regard that employment would be maintained at approximately the present level or possibly increased. I am extremely surprised at the statement emanating from Mr. McGregor and it appears to me to be a continuation of what we have had too much of in the past, and that is, TCA defying the people of Canada.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, may I be permitted, too, to make a brief comment on both statements. I realize that the government is departing from past practice in this House in giving us the budget ahead of estimates. I appreciate this very much. I think this is a practical way of handling the situation. Not only will we know how much money the government requires, but how much the taxpayer is going to have to pay at one and the same time and this may guide us somewhat in our consideration of the estimates.

Also in reference to TCA, Madam Speaker, I too join in supporting the telegram sent by the First Minister of Manitoba to the Prime Minister of Canada. I also was along with the delegation that appeared before the Honourable Mr. Pearson respecting TCA in Winnipeg. I only make this comment now for the purpose of the record so that you have the leaders of the three parties in this House, apparently for once, again on this question of TCA, being in unanimous agreement on an action. I will however, Madam Speaker, I expect later in the day, be making a statement of considerable longer length regarding TCA because it is my intention to speak to the resolution now on the Order Paper.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone -- (interjection) -- oh I'm sorry.

MR. MORRIS GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, may I ask the indulgence and the kindness of this House to permit me to make a very brief statement on the Brotherhood Week.

MADAM SPEAKER: Proceed.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I have made it a practice for many years to speak to this House briefly, at this time, on the occasion of Brotherhood Week. Whenever I did so in the past, I was struck by the paradox of speaking of brotherhood in a world of strife and turmoil. Cyprus, Viet-Nam, Panama, Cuba and the near east are trouble spots in this world today where people seem to think very little of human brotherhood.

In our own country, various basic issues seem to threaten the very foundations of Confederation. Should we therefore give up what appears to be a rather hopeless struggle and take the cynical view that life on this earth is based on self-interest; that right is on the side of those who can produce the better rockets? I think Brotherhood Week should remind us that the answer to this question is "no". Perhaps the very destructiveness of modern weapons will bring us back to a realization that with all the progress of destructive power we can only continue to exist if we try to live together as brethren.

Thus I think it is so important to harp again and again on the theme of human brotherhood. If we don't want to agree to it because it is a lofty moral principle, maybe we will eventually have to agree to it as a postulate of self-preservation.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, if I may have permission to do so, I should just like to say that the House has come to expect my honourable friend to make a statement each year on this very important subject on this occasion, and we again appreciate his motives in bringing this matter to our attention. I think that as we face our problems in this House and in this province and in this nation, we realize that this whole question is not some abstract matter for somebody in a foreign land to take under advisement when it suits them, but it is a matter which concerns each one of us here individually as representatives and as citizens in this province, and it presents to us problems which try human nature to its depths. So I think on this occasion we appreciate even more than ever the sentiments expressed by my honourable friend.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, may I lay on the table of the House the Fifth Annual Report of the Municipal Board for the calendar year 1963.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I beg leave to table the following reports: the Annual Report of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation for the year ending March 31st, 1963 -- I notice that the Annual Report of The Water Power Act for the year ended December 31st, 1963 is included in the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture and Conservation; a "nil" report for the year ended December 31st, 1963 of The Watershed Conservation Districts Act; and "nil" report for the year ended December 31st, 1963 for The Water Rights Act. The orders and regulations are published in the Manitoba Gazette.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I beg leave to table the 24th Annual Report of the Manitoba Civil Service Superannuation Fund for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1963.

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. I'm sorry that I didn't have time to see him before and he can take it as notice if he likes, but I would like to know if all the canteens that are housed in the provincial government buildings, if they are using meat and meat products that come from a government inspected plant?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, I will be happy to take the question as notice.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone, that this House do now adjourn for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance; namely, the urgency of ending the prolonged truancy of 21 St. Vital school children.

MADAM SPEAKER: I consider this matter as not being one of urgent public importance. It involves only 21 school children and this subject matter has been under consideration for, I believe, approximately three months. Furthermore, I believe that this could be brought before this House by means of a substantive motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would only like to quote from the words of the First Minister yesterday when he gave us the definition of urgency as: "a definite matter of urgent public importance for the discussion of which an adjournment of the House may be moved. It must be so pressing that the public's interest will suffer if it is not given immediate attention." I can only rest my case on this, Madam Speaker.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I'm reluctant to interfere in this matter because you have given your ruling and that is that, but I appreciate nevertheless the sentiments that move my honourable friend who wants to have this matter discussed, and if the ruling stands, I see no reason why my honourable friend could not -- oh he's spoken on the Throne Speech amendment, has he? I was thinking that if he had not spoken on the Throne Speech amendment that he could make his speech today and we could have a discussion because I, for one, am anxious that he should have a chance to make his statement and that we could deal with it. But I see that my helpful suggestion here is not going to work out quite as neatly as that. So it does pose a bit of a dilemma.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I think everybody will be happy. I came prepared. I have a question that I would like to ask the Honourable Minister of Education before the Orders of the Day. In view of the fact that the government is now aware that an atmosphere of co-operation exists between the children in the private schools of Winnipeg and the Winnipeg School Board that allow these children to take some courses in Winnipeg public schools without cost

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member should make his question.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well I'm coming to that. The question is in view of this fact, the question might not . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like you to make a direct question, please.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well I'm asking -- all right. Would the Honourable Minister of Health consider meeting with the St. Vital School Board in order to suggest to them that they allow these 21 students to ride the bus as far as the public school until the whole sorry mess is settled, in view of the fact that this atmosphere of co-operation exists between the St. Vital

(Mr. Desjardins cont'd) School Board and children attending private schools in the district who were allowed to ride the bus at no cost for a number of years; and also in view of the fact that the government has announced that it plans to initiate a program of shared services; and especially in view of the fact that the 21 truant students of St. Vital are the real losers in this battle.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, may I have the privilege of answering this question because it concerns a matter of most important government policy and is very similar to the question my honourable friend addressed to me the other day on the same subject. I should observe of course, although I am not going to invoke this rule myself, but it is obvious that the question is really out of order because one is not permitted by Section 171, sub paragraph (cc) to expect the Ministers of the Crown to answer with respect to what advice they are going to tender on particular matters under question. They cannot be asked to make statements on that account, so I just bring that to my honourable friend's notice so that he may consider it when future questions arise. However, in spite of the fact that I am not under any obligation in that sense to deal with his question, I think I should make a comment or two about it.

Before I do, may I say that I sincerely appreciate my honourable friend's desire to debate this subject and we on our side are anxious to give some of the information that we would like to place before the public, so I hope that when the Throne Speech debate amendment is disposed of, on which my honourable friend has already spoken, that he may take the opportunity of raising the matter on the main motion, which he will probably have a chance to do on Monday, and then we can discuss this matter further because if he has any views or suggestions as to how he thinks the matter should be approached, I am sure we would be glad to have them. There is no desire on our part to avoid a discussion in this Chamber of the issue in question, so I offer that suggestion to him.

With respect to the high matter of policy that he raises, I think I must point out to him that the government has announced its intention to commit this matter which involved the whole principle of shared services to a committee of the House and I think it would be irregular and improper for us to attempt to pre-judge what the committee will do or to circumscribe their freedom in dealing with this matter. We hope it will be a non-partisan committee, or let me say a committee on which all political parties will be represented and, as such, it is extremely difficult to deal with the matter in any other way. However, I wish it were possible to find some short-cuts in this matter because the intention of the government with respect to the whole question is now before the public, but it seems to me that we have to follow the procedures that respect the rights of committees and respect the intention of the government to place this matter before the committee to decide. Now that's a long-winded answer and I apologize for it, but I think my honourable friend would like to know how we feel about it.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I take this as being the answer to the question that I asked the Premier a few days ago to allow a motion to stand. Is that the answer to this question also?

MR. ROBLIN: I think that my honourable friend asked in the question about the same general topic that he asks about now.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, Madam Speaker, I am sorry, this is brand new. I think that it would have helped this matter, but it was for all the people of Manitoba, I felt. I was asking permission -- I knew that this was out of order -- I was just asking the Premier if he would allow the placing of a certain resolution to debate that now and I gave my reason, so this is my answer, isn't it?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, the First Minister of this House has no right to make any statements about what he will allow with respect to motions that come before the Assembly. Any honourable member has the right to bring up any motion he likes. It is then up to the Speaker, assisted by the House if it comes to a question of a vote, to decide whether the matter is in order. So I would say to my honourable friend that if that question doesn't arise we have no right to attempt to prevent him from bringing in any motion that he likes, subject of course to the rules as they are generally understood.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, the question of today directed to the Minister of Education and answered by the Honourable Leader of this House was something which I felt should be done immediately, but apparently this can be delayed so I won't pursue the matter

(Mr. Desjardins cont'd) any more, but I would like to ask another question. This time the question is directed to the Honourable Member from St. Vital. In view of the fact that on April 24, 1962, the Honourable member, while delivering a speech on denturists in this very House, suggested that the denturists should go on breaking the law and fully endorsed their attitude. . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: I believe that the honourable member is making a statement. I would like him to make a direct question to the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well my question is bearing on that, Madam Speaker, I just can't -- (interjection) -- you mean I have to talk a little faster? Maybe I can try again.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. I want you to make a direct question please, not a statement.

MR. DESJARDINS: Pretty soon I won't be able to stand up unless I jump up, and in view of the fact that he has refused to assist these people and for the past three months has ignored correspondence and phone calls received from these people, does he (1) Believe that his remark concerning the parents of 21 St. Vital truant students, comparing them to Doukhobors was in order coming from him, and if not, does he not feel that he owes these people an apology?

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): Madam Speaker, I think it was two years ago I attempted to ask the Honourable Leader of the NDP a question. At that time it was Mr. Stinson and I was ruled out of order: I would presume that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface today is also out of order, but I can assure him that either in the Throne Speech or at some future debate in this House, I will deal with these matters that he is raising.

MR. DESJARDINS: The second part of his answer -- I think there is enough of one speaker without having an extra one again from St. Vital to tell me when I am out of order.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. GRAY: May I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture? We have read in the press of the contemplated increase of milk to the consumer in Greater Winnipeg. I was just wondering whether the statement is correct and what he is doing regarding stopping any further increase to the high cost of living that we have now.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, fortunately for the welfare of all the people in Manitoba, I don't have very much to do with the price of milk that they are going to pay. There is a machinery established - The Milk Control Board will hold hearings at which the pros and cons, the needs and otherwise, or the validity of the case of the producers will be thoroughly examined; and only after these public hearings are held will the decision be made, and I cannot in any way anticipate what that decision will be.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to address a question, but I am not quite sure which Minister should answer because there are a number of departments involved I believe so I will make it the First Minister. It's with regard to the situation at Churchill. Will there be a statement made to the House and will we be brought up to date on the negotiations with the Federal Government and the outcome of that arrangement for the townsite and also for the new base?

MR. ROBLIN: I think that's a very reasonable question, Madam Speaker, and I want to assure my honourable friend that we will be glad to give him all the information we have on this matter. In short form, the Federal Government has made a proposition to us with respect to the future of that base, but it is not one that is anything like the kind of thing we have been asking for before, and it means that we have now to make some further investigations of the facts behind the proposal they have made before we are able to decide whether we can accept it in the interests of Churchill.

The present situation, therefore, is that we have received this suggestion and it is now being looked at to see if we can accommodate ourselves to it. In the meanwhile, the Federal Government has undertaken to continue its services at Churchill and its plant for the benefit of all citizens there until such time as we can come to grips with the problem itself. That's the general picture. I am sure that in the discussion of the Estimates of the Department of Municipal Affairs, if members want particular questions on specific points, the Minister will do his best to answer those questions.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the

(Madam Speaker cont'd) Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, with the kind permission of the House, I wish to withdraw this resolution as I have already received most of the information required, and if anything else is needed, I will probably suggest again to the House.

MADAM SPEAKER: An Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: I beg to leave to move, Madam Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member from Logan, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: The number of tuberculosis cases in Manitoba in 1963, known to the Department of Public Health: (a) in hospitals, (b) in other institutions, (c) at home under observation, (d) and the total cost to the Department of Public Health.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return. The Honourable the Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) The total amount paid by the Government, its agencies, boards, commissions, etc., for legal counsel (outside of the Civil Service or those employed by governmental agencies, boards, commission, etc. on a full time basis) in the calendar year 1963. (2) The total amount paid by persons dealing with Government agencies, boards, commissions, etc. to solicitors appointed by the Government or such agencies, boards, commissions, etc., for work done as solicitors for such boards, but for which payment is made by private parties. (3) The amounts, in 1 and 2 above, if any, so paid showing: (a) the amounts paid to each individual or firm (1) as fees (2) as disbursements; and (b) The purpose for which such legal counsel was retained.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: An Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. John.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) The names and addresses of Insurance Agents to whom premiums are paid for insurance coverage on Government property or protection by Government Departments, Boards, Commissions, Utilities, etc., and the manner of selection of same (i. e. by tender, quotation, recommendation, application or otherwise) and how applications for such selections are invited.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: My honourable friend would assist us greatly in preparing the answer if he would tell us for what period of time he is interested. I presume he wants it for the last calendar year. Would that be satisfactory?

MR. CHERNIACK: I would be happy for any recent twelve-month period.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, and do you want the amounts as well as the names and addresses, because we would be glad to provide it.

MR. CHERNIACK: I thank the Honourable First Minister. That was certainly something I thought I had included.

MR. ROBLIN: I had a shrewd hunch my honourable friend might want that.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you.

MR. ROBLIN: We'll be glad to give it. We'll accept the order subject to those amendments, Madam Speaker.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: An Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I'm looking for the same co-operation in moving, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) The following particulars relating to properties leased by the Government and its Boards and Commissions: (a) Name and Location. (b) Nature of use. (c) Term of tenure. (d) Rental payable and escalator clauses if any. (e) Any other costs payable by the lessee under the lease. (f) The cost of capital improvement paid for by the Government. (g) The names of owners at the time of leasing. (h) The names of present owners. (i) Any options to renew or purchase under lease agreements.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, could I ask my honourable friend if he would like to name a period -- probably 1963 would do?

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, this was couched in the present tense and it's what is currently.

MR. ROBLIN: As of today's date?

MR. CHERNIACK: That would be fine.

MR. ROBLIN: The only other thing is that there may be some information about names of owners which is not at our disposal. If it is at our disposal and we know it, we'll tell my honourable friend.

MR. CHERNAICK: Well, Madam Speaker, I appreciate the offer from the Honourable First Minister. Last year the same questions were not replied to and if it was because it took so long to get the answers, I would be happy to have abbreviated answers if necessary in order to get the information.

MR. ROBLIN: I think my honourable friend has done us the courtesy to ask it in good time this year.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: An Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) The number of Medicare cards in effect each month in 1963 where Medicare was the sole Social Allowance benefit. (2) The number of Medicare cards in effect each month in 1963. (3) The monthly payments made by the province in 1962 to Manitoba Medical Services for Medicare cards. (4) The payments made by the province in 1963 for other health costs for Medicare card holders: (a) dental, (b) drugs, and (c) optical.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, if I might ask my honourable friend whether he varies the wording from the wording in the printed notice. I thought I heard him say for No. 3 "The monthly payments made by the province" -- which differs from the text.

MADAM SPEAKER: It doesn't differ on here.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): If I might suggest that this matter be rephrased to include, instead of the number of card holders, the number of persons under Medicare. Apparently this is the way in which the records are kept. In some cases the card represents a single individual; in other cases it may be a couple; and in some cases it includes family members in addition. So if that could be rephrased that way it would save a great deal of work.

With respect to the total payments, if that could be with respect to the calendar year of 1963 we'll do our best to get that information, bearing in mind that there is some overlapping at the end of the year and some payments with respect to the 1963 may be paid in January or February 1964. But we'll try to do it as best we can with respect to the year 1963.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, in order that we may be completely clear here, would you read it so we may check it against the printed sheet here? There's some difference of opinion as to what my honourable friend actually said and want to be sure we have it right -- (interjection) -- My colleague tells me it's in order.

MADAM SPEAKER: Thank you.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: An Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (a) The number of highway construction tenders that were successfully bid and then recalled during the course of the year 1963. (b) The name or names of the construction firms that were successful in obtaining recall of tender. (c) The number of requests for tender recall that were denied by the Minister. (d) The amount of penalty assessed on the contractor(s) whose request for recall

(Mr. Schreyer cont'd) were successful. (e) The ratio of penalty assessment to contract amount.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: An Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I would like the leave of the House to make some change in the text of the Order.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is leave granted? -- Agreed.

MR. SCHREYER: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (1) Whether or not there are any initiation fees, dues or other payments made by the Province or any of its Boards, Utilities, etc., for or on behalf of any Minister, Deputy, Director, or other employee to any social or private club or institution or like organization. (2) If the answer to (1) is yes, then particulars there-of showing: -- and here's the departure -- the amount paid in the current fiscal year, or since April last.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for St. James, and the proposed amendment of the Honourable the Member for Wellington. The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my views and add to the resolution submitted by the Honourable Member for St. James and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Wellington.

I don't disagree with the amendment of the Honourable Member for Wellington, but I am not quite satisfied in the form that it is. I think that the intentions are good but it does not spell out, the resolution or the amendment, what the government is going to do to retain the TCA base here in Winnipeg. It doesn't spell out any action that the government is intending to take. So for this reason I would like to express some of my views and add to this debate.

I would like to agree with the Honourable Member for St. James when he mentioned that we should express our gratitude to the many people and organizations who have submitted briefs and went with the delegation to Ottawa with their submissions at their own expense. I do feel that they certainly should be congratulated. He also makes mention of the St. James Chamber of Commerce, the St. James Council, and Airlines Lodge, and I, too, would like to agree and congratulate those groups.

But I was somewhat surprised to hear the Honourable Member for St. James tell us the other day that he perfectly well knew since 1957 that the transfer of TCA was taking place and was continuing and is still continuing today. I would just like to quote what he had to say: "I felt most discouraged and so took the matter before the St. James Chamber of Commerce, the St. James Council, and together with the St. James Council prevented this matter from dying." Well I would just at this moment like to disagree with the Member from St. James because I don't think he went to the right place. All he had to do is just step one step down and let his colleagues know at the front benches and ask them to take some action -- which it seems that he did not do.

Now I would like to also mention that probably the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce should be complimented for the action he did take, even though he is some four years late in doing so. If the transfer was going all along since 1958, '59, '60 and '61, surely the government knew this, and I can't see why they haven't taken any action until they joined the other organizations in 1962 and showed some initiative.

Madam Speaker, I would like to point out -- I'm not going to go into all the details because I think the brief has spelled out most of it -- but I would certainly like to point out some of the reasons why I feel that the base should remain, and the government and this House should be greatly concerned and take some action to retain it here in Winnipeg.

As you know, there has been concerted effort made by many people and citizens of Manitoba to retain the overhaul and maintenance base here in Winnipeg. There has been three separate delegations to Ottawa and to the Prime Minister and his Cabinet to explain why the base should remain here. Historically, Winnipeg was the birthplace of the TCA. It was selected as the headquarters for the entire network and remained its headquarters until 1949.

(Mr. Patrick cont'd) This was the day since the first transfer of personnel took place. In January, 1961, it was reported that the TCA base might move or close up by 1966, and in 1962 TCA employees were informed that the base will be closed by 1966. There would be a severe impact upon the economy of our province and Metropolitan Winnipeg, particularly St. James and Assiniboia, if this base were removed. To illustrate, there are nearly 2,000 personnel employed here in the city in the TCA base and approximately 1,000 of them are engaged in a factory-type operation, which is equal in terms of employment to 40 average type manufacturing firms here in our province. Statistics show that 1,000 jobs comprising factory-type operations with the other TCA employment would contribute somewhere in the neighborhood of \$12 million in the payroll. A substantial investment has been made in the Institute of Technology and other educational facilities in our province. Removal of the base would terminate a major source of employment and will cause a migration from the province of skilled and trained personnel.

Another significant factor that does not seem to be receiving attention that it should is the question of civil defence. While we are not stampeded by acts of conduct of radical few like the F. L. Q. in Quebec, but I feel one bomb could destroy -- one radical bomb could destroy the whole operation of the TCA when it is located in one place.

There are other considerations too which require our attention, and one of these is the question of national emergency: flood, fire, disease outbreak. Any of these things could have a crippling effect on the operation of an airline which is located in one location. Canada's growth in air transportation age requires airport facilities at strategic locations throughout the country. We are going into jet age. Since TCA has gone into short jet aircraft in service I think arrangements should be made to have this serviced here in Winnipeg. The present facilities can be used economically as a nucleus for maintenance and overhaul base here in Winnipeg. Certainly for our expanding airlines new facilities are going to have to be built. These facilities cost money. The Province of Quebec has a sales tax which will directly affect any cost of further construction.

I've mentioned just a few reasons why TCA base should remain in Winnipeg, and I'm convinced that retention of the base would be a sound move and one that would contribute to national development and security. The only reason advanced for TCA to close Winnipeg operation seems to have been based on the estimated tax savings to TCA. However, facts underlying this alleged tax saving have never been made public.

I think it is our duty now, the time that we have, to give urgent consideration and plan positive programs to achieve what we all want here in Manitoba, the air centre in our province.

Madam Speaker, I would like to move an amendment, sub-amendment to the amendment. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Portage, that the amendment be amended by adding at the end thereof the following words: And whereas the Premier of Manitoba at the time of the December 17th, 1963 delegation to Ottawa stated the public of Manitoba and the Government of Canada had been misled by TCA in a way that was "reprehensible and I go so far as to say shameful"; and whereas the latest reports are that TCA claims to have received no Federal Government directive and is continuing the "phasing out" of its Winnipeg Overhaul Base; and whereas in the brief presented to the Government of Canada by the Manitoba delegation doubts were raised about the alleged savings presumably based on the Dixon-Speas Report; and whereas it is urgent that Manitoba continue pressing its case, and that the Government of Manitoba take all steps necessary for the retention of the TCA base in Winnipeg; Therefore be it further resolved that the Government of Manitoba should (1) continue its efforts to obtain immediate assurance from the Federal Government that it will make fully effective its pledge of continued employment at the Winnipeg Base by ensuring that TCA does not slowly reduce the working staff at Winnipeg; (2) Immediately accept the copy of the Dixon-Speas Report offered to it by the Federal Government some months ago for thorough analysis and study; (3) Formally repeat its request to the Federal Government for a "public enquiry into the action of TCA in respect to Winnipeg" and" of all other factors and individuals who have been concerned with this matter"; and (4) In the event that this is refused, then give consideration to the advisability of having a provincial enquiry with TCA officials attending as the Prime Minister of Canada indicated might be done; and (5) Give consideration to the advisability of establishing a commission or committee made up, if possible, of

(Mr. Patrick cont'd) representatives of the Government of Manitoba, the Government of Canada, the municipalities concerned, and other interested bodies to (a) develop ideas and plans for the continuation and expansion of Manitoba as an International Air Centre, (b) study and recommend ways of continuing and expanding the use of the skilled personnel and complex facilities of the TCA base in Winnipeg, (c) make use of the resources of the federal and provincial Industrial Development Departments in support of this objective, (d) receive submissions from all groups, economic interests and communities that have a stake in the continuing growth of the Winnipeg Air Centre, (e) conduct such enquiries and secure such professional studies as are necessary to achieve this objective.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question before you put the order? Is my honourable friend aware that I organized the three delegations to which he refers and which he approves so heartily, and is he aware that I wrote the brief from which he has quoted so extensively under the guise of his own remarks?

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I would suggest that before we have any debate on this subject that you either dispense with the reading or complete the reading. I suggest to my honourable friend that he do not interrupt.

MR. EVANS: I apologize if I interrupted the reading; I was under the impression that it had been completed.

MADAM SPEAKER: It has been completed. The reading has been completed.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, is the matter now before the House on the amendment?

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to take this amendment under consideration, if this is agreeable, and I will give my ruling on it at a later date.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, in taking that under your advisement and I think considering it is quite a lengthy epistle, would I be debarred from speaking on the previous question, the amendment? I ask your ruling in this regard. Maybe the former Premier, the Member for Lakeside, might give some guidance on this particular point.

MADAM SPEAKER: We have reached this amendment to the amendment and we must base our debate on this, unless by unanimous leave of the House you have consent to speak on the proposed amendment.

MR. PAULLEY: May I ask for that leave, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: Has the honourable member leave of the House to proceed?

MR. CAMPBELL: No.

MR. PAULLEY: I want to thank my honourable friends of the Liberal Party for debarring me from speaking at this time, Madam Speaker.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I suggest to you that it would be against the rules for him to speak on it even with unanimous consent.

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

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, whereas a committee of the Parliament of Canada has agreed to lower the voting age to 18 years; and whereas the percentage of young people in the age group 18 to 21 years is no greater for Manitoba than for the rest of Canada --(interjection)-- I'm sorry, Madam Speaker.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I believe you have called the wrong resolution.

MR. GROVES: Carry on Madam Speaker. I was going to ask if the other didn't.

MADAM SPEAKER: Excuse me, I'm one resolution over. The proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks. The Honourable the Member for St. Vital.

MR. GROVES: I was going to ask, Madam Speaker, if I could have this matter stand and I make the same magnanimous offer that I made yesterday. If anybody else would like to speak on this today, they're welcome to take my place in this debate.

MADAM SPEAKER: Does anyone wish to speak? Has the member leave to let it stand? Agreed. The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the

(Mr. Wright cont'd) Honourable Member for Elmwood, that whereas a committee of the Parliament of Canada has agreed to lower the voting age to 18 years; and whereas the percentage of young people in the age group of 18 to 21 years is no greater for Manitoba than for the rest of Canada, and whereas there has been a tremendous increase in the number of our elder citizens in the age group 65 and over, and whereas there is an appalling lack of interest in the exercise of the voting privilege, especially in matters of local concern, namely: referendums on school money by-laws; therefore be it resolved that this House consider the advisability of lowering the voting age to 18 years.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Speaker, this is not the first time a resolution on this subject has been presented for the consideration of the House. In the past, the case submitted for the resolution was that at 16 years a boy was allowed to drive a car, at 18 he could go and fight for his country abroad, or he could get married, and I was tempted to say, fight at home. I would like to suggest that in 1964 there are more reasons why the voting age should be lowered.

We hear much about the population explosion in general, but not enough about some interesting facts as a result of it. The tremendous increase is not only at the younger end of the age scale but also at the other end. Stewart Chase, the veteran economist, in his book "Live and Let Live" states that by the year 1970, just six years from now, there will be 20 million people in the world over age 65. But let's get closer to home -- in 1960 the Greater Winnipeg Investigation Commission in their report on page 60 have this to say: "The total population of the Metropolitan area increased from 318,004 in 1946 to 409,420 in 1956, in the ten years an increase of 28.7 percent." This is the essence of it, Madam Speaker. "This increase was primarily attributable to the very great increase in the number of children under 15 years of age, and older persons aged 65 years and more." It seems obvious that if there were 65 percent more people 65 years or more in '56 than there were in 1958 and this trend is continuing, then in order to maintain a proper balance the voting age of 21 must be reduced. Madam Speaker, we hear much about the balance of nature, and I am submitting that there should be a similar balance in our voting public.

Then there is this problem to consider -- is a person of 18 competent to vote? Or is a person of 80 years competent to vote? Who is qualified to say? Young people today are living in an entirely different world than those of 50 years ago. Then the tempo of life was much slower, competition not so severe. A university education was not so necessary. Our young people are being forced like plants in a greenhouse in order to get early maturity. They are carefully nurtured and reared under the watchful eye of a pediatrician, they go to a kindergarten, they attend better-equipped schools staffed with highly-trained teachers. With travel made easier and with television they are better informed. These earlier varieties, in my opinion, are showing more maturity than their ancestors did at the same age. Early marriages are also on the increase. Recognition is one reward that we humans crave from the cradle to the grave, but I think the time it is needed most is when young people are about to step out into life on their own. It's true that they sometimes seek recognition within certain groups, whether it be riding around on motorcycles wearing black jackets or letting their hair grow long, but most young people would rather settle for the feeling that they are needed and are getting encouragement. Madam Speaker, I would like to read a clipping from the Tribune dated January 11th of this year, and I would ask the House to bear with me, because I think it has a direct bearing on our young people today. In it there is some criticism of the press but that will have to be as it may. This letter was written by the Premier of the 42nd Older Boys Parliament and he is answering a letter of criticism, which will speak for itself. I quote: "A letter by Peter Familias has voiced criticism against the Boys Parliament. He criticised the proposals which were passed and I wish to answer his remarks. In the first place, it is plain that he did not attend our sessions; he only read reports about our deliberations; and if he did, it is little wonder that he should draw the conclusions he does. In the newspaper, coverage of the parliament was atrocious. Only the last session of the parliament was reported with any degree of accuracy. The very fact that Peter Familias should write a letter is reflective of the inaccuracy that the press conveyed.

"Firstly, the voting age was lowered by a vote of 63-30 and not retained at 21 as the

(Mr. Wright cont'd) papers reported. One of our dailies reported we had rejected bi-culturalism. Biculturalism was affirmed, not rejected. Newspaper reports said we passed resolutions requiring members of the Communist Party to register with the RCMP. This, however, was in fact defeated. I raise these points because they were incorrectly reported and because people like Peter Familias should not be so quick to judge. It must be pointed out that this parliament dealt with issues that many of our over-21 voters fail to confront. The debate was good, and the young men of the parliament were concerned. It must be pointed out as well that many of the clauses in the bills were left intact simply because we had no time. The clauses are proposed with the precise purpose of sparking controversy so that young men will know and will be compelled to declare their opinions on the issues that all of us must individually and collectively face. I am grateful for Peter Familias' letter. I invite him to attend our sessions next year, and I invite the Press to show that accurate reporting is still important, both from a newspaper viewpoint and from a democratic viewpoint. The kind of coverage we got this year is worse than no coverage at all. Signed Bruce Doern, Premier, 42nd Older Boys Parliament."

I appreciate being allowed to read that, Madam Speaker, because I think it does show that young people today are not all irresponsible, that they do take the responsibilities of life seriously, and I did want to point out that there were some mistakes made in reporting, because after all, it did give the public a wrong impression, and I think it's timely, because it shows how easy we can get the wrong impression. Wrong impressions are easy to acquire and sometimes our young people are discredited by the few hooligans who are always in the public eye seeking perverted recognition.

Our over-21 voters -- I should call them non-voters, Madam Speaker, because they do not seem to appreciate the right to vote -- are not setting much of an example by the way that they show their appreciation for the privilege of voting, for the privilege of living in a democratic country. Why are we so hesitant about giving our 18-year olds the right to vote when we have seen only five percent of the eligible voters turn out at school money-by-law referendums, and this in the metropolitan area, Madam Speaker. I don't think there is much maturity shown there, and of course not all under 21 use their franchise or will even be interested, but I submit that the percentage who do will surprise us. Let's give the recognition that will mean so much to them and can bring such great dividends to the rest of us. Madam Speaker, I ask the support of the House in concurring with this resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: If no one else wishes to speak at this time, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed motion, the Honourable the Member for Carillon, the Honourable the Member for Fisher.

MR. EMIL MOELLER (Fisher): Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Emerson. The Honourable the Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): In the absence of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, Madam Speaker, I would crave the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed resolution, the Honourable the Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Elmwood, the following resolution: Whereas the cost of living has increased by 34 percent since 1949, and whereas the present old age pension of \$75.00 a month will purchase only the same volume of goods that could have been purchased by \$55.00 in 1949, and whereas this level of purchasing power is not sufficient as a means of subsistence for elderly citizens with no other form of income, and whereas providing of the means for these elderly citizens to live a life of dignity in the absence of deprivation should be one of the most worthwhile and meaningful objectives of our centenary program, therefore be it resolved

(Mr. Gray cont'd) that the Government of Manitoba give consideration to the advisability of recommending an increase in the Old Age Pension to be carried out in three stages to the amount of \$100.00 per month by our centennial year and that this pension be payable at age 65.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I have made representation on behalf of the old age pensioners for a number of years and, realizing the intelligence of the members of this House that do remember the arguments and know the necessity, I shall forego the pleasure of making a lengthy speech at this time in support of this resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that this debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member from Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, before presenting this resolution I'd like to get the permission of the House to change Item No. 2 to "two years" instead of "one year", and the same in item No. 6. In other words, my intentions were to have two years instead of one.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is permission granted? -- Agreed.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, that this Legislative Assembly recommends to the Government of Canada that it take steps to introduce amendments to laws governing dissolution of marriage by divorce, to provide the following as reasons for dissolution of a contract of marriage, any one of which may be applicable: (1) Adultery. (2) Desertion for more than two years. (3) Persistent physical or mental cruelty. (4) Insanity, continuous or recurrent. (5) Imprisonment for two or more years. (6) Legal separation for more than two years.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, this problem has been under consideration and debate in Ottawa and different provinces in Canada. Present divorce laws in Canada are a disgrace to a community which pretends to be civilized. They breed perjury and contribute to juvenile delinquency. A judge of our own Family Courts says: "The basis for divorce in Canada should be at least as broad as it is in England."

Under Canadian law there is only one cause for the dissolution of a marriage, that is adultery. A married couple may find themselves absolutely incompatible. One may become insane, may be brutal and violent in temper, may be a chronic alcoholic, may desert his partner, may be criminally inclined, yet the marriage cannot be dissolved. There are no statistics on the number of married men and women who have deserted their partners. The people who suffer most from our present brutal law are pretty helpless -- they're obliged to suffer in silence. It is said that divorce breaks marriages. This is not true. The marriage is broken long before divorce proceedings are begun. All the divorce does is to make it possible for the victims of unsatisfactory marriages to become rehabilitated, and perhaps to consummate more satisfactory marriage later on.

Under the present law, those who have discovered that their marriage is not satisfactory are faced with two alternatives, both of them bad -- either to commit adultery, or to commit perjury.

Divorce is not a social disease. It is a cure for an unsatisfactory marital situation. Divorce does not break up families. The family ties are already broken. Divorce makes possible a new and more satisfactory family life. It makes possible a greater number of happier and unbroken homes.

The position of a woman who has been deserted by her husband is pretty terrible. If she has no business training and has young children to care for, in addition to the humiliation of desertion she is obliged to suffer the additional humiliation of seeking city relief. After being deserted for a number of years she might qualify for Mothers' Allowance. On the other hand, she might make the acquaintance of a man with a compatible temperament who would be willing to marry her and provide a good home for her family, but under our present law she cannot marry him, and our society is the loser. Desertion for two years or more

(Mr. Gray cont'd) should be one of the grounds for divorce.

Constant cruelty should be another ground for divorce. Under the present law a man might try to murder his wife. He might be sentenced to life imprisonment, but still his wife would not be able to get a divorce. This marriage is completely broken.

Incurable insanity should also be a sound reason for divorce. A man or a woman might be pronounced incurably insane; might be confined to an institution like the one in Brandon for life, yet the partner to the marriage, which is completely broken, cannot get a divorce.

Legal presumption of death -- if one of the partners to a marriage has disappeared and after a certain length of time been presumed legally to be dead, then the other party to the marriage should be allowed to remarry.

These are four moderate, additional grounds for divorce. Not one of them would break a marriage. In each case the marriage is already broken and divorce would make remarriage possible.

This is not compulsory legislation. Those people who believe that marriage once consummated is for life and should not be broken under any circumstances need not invoke the law, but those people who think that marriage should not be broken should not be allowed to impose their ideas and their prejudices on the rest of the community.

In a poll of public opinion that was taken not very long ago, 75 percent of those questioned were in favour of liberalization of our divorce laws. Prevention is better than cure. More thought should be given to education, a counselling of young people before marriage. There should be courses on the problems of married life in our secondary schools and universities.

Also, as in the case of industrial disputes, a process of conciliation might be introduced to make a study of the problems facing the married couple. But in the meantime some liberalization, some help should be given to those cases who unfortunately find themselves in the position that they could not get rid -- one could not get rid of the other unless the cruel law which we have on our statute books now is proven. Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak at this time, I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed motion standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, may I get the permission of the House to let this matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 5. The Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre) presented Bill No. 5, An Act to amend an Act to incorporate Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba Limited, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, this is simply a Bill to increase the authorized capital of the company from \$1 million to \$5 million in order that it can carry on business on the larger scale and meet the needs of the various local credit unions in Manitoba.

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

. continued on next page.

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

HON. S. E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Attorney-General)(Dauphin): Madam Speaker, in rising to take a very brief part in this debate, I join with the others in extending my congratulations to you as you resume once again your place as responsible for this House, and to extend the wish that you will be spared to continue in your responsibilities here for many long years to come. This is the traditional time when the confidence of the government is at stake, when the right of the government to continue in office receives the attention of the members and when we are presented with the traditional motion by the leaders of the opposition groups in which they seek to call into question the confidence of the House in the government of the province at this particular time. This is a useful exercise because it makes it possible for those who may feel that things are not being handled as they should to place their complaints on record and it makes it necessary for those who have the responsibility of government to justify what they are doing in order to continue in the confidence, not only of the House but of the province, and it is within this context that we debate here those matters which have been brought to our attention by those opposite.

Perhaps it would not be out of order if I were to refer to only one or two matters dealt with by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in his address in support of the motion which he placed before us for consideration by the House and to say, Madam Speaker, to the House that, in my opinion, the matters which he has brought to our attention do not require the dismissal of the government and do not support the proposition which he has placed before us that we no longer possess the confidence of either the House or the province, and indeed the record, Madam Speaker, is quite to the contrary and that we are entitled on the basis of the policies which have been adopted and carried out, and which are in the process of being carried out, to continue in the confidence of the House and the province.

Perhaps it would not be out of order if I were to refer just to one or two matters having to do with my previous responsibility in the government, because they were referred to in the context of matters and the way in which they were handled while I had that responsibility. I do so not necessarily in the sense of attempting to justify or to say that everything that was done at that time was all perfect, indeed I'm only too well aware of the imperfections of it, but rather to point out and make some observations on some of the things that have been glossed over in the presentation made by the Leader of the Opposition.

He dealt first -- first that is in relation to the Department of Education -- with a theme which has become of some interest to him, that of curriculum. And here may I say, Madam Speaker, that of course this is a delightful subject in which to become engaged, because if there are 990-odd thousand people in Manitoba, there are 990-odd thousand ideas about what ought to be taught in school; how it ought to be taught; when it ought to be taught; and by whom; so that this offers a real scope for anyone who wishes to indulge in critical comment. There are different opinions and I would be the first to acknowledge it. But he says in particular, he says: "the curriculum reform has been handled on a piecemeal, part-time basis and little progress has been made." Well let me acknowledge at the start that, without any question, that the reform on the curriculum of Manitoba is not complete and indeed let me say this, that when it is complete on the first round, then the second round will start immediately and the job will never be completed. But I submit, Madam Speaker, to the members of the House, that the Leader of the Opposition has either been misinformed or he is attempting in a sentence or two to put forth an idea which is not supported by the facts.

The facts are that there was engaged in the Department of Education as the Director of Curricula, or Director of Curriculum whichever expression you may prefer to have, the gentleman who had been the Secretary of the Royal Commission on Education and who for the entire time that that commission was engaged in considering educational matters in the province was directly and intimately associated with the views which had been expressed throughout the entire Province of Manitoba by all of the groups and individual people who had presented themselves to that commission with ideas and suggestions with regard to curriculum as well as to other matters. In addition, he had spent that same period of time with the Chairman and the members of the Commission -- the other four members of the Commission -- and was well

(Mr. McLean, Cont'd.) . . . aware of their views with regard to this matter, and I should think that in engaging him as the Director of Curricula we took an important step in ensuring that the one person, who in a professional sense was closely associated with the thoughts which had been expressed, was engaged to undertake that important work on behalf of the department and on behalf of the government. He then associated with himself, with him, other persons who in their professional capacity were, in our opinion and in his opinion, able to make useful contributions towards this process of developing the curriculum in Manitoba.

Here again may I be quite clear that among these professional folk there is a wide divergence of opinion. I once said, Madam Speaker, that if I could ever get six teachers who would agree for about one half hour on any one particular thing I would have adopted it right on the spot, because there are just as many different opinions as there are teachers about every subject and all the whole performance. In any event, the Director of Curriculum did associate with himself those who were professionally trained and equipped to be of assistance.

Now it's all very well to talk about taking teachers and removing them out of the classrooms and assigning them the task of working on curriculum, but that overlooks an important point; namely, the benefit of having people who are directly working day by day with these matters in the school, because the moment the teacher is out of the classroom, he or she, irrespective of his past experience, is disassociated with the active practising work of curriculum development and so it seems to me always that there is a good argument to be made for using those people who in their daily work are engaged in this process. Now this is a matter of judgment and there'll be those who say it's not a good idea and others who say it is a good idea, and all I'm saying is that this is not something that just happened by chance, this was a conscious decision made on the basis of what was considered to be a satisfactory policy.

But, Madam Speaker, what has actually happened under this plan? We developed a completely new course from beginning to end. The new -- what is commonly known as the new general course for the high schools -- for three grades, 10, 11 and 12. This was planned from the very beginning. It began with a seminar of teachers and inspectors and those professionally competent in laying out the guide lines -- the broad general outline -- and the entire course was developed on a planned basis and is now in operation in the Province of Manitoba. And so I say to the House, Madam Speaker, that progress has been made because we have in the Province of Manitoba a new up-to-date modern course for the high school students that did not exist some short four years ago.

In addition, the ground work, the planning, and the work of a revised university entrance course was undertaken on the same basis, involving the same general procedure and using those of professional competence. And so I put these two illustrations before the members, Madam Speaker, because this gives the lie to the suggestion that there has been no planning or that nothing has been done, because a great deal has been done. There are other things but I won't trouble or I won't weary the House by outlining the many matters which have been undertaken, but here are two positive illustrations of a well-planned, a well-executed, Madam Speaker, revision of the curriculum insofar as high school is concerned and, as I say, there are many other things to be done.

Now, Madam Speaker, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, always one to choose the safest berth possible says, "well" -- and here he's repeating what other people have said -- "instead of starting at the top end you ought to start at the other end; you ought to have started at grade one." Well that's a matter of opinion. My own view is, in the circumstances in which we found ourselves, the best place to start was at the top end, if you'd like to call it that, of our school system. But it was possible to have started at the other end. I think the comparison, Madam Speaker -- and I am taking this comparison from a field in which I am quite incompetent really -- but my understanding is that if you have a body of water at (a) and you want to drain it into location (b), you don't start digging your ditch at (a), you start digging the ditch at (b) and lead back, so that when you've tapped into the body of water your ditch is ready. Now whether that's a suitable comparison to what is necessary in education or not I don't know, but this was a conscious decision, to start at the top end of the educational system and to revise our curriculum down to grade one.

But, Madam Speaker, if we had started -- and this is a thing that always interests me -- if we had started at grade one and worked up to two, three, five and on up, what then would the

(Mr. McLean, Cont'd.). . . Leader of the Opposition be saying to us here? He'd have been coming in and declaiming that we had started at the wrong end; we had started at grade one when we should have started at grade 12, where it was of course. He would then say to us, "why, Madam Speaker, we ought to be preparing these boys and girls, these young men and women for entrance to university and technical school, and what are they doing? Why they're starting way down here in grade one." So he's on safe ground and, irrespective of how you do it, he has his complaints.

I said a moment ago that there were two ways of doing it. You could either start at grade 12 and work back or you start at grade one and work up and, as I say, you have to make your decision. There is one other way that I didn't mention and it's the method that was adopted by the previous administration, and that is "do nothing", and that's what we've been having to overcome during the past few years.

Now into this little dissertation about the curriculum, into this little dissertation about curriculum he interjected the subject -- although I notice he dealt with it very delicately, hardly -- you'd have to watch carefully to know that he was talking about it -- he now refers to the text in a certain geography course, and I'll admit, I'll be quite frank to say, Madam Speaker, that I didn't really think a year ago that when the Leader of the Opposition got up to criticize geography texts written by perhaps one of the most eminent geographers in the Common Law of the Nations, one of the most outstanding geographers that had been associated with the University of British Columbia, I didn't really think that he was serious. I sort of passed it over, and if I'm at fault I'm at fault. In fact, I've regretted not taking it more seriously since, I can assure the House of that. I was interested however, Madam Speaker, that after the latest blast . . . before the House resumed, when my colleague the Member for Ste. Rose journeyed into this delightful field of geography, that he and I were invited to discuss this important matter on television. Yes, we were going to meet on the CBC television, and he was really going to confront me with this terrifying geography text, and I was interested -- and I don't know just quite what the right words are to use -- I was interested in the fact that -- how should I say it? Well, the honourable gentleman wasn't there. Don't know what the explanation is -- wasn't any given to me -- but I have a strong suspicion that he found perhaps that his complaints were not entirely justified.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could interrupt the honourable member on the point of personal privilege here?

The Minister knows full well why I wasn't at the television station. It's because my honourable friend would not appear to debate with me. He refused CBC to appear at the same time as I did on the program. He would only accept to appear if he was to appear alone, and be questioned alone -- (Interjection) -- but not at the time when I could debate it with him -- (Interjection) --. On that basis I said, "If the Minister wants it that way, he can appear. -- (Interjections).

MR. McLEAN: Well, I don't know if that's the report that my honourable friend received. I -- (Interjections) -- Oh yes, I see -- (Interjections) -- I shall deal directly, Madam Speaker, then in the future, with the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in matters of this important nature.

Some reference was made to the technical education. Madam Speaker, I think the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is overlooking the fact that starting on the 1st of April, 1959, we have had a very intensive program of technical and vocational education throughout the Province of Manitoba, that many high schools have been built and provided with the facilities for these classes, and we are not only not behind other provinces, we were much in advance of them in this particular field in providing technical and vocational classes in the high schools throughout the Province of Manitoba, some of which are located in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Ste. Rose.

I notice, Madam Speaker, that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is interested now in what he calls "the forgotten group in education" -- (Interjection) -- I'm just interested in that because I never heard him speak about this subject before, although he has a colleague who has often referred to it during the past year outside of this House, and it is interesting to note the honourable member's rather sudden interest in what he refers to as "the forgotten group."

(Mr. McLean, Cont'd.)

Now, Madam Speaker, there was one other matter. Not only was the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition worrying about the things that he alleges are here now, but he worries and asks the House to vote non-confidence in the government for things which haven't happened yet. He worries about the sales tax. Now, I would leave to others more able than I to deal with the specific comments that he made, except to note that he is come down four-square on the side of no sales tax. Well, I was wondering, Madam Speaker, if he had heard or read about that famous fiscal abortion in Canadian history known as "The Gordon Budget." I have some recollection, Madam Speaker, that that budget raised the sales tax, and I am not aware, Madam Speaker, of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition making any public statement either disassociating himself from that exercise, or making any public statement about it. But, Madam Speaker, there's an interesting thing about that Gordon Budget sales tax, and I recognize the seriousness of the words that I am about to use. Madam Speaker, it might be of interest to the House to remember that the increase in the sales tax made by Mr. Gordon was made without a mandate to do so. As a matter of fact, if my honourable colleague from Ste. Rose will recall some of his own speeches during the last Federal Election in the federal constituency to which he and I have the honour to both belong, he will recall that he spoke, as indeed others did -- these were their instructions; they had their instructions and I had mine -- pointing out that the group to which he owes allegiance and loyalty was going to reduce taxes, and yet we have Mr. Gordon's budget increasing it. Now I just mention that. That doesn't contribute too much to our deliberations here, but it might be useful to keep it in mind if one is discussing the subject of sales tax. -- (Injection) -- It's a wide-open race, Madam Speaker.

MR. DESJARDINS: there. Watch out!

MR. McLEAN: This a democratic party we belong to.

MR. DESJARDINS. Is that why Dief is still there?

MR. McLEAN: I want it quite clearly understood, Madam Speaker, that the Dauphin constituency is generally called upon to make the greatest sacrifices in these matters.

MR. DESJARDINS: We'll never make those kind of sacrifices, never. We're not that desperate.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker,

MR. DESJARDINS: Tell about TCA now.

MR. McLEAN: Dealing with the sort or reasons that have been advanced and why, in the opinion of the Leader of the Opposition, this government no longer possesses the confidence of the House in one aspect. But it does seem to me that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition has overlooked the positive side of this matter which I just mention very briefly to the House, and that is the increased opportunities which have been provided by the policies of the government for every group and class of people in our province. I had a letter a short time ago in which a young lady was telling me about the opportunities that had come to her as a student in the rural part of Manitoba, and she referred to these enlarged opportunities which provided her with high school education and university education, and I should like to suggest to the House, Madam Speaker, that this is true of many avenues of activity here in Manitoba since 1958. Enlarged opportunities for employees and employers; enlarged opportunities for those engaged in agriculture; enlarged opportunities for those engaged in the processing, the reaping and the processing of our natural products; enlarged opportunities for the boys and girls and the young men and women of our province. And aside altogether from the fact -- and indeed one would acknowledge it, that everything has not been done, and we do not say that it has, we do not say that everything has been done perfectly -- there have been many errors, and much remains to be done -- but the plain fact of the matter is, Madam Speaker, that there has been an enlargement of opportunities for every group, for every citizen of our province, and that on this basis this administration is entitled, and indeed, I hope, will receive the support of this House when the vote comes.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, may I direct a question to the Honourable Minister? It's relating to a very specific matter, Madam Speaker. The geography text which the Leader of the Opposition attacked, which the former Minister of Education defended so staunchly on that particular television program -- I understand it's now been replaced. Is that true?

MR. McLEAN: I imagine it has, yes. I certainly asked that it be replaced.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. J. P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. McLEAN presented Bill No. 27, an Act to amend The County Courts Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, just a word or two in explanation. The main provision of this bill is to increase the jurisdiction of the County Court in those types of actions which may be tried in the County Court, from \$2,000 to \$3,500.00. Members will understand that there is a sort of a financial limit on the kinds of action that may be heard in the County Court and this is now being increased to \$3,500.00. The other provision, Madam Speaker, is a technical one. Apparently some problem developed about records being transferred from the County Court to the Queen's Bench and this will allow that to be done. It's obviously in the public interest to make that possible and that's why this provision is here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Would the Honourable the Minister be able to tell us offhand as to when the last raise was made in the financial jurisdiction of the County Court? I am of the opinion that I remember quite well when the jurisdiction was as low as \$800.00. I think it has been raised on a couple of occasions since that. Would he know offhand when it was raised the last time?

MR. McLEAN: I think, Madam Speaker, and I intended to look that up before I came to the House this afternoon, as I think it was either 1959 or 1960. The raise to \$2,000 was made since we've been in office, since this Government has been in office. A voice in the wilderness over here says 1957. It was increased from \$800 to \$1,200, then from \$1,200 to \$2,000, if 1957 is the right date, and now to be \$3,500.00.

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

MR. SMELLIE presented Bill No. 7, An Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, there are really two points raised by this bill. The first amendment is required because of the amendment to The Municipal Act last year relating to appeals from assessment and the method of such appeals. We are just now bringing the Metropolitan Winnipeg Act into line with The Municipal Act because it made reference to the method in this particular section.

The second amendment is, as the Bill says, self-explanatory. It requires the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg to file the statement of their outside auditor with the Department of Municipal Affairs in the form that may be required by the Minister. This, of course, is so that the statistics prepared annually by the Department of Municipal Affairs may include the statistics of the Metropolitan Corporation along with those of all the municipalities.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, is it correct to say that under the bill passed here, setting up the Metropolitan Corporation, this House has imposed on the Metropolitan Corporation the necessity of having in addition to its internal accounting and audit system, an outside auditor? Is that correct?

MR. SMELLIE: That's correct. They are using the outside auditor system now. It was just a question of what form the reports would be to the Department of Municipal Affairs, and because there was some question arising the return was filed on one occasion in a form that didn't agree with the form of returns from other municipalities and it made it very awkward to complete the statistical returns. We're just making it perfectly clear that we want it in the same form as the other municipalities, so that it can be put into the statistics.

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

MR. WITNEY presented Bill No. 16, An Act to amend The Hospitals Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, in explanation, in amendment to The Hospitals Act, provisions were made for official committees which could be set up by the Ministers who would request the College of physicians and Surgeons to do so. These official committees were set

(Mr. Witney, Cont'd.) . . . up for the purposes of research and study into operation and to benefit the whole aspect of medicine in dealing with the patient. This section is being added to prevent the study that is made and the research made by these doctors from being used as evidence in cases in the court. However, I wish to emphasize that the original hospital records, the original medical records, are still subject to subpoena for any case in court.

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

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne) presented Bill No. 29, an Act respecting the Wages and Hours of Work of Persons employed in the Construction Industry for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, I feel that it would help put this legislation in its proper perspective if I were to review -- and I will attempt, gentlemen, to review it rather briefly -- the background. The origin of this bill goes back to September of 1962. At that time, the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, who was then the Minister of Labour, invited employers and unions in the construction industry to undertake a joint study of the problems of that industry in Manitoba, and in particular the labour legislation affecting the construction industry. Now the response was very gratifying, and as a result of the Joint Committee on Labour Management problems in the construction industry, this was the forerunner to this Act. This Committee got underway officially in January, 1963.

I think it is fair to say that it was a large and representative committee. On it were the representatives of contractors in rural Manitoba. There was the Brandon Builders Exchange, the Manitoba Roadbuilders Association, the Canadian Plumbing and Mechanical Contractors Association, the Manitoba Federation of Labour, the Pine Falls Labour Council, the Flin Flon & District Labour Council, the Winnipeg Building Trades Council, the Winnipeg & District Labour Council, the Winnipeg Builders Exchange and the Winnipeg Housebuilders Association. Now this committee, of course, was too large to deal with the problem and a smaller committee, a special study committee, was set up and this committee became known as the Blake Committee. It was headed by Doctor Gordon Blake, Department of Economics at United College. At its first meeting the members of that committee were balanced representatives of contractors and unions. The employer members were Mr. Claydon and Mr. Plotkin. The Union representatives were Mr. Otto Anderson and Mr. Dennis Flynn.

The first meeting of this committee was held on February 14, 1963, and the special committee outlined its objectives in the following terms:

1. It was to seek out and identify problems which may affect the conditions of labour, the conditions of management, and the relations between the two in that area of economic activity in the Province of Manitoba commonly known as the construction industry;
2. To recommend solutions to problems discovered and when they have been identified and subjected to study and discussion; and
3. Generally to build up a body of useful information and reference material relative to the construction industry in Manitoba and elsewhere.

Now the committee felt that in the course of its studies that it should review Manitoba legislation as it applied in various ways to the construction industry. Included in the recommended studies were The Labour Relations Act, The Employment Standards Act, The Fair Wage Act, The Vacations with Pay Act, The Workmen's Compensation Act, The Apprenticeship Act, The Construction Safety Act, and The Tradesmen's Qualifications Act, as these acts applied to the construction industry. Now this was what the committee had in mind originally. Then a little less than a year ago, problems arose that made it quite apparent that The Fair Wage Act should be given top priority and study. Early in August of last year the Special Committee issued a report and this report became widely known as the Blake Report. The report had this to say about the then current state of The Fair Wage Act, and I quote from the report:

"Criticism of the Act and of its administration comes from various quarters and is of various kinds. It has been described, for example, as out of date, contradictory, ambiguous, badly constructed, a patchwork impossible to properly administer. Smaller contractors claim that it was discriminatory and unfair and out of touch with the economic realities of life in rural Manitoba. It was said to aggravate already vexing problems of urban spread on the fringes of rural municipalities affected by the Act. It is charged with encouraging the

(Mr. Baizley, Cont'd.) . . . substitution of factory processes for on site construction to the detriment of both contractors and tradesmen in some areas. It is held that it threatens the existence of the jack-of-all-trades, a person apparently highly valued in rural communities if not by trade union officials. It fails to take account, it is said, of the rural construction worker who many spend part of his time farming and part as more or less casual construction worker."

I continue to quote from the Blake Report: "Some communities fear that it will upset certain satisfactory existing employment patterns in which workers in smaller towns are presently kept employed on a year round basis, and this to everyone's benefit, a condition which would be impossible under the full impact of the Act. Some believe that the fact that a tradesman residing in Greater Winnipeg may carry his fair wage with him when he works outside the area creates undue discrimination between men of the same craft working side by side. The Fair Wage Board itself has been charged with being a vehicle by which persons in Greater Winnipeg attempt to force unduly high wages on rural areas, thus tending to destroy competition in those areas. Finally, there is apparently rather widespread criticism that the Act was not enforced with sufficient rigor and equity."

Now in the face of this array of criticism of The Fair Wage Act, the Blake Report recognized that four alternatives were possible. The first was to eliminate the Act entirely, and the second was to leave matters as they stand for another year or so that further study could be given to the construction industry, and the third was an attempt to amend the Act piecemeal, or fourth was to introduce entirely new legislation as soon as possible and attempt to improve on the Fair Wage Act, while retaining the principles establishing basic wages in the construction industry. The Special Committee unanimously agreed that of these four alternatives only the last was really desirable, and I might say that I would have been happy at several stages in meeting with this committee and offered to repeal the Act for them. This was not acceptable to anyone.

So the recommendation was as follows: 1. There should be a new Act which would continue the principle of basic wages in the construction industry. 2. The new legislation would retain unchanged the present Zone A under The Fair Wage Act. For example, that's the area extending for a 30 mile radius from Broadway and Osborne. It would extend the present Zone B under The Fair Wage Act to include all of the province and that a single basic fair wage, to be determined by The Fair Wage Board, would apply to the new Zone B on contracts under \$50,000.00. In the case of contracts in Zone B whose amount was over \$50,000 then Zone A rates and maximum hours would apply. Maximum hours of work might differ between Zones A and B except where the value of the project was in excess of \$50,000, in which case the Fair Wage Board would set the maximum.

Now the recommendations of the Blake Report were then presented to the general committee. This committee was substantially in agreement with the overall approach of the recommendations. Well I might say there were some differences of opinions about some of the details, Madam Speaker. There were more meetings of the Blake Committee and the general committee to try and work out the differences. Some were eventually reconciled; others could not be. The Bill you now have before you incorporates, I believe, to the fullest degree possible the suggestions put forward by those who have given this major problem such long and serious consideration. This Act continues the principle of establishing basic wages and hours in the construction industry through recommendations by employers and workers in the industry.

The Act recognizes that different sections of the industry have different problems and that conditions affecting the industry are not the same in rural Manitoba as they are in the metropolitan Greater Winnipeg area. With this in mind, the Act provides for separate Boards. There is a Board for the building construction industry in Greater Winnipeg and major building construction projects anywhere in the province. There is a Board for the building construction industry in rural Manitoba, excepting major building construction projects, and then for the road building and heavy construction section of the industry there will be a Board for that area of the industry for the whole of the province. The Act also provides for the establishment of basic wages and hours to meet the particular needs of each section on the recommendation of the appropriate Board.

One of the basic principles upon which this legislation is founded is that these employers and employees who actually do the work shall, through their representatives, have a strong say

(Mr. Baizley, Cont'd.) . . . as to the basic wage rates and hours applicable. The Act recognizes the need for effective co-ordination of the activities of the three Boards and provides for this by allowing the appointment of a common chairman. This act retains the procedure under The Fair Wage Act for wage claims against employers performing work for a government or Crown agency. The Act also strengthens enforcement by imposing more stringent sanctions and extending to one year the time limit for prosecutions and by providing for enforcement of a magistrate's order for payment of wages as a judgment.

In addition, the provision of bonding of employers convicted of failing to pay wages is continued. The Act applies to construction work done by municipalities. It should be noted that this legislation differs in three important respects from proposals put forward by the general committee as a whole, or by some of the groups comprising it. First, the general committee recommended against a separate board for the road building and heavy construction industry. The committee believed that there was no need for a separate board. It believed that problems relating to the road building and heavy construction sectors of the industry could be handled adequately by the board responsible for the Metropolitan Winnipeg area. I have been unable to accept this position. In my view, the complex nature of the heavy construction segment of the industry and the ramifications of its many difficult problems call for a particularized treatment. I believe this can be done effectively only by a separate board devoted exclusively to that end. The Metropolitan Winnipeg Board is certain to be heavily burdened with its own problems and I feel that a separate board, fully representative of those who are directly engaged in road-building, sewer, water, drainage, bridge and other similar works, is the most desirable approach.

Second, the general committee recommended that the present boundary of Zone A be retained. This is, as I have said, a 30 mile radius from Broadway and Osborne. Again I have had to differ. In my opinion, the 30 mile radius is an arbitrary and artificial boundary, whereas it is much more realistic to make the Zone A boundary coincide with the territorial bounds of the Greater Winnipeg metropolitan area. Included in this 30 mile radius -- the Honourable Members might like to know this -- there are 150 small communities that, in my mind, are in fact part of rural Manitoba.

Third, some of the groups comprising the general committee have vigorously opposed the reappointment or the appointment of public members to the boards, but let me emphasize that this opposition has only come from some of the groups and not the committee as a whole. I think, Madam Speaker, that these groups are wrong in opposing public members in an area of the economy of this province which is of so much public interest and concern. I have taken a good deal of time, Madam Speaker, with this statement. However, I am sure that honourable members can see that by joint consultation, by continuous study and by review, it is possible to develop legislation that is in the best interest of all of Manitoba.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would permit a question or reply to a request? Is there a copy of the Blake Commission available that I may have?

MR. BAIZLEY: Yes.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. G. E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments on this Bill 29, and it's only from some casual observation and in speaking with some people who have a knowledge of the subject.

Now one thing that strikes me as quite unusual -- and the Minister has partly answered -- but I don't believe I can go all the way along with what he has to say. I have here in my hand a submission from the Winnipeg and vicinity Building and Construction Trades Council and the Winnipeg Builders Exchange. These people submitted this on January 31st as a joint submission and three of their items are opposed, as the Minister has said, but I don't feel that his reasons are strong enough. It's almost against the whole principle of the Bill.

In the one, it's referring to paragraph 1, section (g), defining Greater Winnipeg under The Greater Winnipeg Act -- which means I believe a five mile radius of Winnipeg. Now we know that in this day of rapid transportation that we can hardly classify from five miles out in an arbitrary manner as rural Manitoba. It's a well known fact, I believe, that in these specialized trades of which Winnipeg is a large centre, daily the people from these trades go out to

(Mr. Johnston, Cont'd.) . . . their jobs and they probably can go out 30 or 40 or 50 miles quite easily and back home again at night. So by changing this, arbitrarily as the Minister says, from the 30 mile radius which all existing agreements are based on down to a five mile radius, he's upsetting all existing agreements that have been built up over the years, and by his own words a few minutes ago he says that five miles outside Winnipeg is rural Manitoba and it should be left as such. Well, this may be a considered private opinion, but when one looks at the situation as it exists, it is well known and it is done every day, that hundreds of workmen go out from Winnipeg and they work outside this five mile limit.

In their submission -- No. 2 of their submission -- they say "that Zone A as it is presently constituted be retained, also the 30 mile radius from the corner of Osborne and Broadway. We feel that reducing their radius will interfere with practices established through decades of collective bargaining. Employers and trade unions alike know that by far the majority of tradesmen working in this area commute daily from the Greater Winnipeg area; likewise a substantial number of tradesmen commute from this area into Winnipeg. We feel that the status quo should be maintained regarding the categories of occupation titles, individual wage rates and hours of work." Again, Madam Speaker, I remind you that this is a submission from probably 250 contractors or builders plus a trade union. It isn't one side or the other of the story. It is a general agreement between the two groups.

Now they also state in No. 4 of their submission: "We strongly oppose your suggestion to place public representatives on the boards. Neither management nor labour feel that they will add to the harmony or efficiency of the industry, mainly due to the lack of basic knowledge in management and labour relations and practices in the construction industry." On a quick glance at the Bill where the Minister is proposing three representatives on all of these boards, and from experience with governments -- and I don't necessarily condemn this government -- but in past experience has it not been a fact that when a government appoints three public representatives that they are inclined to appoint their own friends or they are people who think their way, and if there's two from the labour, two from management and three who are appointed by the government, that only one idea is going to prevail at the end of each meeting. I am suggesting that there is always going to be three people thinking alike, thinking what the government are hoping for and pulling any decision their way.

On their submission again on No. 5, they say here that special provision should be made in the Act to ensure co-ordination of the thinking and recommendations of the different boards established under the Act. Now we have just heard, and we see in the Bill, that there are three different boards established. Why three I'm not sure, because heavy construction is the same wherever it's carried on, and I think this could be done quite easily by two boards. But, however, there is no provision whatsoever for any co-ordination between these boards; there's no implication of any such provision. It's not . . .

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the honourable member a question. I would like to ask him if, when he is commenting on the Act, if he, in fact, did read it because there is provision for liaison between the boards. There can be a common chairman of the three boards.

MR. JOHNSTON: Would the Minister later on mind telling us how they would carry this out, how they would do this? I'll refer to a specific item for you to consider. Now, each board has the onus of deciding what size job is going to be considered as large enough to be considered under the Winnipeg pay scale or the rural pay scale. Now what would happen if each board took a different figure, or a different size construction project? It's not laid out in the Act. I believe there was some mention made by one of the people or groups who submitted, of \$50,000 as a general figure. Now I'm not in agreement with perhaps an arbitrary figure of \$50,000 but I think there should be a limit somewhere so that all three boards have a common talking point, and at present they have not got this. It's conceivable that one board could set a project size at one million, and then they do their regulations from that base. And this is what I'm speaking about, Madam Speaker, when I say that there are no hard and fast meeting ground for the three boards.

One of the rather vague definitions that is disturbing is in No. 3, Paragraph (b): persons employed in prefabricating a structure, or part thereof, elsewhere than on the site on which the completed structure is intended to be situated. Now what is the definition of this? Madam

(Mr. Johnston, Cont'd.) . . . Speaker, I'd like to have a more firm commitment, something tied down exactly. Now I see a situation that could be developed where someone could be building a large-scale housing development, and they could prefabricate on one lot and ten yards away they could put up the building. If it had a definite wording -- I'm thinking now of prefabrication that takes place in a factory or a shop where the place of prefabrication is defined. For instance, in Webster's dictionary a shop is defined as a permanent site closed in, a closed-in building and site, where, in this particular case, prefabrication would be carried on. This part of the proposed Act leaves quite a large loophole that someone could take advantage of this by moving their prefabrication operation wherever their job is, thereby affecting wage rates, etc.

During the later stages of this Bill I am prepared to make some amendments. Thank you!

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, 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 2:30 Monday afternoon.