

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock Monday, March 15th, 1965.

MADAM SPEAKER: When we adjourned, the Honourable Member for Assiniboia had the floor. The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, before we closed at 5:30 I made some references which I was concerned, and that was to what extent will Metro be responsible for the Red River Exhibition and an inconsistency, because if the Provincial Government are responsible for the Brandon Fair, why should it not be responsible for the Red River Exhibition? Now on No. 6, Section 6, it's an internal matter as far as the Metro Corporation is concerned and I think it's strictly for efficiency. They can hire their own personnel. I haven't got much objection to that with the exception that I'm not too clear on that point. I know we'll be able to raise most of the points section by section in Committee, but these are the points that I'm concerned with now and under Section 19: why should the municipalities be responsible for the 100 per cent collection of taxes if they're not able to collect themselves? Now there is as far as the Metro legislation is concerned, there is some confusion. Today we have zoning, planning and a building code, water mains, sewers under the control of Metro. It seems there is very little left for the municipalities to do. I wonder what is and what will be the purpose of the Municipal Council. In planning I think there should be more co-operation than we have now. I don't believe there is enough co-operation as far as the Metro and the local municipalities are concerned. For instance, in St. James I know the council opposed a structure on Mount Royal Street but this was to no avail because Metro went ahead and issued the building permits anyhow. So at the moment I'd say there's not -- every year there's less and less for the local municipalities left to do and as far as I'm concerned it might have been better if the planning had been left within the local municipalities and probably fire and police were taken by Metro. It probably would have been better. At the present time there's just the police and the fire department that is left with the control of the local municipalities. I feel that local councils should have a little more authority as far as planning is concerned because the way the situation now is, it seems to be a lot of confusion and just not the proper co-operation between the two areas, the Metro Corporation and the local municipalities. I will be raising more points in connection with this bill in Committee, Madam Speaker.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia has raised some interesting points with regard to the limitation of the jurisdiction of municipalities now that Metro has been in effect for some time and it seems, as perhaps could have been thought natural to take as time goes on more and more powers to itself. As a matter of fact on the local news on TV at the dinner hour I noticed a report that seemed to indicate that the council of the City of Winnipeg had taken the position that with regard to this very controversial subject of the fire precautions and safety measures for rented houses or actually tenement houses, I believe, that the council, so the news commentator was speculating, was likely to ask Metro to take this over. Well perhaps that's a good move and at least it might ensure some uniformity and apparently it is a question that needs some decision made on it.

But the point that I really got up to mention briefly was the one that has been raised by the Honourable Member for St. George, where he has been asking the Minister of Municipal Affairs on more than one occasion, for an opinion as to whether Metro Council has jurisdiction in such matters as making grants to, for instance, the Pan-Am Games, and I have been intrigued by the reply of my honourable friend, the Minister of Municipal Affairs who, though he usually seems quite willing to answer questions and discuss policies and programs at some length, seems very reluctant to engage in a discussion of that interesting and important, at the present time, point and he says, "No, he hasn't an opinion to give on it and he won't undertake to give one." Well I couldn't help but compare that with the position of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources who a few days ago said very definitely in this House, that the legal position on a certain matter -- as a matter of fact we were discussing the questions of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead -- the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources said very definitely the legal position is so and so, that's it and the law officers of the Crown have said that's it.

And then just today, my Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs himself in discussing this same question said, "That is the position, that's what the law officers of the Crown have said." Well now, Madam Speaker, I simply ask my honourable friend, why can't he refer this question to the law officers of the Crown, and provide an answer to the Assembly,

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd).....because this matter of the Pan-Am Games is going to be coming up for discussion likely in a short time again and surely that's an important consideration in discussing that very interesting subject? Surely my honourable friend could get the law officers of the Crown to give an opinion on that matter. I can recognize that in spite of his own admitted legal talents that he doesn't want to be giving the legal opinions for the government here, especially not on short notice, but we have the Honourable the Attorney-General sitting here and available to the government and to the House at any time even though I've not been successful in persuading him to give me some answers on some questions. I'm sure that my honourable friend, his colleague, could persuade him in short order to get an answer to this question. See what the law officers of the Crown say and I, along with my honourable friend from St. George, give notice now that when we return to the Pan-Am Games discussion in here I will join with my honourable friend from St. George in pressing for an answer to that question. Surely with all the legal talent that we have in the department, and that the Metro itself has, that we can get an answer to this question. Surely it's not so involved that the law officers of the Crown can't tell us what the situation is and that fairly definitely and in a fairly short time.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, I wish to mention something on Bill No. 38 and more in line with what the Honourable Member of Assiniboia has mentioned. And that is that the Red River Exhibition, it will be perfectly all right for Metro to guarantee these bonds if everything is in order and there's no default of any such guarantee but in the event of a default in a payment by the Red River Exhibition, then there's an onus placed on the member municipalities to acknowledge and pay up the deficit on which they have had no opportunity to be responsible for. In other words, it would make the member municipalities have to pay for a deficit that would have been created only by the actions of the Metropolitan Council and I think that there is a certain amount of danger involved in this. It's quite all right to say, well the Red River Exhibition will always show a profit, or it is operating at a profit. That may be well, but sooner or later if you run into very ambitious schemes in connection with the Red River Exhibition, you may be faced with a loss and then Metro may have to pick up the loss and if these bonds have been guaranteed by Metro, so Metro would have to make up the deficit.

Then the next issue that will come is that the Metropolitan form of government may be asked to support the bonds for the Winnipeg Art Gallery or the Winnipeg Ballet and I think that these are just as important and just as worthwhile as the Red River Exhibition and I feel that there is a precedent going to be set here which I truly think is more the responsibility of the Provincial Government rather than the responsibility of Metro. I think that in view of the high tax structure that the metropolitan form of government is costing the average taxpayer in Metro Winnipeg is high enough and I think that we should not saddle the taxpayer in Metro with any unforeseen additional tax commitments which could result in the event of any loss created by the Red River Exhibition and I am not saying anything about the purpose of the Red River Exhibition. I think it's a good worthwhile association but I honestly do not think that Metro should have to guarantee any bonds or any debenture issue to this association and it rightfully should come from the province.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the, my honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs, if he is not in a position to give us an intelligent answer to the question that has been posed to him as to certain legal aspects of the impact of the bill, I wonder if when he gets up to answer the questions, can he tell the House how we are to be expected to vote intelligently on the bill. After all is said and done, Madam Speaker, Metro is a creature of this government and as such I think they are entitled to know some of the answers that have been asked. It seems as if my honourable friend holds the position that because of the fact that the government legislators make the laws that by the same token they are not expected to interpret them and that may be so to some extent but I think that in this case, immediately before a vote comes we should have the answers in order for us to vote intelligently.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, firstly I want to declare personally that I am opposed to the Pan-American Games. I think we have enough sport activities in Canada during 1967 rather than this and expect a deficit of over \$3 million according to the press. I would rather have built another building to perpetuate the memory of the year. To have the Pan-American Games here when Montreal has one, and Toronto has one, and Vancouver has one, will not add anything as far as Winnipeg contribution. So definitely I want to declare myself opposed to the

(MR. GRAY cont'd). . . . . whole thing. And then if you are opposed to it then the question of the Metro and the City and the Province and the Federal Government will be settled.

There are many institutions that could be built for our future generations and in a hundred years from now they will have something to show but they will have nothing to show with the Pan-American Games. I am definitely opposed to those no matter which way it goes. I am against it personally, and I think that this is absolutely foolish on the part of all governments to worry about it, who is going to cover the deficit, particularly when they know there is going to be a deficit. So I think let's concentrate our efforts for the many millions of dollars which we expect to lose and the millions of dollars which we are spending every year, let's concentrate on other institutions like libraries, and buildings for culture, buildings for art, buildings for drama, something to leave our generation something that they could see. The Pan-American Games as far as I am concerned -- probably to some people accuse me that I am not a sport -- maybe they will be right but I think it will be a waste of money because we have enough sport as it is throughout Canada now.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): I would just like to say a few words in connection with this bill. As has been stated earlier, Metropolitan government is a creature of this legislature. It hasn't worked as well as people had hoped it would work and as was stated by the Member from Assiniboia, that all that is left now is the garbage collection, the fire department and the police departments that Metro is not responsible for. I would think that the Minister of Municipal Affairs would start thinking now of getting the municipalities together and getting rid of Metro and having total amalgamation.

MR. FROESE: 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.

MADAM SPEAKER: The second reading of Bill No. 22, the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville) presented Bill No. 22, an Act to amend The Rivers and Streams Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HUTTON: There are two fairly important sections in here, the one deals with the definition of a river and stream, and in view of the growing importance of the lesser streams and creeks and even drainage ditches within Metropolitan Winnipeg, it has been made broad enough to include all such streams, creeks, canals, drainage ditches, etcetera. There's a growing concern by the area municipalities in the Rivers and Streams Protection Authority about the impingement of development on the natural water courses, especially within the Metropolitan area. If by any chance the ability to develop and maintain these surface water courses and natural water courses should be lost, it could mean tens of millions of dollars in the provision of storm sewers, costly storm sewers, in the future. So it was with very real concern on the part of the area municipalities that we are extending the jurisdiction of the Board, or the Protection Authority, over these lesser streams.

The second part of the bill provides for a schedule of fees to be charged to those people who are making application or taking out permits for buildings in areas that come under the jurisdiction of the Rivers and Streams Protection Authority. The monies will be used to help defray the costs of studies such as soil mechanic studies that they must carry out to determine the stability of the river banks. There are very many costly buildings now going up along the rivers, both rivers, and they should not be constructed unless adequate studies are carried out beforehand. The area municipalities feel that rather than the taxpayers in their municipalities carrying the financial cost of these studies, that those who are making application and who want to develop these properties should contribute towards the cost of the studies that are necessary.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Madam Speaker, there's nothing overly objectionable about this bill, but I was wondering whether the Honourable Minister has taken into consideration the impact that this definition of a river can have? A natural water course throughout the years has been defined quite well in our courts and case law and insofar as common law is concerned. I'm just wondering if he includes all man-made projects in that definition, and if he has whether the net result wouldn't be that you'd be just as responsible under those laws for any man-made channel or ditch as you would be in connection with a river or stream? I haven't had the opportunity to look into this too carefully but it appears to me that by widening that particular

(MR. HRYHORCZUK cont'd).....definition you may be asking for a great deal more than appears on the surface.

Insofar as the permits and authorities are concerned, it's understandable that this is only applicable I believe to a designated area, is it not, where the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council or the Minister designates a certain area then this particular matter of tariff comes in, but where there is no designated area, then this would not apply. And yet, Madam Speaker, I believe that at present there are provisions in this particular Act where anybody that's being hurt by some interference with a natural water course or even by surface water can ask the Minister for assistance or a ruling. There's also, I believe, a provision where you can ask for a permit to do some construction on a natural water course or on a man-made channel -- where you have to have permission. This wouldn't cover that if it was outside a designated area. That's my interpretation of this particular subsection.

It appears to me that the government is sweeping out all the corners it can to raise all the revenue that they can find. This is about the sixth bill that covers permits and fees and I don't see why we couldn't give the public of the Province of Manitoba some services without asking them to pay for it. After all, we're the government of the Province of Manitoba, and it appears it won't be long before there won't be a service performed by the government without a fee having to be paid. I am not quite sure whether it is the rule that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council sets the fees in cases of this nature. Has the Minister ever considered the possibility or the wisdom of having the Legislature set the tariff of fees.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I have a couple of questions that I would like to ask the Minister to consider when he closes the debate on this bill. First and foremost, I'm aware that there is an authority as defined by The Rivers and Streams Act in the Metropolitan area. I believe there is only one authority in this area under that definition. Are there some others in the Province of Manitoba that have been set up under that definition and, if so, could the Minister tell us where they are?

Then with regard to the question of the tariff of fees, I understood the Minister to mention the two rivers in particular and the desirability of restricting building close to the banks of those rivers. Well my thought would be that with the exception of the small area downtown, that those sites are largely taken up now as far as the present areas are concerned. Aren't they largely taken up by private dwellings and won't the future, to the extent that there are some vacant spaces still, won't they be mainly private dwellings? If that's the case, then is it the intention to load the cost of all these studies and surveys that the Minister envisions on private individuals who might be planning to have a river site to build on?

Now I recognize that when the floodway goes through, and other developmental works of that nature, that perhaps there'll be desirable sites for building there and that they might be added, but at the present time, I thought the Minister had mentioned mainly the two rivers in the Metropolitan area.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, the bill expands the definition in meaning of river and stream to include those following such as drainage ditches and natural water courses and so on. I would ask the Minister if there is any expansion or increase in the authority of his department to deal with problems that arise from interference with natural water courses? I suspect that this is a problem that's all too familiar to a good many members, namely, that often one finds that a property owner throws up a dike or an interference on a natural water course, the neighbour has apparently no recourse except for civil suit. It is my understanding that the department feels it doesn't have enough authority to deal with these impoundments that might be thrown up on a natural water course. Well a civil suit isn't a very practical solution for many people. I would simply ask the Minister if this bill would have any impact or any effect with regard to this kind of problem?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam, there's only one thing that I want to raise and that is this, that I realize that the definition of a river and stream only applies to Part III of the Act but that is the only part in that Act where a river and stream is defined. Now I want it made abundantly clear that that definition you are using in Part III is not applicable to the other part of the Act. I don't think it is, but I want to be clear on that fact.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. HUTTON: In respect to the fees, these monies do not accrue to the government, to the Consolidated Fund. This would allow the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to set a schedule of fees that the authority could levy, and it will save the municipalities, the member municipalities in the authority, the necessity of contributing the total cost of the studies to be

(MR. HUTTON cont'd).....carried out. The idea is not to have total restriction, but it's to make sure that the type of development that takes place on any given location along the rivers or streams is the type of construction that is best suited for the stability of soil that exists in that area.

Now I think that the municipalities are thinking in terms of something like one-fortieth of one per cent as the value of the building to be -- the estimated value of the building to be constructed, so it isn't a very heavy tariff in any case, and I think that there is some equity in the fact that those people who want to develop these river bank properties should include the cost of some of these studies that should be carried out before they go ahead -- include them in the cost of construction.

Now what is concerning the River and Streams Protection Authority are the number of high-rise apartment blocks that are going up on what is known indeed as a very unstable soil condition, and their concern is that we should be pretty sure, more certain than we are at present, that adequate investigation has been carried out.

Now the question raised by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead falls properly under The Water Rights Act and we had very good intentions of getting The Water Rights Act revised. Unfortunately, we weren't able to get it done for this session but the intention is to get it revised as soon as the Legislative Counsel is able to do it--(Interjection)--I'm afraid we won't be presenting it at this session of the Legislature--(Interjection)--all summer.

The rivers and streams -- the Honourable Member for Selkirk raised the point that I just don't feel -- the definition of rivers and streams that is given here is for certain applicable in the area for which the authority No. 1 is responsible. Beyond that I cannot tell you, Sir, but there is no application of this Act beyond the one area. There is only one protection authority functioning in the Province of Manitoba at the present time, that is Protection Authority No. 1. It has been expanded beyond what it used to be to include all of the municipalities contiguous to the Red and Assiniboine Rivers within the Metropolitan area.

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

MR. HUTTON presented Bill No. 56, an Act to amend The Department of Agriculture and Conservation Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, this is a bill which might keep us here all summer. This amendment to the departmental Act would authorize the department to make grants to municipalities where due to a water control work the municipality has suffered an unusual loss in revenue. Unusual loss in revenue as defined by the government means loss of revenue in excess of one per cent of the total annual revenues of a municipality. The proposal for an adjustment grant to municipalities affected by such works of such magnitude is that a grant should be calculated on the basis of a five-year period; that it should be the difference between the actual loss in revenues sustained by the municipality and one per cent, that amount over a five-year period and discounted at six per cent interest and the payment made in one lump sum. Under this formula there are two municipalities on the Red River Floodway which qualify, St. Clements and Springfield. The others, Ritchot, St. Boniface, East St. Paul, St. Vital and Fort Garry all sustained much less than a one per cent loss in revenue.

In the case of the Shellmouth Reservoir, both Shellmouth Municipality and Shell River have qualified. In the case of the Portage Diversion, the Municipality of Portage sustained somewhat less than one per cent loss in their total revenues. I must confess that the Municipality of Portage is one of the largest municipalities and certainly the wealthiest municipality in Manitoba, and therefore, even though their loss in revenue is rather substantial, still the relevant effect upon their municipality is not greater than in the case of smaller municipalities who lost lesser amounts. I don't think that there's very much more I can say in developing the proposal here. I know that others will have a great deal to say, and I think I'll sit down and take some advice.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: I am happy that the Minister has given us somewhat more detailed an idea of what he means by "serious loss to tax revenues", because when this was discussed first of all in Committee and when we received the copies of this bill it appeared to us that that terminology was entirely too vague to provide any protection whatever for the municipalities. So, presumably now, by "serious loss to tax revenues" as worded in the Act, the Minister means in effect one per cent of the total annual revenues of the municipality. Is this what -- I beg your pardon?

MR. HUTTON: . . . . .in excess.

MR. MOLGAT: In excess. I wonder then why this would not be put into the Act as such? There may be some technical reasons why the Minister feels it shouldn't be there, but I would think that the preferable arrangement would be instead of Clause (e), simply saying "the establishing of a formula," the formula should be set out, so that there will be no argument then at a later date as to exactly what the arrangement is. One of the very important aspects here is to make sure that all municipalities are treated alike. This, then, brings on some of the other problems which I think may arise here. This is specifically an Act regarding the Department of Agriculture and Conservation, but there are other departments of the government who are purchasing land. What happens if several departments end up by owning land in a municipality, apart from the Department of Agriculture and Conservation? Will they total these other lands that are owned by the Crown in order to arrive at the one per cent or is this to be strictly a Department of Agriculture. . . . .? It would seem to me that in fairness to the municipalities it should take in all departments; in other words, that any land taken over by the Crown for whatever purpose they may be taken over, be included in the formula. Possibly that is the intention of the government, but to this date it has not been spelled out and I think that it should.

I wonder if the Minister could advise the House as well, as to the basis of the one per cent. Was this discussed with the municipalities at all? How was this figure arrived at? It would seem to me to be a -- while one per cent doesn't sound like much money, it can, I think, in a number of municipalities really amount to a fair amount of dollars and cents. Was this done in consultation with the municipalities, and is there the approval of the municipal organizations to this particular formula?

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, it seems to me that this is another incidence where we members of the Legislature are pretty well called upon to accept what has already been done by the Government of the Province of Manitoba. We're dealing with an amendment to an Act here, which sets up provisions to consider a formula as established by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to pay grants to municipalities, but notwithstanding whether this Act passes or not, Madam Speaker, the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture has already told us what the formula is that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council has established. I resent this very much. This has happened on a couple of occasions already in this session, where we've heard of things being done before we, members of this Legislature, approve of them being done. I realize that under our British system of government we have a majority government, at least here in the Province of Manitoba. But I would suggest, I would suggest that even though we have a majority government here in Manitoba, that that government at least should give sufficient courtesy to the Legislative Assembly and not to produce. . . . . before legislation is passed; at least, Madam Speaker, not until it's adopted in principle following second reading. And I want to raise my objections once again to this arbitrary Act of the government we have in Manitoba at the present time. And I think once again the cart is being placed before the horse so far as the government is concerned. Oh, my honourable friend, Madam Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture, can smile at me raising this particular point, but I would suggest to my honourable friend when he or when a few of his party are on this side of the House in opposition before too long he may be raising similar points and condemning a government on that side, if it were to pursue the same course as is being done by the government opposite today. --(Interjection)-- Pardon? Oh, I'm afraid -- not afraid, I'm satisfied that the Honourable Member for Selkirk and the party he represents certainly won't be across the hall. Apart from that, Madam Speaker, dealing with this particular bill, now that we have apparently heard what the formula is going to be, I want to ask the Honourable Minister why, or is there some right of appeal to the Lieutenant-Governor or the Minister in respect of the formula? Now the Minister has said that the formula will be one per cent. I respectfully suggest, Madam Speaker, that the one per cent which apparently has been arbitrarily agreed upon, could work hardship on various municipalities of differing natures. What might be one per cent of the revenue or the area in one municipality could impose a different hardship on that municipality than it could in another one, and I suggest that within the formula, if there isn't already, that the government should give some consideration to having a board of arbitration or some provision where an appeal could be made to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council's formula, or as to how that applies to any municipality. Because apparently, it seems to me, that from the Minister's statement and also from the reading of the Act itself, this can be arbitrarily done without consultation. I note that in the portion of the bill, that deals with the school board

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . . section of it, the legislation does not give to the municipal council the power to apportion to the school district, but gives this to another body, the municipal board. So I would suggest that the government should consider this viewpoint in order that there may be more satisfaction to the municipalities.

These are just a few points that I have to raise. I still would like to see a more clearly definition of the word "serious" in the legislation itself. I don't think, Madam Speaker, that when we're dealing with the legislation which it states, "pay a grant to municipalities as compensation for serious loss of tax revenues", I don't think this is the terminology that should be in legislation. If the Honourable the Minister and his formula is to be the formula, let's put it into legislation or let's have a more clear definition of "serious" because it can be relative to the larger or smaller municipality as what, in their opinion, is serious loss of compensation. I make these few comments now for the consideration of the Minister. Madam Speaker, I'm not going to oppose the bill going to second reading, and I hope at that particular time we may hear representations from the municipalities that are affected, because the Minister knows the members of the House -- now within my own constituency, some of the municipalities he mentioned are part, and may have comments to make on this particular bill.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister which is a minor question but I'd like to get cleared up. 7(a) "damages paid to the municipalities", 7(b) it's paid to the schools, different kind of schools. Why the difference? The municipalities are responsible for the schools. Why have the two sections? I don't think it's anything serious, but as one that doesn't know the details on which, I'd like to be informed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, the Honourable the Minister seemed to anticipate when he was finishing his remarks that there might be some considerable discussion with regard to this bill, and evidently he isn't going to be disappointed. I would like to add my word to those who have mentioned the fact that the word "serious" should be more carefully defined, and defined in the legislation. I listened pretty carefully to my honourable friend when he spoke on the bill, and I thought he defined the word "unusual". I didn't hear a definition of "serious". Now, if serious means unusual, then I guess we have the definition of "serious". But, seriously, I think we should have a better understanding of what it is, as contained in this Act, and I would think the formula should be put right into the Act.

Madam Speaker, this question of compensation for tax revenues to municipalities is certainly not new. It's been before the government of the various provinces for a long time and certainly before the Federal Government for a long time. I can well recall when no taxes were paid on provincial government buildings, and even in the early days they weren't paid even on the commercial institutions. The municipalities raised the question, quite properly in their view -- seemed to in the course of time be felt to be proper from governing bodies as well, that they should have, the municipalities should have, some revenue from these buildings and other properties that were acquired in their municipalities and gradually, so far as Manitoba was concerned, we came along to the position of where we first paid on the commercial operations and then had a definition whereby if they were revenue producing, there was some money paid on them and so on and so on and so on. Gradually that was expanded, that theory.

But with all due respect to the Minister's position in this matter, I think there's a great difference between the position of a municipality that has situated in it an institution or a building or has some property acquired in it, particularly if there are people employed there, there's a great difference so far as the municipality is concerned and the municipal taxpayers in that situation and when the government goes in as in the case of the Portage la Prairie diversion and arbitrarily takes out of production a certain amount of high revenue producing land. I'd like to ask the Minister just what the estimate is, so far as Portage la Prairie municipality is concerned. I believe it's something in the nature of 8 or 9 thousand dollars, and surely when the government moves in and takes this land right out of production, thereby off the tax roll, surely they should make compensation. In my opinion the taking of the land is bad enough to start with, particularly when it's for a purpose that the local people do not agree with. But then to take it for those purposes and then say at the same time, well because there isn't a certain amount of tax revenue going to be lost, we won't pay any compensation for the loss of tax at all. I think that is very arbitrary. As far as the level at which my honourable friend says that it will be paid, I understood him to say that it would be paid if it was in excess of one per cent. Does that mean that just the excess over one per cent will be paid or does it mean that if it's in excess of one per cent that the whole amount will be paid? So it's just the excess over one per cent.

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

Well now, Madam Speaker, surely this is a very dictatorial stand for the government to take that they say that every municipality, regardless of where it is or what the purpose, whether they agree with it or not, whether it's against their wishes or in conformity with their own judgment in the matter, the government will walk in and will say, "you must make a donation of at least one per cent of your annual tax revenue for our purpose." Now I argue at times that the government is facing some serious financial problems, if it keeps on without mending its ways, but surely we haven't arrived yet at the position where we have to ask the municipalities, even one that my honourable friend characterizes as a rich one like Portage la Prairie, where we ask them to finance the government.

I would like to make an appeal to my genial friend, the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation, to be a little more, a little more generous with these municipalities and having disturbed the situation so great, having put so many people to trouble and loss, that at least they compensate them in full for the lack of tax revenues. And then so far as the question as to whom it should be paid, I would think, and I gather this is in line with the thinking of the Leader of the New Democratic Party, I would think that the payments should go to the municipality. It appears to me from reading the bill that the intention is to ask the municipal board to allocate the revenues to the various school districts. Well, it's to the municipality that the revenues go now; surely they could be handed over to the municipality and obviate the necessity of the board making an apportionment of it.

MR. SCHREYER: Since this bill has to do with the problem of municipalities and school districts that lost some amount of taxable assessment and tax revenue as a result of the floodway, and since the floodway has to do particularly with the constituencies of Springfield and Brokenhead, it is not unnatural that I was interested in the content of Bill 56. In fact, Madam Speaker, it is the Member for Springfield and myself -- we do team up occasionally, and as I recall it was four years ago when I sponsored a resolution in this Chamber and it was amended, the sense wasn't destroyed, it was changed slightly by the Member for Springfield asking -- the resolution asked for the government of the province to take the necessary steps to compensate the municipalities for loss of revenue as a result of the floodway. We must understand that the floodway is not of local benefit to these municipalities, therefore why should they sustain the tax loss. So I'm glad to see Bill 56 although I have the right to ask a question -- why it took four years, four years, to get this legislation before us. In the meantime, these municipalities have lost a certain amount of revenue for each of the last three years without compensation and I don't suspect that this bill has any retroactive effect. I'd be surprised if it did.

Now, I really don't have any objection to the concept here that the municipal boards should earmark the monies paid by the Consolidated Fund. After all, it is school districts that are being hit as hard as the municipalities, in fact some of the school districts, and I'm sure honourable members can understand this, some school districts are going to feel the impact of the loss of revenue more than the municipalities, so I see nothing wrong with earmarking being done by the municipal boards. In fact on that very point, Madam Speaker, I want to point out to the Minister that when he says that everything, all the loss over one per cent shall be reimbursed, this is not quite good enough, in this sense, that what is one per cent loss to a municipality might be as high as 10, 15 or 20 per cent loss to a school district. For example, under the terms of this legislation, the Municipality of St. Clements will be reimbursed for its loss of tax revenue over one per cent of its total. This is pretty fair but the school district of Gonor which is inside the municipality, may have to sustain a loss of as high as 10 or 15 per cent of its school district revenue before this formula comes into effect and so, and I admit it would be more difficult, but it would have been much more equitable to have this formula based on impact to school district rather than on impact to municipality. Now if the Minister is really keen and anxious to deal with inequity here is a nice problem for him to work on.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, the bill is of interest to me as well, since at some future date there might be some waterworks development in the area where I come from. I just wonder, will this cover projects that are dealt with by the Federal Government as well? Will the Provincial Government make compensation in a case like that? I would like to see the term "water control works" defined a little bit better. Maybe the Minister could tell us just what he means by water control works in Section 5. Will this also cover areas like Grand Rapids where they built the new Hydro plant and where they flooded many acres of land which I



(MR. FROESE cont'd). . . . . don't think are in a municipality but are local government districts? It just mentions municipality here but will those areas stand to gain by this legislation as well? When revisions are made as to the losses sustained, will these be made annually and will the old values apply or will new values be made when revision is done?

MR. HUTTON: I'd like to assure my good friend, the Leader of the NDP, that I was in fact trying to be courteous when I gave the House here the proposed settlement that the government was contemplating and I did so because we'd like to have it discussed. Because this was a very difficult thing and I realize that four years is a long time, but it was a very difficult problem to try and arrive at a basis on which we could give consideration to the impact of these large public works without establishing a precedent of the government being responsible for loss of tax revenue every time a public work was undertaken. I think you can appreciate the fact that I don't think it would be a very good thing for the public of Manitoba if such a contingent liability were to rest on the government every time it undertook a public work. I think it would tend to stifle development projects. So the problem was to find what appeared to be a fair and equitable basis on which consideration, financial consideration, could be given to municipalities under unusual circumstances or where serious tax loss was incurred. We arrived at one per cent. The Honourable Member for Lakeside says it's a dictatorial stand, it's an arbitrary stand. I admit it -- we admit it. What is unusual loss? What's serious loss? We came down at one per cent. You might come down at half of one per cent. If we came down at half of one per cent the Municipality for Portage would qualify for consideration but then some others would be left out. For instances, I think I have some figures here -- in the case of St. Vital for instance, we'd have to come down at less than one-third of one per cent before that municipality would qualify -- St. Vital--(Interjection)--oh, in the case of St. Boniface their tax loss was \$168 in 1961. Now these are just rough estimates. So it is an arbitrary decision, the best one we could make. Now we're not saying that it's right. We think it's right.

I have invited the Reeve of Portage Municipality to come to Committee. Mr. Adrain was at the meeting that we had up at Neepawa last week in respect to the implementation of the provincial waterways policy. I expect that he will be here representing the Municipality of Portage when this bill is being considered in Committee. Other municipalities may very well come in. We did carry out some discussion. I had two meetings with the municipalities involved in the Red River Floodway and we had a meeting with the Municipalities of Shellmouth and Shell River. They -- I must confess, Madam Speaker, that the municipalities would have liked more. Some of the municipalities on the Red River diversion, or affected by the Red River diversion, those that qualified were reasonably satisfied. I think everybody would have liked more. But this represents the best thinking that we have given to the subject over some period of time and we think provides an adjustment grant that can be used by the municipalities and by the school districts so that it will buffer the initial impact of this kind of loss in revenue.

In the case of the Red River diversion, it is proposed that the amounts be calculated on the basis of the loss of revenue that took place in 1961. This would be adjusted for interest accruing to these monies so that there is really no loss in revenue because of the delay in arriving at a formula. In the case of the Shellmouth Reservoir, the basis of the calculation would be at the time that the land was taken by the Crown and the same would apply in the case of the Portage diversion. I would say that we want to be very careful about establishing this precedent in the case of small reservoirs for instance, which might have quite an impact on a local school district for instance, and then it would be a question of whether you were going to build that reservoir or whether the school district was going to be sustained. We know that, due to changing times and changing organizations, changing scenes, that local organization especially in terms of school districts is changing from day to day, certainly from year to year, and I think that it would be very bad government if we were to attempt to sustain local organization on indefinitely into the future because they were affected by any type of public work. It is for this reason that we have rejected the idea of the cumulative effect of public works, because if you were to take all the different public works that are carried out in terms of highways and bridges and by-passes, etcetera, etcetera, it would be very easy to claim unusual loss of tax revenue or serious loss of tax revenue, and I think one doesn't want to forget that a lot of public works that in the first instance may reduce the revenue of the municipality, over the long run may substantially increase it too and it isn't easy for anybody to determine accurately at this time in history, or at any time in history, what the exact financial impact is going to be on the area in which a public work is undertaken.

MR. SCHREYER: I wonder if the Minister would permit two questions. First of all, is this bill or the provisions of this bill to have effect for a five-year period only? In other words, is there a five-year limit on this money to be paid out? And secondly, would he like to comment on the impact on school districts as opposed to municipalities?

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, the bill just gives us the authority to establish a formula. It doesn't spell it out. The second thing -- the five-year, the payment, the lump sum payment calculated over a five-year period, is just the proposed formula that we have developed and proposed to the municipalities. In the case of the floodway there was only one school district that was really faced with a problem and that was Gonor School District, and they're faced with the necessity of reorganization up there and we have made--(Interjection)-- yes, that's true. We have made -- tried to assist. My department, while the floodway was under construction, tried to assist them by providing transportation. When the actual construction of the floodway was completed in that area the Department of Education moved in and gave I think very generous assistance to help them during the intervening period, while reorganization of the school districts can take place. I made a specific point of requesting through the municipalities of any school districts along the floodway that needed special help. Gonor was the only school district that was reported to me in this condition.

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

MR. McLEAN presented Bill No. 57, an Act to amend The Public Libraries Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, if I can direct the members' attention to some spiritual matters, I would like to say that there are four points covered by this bill. First, this will allow a local government district to become part of a regional library. This is accomplished by virtue of a definition of municipalities which is contained in this bill and which would allow one of the local government districts, which is permitted to become a municipal library, to become part of a regional library. There are certain sections in the bill which relate only to procedural approval of bylaws. This is a technical matter. The by-laws have to be approved at the present time and this simply sets out in a rather better form the procedure for having those approvals given. The Local Government District of Churchill is added to the local government districts that may have, subject to complying with the general requirements of the Act, a municipal library.

And the fourth point is a provision which would allow a municipality which is included in a regional library to increase the amount of money that it may contribute toward the operation of the regional library to which it belongs. At the present time, where there are two or more municipalities forming a regional library, they contribute toward the expense of the regional library and there is a somewhat complicated provision which relates their contribution to their relative populations, and that has worked quite satisfactorily until we encountered the regional library of Assiniboine River, where there has been a rapidly expanding population in Assiniboia -- a more rapidly expanding population than in Charleswood, which is the other municipality in that particular region, and with the result that the relating their proportionate expenses to the 1961 census tends to make it difficult for them to operate. The people in Assiniboia, that is the council and those directly associated with the formal operation of the library, have brought the problem to our attention and we are proposing in this bill a provision which would allow any municipality -- although I would expect that Assiniboia would be the first to make use of it -- to increase their contribution beyond that which their regular proportion would be on the basis of the arrangements in the Act, subject always to the fact that they will not be required and indeed cannot contribute more than one mill on their assessment. That limit exists and no change is being made there. As I say, this would be particularly helpful to the Assiniboine River regional library at the present time, because of this disproportion caused by the rapidly expanding population in Assiniboia. It would be of course also available if similar situations were to arise in the future in regional libraries containing municipalities, particularly suburban municipalities, where there is an uneven increase in their population and where there may be some disposition for a municipality to increase the contribution it would normally make to the regional library.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Madam Speaker, only a couple of questions I would like to ask the Honourable Minister. I notice that in widening the definition of municipality, there are five local government districts added in the definition. We have other local government districts in the Province of Manitoba and some of them have fairly large settlements within their

(MR. HRYHORCZUK cont'd) . . . . . areas. Is there any provision in the Act whereby these settlements could establish libraries? That is question number one. The other is, the Minister stated that at present the establishment of a library requires the approval of the Minister. I don't see that provision in the present Act and it would appear that this is a new provision, and if it is I'd be interested to know why the Minister is asking for this particular provision. It seems to me that in the past whenever we had a talk about municipal and regional libraries, we always heard a good word about the Municipal and Public Utility Board who were the authority before the Municipal Board was established. Is there some particular reason why the Minister should now change his mind and ask for the authority to approve before the libraries are established?

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, if there are no other questions. Up until last year there was no provision under which a local government district could vote on and establish a municipal library. There was interest expressed from a number of local government districts which are essentially towns or -- yes, towns. I'm thinking of places like Thompson, Snow Lake, Pinawa, and quite frankly, we proposed a provision which was approved, which would allow those local government districts that had indicated a real interest in considering a library, into the Act. And it was just a case of putting into the Act, by name, the local government districts where there was some indication and an interest. And last year the Local Government Districts of Lynn Lake, Pinawa, Snow Lake and Mystery Lake or Thompson, were put in. And this year, Churchill is being added. I can't give any rationale. I think it would not be practical for example to include the Local Government District of Consul, which is a vast territory, although if there was some part of that territory where there was a real interest indicated, certainly that could be done. I can give no other explanation than that, except that these are the places where interest in libraries has been indicated, where they have what is in effect a town and where they could, if they saw fit to do so, support a public library if it were approved.

With regard to the approval, I was just quickly getting out the Act. I think the Honourable Member for Ethelbert-Plains will find that this is approval of bylaws only, prior to submission. It relates to the matter of approving them from a standpoint of form and otherwise, and we are not proposing to add anything in that reference here, but it's really the approval of the bylaw prior to its submission to a vote of the resident electors in the particular municipality concerned.

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

MR. McLEAN presented Bill No. 24, an Act to amend The County Courts Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, there are two matters dealt with in this bill. The first has to do with the authorization that is sometimes required whereby a county court judge appointed to a judicial district is asked to act in a district other than the one to which he is appointed. The authority for his so acting at the present time is an Order-in-Council of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and we are proposing to substitute for the order of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council an order or direction of the Attorney-General. These are formalities, they happen perhaps for temporary periods, holiday time, and otherwise, or other circumstances and it is thought that it would be sufficient if that request and authority could be given by the Attorney-General rather than having to have an Order-in-Council.

The second matter deals with the repeal of some sections which the House approved a year ago. At that time, it was our intention, and I presented the bill, which would have established the system whereby the county court judges, who are appointed of course by the Governor-in-Council at Ottawa, that they would be appointed as county court judges for the province, as distinct from being appointed to a particular judicial district. And that from that point forward they would then be as it were assigned by the Attorney-General to a particular judicial district within the province. It was my understanding, and I now have to confess mistakenly, that this was the system which was in operation in Alberta and in Saskatchewan. In any event, the legislation was approved by the House to come into force on proclamation. But on drawing the matter to the attention of the Minister of Justice, he informed us that he didn't approve of that type of legislation, that he felt that the appointment of the county court judge to the particular judicial district should be made by the Governor-in-Council at Ottawa, and in view of that we have not proclaimed the particular provisions of the bill that was here a year ago and we're now suggesting that those sections be repealed, so that they will no longer form

(MR. McLEAN cont'd). . . . . part of our Act. We haven't proclaimed them. We don't intend to use them. We've been advised that they do not meet the wishes or the principles are not satisfactory to the Minister of Justice, and I think the handiest way is for us simply to repeal them and let it go at that.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Madam Speaker, both this bill and the one that follows it, No. 25, are pretty well along the same lines. I am not altogether happy about the change from the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to the Attorney-General. I think the assignment of judges to sit on other cases in other jurisdictions is fairly important, and I doubt whether it is wise for an Attorney-General to take the responsibility upon his own shoulders to make such assignment. I think it is best left with the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. I also note that there's another change been made here, and that is that under the present law a local judge, in case he has a reason that he can't sit on any particular case or matter that comes before him, could ask any other county court judge, request him to come and take it over. This has been struck out of the legislation; a local judge can no longer do that. Now, I can see or anticipate cases where it would be important that something be done immediately. Supposing a judge gets ill during a hearing or in the event something is before him or about to come before him, he could get assistance from another judge much sooner than to have to report the matter to the Attorney-General and then have the Attorney-General assign the judge. I don't think that either one of these provisions are an improvement on our present legislation.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the force of what the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert-Plains has said with regard to the question of whether it is wise to leave the direction of a judge to the Attorney-General as distinct from the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and one would have to acknowledge that there can be honest differences of opinion on that point. Inasmuch, of course, as the Attorney-General generally is the one who recommends the Order-in-Council and in many instances it's a formality, there might be an argument for saying that it could more easily be done by the Attorney-General rather than involving the time and the concern of a much larger number of people who in the final analysis, of course, have to take whatever advice they receive -- as a practical matter take the advice of the Attorney-General. As I say, it's a matter on which there may be a very honest difference of opinion and this is thought perhaps to commend itself to us.

On the second point, I think the Honourable Member is misunderstanding because there is no intention to remove from the provision of The County Courts Act the authority which would allow a judge to ask another judge to act on his behalf, but if when we get into committee an interpretation of this bill would indicate that the Honourable Member for Ethelbert-Plains has interpreted it in that way and that is the interpretation, then I will be the first to say that it ought to be changed, because we had no intention of making that change. We were only intending to deal here with the order which is normally made by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

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

MR. McLEAN presented Bill No. 25, an Act to amend The County Courts Judges' Criminal Courts Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, as the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert-Plains indicated, this bill is in some respects a companion bill to Bill No. 24, and would allow a judge who is authorized to act in a district other than the one to which he has been appointed, where he has been authorized to act in another district, to be the judge under -- to hold court under the provisions of The County Court Judges' Criminal Courts Act. This is a Manitoba statute and establishes this particular court, and this would allow the judge who has been authorized to act in a district other than his own, to act in all respects so far as criminal matters are concerned, in the same way as he may act in civil matters.

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

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon) presented Bill No. 43, an Act respecting the Care and Treatment of Mentally Disordered Persons and the Custody and Control of their Estates, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, the bill before us, No. 43, is quite a complex bill, and I trust that when we get into committee that the detailed questions will be asked at that time, when we will have with us some of the professional people to explain fully for the members

(MR. WITNEY cont'd). . . . . of the committee the methods of admittance to our hospitals in Manitoba. The general principle of the bill, though, is to make our mental hospital facilities as available as possible to all those people who are suffering from a mental illness, and also to allow them to go there either in two forms of admission, either on a non-compulsory basis or on a compulsory basis, and to do so without difficulty or stigma, to obtain help for the problem that they face.

The principle that we have here is basically enunciated by the principles that were brought down by the Legislative Committee of the Canadian Mental Health Association in Canada, a committee that comprised psychiatrists and lawyers and lay people. As a matter of fact, the bill was held up for about a year until such time as the Legislative Committee of the CMHA made its final determinations and we were able to take advantage of the thinking for 1964. The principles that are outlined in this bill, the modes of admission and the inclusion of addiction, are principles that have been accepted in many other jurisdictions in Europe and in this country, and we are now accepting them here in Manitoba.

I'd like to draw to the attention of the House the fact that addiction to alcohol or to drugs is such that the person suffering is one who is either a danger to himself or a danger to others, and he does in fact exhibit some of the symptoms of a mental disease.

Another principle that is enunciated in the Act before you, apart from the modes of admission and the inclusion of the principle of recognizing addiction of alcohol and of drugs is the fact that the person who either enters the mental hospitals in Manitoba either as a non-compulsory patient or a compulsory patient, now must be examined within a specified time period. Up to the institution of this bill there has been no time period, and we are recognizing now that a patient who comes to us for assistance must be given assistance within a specified time.

Included in here, too, is what is termed the Minister's Committee, which will be an appeal section for both admission and discharge from our mental facilities in the province. We do have in the present legislation what is known as a Board of Control, and it is permissible -- in this bill we are making the Minister's Committee mandatory, and instead of terming it the Board of Control we are terming the committee the Minister's Committee, and people may appeal decisions of the Director of Psychiatric Services with respect to admission and with respect to discharge and with respect to movement of patients from one facility to another.

In the matter of the control of the estate, we have made one important change in principle. At the present time anybody going into our mental facilities their estate is automatically taken over or taken away from them. Now, under a non-compulsory admission unless the Superintendent of the hospital feels that the patient would benefit by having someone take over the estate, the estate remains in the hands of the person who has admitted himself to the hospital on a non-compulsory basis. On a compulsory basis the estate, after a period of 21 days, would be turned over to either an administrator of the Estates of the Mentally Incompetent if there was not a committee to take care of the estate for the person, or before 21 days if in the opinion of the superintendent of the facility it would be of benefit to the patient to have the estate taken over. We have done away in this Act with the terminology that was in the other Acts that are now in force, of moron, imbecile and defective, and we have termed "mental retardate" which is a definition which is now accepted pretty well across the country. There has been a considerable amount of work gone into this bill and a considerable amount of examination of the bills in Great Britain, in Alberta, in British Columbia, in Ontario and in Saskatchewan, and I feel that it is a step forward in the Province of Manitoba and recommend it to the House.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. ROBLIN presented Bill No. 50, an Act to amend The Insurance Corporations Tax Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: There's very little I can add, Madam Speaker, to the explanations that were given in Committee of the Whole. This does not increase the provincial revenue in any way. It simply provides for a different system of collecting it within the province. This Act will not come into effect until other provinces have adopted similar legislation as has risen

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd). . . . . from the conferences of the superintendents of insurance on uniformity.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, did the Honourable the First Minister say that it would not increase the revenues of the province, or -- it would not increase. The only question then, I think, Madam Speaker, that I have is, will the revenues be affected one way or another? I believe that the Honourable Minister said when it was introduced that the insurance companies were asking for it. Was it this one? Well then, my question is, will the revenues of the province be affected one way or another?

MR. ROBLIN: If there are no more speakers, I can say the answer is no.

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

MR. ROBLIN presented Bill No. 54, an Act to amend The Insurance Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I think that the explanations in the Act pretty well set out what this bill attempts to do. There's no principle in it in the usual sense; it merely consists of a number of rather minor legislations that are being made to The Insurance Act to give greater certainty with respect to certain operations under the Act, and is one of these bills that arise from consultations with superintendents of insurances across the country and the insurance industry. If any member is interested in a particular clause or item in the bill, then I suggest that perhaps at Committee stage we can go into it further.

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

MR. WITNEY presented Bill No. 61, an Act to amend The Health Services Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, is the Minister going to give any explanation of this bill?

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, all the schemes for hospital districts that have been adopted since July 1st, 1958 provide for payments made by the Manitoba Hospital Commission on depreciation and interest payments to be applied toward the annual payment due on the debentures. In some areas, before July 1, 1958, this was not being done, and there was in fact two payments being carried forward for the same thing -- the levy was being carried forward and the money that was being paid by the Manitoba Hospital Commission was also being carried forward -- so we are now providing for the monies from the Manitoba Hospital Commission to be paid toward reduction of the debt, similar to those hospital schemes that have been adopted since July 1, 1958.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister. It seems to me there's another section here in the bill regarding representation from Local Government Districts. What is the purpose of that change and is there a problem behind this?

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, it will only -- the Minister could appoint no one who was not a ratepayer only if there were no ratepayers in the area. Up in Churchill we have a hospital up there that is in the Federal Government, around the camp up there, around the Fort. It is in a school district and all the people in that area are employees of the Federal Government, they are not ratepayers; and yet the Federal Government and the Provincial Government are all contributing toward that hospital and we feel that it would be of advantage to be able to appoint someone from the school district of Churchill on the Hospital Board at Churchill -- that's basically what it's for.

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

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

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, I go along with the idea, with the amendment, that it should be referred back to the committee and especially on the second point of having two enumerators. The other points have been aired quite a bit in this House and there is no need for me to add anything to that; but on the second point of having two enumerators, I found during the last election, in my own constituency when I was going through the Voters List, I found a name on that Voters List of a fellow whose funeral I had attended a few weeks previous to that. Now apparently what had happened -- the weather was cold, the election was in

(MR. PETERS cont'd). . . . . December and we had some pretty nasty weather; the enumerator got hold of the last Voters List and just took it for granted that it was the same and just copied it, and I think that if we had had two enumerators a thing like this wouldn't have happened. It would have been interesting to see if a dead person had voted, but fortunately the dead person didn't vote. Also in my constituency, and also the constituency that I live in, Kildonan, there were in Kildonan two blocks that were left off the Voters List, that the enumerator didn't go and see at all, and I'm sure that if we had had two enumerators that this wouldn't have happened, and I can't use language strong enough to urge the government to reconsider and send this report back to the Committee and let them give it further consideration, especially on this point of the enumerators.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

. . . . . continued on next page

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, . . . . . that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition does not wish to speak tonight on the Budget Debate, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department of Education.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, it is with a heavy sense of responsibility that I present for the consideration of this committee the largest estimates for education in the history of Manitoba, and it is with a modest pride that I propose to account for our stewardship over the past year.

Just ten years ago in this Chamber, the then Minister of Education submitted estimates for the operation of the Department and the support of public education in Manitoba totalling \$12,660,680, while today you are being asked to provide \$56,753,446 for the support of a system of public education but most assuredly not for the support of the same system. In the intervening years the world and the province have seen changes which stagger us in their breadth and rapidity, and the changes in public education in Manitoba have not been less startling than they have been in industrial techniques, social concepts and the emergence of new powers in world affairs. No doubt, as we proceed through the estimates, the House will take note of some of the changes which have already occurred and share with me the anticipation of improvements planned for next year. I think the Members of the Committee would be interested in another comparison: I note that the estimates of the province for ten years ago were \$1.6 million greater than the estimates now placed before you for the Department of Education alone.

I would like, before proceeding further, to pay tribute at this time to the staff in the Department of Education. Some trusted employees have retired in the past year, notably Mr. McDonald, the School Attendance Officer; Miss Aileen Garland who for nine years served as a history teacher at the Teachers College after a long and distinguished career as a teacher. She was awarded a Doctor of Laws degree by our University last year; and as reported in your annual report, we're sad to -- on the death of Mr. Sims, a very highly respected school inspector in the Winnipeg area. An extensive reorganization of the department was effected to distribute immediate responsibility of the vastly increased workload over the past few years, and I must say that the dedication of the staff in the department to the public school system is most commendable, and I know you all join with me in expressing to the people of our province that we are indeed fortunate to have men of such high calibre in the positions of trust, and we are certainly indebted to the members of the staff for their exemplary devotion to duty. I would be remiss if I also didn't say at this time that, especially in the past year, we have had the widest consultation with the Manitoba School Trustees Association and the Urban School Trustees Association over a wide range of activities, and we are most grateful for their co-operation and understanding, and for the dedication which trustees across the province have shown and will continue to show, I know. Also the officials of the Manitoba Teachers Society, and as I will be pointing out during the course of these Estimates, the role and concern and interest they are showing in co-operating with the department in curriculum revision and in teacher restraining programs. I have been most grateful to all these groups for their efforts in this field over the past year.

As we proceed through these estimates appropriation by appropriation, I will try to give you detailed information of the operation of the department and of the school system in general, and I would like to say that I propose to try and point out any policy adjustments or any differences or highlights of the program as we come to each main estimate, each of the main appropriations, because in such a wide area I think it's pretty hard for myself or possibly members of the Committee to follow the advances, and I hope members will have better opportunity to question the programs, but before we move to that closer consideration, perhaps you would let me tell you of some of the highlights of the past year.

Our enrollments have been climbing steadily and at the moment total 218,770 children in the public schools. The increase is particularly notable in recent years in the high school. In 1958, the last year before the establishment of school divisions, total high school enrollment was 30,647. At the end of December 1964 it stood at 54,831, an increase of 79 percent



(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) . . . . . in six years. This year the total number of teachers employed in our system is 9,126 compared with 6,645 in 1958. The proportion of graduate teachers has increased from 17 percent of the teaching staff at that time to 25 percent of the teaching staff now. Now, this may not seem like a very great improvement, until you realize that the 17 percent really means 17 percent of 6,645 teachers, while the 25 percent means 25 percent of 9,126. Numerically, the comparison is between 1,170 graduate teachers in '58 and 2,314 in 1964. Seen in this light, the number of graduate teachers has exactly doubled in the past six years. At the same time, conditional certificates have been eliminated this year and the requirements for admission to Teacher Training courses have become more demanding. Steady progress has been made in the provision of first class school accommodation. In 1964 almost \$9 million worth of schools were built, providing 564 classrooms and classroom equivalents; 296 of these were elementary classrooms and 268 were secondary. Fourteen new consolidated school districts were formed and 50 school districts, chiefly small rural districts, were dissolved. Many parents have expressed to the department their great satisfaction in having been able, for the first time, to send their children to a graded school. 32,000 rural pupils are being transported on 1,900 routes in a fleet which includes 370 buses ranging from 17 to 66 passengers. I should like to express my appreciation for the very excellent program of testing school bus drivers and inspecting school buses, which has been developed by the Highways Safety Branch.

The Manitoba Institute of Technology is now in its second year of operation with an enrolment of well over 500 in technology courses and a peak enrolment of 957 in other day courses. The response to evening school courses has been most encouraging. The peak enrolment this winter has been 1,924. Not only has enrolment been increasing at the Brandon Vocational Centre, but new courses are having to be established to meet the demand.

The course offerings and plan of the proposed new Brandon Vocational School have now been approved at Ottawa. Preliminary drawings have been completed and the detail working drawings are now being prepared. We expect that tenders will be called and the contract let in the spring of this year and, similarly, the work and building plans for the Northern Vocational School at The Pas have been approved by the Federal Government's Department of Labour and detail working drawings are now being prepared for it also. We expect construction to start in the early summer and the school should be open in September, 1966.

Plans are actively moving forward with respect to the Junior Vocational School in Winnipeg, with a capacity as we noted last year of 700 students, and we expect to turn this school over to the Winnipeg School Division for operation by September of 1966.

Last year I was able to report to you on our progress in the expansion of the program of basic training for skill development. This is a program in which unemployed people with low educational achievements or attainment are enrolled and up-graded in a very practical academic course which includes maths, science and the use of English. Those who were enrolled in the course last year were given a living allowance to enable them to attend and take the courses. The program was quite successful and it is being operated just as actively this year.

I am happy to tell you that we have since extended the provision of living allowances to unemployed people taking other courses, for example trade training at the Institute of Technology and at Brandon, and these same considerations will be granted to unemployed persons who enroll in the school at The Pas when it is ready for operation.

Divisional Boards are extending their vocational high school offerings and 13 percent of our high school population are enrolled in vocational, industrial and commercial courses this year. The school boards also offered academic, vocational, citizenship and practical arts courses in evening classes at 24 centres throughout the province, with a total enrolment exceeding 13,000 students.

An in-plant training program organized by Industry and Commerce, with the co-operation of our department and with financial support from the Federal Government, has caught the attention of a number of industries and provinces in Canada. The program is operating at the moment chiefly in the garment industry where over 500 people have been trained in the past year, the majority of whom have continued in employment not only in the industry but with the firms in whose shops they were trained.

We are also at this time operating both a one-year course and a two-year course for the training of vocational and technical teachers. The course is offered at the Institute of Technology and at the present time has an enrolment of 28 in the one-year course and 11 in the

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) . . . . . two-year course.

A comparison of the estimates of a few years ago with the estimates presented to you will show the massive effort that we are making in the field of curricula. Last year the House displayed a very lively interest in the new courses being developed, and as I propose to make a somewhat detailed presentation to you when we come to that item in the estimates, I will not dwell on it at the moment other than to assure you that there are literally hundreds of the most competent teachers working diligently with a greatly expanded departmental staff to evolve new and modern courses in every grade and discipline in the public school system. I'm sure that never in the history of the province have courses and their content been studied with a more critical eye or techniques and methods been more carefully analyzed than they have been this year. The changes being planned will not only challenge students by their content, but will require the learning of new techniques and approaches by teachers. I would like to express in very clear terms our appreciation of the support and help we are receiving from the many, many teachers and from their professional organization of course, the Manitoba Teachers' Society, in the fields of curriculum development and teacher re-training.

Within the Directorate of Special Services, this last year has been one of great activity. We have always felt in this province that a really satisfactory job could not be done with deaf students in a residential school of less than 100 students. Manitoba has now reached the point where our number of deaf is considerably in excess of 100, and the determination was made last year that we would undertake the education of all our deaf children within our borders instead of having some of them attend schools elsewhere.

Last summer we saw the principal who might take charge of the new institution and at the same time replace Miss Eldred who for many years had served as principal of the day school for the deaf here. I would like to pay tribute to the skill and devotion which Miss Eldred has cared for her charges. For quite a few years she worked under rather trying conditions and it was only her genius as a teacher of the deaf that made it possible for the excellent results that we have attained. We appreciate too her willingness to remain on the staff this year in spite of the fact that she had technically retired.

We believe we've been singularly fortunate in engaging Mr. Don Plummer to serve as principal of the School for the Deaf. Many of you will remember that Mr. Plummer previously served our department as Supervisor of Special Classes, having under his purview the education of children with various types of physical and mental handicaps. In 1963 he left our service to assume the position of Assistant General Secretary to the Council for Exceptional Children in the United States, and we now feel that with his return to our department we will reap the benefit of the broadening experiences that he has had elsewhere. Under his guidance the School for the Deaf will be brought back to its home in Tuxedo and we hope that Manitoba's deaf children will never find it necessary to leave the province to secure an adequate and satisfying educational opportunity.

Plans are now under way for the renovation of the premises. As most of you know, they have been occupied for almost 20 years by the Manitoba Teachers' College. In this last year the attendance of our children at the school in Saskatoon -- at the Saskatoon School for the Deaf -- I would like to acknowledge the many courtesies and considerations our children and our officials have received from the Government of Saskatchewan and the principal and staff of the Saskatoon School. The Deputy Minister advises me that there has been the most excellent relationship throughout the years.

As most members know, there is a section of The Public School Act which permits the Minister to operate schools in remote places where in his opinion a school is necessary but where there is no school district. Under this section we are now operating 36 schools with 101 teachers. Some small local contributions are made in cash or in services, but in the main the cost is paid from our departmental estimates. The estimates before you will provide for the construction of seven new classrooms and at least four new teachers in these remote areas. These schools are scattered, as I say, in the fringe settlements of the province. They have been increasing in number and improving in quality of accommodation and instruction but we feel that the time has now arrived when, for most of them, a new outlook and new opportunities must be provided, and to that end, legislation will be brought before the House to provide for the establishment of a division to include most of these special schools and a number of other schools in isolated locations.

Later in my remarks I wish to address myself with more length to this proposal, but at this point I wish to acknowledge the debt owed by many of the remote settlements of the

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) . . . . . province to Mr. Bernard Grafton. He became Manitoba's first supervisor of special schools in 1948 and has served in that post ever since. Under his devoted guidance, educational services have been extended to the outskirts of the province. Attendance of children at his schools has been much improved. Some 70 students have been enrolled for high school work and a small number have even gone beyond high school to Teachers' College, nursing and the university.

We feel however that there will be a limited improvement in the return from the continued operation of these small units and some equally small and isolated school districts if that continued operation is on the independent basis which now exists. Further improvements we feel will have to come through the establishment of a division and the extension to the remote areas of some of the benefits which have unquestionably flowed from the establishment of school divisions elsewhere. Accordingly, the legislation will permit the establishment of a school division which will be a composite of almost all the special schools and isolated school districts lying north of Township 22. I will provide you with additional detailed information on this project when the legislation is under discussion, which should be any day.

I have already mentioned that Mr. Plummer who had been our Supervisor of Special Classes had resigned to serve in a Secretariate to the Council for Exceptional Children in the United States, and we have now been able to engage a Mr. Peter Wilby to fill this vacancy. He is a man who is eminently suited by experience and interest, training and ability, to help us move ahead in our program for the education of handicapped children. His responsibilities will include the education of the blind, the physically handicapped, and the mentally retarded. Our blind children are all being educated at the Ontario School for the Blind at Brantford. We've had this arrangement with Ontario, as you know, for a good number of years, and there is no doubt that our children receive a much better education there than we could hope to arrange in Manitoba for such a small number.

The arrangement we made recently with the Department of Welfare for the full time services of Mr. George Nick as Supervisor of Physical Education is working out very well indeed. He was formerly an instructor in physical education at the Manitoba Teachers' College and his close and intimate knowledge of the kind of assistance needed by teachers in his field is of great benefit to physical education teachers across the province.

Similarly, Miss Helen Janzen, the Supervisor of Home Economics, has not only been providing excellent services to the home economics classes in high schools but has at the same time been of great use in other sections of the department in the planning and services of the School for the Deaf, the new trade and vocational schools being built, and the residential high school for the new division mentioned a few moments ago.

The Instruction Division provides the services of school inspection, correspondence schools, the Visual Education Branch, and the School Broadcast Branch, including both radio and television broadcasts, and the Teacher Training Branch. Plans have been made for the establishment of a Guidance Branch within this division and I will outline these to you shortly.

During the last few years we have drawn rather heavily on the experience and abilities of members of the inspection staff for duties other than that of school inspection. Some have been seconded full-time to the Curriculum Branch where they've aided in the development of new courses; some have been given temporary assignments requiring them to work only with those schools which have undertaken some of the new courses. All have had brief in-service periods of training and will have further in-service training in some of the new techniques being introduced into the schools. We expect in the fall of this year, in '65, to establish on a trial basis in the southwestern part of the province an entirely new project, in which a group of inspectors will work as a team during the entire year, each contributing his particular talents and experience to the group and all working as an integrated unit under a senior inspector.

The Correspondence Branch has always been a very active operation, teaching a host of people who, because of their isolation, ill-health or age, cannot attend regular school classes. In the last decade the pattern of enrollment has changed very markedly. Ten years ago more than 50 percent of the students were enrolled in elementary grade subjects, but last year 90 percent of the enrollment was in the high school grades. It was expected that with the establishment of school divisions and the broader opportunities being offered for high school education, the Correspondence Branch would be very materially reduced in both size and function. We found, instead, that while there was an abrupt drop in total enrollment about 1961, there was no corresponding drop in the number of adults enrolled. Since that time,

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd ) . . . . . enrollment in all categories has climbed steadily, and today the high school enrollment in the Correspondence Branch is almost equal to its previous high level, and the enrollment for adults for high school work with the Correspondence Branch is more than double than what it was 10 years ago. There are 800 adults enrolled in the Branch for high school work by correspondence. We expect to begin almost immediately with the preparation of correspondence lessons in the General Course to enable those who begin the course at school but drop out, to complete their studies, and as the new University Entrance Course becomes defined and established, new courses -- correspondence lessons, of course -- in . . . . . subjects, will also be produced and made available.

We appear to have a rather constant enrollment of slightly over 200 students who are taking elementary courses. The Committee might be interested to know that a fair number of these students no longer live in Manitoba, but having taken a portion of their elementary work here, then moved away, they have enrolled with us to complete a year or two, and in some cases to continue year after year with us in the anticipation of later returning to Manitoba and having again to fit into our education system.

The Audio-Visual Branches have been extremely active during the past year. The use of films and film strips is increasing at a rapid rate and will increase even faster as the new science courses come into being. I'm sure you're all familiar with the daily school broadcasts -- radio and television broadcasts. Radio lessons which cannot be received by some classes in larger schools because of time-tabling problems, are provided to the schools for later use by means of tape recordings, except where union regulations prevent this.

The members of the Committee might be interested to know that we are experiencing a great demand for the recordings of French language broadcasts. Next September we expect to begin a Saturday morning series of telecasts to provide in-service training for mathematics teachers throughout the province.

I mentioned earlier that the revision of our curriculum is not just a matter of sorting and re-allocating content amongst the various levels of instruction, but it involves major changes in the techniques on the teaching, and presenting new concepts. From now on, teachers coming out of our teacher training institutions will have had practice in these techniques, but many of those who are now actively engaged in teaching will have to learn the new methods. The Saturday morning TV series is intended to provide this type of training for those teaching elementary school mathematics. Involving as they do telecasts which can be received by almost all homes in the province, they should serve as an additional purpose, that of acquainting parents everywhere with the new approaches which are being introduced in mathematics. We hope they will not only train and stimulate teachers but create a better bond of understanding between the home and the school in the field of mathematics. I might say in this connection that co-operation of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in making our plans come to reality in this area is most gratifying.

In the last few months we have been fortunate enough to bring together in the building formerly used as the Manitoba Technical Institute, the so-called Ford Building, a substantial group of departmental services to form what is in reality a teaching aid centre. At this one location we now have all the facilities of the Textbook Bureau; the Departmental Library for free use by teachers throughout the province and by our own staff; the Curriculum Branch; the Visual Branch; and the School Broadcasts Branch; and we're proud of these services available at this location, and I was very pleased that some of the Members of the Legislature visited this building and saw the program there this morning. I'm sorry more were not able to take part in this tour but I think all members who did attend were impressed, and we're particularly happy to have been able to establish two radio studios on the second floor where we will be producing all our own school broadcasts in our own quarters but with the assistance of the CBC personnel. Those who attended and saw the facilities this morning noted that the co-operation between the CBC and the Department, or the relationship, is a very happy one, and it was pointed out to us that these are probably the finest facilities which any department enjoys in the country.

In the field of teacher training, I think probably the most important decision in many years was taken when we completed an agreement with the University of Manitoba for the transfer of that institution, of all the teaching staff and functions of the Manitoba Teachers College. Through the daily press you will already have been informed of most of the terms of the agreement, and under the Teacher Training appropriation in our estimates you will have an opportunity to discuss this transfer in detail. In the meantime, I think you would be interested to know

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) . . . . . that the new addition to the Faculty of Education Building at the University is moving ahead very quickly, and that the Committee on Admissions has been established, and the Committee on Teacher Education is in the process of being established. For obvious reasons, such as the close proximity of shops, we will continue to train our technical and vocational teachers at the Manitoba Institute of Technology.

Since we received the report on the Manitoba Royal Commission on Local Government and Finance, the Michener Commission, last spring, the portions of it dealing with education have received most careful and detailed study. A series of meetings has been held, as you know, with interested and representative organizations, and we have received a number of briefs and submissions on the implementation of this report. Legislation will be presented to you which we think will prove our serious intent while at the same time permitting the retention of a desirable measure of local prerogative. When we come to the next item under my estimates in Administration, I propose to make a statement and elaborate on this particular aspect.

When our estimates were being prepared several months ago, and in anticipation of the receipt at some later date of the report on the Education of Handicapped Children, but without knowledge of its recommendations, a sum of \$150,000 was included in the department estimates for Special Services. It was our opinion, and still is, that regardless of any recommendations which might be contained in the report, that the maximum age for grant entitlement in the class of educable retarded should be raised to 18 years from sixteen. We also expected that there might be other improvements which it would be desirable to bring into effect during the coming fiscal year, and when I speak on my estimates on Special Services I hope by that time to have sufficient copies of the report on Handicapped Children, dealing with the mentally retarded, to distribute to members of the Committee. In the meantime, the Departments of Health and Education have been asked to prepare a detailed analysis of the report for our own study, and I can say at this point that the government will certainly have to find it necessary to consult with the voluntary associations before taking action on the report. I would point out at this time, however, that the raising of the maximum age for inclusion in a class of educable retarded will enable some districts more easily to attain the enrollment required to form a class and earn grants, and make it possible for some urban areas to qualify for additional grants through the inclusion of some students who were previously excluded by age.

Our department has also felt for some time that a more serious approach to guidance in schools was required, as society is becoming more complex and the schools naturally react to changes in programs and courses and offer their students a much more diverse range of studies. Students stay at school longer, many with special problems, and many, who in the past year would have dropped out, continue their studies and require specific and additional forms of advice and guidance. And we're providing this year in the Estimates for the establishment of a Guidance section in the department, and we hope to be able to recruit a staff of specialists to help students and teachers in this very important work. I would say at this time that, while we announced last year that we had established a Division Supervisor of Guidance, despite some valiant efforts over the past year to find personnel we have not been able to secure the person to head this program. However, I'll deal -- and this year we are going to be presenting to you a more complete Guidance section to get a start within the department, and I can deal with that in some more detail later.

Members of the Committee will probably have noted through the press, that last September Manitoba was host to the Annual Convention of the Canadian Educational Association; 735 delegates were in attendance including, for the first time in its history, all of the Ministers of Education. This organization, although it has no authority to make decisions for the various provinces on matters of consequence, nevertheless performs many of the functions which would be handled possibly by a Federal Department of Education, if there were such a department, and it brings together senior educators and administrators from departments of education, colleges and universities, local superintendents and other officials, representatives of trustee organizations, and such national bodies as the Home and School, Citizenship Council, and the Canadian Association of French Language Educators, and others who are interested in educational matters.

It is with deep regret that I report the death of Dr. F. S. Rivers, who was the Chief Director of Education in the Province of Ontario, and was president of the Canadian Education Association and presided over its meetings during the Winnipeg Convention.

For about 15 years, our department and the Federal Indian Affairs Branch have had a

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd . . . . . working agreement -- a working arrangement, as it were, with one another -- on the education of treaty and non-treaty Indian children in isolated settlements. As a rule, where the Indian children were in the majority the Indian Affairs Branch operated the school, and where non-treaty children were in the majority our Department operated it. In some instances the arrangement was recognized by the signing of a formal agreement on cost sharing, while in other cases the operation of a joint school by Indian Affairs was considered to be balanced by the operation of a similar school by our department, and no exchange of monies occurred. Recently, we have both felt that the process of integration must move along at a faster pace, and the Indian Affairs Branch has negotiated agreements for the attendance of treaty children at public schools in areas which are not at all isolated. This has resulted in a number of agreements which differ from school to school, but which generally require the payment by Indian Affairs to the local district of a sum of money which will guarantee that the local district does not have to pay through local taxation the cost of educating the Indian children attending the school. There is, however, another cost which has not been covered. It is the cost incurred by the province through the inclusion of Indian children in the enrollment and the payment by the province to the district of regular Manitoba grants. Indian Affairs Branch has given an assurance that it is prepared to reimburse Manitoba for its out-of-pocket expenses for the education of Indian children in the public school system, and we on our part have made a proposal to Indian Affairs Branch which will cover the financial angles to the satisfaction of all parties and which will represent a giant stride forward in the process of integration.

It is our proposal that The Manitoba Public School Act be amended to guarantee to all Indian children precisely the same rights that are given to non-treaty; that is, the right to attend the school in the district in which the child lives, or if he does not live within a school district, the right to attend the nearest school which does have sufficient accommodation to accept him; and in either case to attend without the payment of a non-resident fee. The financial arrangements between the province and the Federal Government on the one hand, and between the province and the Local Districts on the other, will guarantee that the Indian children attending public schools are not segregated even on the rolls of the school. It is our firm belief that the solution to the so-called Indian problem, like the solution to most other problems, economic and social, afflicting our world today, lies in the extension of educational opportunities and privileges, and we feel that only by integrating Indian children into our school processes can we hope to integrate them into our society. We hope the proposal we have made to Indian Affairs will be acceptable and that, as a consequence, we will be able to ask your approval of legislation which will give to treaty Indian children the educational rights and privileges which have been a heritage of the non-treaty children in our province.

The number of students enrolling at University level courses gets greater and greater, and this growth is paralleled by an increase in the complexity and diversity of courses offered and demanded. Rising costs have made it essential that a careful study be made of the facilities and services which the University and the colleges now have, the ones they will soon require, and the need for duplication of courses; and we have therefore held discussions with the University and the affiliated colleges aimed at the establishment of a council of higher learning. The government has agreed with these institutions on the form, functions and terms of reference of such a council, and it is now in the process of being established. I might say these discussions initiated last spring and were recently concluded in January -- the early part of January -- and it's just a matter of formality in forming the group.

You will also find in the estimates an increased sum of money for the provision of bursaries to students in the province. Last year's estimates provided \$200,000 for bursaries and \$150,000 for student loans. In September of last year the Federal Government, as you know, brought in the Canada Student Loan Plan with the Provincial Department of Education as the administering authority here. This plan can provide students with non-interest-bearing loans totalling \$2 million per year. Of this amount approximately \$1,350,000 has been loaned to students this year, starting last September, and there will be available to students beginning in September a loan fund of \$2 million, plus the appropriation before you totalling \$350,000 in bursaries. There is some indication that if Manitoba requires more than its allotted \$2 million for student loans, further sums will be available.

Mr. Chairman, in terms of what has been accomplished in the last year, or what we are planning for the coming year, I think our department can rightly claim to be making tremendous progress in the improvement of our educational system in the breadth of services which we will

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) . . . . . offer to the school children and the adults of Manitoba. The strains of a program such as this have required a reorganization in the department, as I mentioned earlier, resulting in the appointment of three Assistant Deputy Ministers and the establishment of four positions of Assistant Director; the establishment of a new Guidance section; the expansion of the staff of the present day school for the deaf to provide the additional teaching staff needed for the repatriation of Manitoba deaf children who have been educated elsewhere; and for the operation of the residential school and the establishment of the additional positions needed to staff the rapidly growing operation in the vocational field. This expansion of staff is counterbalanced in part by a reduction which will result from the closing of the Manitoba Teachers College and its transfer to the University.

In these introductory comments to committee -- I have been reading, of course, and I'm trying to touch on some of the high spots of the year of activity and to outline our plans for the coming year, but it is my intention to provide a more detailed statement in introduction of each of the major appropriations of the department. I should like to assure members that I will do my best to provide reasonable and logical answers to questions, but I hope that where it is possible to do so, the questions might be asked during the discussion of the appropriate item. I realize that there will inevitably be a wide-ranging discussion and a number of general questions under the heading of Minister's Salary, but I can assure the members that I hope to give ample opportunity under the specific items for further questioning. I think I can probably dig up the answers a little more efficiently and completely for you under that system.

Although it has occupied a great deal of my time this year, I have made no mention in this review of the question of shared services. I have deliberately omitted this in the certain knowledge that each one of us can express his own views after the report of the committee has been tabled.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I summarize briefly the new developments which are engaging our attention and for most of which there is provision in the estimates before you:

1. The implementation of certain recommendations of the Michener Commission.
2. The establishment of a new school division to encompass many remote settlements and to provide continuous opportunity for the students from Grade 1 to 12, under conditions which we have never been able to establish before.
3. A rapid and carefully planned development of vocational education including the immediate construction of centres at The Pas and Brandon.
4. The transfer of the new Teacher Training activities presently conducted at the Manitoba Teachers College, to the University, and the centralization in the University atmosphere of all teacher training with the exception of that related to technical and vocational teachers.
5. The re-establishment in Manitoba of a residential School for the Deaf and the repatriation of Manitoba deaf students to that centre.
6. The establishment of a Guidance section in the Department of Education.
7. The expansion of a program of student aid which will provide for our students a total amount in loans and bursaries from the governments of not less than \$2,350,000.
8. Additional grants to encourage the adoption of certain recommendations contained in the Michener report.
9. An expanded program of assistance to schools through television, including a very comprehensive program for the re-training of teachers in mathematics.
10. A proposal for the integration of Indian children into the public school system of the province, and for the extension to them of all rights and privileges now enjoyed by non-treaty children.
11. The study of recommendations brought forward in the so-called Christianson Report for the Education of the Mentally Retarded, and an assurance of careful study and consideration of any further report which may be made respecting the education of children suffering from other handicaps. You will recall that report calls for quite a broad study.
12. The establishment of a Council of Higher Learning to guarantee that plans are made for the orderly development of university level facilities in the province.

Mr. Chairman, the record of accomplishments or plans can never be told fully by reference to dollars spent in the past or allocated for the future, and it is for this reason that I have taken the time of the Committee to outline in words, rather than dollars, the things we have done or are now attempting to do. However, I am sure you will already have noted that our plans and good intentions are also backed up with solid financial support.

The current estimates for the Department will represent 30.6% of the entire estimated expenditures of the province, and I hope you will see fit to grant us this money. I assure you that we will give you back full value for every dollar of it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opening statement.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm disappointed. In the words of the late Honourable

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd) . . . . . Wally Miller, one of the former Ministers of Education, in his words I'll say -- I'll just change one word -- "Not a brag for Gimli." That's why I was disappointed. "Not a brag for Gimli."

I wish to thank the Honourable Minister for his rather lengthy introduction and I hope that most of his visions come true. I like his tone, and I hope that it prevails throughout the whole of his Estimates. I am just wondering if the Honourable Minister has a rhinoceros hide, like the Minister of Agriculture said it was necessary when you were a cabinet minister, because although there were some pertinent questions asked last year, I think that maybe the honeymoon is over; the present Minister has had some experience and I believe that he may be asked to explain some of the unpardonable blunders of the former minister.

At this time I would like also to express our best wishes to the retired personnel. We also regret the loss through death of some of the personnel of the staff. Congratulations will go to Mr. Dalton in his new position as Assistant Deputy Minister in charge of Administration and Vocational Training. Also, Mr. Davies, Assistant Deputy Minister in charge of Special Services. Another appointment, Mr. Lightly, who is now Assistant Deputy Minister of Instruction and Teacher Training. We wish them the best. On behalf of the Liberal Party I would like to express our sincere appreciation of the courtesy extended to us by the civil service of this department, just as they usually do. I was very happy to learn that the Department of Education has acquired the services of a very able educationalist, Mr. Bobby Bend. I'm sure he will be a great asset to the Department of Education. And we, on this side, the Liberal group, I think should know.

I'm also pleased to note that considerable use of loans is being made by the students. It's a good indication. The loans have steadily been increasing since the program was initiated by the former Liberal administration. I regret, however, that we still have too many permit teachers in our schools. It was indicated by the former Minister of Education that the new look in education would gradually eliminate permit teachers, but if we look on Page 84 of the Department of Education, we notice that it shows a steady increase in permit teachers. It is almost 300 percent increase in elementary and over 50 percent in the secondary. It seems to be worse in elementary. I think some explanation is due from the Minister.

Later on I suppose we'll be asking some questions about the highly short-sighted policy of the secondary school building construction in rural divisions. As we all know, the facilities now are not adequate to cope with the curricula changes and I know that the present Minister has a formidable task to overcome -- maybe one that'll be pretty hard to overcome.

I also notice that in 1963-64 over \$11,000 was paid out in scholarships to individuals for academic achievements. This is a very commendable practice. We should recognize the efforts and capabilities of the individual scholar or student, and this is fine; but on the other hand when it comes to bursaries I think that the government is being niggardly -- not in the amount of money expended but in the method of awarding deserving individuals, and where can you . . . . . individuals now. Bursary awards are based on scholastic ability and established financial need of the individual. Now, since need enters into this category, I feel that the government should be more generous as far as individuals are concerned, and I'm not making a plea now for separate schools or parochial schools or anything. I'm talking about the individual. Everyone should be considered who qualifies. We should not deny some poor student the opportunity of an education or an assistance towards that education, and I further feel the Department should not discriminate against an individual for any reason whatsoever. I have a complaint made by an individual who applied for a bursary but was denied it, and the answer he got was in this vein, and I'm going to read it. This was the answer that he got from some official -- I have no signature here but I suppose it could be traced through the content: "I am sorry to have to advise you that the Committee making the awards could not include your name amongst those who secured the above-named bursary. Under regulations, awards can be made only to candidates with clear standing, recorded scholastic ability, and established financial need. Students must also be in attendance at a public secondary school of the province. These bursaries are not tenable in private schools. The Committee hope that you will not be discouraged by this decision but will meet with success in the work of coming years."

And my objection to this is, in one case where a student proves himself or herself academically he receives a scholarship -- no strings attached. In the other case, where he or she establishes need, he does not qualify because he wishes to attend the school of his choice, and I think this is discrimination, against an individual and not an organized group. I just fail to see how the government could justify its actions and I would like the Minister to look into this and explain to us.



(MR. TANCHAK cont'd).....

I'm not going to be too lengthy in what I have to say because I know that we'll be able to get up and ask questions as we proceed in the Estimates, but there is one thing that I can't restrain myself from commenting on, and this is that item of \$10 million tax rebate which is included in the Department of Education estimates. The Minister was boasting just a few minutes ago that estimates in the Department of Education are up to over \$50 million, but I would say that we could immediately discount this by at least \$10 million. How on earth can any person with common sense debit this to the Department of Education, I would like to know? This item pollutes the Department of Education estimates, and knowing the Minister of Education to be a learned man, a doctor, a man of high integrity and good common sense, I can hardly believe that he is the man responsible for this entry in the department of estimates. I'm almost convinced that he doesn't like it as much as I don't like it. This is a falsehood; it is a misrepresentation. It does not in any way contribute towards the spending in education. It does nothing for education.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, I must object to the word "falsehood."

MR. TANCHAK: Pardon, I didn't catch the word.

MR. ROBLIN: I must object to the word "falsehood."

MR. TANCHAK: Well, in my opinion, you may object . . . . . (Interjection) If it is unparliamentary to use that word, I will not use it, although I think it's so. The answer, the manner in which the tax rebate is being handled, in my opinion constitutes a bribe, not a school expenditure. Why a bribe? The Premier, some few weeks back with TV media said that the reason for this policy was that he wanted the people to -- and this is in quotations -- "to see the colour of our money." The colour of our money, presumably government money. Whose money, I say? This isn't the government's money; this is peoples' money, not the government's. It's their own money. They'll have to pay a premium on their own money. The taxpayer must first pay the total tax, then apply for a refund of his own money. Who'll pay the cost of processing applications, issuing cheques, mailing them, and who'll pay for the staff expenses? Will this Department of Education be asked to bear these expenses, and if so, if the Department of Education will have to pay these expenses, is this an educational expense? I say no, and in my opinion it is not right and it is not true. It is misrepresenting the item. I would say that this item should be removed from the Department of Education estimates and entered in some other department -- perhaps in Industry and Commerce, if you want to know, and you may call it the Department of Propaganda and Bribe -- the \$10 million in this Department of Education estimates. I'm in favour of property tax reduction but I am opposed to this kind of misleading and unfair entry, because I consider that it's misleading in this Department of Education. As I said before, it does nothing for education whatsoever. It has no room in the Educational estimates. I'll have more to say about it probably later, and I'm sure there will be other members who will express their objection to this. I think at this time I'd rather sit down. I might get in trouble with the Minister and later on, as different items come, I'll have more to say.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that there are only six minutes left and since I would like to speak for about 30 minutes, I would ask if it were possible to adjourn.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, I think out of consideration to my honourable friend's position, we'd be glad to accede to his suggestion and the Committee could rise now and he can make his comment at our next sitting. I move the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, I wish to report progress and ask leave for the Committee to sit again.

#### IN SESSION

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, before moving the adjournment, may I just remind members that at 10:30 tomorrow the Pan-Am Games discussion will take place immediately following the Law Amendments Committee which meets at 9:00. I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, before we rise, could I have one question? I'd like to ask the First Minister what bills will be considered in Committee tomorrow morning?

MR. ROBLIN: . . . . . been listed in the Order Paper two days ago, Madam Speaker-- in the Votes and Proceedings.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Tuesday morning.