

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, January 26, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

MR. M. E. MCKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): I beg to present the petition of Donald Ralph Graham and others, praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate the Agricultural Community District of Newdale.

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

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation)(Rockwood-Iberville) introduced Bill No. 26, an Act to amend The Agricultural Credit Act; and Bill No. 27, an Act to amend The Crop Insurance Test Areas Act.

HON. THELMA FORBES(Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Cypress) introduced Bill No. 8, The Official Time Act; and Bill No. 32, an Act respecting the City of Portage la Prairie and the purchase of certain lands from the Government of Manitoba.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS(St. Boniface) introduced Bill No. 30, an Act to amend The St. Boniface Charter, 1953.

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James) introduced Bill No. 31, an Act to amend The St. James Charter.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's) introduced Bill No. 21, an Act to amend The Employment Standards Act.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain) introduced Bill No. 36, an Act to validate By-law No. 30-1966 of The Town of Killarney and By-law No. 11-1966 of The Rural Municipality of Turtle Mountain and to add a portion of the South East Quarter of Section Three in Township Three and Range Seventeen West of the Principal Meridian in the Province of Manitoba to The Town of Killarney.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan) introduced Bill No. 34, an Act to amend The East Kildonan Charter.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 29, an Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956.

MR. DESJARDINS introduced Bill No. 23, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Les Reverends Pères Oblates in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask the House if they would consider giving unanimous consent to withdrawing the two items for the committee - they both stand in my name. It would be my intention to re-introduce them later after some further study and after some changes.

MR. SPEAKER: May the Honourable Minister have leave? Orders of the Day.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. In view of the recent announcement that the Winnipeg Police Commission is recommending to the City of Winnipeg the purchase of a lie detector, could the Minister advise this House with regard to whether a person can be required to submit to a lie detector test?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid my honourable friend is asking me for an expression of a legal opinion which is contrary to the rules. I would be quite happy, however, to ask the department to take the matter under consideration, and if I can let him know privately I'd be prepared to do so.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. From wandering around the halls the last two or three days looking for a particular item I finally found out that he has the final decision on this, and I would like to know how the members on this side of the House may obtain the small stickpin with the buffalo on for distributing in their constituencies.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that I have the final decision on this matter. I can only take the question as notice.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Could he indicate to this House the progress to date regarding his investigations of the complaints that I made in early December concerning the CPR at the Chalmers and Gateway crossing in Elmwood, and whether a prosecution has been commenced in this regard?

MR. LYON: The last information I have on this topic was to the effect that certain investigative procedures have taken place with respect to the incident about which my honourable friend spoke, but this information in turn was being passed along to the Board of Transport Commissioners by the person or persons in the department responsible for this, and I don't know whether any contact has been had from that board at this time or not.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question? I'd like to also ask the Attorney-General whether he has ascertained on the basis of the information he has, whether or not he will begin a prosecution, or does he require additional information?

MR. LYON: I think additional information is required from the Board of Transport Commissioners as well as additional information on the ground before anyone could give a final answer to that question.

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the First Minister, and it is with respect to a clipping in the Free Press here calling for a national farm conference. I was wondering if the Honourable the First Minister could give us a report on what response he has received from the Federal Government with respect to the conference on farm problems and farm policy.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): Mr. Chairman, I'm interested that my speech has attracted so much notice, first from the Leader of the Opposition and now from my honourable friend. I gather from reading the paper what prompted my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition's query, because it was only a very partial extract from my total remarks, and I will investigate and see whether it is possible to produce a complete copy of the speech. It may have been recorded and if so I would be glad to give it to any who are interested.

Respecting the question itself, we first made this proposal to the Federal Government about a year ago and at that time I received a reply from the federal Prime Minister saying, in effect that he would look into the matter. I've had no further communication from him.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): In regard to point, Mr. Speaker, does this indicate that the Prime Minister of Canada doesn't pay much attention to the First Minister in Manitoba?

MR. ROBLIN: I think I should answer that because it would be quite unfair to the Prime Minister of Canada to indicate that he was discourteous in any way to me, and I think the same would be true for any provincial premier.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I also have a supplementary question. Before proposing it I would just comment on the last question, that I think both parties in Ottawa are paying a good bit of attention to my honourable friend the First Minister. Dealing with the question that was asked earlier, I would like to put in my bid also for a copy of that particular speech because my information regarding it is not, I gathered, from the press; it's from TV. My honourable friend perhaps isn't aware that he was on TV for some little time, and having observed him closely on TV and listened very carefully to what he said, I want to ask him if I may have a copy of those notes because I gathered they were pretty extensive notes. They were presented from a lectern and my honourable friend seemed to be sticking closely to them. So the notes themselves would be sufficient for me, if I might have them.

MR. ROBLIN: I don't think my honourable friend should draw any conclusions from his observations of TV because I doubt that they would be accurate in any degree at all. But I'm flattered by the attention and I'll do my best to oblige.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General, and I apologize for not giving him due notice. Sometime I believe last September the Honourable the Attorney-General made a public statement to the effect that the RCMP would investigate into the circumstances surrounding the now famous Headingley Jail break. My question to my honourable friend is: has the investigation been completed and can the Minister either indicate to the House the results of the investigation or give copies of the report that he may have received from the RCMP in respect of this situation?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, that's hardly a question one would want to answer on the Orders of the Day. I can tell my honourable friend that the investigations so far as the RCMP are concerned were completed; we do have the report; the reports, of course, as with all RCMP reports, are confidential and would not be tabled in the House but I will be more than happy to discuss this matter, I'm sure, in detail with my honourable friend when my estimates are before the House.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General, who's the Minister in charge of the administration of justice in this province. I would just like to know whether his department has authorized any police department in Manitoba to require citizens to submit to a lie detector test?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, not to my knowledge, but I'll certainly take that as notice and ascertain definitively whether it is the case. Not to my knowledge, however.

MR. GREEN: In other words, what you're saying is that your department hasn't authorized people

MR. SPEAKER: Did you have a supplementary question?

MR. GREEN: I have another question, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who I note at the moment is being distracted, Mr. Speaker. I don't know whether it's parliamentary, Mr. Speaker, but I say to the gracious Minister of Municipal Affairs, I noticed that the Mayor of the City of Portage, appeared in a very agitated state on television yesterday. I, too, watch television and I just wonder whether the Minister can advise us whether the not ordinary situation of that municipality is soon to be rendered ordinary, or whether there is anything she can say about the status of the extra employee in that municipality.

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, the situation in Portage remains the same as when I spoke in the House before. I have had no comment direct to me from the Mayor nor from anyone else at Portage la Prairie.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education, in regard to whether or not there has been a report from the Council of Higher Learning, or recommendations, and if so whether he will make them available to the House?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education)(Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I think during the course of my estimates under University Grants and the Council of Higher Learning, I'm prepared to give the House a statement of information which has come to them to There has been one recommendation, to make Brandon College a University. I can advise the House that an Order-in-Council has been passed establishing Brandon College as Brandon University as of the 1st of July, 1967. Since we last met this recommendation came to me, also a further recommendation was made to my office. I can make a full statement on that during the course of my estimates, if I may.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Speaker, just as a supplementary question: if these reports come in a fashion which are not only recommendations but reasons and background, would it not be considered advisable to let members of this House have it in advance so that they could more intelligently deal with it when the Minister makes his formal report?

MR. JOHNSON: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the recommendation with respect to Brandon College is a firm recommendation which copy I will try and obtain for the House. Certain of the correspondence I believe was privileged. I'll check into that. I think it was more a letter making recommendation and asking for some guidance. I'll check into that and make whatever I can available to the honourable member.

MR. CHERNIACK: I thank the Minister, Mr. Speaker. May I now address a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General? I have been informed without too much authority that a committee of some type has been studying the Expropriation Bill which was presented last year. I'm wondering whether this is so and if there is a report available for members of this House in order to review what has been recommended.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, my recollection - I'm informed somewhat the same way as my honourable friend - my recollection is that this matter of the Expropriation Act was before the Law Reform Committee. My predecessor in office could probably confirm that better than I could. In any case, the Expropriation Act which was before the House at the last session, will be before the House again very shortly.

MR. CHERNIACK: A supplementary question if I may. Will we have the benefit of the report to work along with the new bill?

MR. LYON: fact there was a report and if that report does not fall within the standard rules of confidentiality, yes.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, I have another question I'd like to direct to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. It has to do with pins once again. I was informed that he is the high authority on these again and has the final decision. How do the members on this side of the House obtain the Centennial type pin to distribute to their constituents, and those stickers?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I've taken the question as notice and I will be replying to the House.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Health. I did ask a question a few days ago about when we would receive a copy of the Manitoba Hospital Commission Report, and he did say at the time that he'd try to have this as soon as possible. I wonder, in view of the fact that the Honourable Minister will be in his estimates either today or tomorrow - I hope, if I'm not too optimistic - I wonder if we could have a copy, at least one for each party, because this is something that I think that we should have before we go into his estimates and I'm sure that he must have at least a copy if the booklet is not printed as yet.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health)(Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, first of all I'd like to thank the Honourable Member for the advance notice that I will be up in my estimates today or tomorrow, and I'll be ready for tonight. I would say that the legislation calls for the Manitoba Hospital Commission to table its report before the end of March - March 30th. After the question was asked I checked into this matter. Figures are presently in the hands of the auditors and when they come from the auditors the report will be printed. Thus I don't expect that the report will be down until some time in the middle of February, but I'll see what can be done about his specific request.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am rather concerned with the effect that a previous question of mine had on the Attorney-General. I want to make it plain to the House that I have no information that any instructions have been issued by any department with regard to the use of lie detectors. I asked the question so that there would be an answer from the Attorney-General that he has given such instructions were given, and I don't want anybody to draw the conclusion that I have such information.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. People of Canada have been alarmed over the bankruptcies in Prudential Finance and Atlantic Finance, and I noticed in today's paper where there have been convictions in our own courts for breaches of The Securities Act involving \$65,000. My information is, subject to correction, that some individuals have lost \$65,000 in this affair. Could the Minister tell us: were these losses suffered as a result of the breaches of The Securities Act? And does he intend to inquire into the matter to see what caused it?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I don't know which part of the question to start answering first. The honourable member asked me if there was any relationship or if this was the type of loss that was suffered in the Atlantic Acceptance or the Prudential matter. I'm not aware of that. I'm not aware of the details of the particular prosecutions about which he speaks, and I will ask for a full report on it. I'm not aware of any similarity or whether in fact the losses that he speaks of flowed directly as a result of actions which caused the prosecution or not. I'm not aware of that at all but I'll ask for a full report and let him know.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm not suggesting that they're the same. People are concerned with all subjects related to securities and reasons of bankruptcy, and my question is: was this loss suffered as a result of breaches in The Securities Act?

MR. LYON: Not that I'm aware of, Mr. Speaker, but I'll attempt to get more definitive information.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General in connection with my previous question on Headingley Jail. Were there any other investigations made into the situation at Headingley Jail, namely the jail break, by any other organization or body than that of the RCMP, for which the Honourable the Attorney-General may give us prior reports to the time when we are considering his estimates?

MR. LYON: The first part of the question is yes, there was an investigation undertaken by a senior member of the Penitentiaries Branch of the federal Solicitor-General's Department at our request, and we'll again be quite happy to discuss that subject on estimates.

MR. PAULLEY: I take it - a supplemental question - there are no reports available to the members of the Legislature at this particular time?

MR. LYON: Not at this time, Mr. Speaker; again, because of the question of confidentiality.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the First Minister in light of all the criticism that has taken place both inside the House and outside of the House in respect to the Cabinet increase in pay. I wonder if he would undertake to supply the House with a copy of the Order-in-Council No. 1221 of September 7th last, that authorized the increase in pay. I might say that I thought it was in the Gazette and I don't believe that it is necessary to be recorded in the Gazette, and if he would undertake to supply the House with a copy, that would satisfy some of the members perhaps.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, Orders-in-Council are public documents and they may be examined in the Executive Council Office at any time.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Then I take it that my honourable friend wouldn't undertake to supply a copy. Could I get a copy and have a photostat copy made of it, or how could I go about to get a copy for my own files?

MR. ROBLIN: Well I'm not in the copying business, Mr. Speaker. My honourable friend can see the document - it's a public document.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister, and that is related again to the question which was asked previously this afternoon. In view of the fact that response from Ottawa on the question of a conference on agriculture is slow, will the First Minister consider the idea of calling a conference of provincial premiers to deal with the critical problem?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I have no such present intention. I have not given up hope with respect to my federal colleagues.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. I note in the newspaper today that at least one other province is giving a day-long school holiday to mark the Centennial year. Is it the intention of your ministry to grant a like holiday in Manitoba?

MR. JOHNSON: This is under active consideration. I'll notify the House as soon as a determination has been made.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could clarify a misunderstanding that seemed to come up in the debate that we had yesterday; if at all possible I'd like to make it here so we wouldn't take the time of the Committee. It was in the second motion that I presented yesterday on the Minister's salary. Some of the press, radio and TV reported that the motion would delete, would reduce the Minister's salary by \$3,000, the amount of expenses, and just in case some of the members of the Opposition also misunderstood the motion, the motion was that we leave the \$18,000 but that it would be classified the way we think it should be, as a salary and not expenses. Now it's possible that some of the back-benchers had this understanding and had they known what I had in mind might have voted for us, but I can assure them that they'll probably have another chance to change their minds.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I wonder if I may take the time of the House for a moment and inform the House that on my right there are 60 Grade 8 students from the Selkirk school under the direction of Mr. Hollinger and Mr. Southern. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Selkirk. On behalf of all the members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here today.

It is a pleasure, too, to inform the House that there are 50 Grade 11 students in the gallery on my left under the direction of Mr. Deleurme. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Attorney-General, that of Fort Garry. On behalf of the members of the Manitoba Legislature I welcome you all here today.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The ajourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak overly long on this motion, but as I took the tenor of the remarks of the Honourable the Minister for Welfare when he was bewailing the fact that this side were kicking up too much of a fuss and maybe scaring away potential investors from our province, he seems to have missed the whole point that the Order

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd), . . . for Return is information, a request for information, that deals with the taxpayers' money, namely Industrial Development Fund money, and with concessions given by the taxpayers. The Honourable Minister asked us to trust to the judgment of his front bench as to whether or not the Monoca agreement is a good proposition for Manitoba and the taxpayers or not. So I beg to differ with the whole tenor of his argument and all the red herrings he brought in as to why we should trust to their judgment, because if we take his argument in this case and apply it to other matters that have gone through this House in the short time that I have been in the House, I would find that, for instance, in 1963 there would have been a tax gone through on real estate transactions that would have increased the prices of houses anywhere from \$200.00 to \$500.00, but because we did not trust the judgment of him and his honourable friends on this side, and we held this up to scrutiny, the bill was withdrawn.

I might also remind him that the judgment of his First Minister and his friends was not so good or correct on the Cabinet Ministers' pension plan that was withdrawn in such disarray in 1965. May I remind him that events after the heat tax was put on finally brought it to their attention that the front bench judgment was not so good on this matter either, and I could go on and I could mention the mess that the school tax rebate system is in. I could mention the land purchasing methods that his government found to be in very poor order and had to be corrected, and these are all matters of judgment, that the judgment was put before us and we scrutinized it and we found bills that we found judgments wanting.

Now I submit to this House that the matter of the Order for Return requesting financial information about the company that is going to carry out the Monoca agreement is a matter of whether or not the people of Manitoba, through the representatives in this House, should accept his judgment or not. It is not a matter of not trusting your integrity but we don't trust your judgment, and we simply ask that the information required in this Order be given.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. EVANS: I rose briefly to speak to the House before. The purpose of my rising at that time - I rose just before the Leader of the Opposition - was to say we'd be glad to accept the Order.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned. I will be closing the debate if no other members wish to speak.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I rise impromptu to ask whether this is a substantive motion on which debate is closed. I just ask for guidance on the matter.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I think you will find that there have been many instances of this previously in the House. I can search them out because I have made notes on them when they have been done, and I think it's the custom of the House.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing:

1. Was the American paper firm of Parson's and Whittemore requested to make a feasibility study of the possibility of establishing of (a) a pulp mill, (b) a lumber mill, (c) any wood products industry;

2. What was the cost of such study.

3. When was the study carried out and what area of the province was studied.

4. What were the recommendations of the study.

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

MR. JOHNSTON: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. Was the amount of \$6,974.24 shown on page 215 of the Public Accounts of the Province for the year ending March 31st, 1964 as being paid to Foster Advertising Ltd., Winnipeg, paid to a corporation, firm or individual?

2. What is the name of the "corporation", firm or individual to whom the payment was made?

3. What services were rendered by said corporation, firm or individual for this payment?

4. To what Department or Departments were these services rendered?

5. Was the opportunity of performing these services open to other corporation, firms or individuals (a) by public tender; (b) by competitive bidding; (c) or otherwise?

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd).....

6. Were the services to be provided covered by a written agreement, or outlined in a call for tenders or similar manner? If so, a copy of said agreement, calls for tenders, etc.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside, that an Order of the House to issue for a Return showing the following information with regard to Contract No. H.D. 71, PTH No. 20:

Supplying and depositing gravel base course material on PTH No. 20, Ochre River - Dauphin Beach, in the RM of Ochre River:

1. The date the tender was called.
2. The closing date.
3. The number of bids received.
4. The names of the bidders and the amount bid by each.
5. The government estimates of the cost of the work.
6. The name of the successful bidder and the amount.
7. A copy of the contract awarded.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Highways)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to accept the Order with the exception of No. 5 which is the departmental estimates of the cost of the work. This is privileged information which we feel shouldn't be divulged.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I will be closing the debate speaking at this time, I believe. If anyone else wishes to speak -- well if no one else wishes to speak then, Mr. SpeakerI appreciate what the Minister tells me with regard to question Number 5, and I expected frankly that that would be the answer that he would give me because he has said this to us in the past. Nevertheless I have put the question there. I'm not going to insist at this time, Mr. Speaker, that I get the answer from the Minister but I think when we come to his estimates that we need to have debate on this question because I believe there is a real problem in the Province of Manitoba at this time on the matter of bids, and I'm one who believes in the bid system. I know the Minister does as well, but I'm sure that he's just as aware as I am of the difficulties that arise at times. In the case of this particular contract a number of people in the area who have done work for the contractor involved have not been paid. There's been a great deal of delay. I have a number of people who have come to see me, waiting for their money ever since last summer. Many of these people simply cannot afford not to get their money. In many cases they buy equipment to do some subcontracting work for someone who has a contract from the government, they have their payments to meet on the equipment that they have purchased, but because the contractor gets into financial difficulties and is unable to pay them, they in turn are unable to make their own payments and there is a very bad chain reaction.

Well, someone can say it is a question, of course, of the bond, but the past experience has been that it's pretty slow getting your money from the bond company. Meanwhile serious troubles can arise for people who have really no means of protecting themselves.

Now, it seems to me that what has happened in a number of cases, and in this one here, is that the low tender was in fact far below what the work could have been done for, and that the government estimates must have shown that it was impossible for the successful bidder to complete the work without going bankrupt. So I ask the Minister what the department is doing and what he proposes to prevent these things from happening in the future. Maybe we have to be stricter on our bond requirements. I don't believe that we should abandon the question of the low bidder, but we have to make sure. It seems to me if the work is going to be done properly for the government, if people who work for the contractors are going to be paid - and I'm sure the government wants to see this done - that there is some connection between the actual bid and what the work can in fact be successfully completed for. This is why I would have liked to have in this case the actual estimates that the department itself prepared prior to releasing this contract.

I have reason to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the government estimate was substantially higher than what the final contract was awarded for. And so the government must have known that trouble would develop, that either the contractor made a mistake in his bid or, alternately, the department made a mistake in its own estimates, because after all, the cost of transporting gravel is something that can be ascertained reasonably easily and I think the department has the figures on that whole question. So I will not insist at this time on the item Number 5; the

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd).... Minister tells me it is privileged information. But I would ask him when we come to his estimates to suggest to us then what action the government is prepared to take to ensure that this doesn't happen in the future, whilst at the same time quite obviously protecting the public interest. And I would hope at that time that he may be in a position to give us some idea of the estimates with regard to this particular contract.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is moving this motion with the exception of Item No. 5.

MR. MOLGAT: Right, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates on second readings. Proposed motion of the Honourable Provincial Treasurer, Bill No. 3. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to have leave of this House to let this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have leave? Second readings. Bill No. 17. The Honourable Provincial Treasurer.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate having the indulgence of the House to allow Bill No. 17 to stand.

MR. EVANS presented Bill No. 19, an Act to amend The Mineral Taxation Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, at the resolution stage for this bill some discussion arose and I would like, if I can, to offer some comments to clarify the situation with regard to taxation on minerals, which I find is a somewhat complex matter and one that has grown over quite a period of time. Some of the measures involved in this came from the original tax rental agreements in 1947 when, as I understand it, the corporation income tax was transferred to the jurisdiction of the federal government and an attempt was made at that time to segregate out taxation as it might apply to ores and minerals and the profit arising from the extraction of those from the earth. I have not been able to trace the detailed discussion at that time but I do know that the arrangements began at that time.

Taxes at present, or as the legislation stands at the present time, arise in three ways; the first is, the Mineral Taxation Act, which is before us for amendment, now provides only for payment of tax by freehold owners of land from which oil is produced. Second, the Mining and Royalty Tax Act refers to other mines including gypsum, industrial minerals and metal mines, on both freehold and Crown-owned mineral rights. And three, oil and gas produced from the Crown-owned mineral rights are not subject to either Act but are subject to a 12 1/2 percent royalty tax under the regulations under the Mines Act. Similarly, potash produced from Crown-owned mineral rights is subject to a royalty tax on a sliding scale under the regulations. That is a summary as I understand it of the present provisions of the statutes.

This bill before us provides for payment also of a tax by freehold owners of mineral rights of land from which potash and gas are obtained. Previously, potash and gas were not included in the Mineral Taxation Act simply because we didn't produce either of them in the province. It's probably a good question as to why potash becomes a mineral and I think it's really a matter of administrative convenience and consistency with the other provinces. They are treated this way in the other provinces and we propose to include it in that way in our Act for that reason.

The bill before us today also establishes formulas for computing a fair actual value for the purpose of assessment of these minerals. This new policy will have no immediate effect on the revenues received under the Act, as at present neither gas nor potash are produced in Manitoba. However, it is considered desirable that provisions should be made for taxation of this land from which either gas or potash might be produced so that anyone coming into the province will know what the conditions are beforehand, and to make them consistent with the other provinces. During the last session of the Legislature certain amendments were made to the Municipal Act and this bill makes new provisions in respect of appeals under the Mineral Taxation Act to bring the appeal procedure in line with those of the Municipal Act. I hope I carried over and have been able to answer the particular questions that I was asked before the House adjourned.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to oppose the bill at this stage. There are some technical details here which obviously -- I hope we'll have the experts from the department when we reach the committee stage outside the House, and I think I will reserve my

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd).....questioning until that time. I would hope that the Minister would at the same time when it is going to go to outside committee make it publicly known so that any bodies outside of this Chamber who may be interested in this bill can also appear and give us the benefit of their information on this matter.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker,question that I wish to direct to the Honourable Minister. If he does not have the answer to it at the present time I think it would be appreciated by the House if some information could be given us on this point, and it's with respect to Items 1 and 2 of Schedule C. I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, how this method of assessment compares with that used by other provinces in Canada.

MR. EVANS:questions, Mr. Speaker. I would think that the usual form of public notice with respect to committee hearings will be used to tell the public that this bill is before the Law Amendments Committee and I would expect that they would see reports of today's discussion and see any notice of the calling of the Law Amendments Committee and the bills to be referred to it, and anyone of course is free to attend and to make representation.

I think if my honourable friend has some detailed questions to ask about the Schedule C and its relationship to other provinces, it would be more convenient at the committee stage when we are expected to deal in the details and to have our technical advisors there. In general, it's my understanding that these regulations will become even more close to those of other provinces than they are now.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Just a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Do I take it then, that the formula that's presented here is not as favourable as that in other provinces? I'm making this statement by reason of the fact that the Honourable Minister has just stated that it will come more close to that in use in other provinces. In other words, will we have here something not as good as other provinces have?

MR. EVANS: I think that's not correct but I'd be glad to discuss it in detail at the proper time.

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

MR. EVANS presented Bill No. 20, an Act to amend The Mining Royalty and Tax Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, this is the second of the bills that was introduced before the Christmas interval, and I have been asked to clarify certain points. When the resolution was first passed before us I promised clarification of certain points.

The bill before us provides that potash or potassium salts and the ores thereof, as they are referred to in the bill, shall not be taxable under this Act since they're covered by another Act. This is the reason for this legislation; potash has not previously been identified by name in the Mining Royalty and Tax Act and hence could be construed as being subject to this Act. In other words, it was never clear as to whether potash was a mineral or not and subject to this Act, but the present legislation clarifies the point. As I have already said, one reason for this legislation is simply to exclude the production of potassium salts and the ores thereof from provisions of this Act.

Some discussion arose as to whether the wording was a device to escape the charge that it might be considered an indirect tax, and such is not the case. It arose, as I indicated in my remarks concerning the other bill, from tax arrangements that were made in 1947, and there was an attempt to tax the mineral value of the ores, or the part of the profit arising from the extraction of ores from the earth and processing them up to the point where they enter either a smelter or a refinery. I find that the history of it is a little bit obscure but it is not an attempt to declare it to be whichever kind of thing we're entitled to -- we distinguish it from being a direct tax in any event.

I think the rationale behind this move is a thoroughly sound one, that we would not want the Federal Government to consider taxation on the mineral resources of this province as being part of their particular jurisdiction. I think the basic distinction is a good one and it is not an attempt to do as the question arose during the last session.

The second reason for the proposed amendment is to provide for the method of calculating income by the deduction of certain expenses, and for the method of calculating income in the cases where there are two or more mines owned and operated by or under the same management. The bill makes clear that where a new mine is opened up and then becomes productive its profit is to be considered as a part of the joint company and not separately. I understand that the wording was a bit confusing in the resolution as it was introduced to the House in the

(MR. EVANS cont'd)... first place, and would have been helped by some punctuation as was pointed out at that time.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, the same thing applies, as far as I'm concerned, with this bill. I'm prepared to let it go through now and get the details from the department experts when we reach the committee stage.

I am concerned, however, about the comments made in the explanatory notes regarding the open pit mines, the fact that these will be ineligible to get the reduced rate of royalty tax during the initial years of operation. I would like to have from the Minister an explanation as to why that is so. I realize that by and large the open pit mines have a lesser capital investment, in their initial stages at least, as compared to a shaft type operation. On the other hand there are, I think, a number of places in Manitoba, particularly in the gypsum field, and my own constituency is one that is directly affected by this; we have had there a gypsum mine for some years. It was closed down and is presently not producing. Another mine was opened in another part of the province, also on a shaft basis, but a different type of shaft; instead of being the old vertical shaft, with a lift, it's a diagonal type shaft with conveyor. Well now, a second mine is being developed in the same Amaranth region at the moment on the basis of the diagonal conveyor type operation, but I understand that there's also a good deal of interest right now in the possibility of a fairly extensive open pit operation there and I expect there will be an announcement made fairly soon by the people who are so concerned, which will be certainly of importance to the Province of Manitoba.

Now I have no means of knowing the relative costs of the shaft type versus the open pit type, but I'm sure that all of us are concerned in seeing the development proceeded with and that there be no action taken by the Provincial Government in shifting of tax burdens or the amendments to an Act which would prevent developments from taking place, and I presume that the Minister is aware of the very substantial interest in the gypsum development in the Amaranth district at this time.

The other item in the explanatory notes, the one regarding the mining... the amendments made last year whereby gypsum mining might be taxed on a volume basis. Here again I would like to know from the government exactly what is proposed and what might be the effect of any changes in this regard insofar as the opening of new mines. Quite obviously we support the principle that we should get everything that we can as a province out of our natural resources, and certainly we don't want to see the gypsum taken out without a fair return to the people of the province because it is an asset belonging to all of the people. On the other hand, there is no point in letting the gypsum lie there below the ground and not be exploited if by our taxation schedules we are encouraging development in other areas. So I say to the Minister, in view of the very definite interest right now in this specific area in the province where the gypsum does exist, where we do have problems in any case of other economic activities which are very reduced in that area - we have welfare problems there; we have a large Indian Reservation with very little employment possibilities - I would hope that this has all been considered in the establishment of the rates, and that when we come to the committee stage the experts can give us assurance on these points.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd just make one comment in connection with the bill itself, and I will be asking for clarification of the point when we do get into the committee stage. I know it's usually contrary to the rules to refer to a section of a bill on second reading but in this case I think it's proper that I should refer to Section (3) where mention is made of various mines, a new mine and all mines owned and leased and occupied by the same person or the same management or under the control. Now most of our mines here in the Province of Manitoba, or a goodly percentage of them, are owned or controlled by people without the jurisdiction of the Province of Manitoba, and due to interlocking directorates and the likes of that it's quite conceivable that mines scattered throughout the whole area of Manitoba may in effect be under the control of ownership of the same group, or indeed conceivably by individuals. As I read that section - and of course, as my friend the Provincial Treasurer is well aware, I'm not learned in the law - but it does seem a bit confusing to me, and on reading it it did seem that this could raise questions in connection with actual ownership and actual control. So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister the Treasurer may give this some consideration as the question is likely to be raised at the time we are considering the bill in the committee stage.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. EVANS:further questions, Mr. Speaker? I think we should continue these discussions in committee -- any of the matters, naturally, will be discussed at that time and I'll have the benefit of some technical advice, but some of these don't seem to require it at this stage. I'm quite sure the Leader of the Opposition had the right reason when he said that we do not allow the tax abatement during the first three years of an open pit mine; that is, that they have nothing like the capital investment before they begin to recover ore values from the pit. I'm sure that must be the explanation of that but I'll be glad to discuss it further in committee.

The question of gypsum and the angle at which shafts go into the ground is quite beyond me, and I would ask him to allow me to discuss that further in committee stage.

The question by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. I think there are a number of matters referred to here. He does refer to interlocking directorships and that groups or consortiums of companies might indeed control a lot of different mines, and I think that matter is not contemplated in the provisions of this bill. It's really a legal matter but I would say that the several mines owned in Manitoba by the International Nickel Company, a corporate entity, could be grouped together for this purpose, but if there happened to be some interlocking directorships or other means of control of a number of separate corporations, that would not be the kind of thing contemplated by Section (3) of the Act, of the bill, rather. So it becomes a little complex but there's no intention to go beyond the mines owned by a separate, by a single mining corporation, a mine being, as I understand it, a hole in the ground, but a mining corporation being the company that owns them.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister a short question. With regard to the potash in Saskatchewan now, they have several potash mines where they are doing it with liquid, drilling a hole, putting the pressure down and bringing it up the other way. I was just wondering if you're familiar with this, and where would they stand with regard to this tax?

MR. EVANS: I think I'll ask my honourable friend to raise that in committee as he will understand I'm not an engineer and my understanding of the method of mining would not make any difference but I'd like to discuss it further at committee.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare, that Mr. 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.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Arthur in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Education, 1 (a) --passed. . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we leave the Minister's salary I'd like to turn back very briefly to the White Paper which the Minister gave us the other day. I will not be making any extensive comments. My colleague the Member from Emerson has already done so.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I recall correctlythe Member for Rhineland had the floor.

MR. MOLGAT: Oh, my apologies.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I certainly have no objection for the Official Leader speaking but I thought I'd like to complete what I had to say before any other one gets up to speak.

I think when I stopped last night we were discussing the matter of centralization and also the matter that I feel that considerable improvement could be done even on the items that are contained in the White Paper without the centralization that is taking place. And I'm just wondering whether the Minister really realizes the sacrifice that some communities will be making as a result of this if they vote the one district division in. Also, I feel that there are many unnecessary expenditures will be made if the new plan goes into effect.

There are a number of advantages that we have presently under this system that we're working under that we will not have under the new plan. I've already spoken on these on past occasions and I certainly don't want to bring out the same matters again; I don't want to repeat what I've said on previous occasions, but I think there are certain matters that should be said.

(MR. FROESE cont'd)... For one thing local boards that are presently operating in districts can offer incentives to the elementary teachers in their particular districts which will not be permissible or certainly will not be working out under the division plan. Today, districts can offer a good teacher a good bonus if he or she stays in that particular district, or comes into the district, and I personally wouldn't even hesitate to offer a teacher a good bonus of \$500 or even \$1,000, for that matter, if it is a matter of obtaining a good teacher, because I think we need good teachers badly in this province. I am only too glad to say that we still have a good number of good teachers but as you know, Mr. Chairman, we have no merit rating in this province on teachers and I think it's the rural areas that do any type of merit rating because of the salaries that they offer. Certainly this government wouldn't touch merit rating with a ten foot pole. The inspector's report that we have been getting and that the school districts get, actually are of very little value just because of this - that there is no merit rating in this. This will be a real big problem to one-district division boards once they come into effect on this very matter of teacher engagement and placing. In fact we will have an awful time telling teachers what school you're going to, because certainly if they are going to get the same salary it is common sense that they would like to stay in the better populated community, in the community where they're able to enjoy more recreation and so on, so that teachers naturally will tend to stay - and want to stay - in those centers, and I think teachers should think twice, too, before supporting this plan wholesale and wholeheartedly. Already I know of certain teachers who are thinking twice on this matter just because of this very thing.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, would the honourable member submit to a question?

MR. FROESE: Not at the present time. I think I'll deal with those later on if there are any questions that members want to ask.

Certainly there will not be sufficiently larger -- a larger number of larger elementary schools over night, and these school division boards will have to deal with the provincial board that they're going to set up in connection with allowing and approving capital expenditures for new elementary schools, so that here is another area even if some division boards will probably want to proceed, that they probably won't be able to.

In my opinion, I am doubting whether the larger grants that are being offered - a carrot so to speak - is warranted, and I think and I consider them actually to be a bribe in the coming referendum. I, too, think that it's ill-timed, because members of this House who should properly inform the people of this province on this very matter will be sitting and won't be able to do the job and tell their own constituents what the score is. Later on who is going to be to blame when things should not work out as expected? Certainly it will be the members of this House because we have not done our duty. The remark is made here it's the Minister's responsibility. Well I think, as a member of this House, that it's also my responsibility to inform the electors of my riding on this very important matter.

Then, too, we know that the general levy today is 7 mills and this is supposed to be increased to 9 mills. I have not got the figures of the assessment of the divisions in my particular area. I know the assessment in round figures of the municipalities concerned, and in Rhineland municipality we had up until now an assessment of 8 million and if you apply the 7 mill rate on this 8 million it gives you 56,000 that the government collected in revenue from this municipality toward school costs.

Now we find that we have had a reassessment take place. The assessment is now increased to roughly 15 million in round figures and we will now have a 9 mill general levy, so that means that they will be collecting 135,000 instead of 56,000. This is a very substantial increase. The government is going to draw some 79 to 80 thousand dollars more from that particular municipality to pay for its school costs.

Take the municipality of Stanley which had an assessment of 5.5 million, and a 7 mill rate for the general levy gives you 38,500. Now under the new assessment of 8 million - this is also round figures - and 9 mills gives you 72,000, and this is an increase of \$33,500, so that the municipalities in this particular area will contribute substantially much larger sums toward education in Manitoba. I would like to get more information from the Minister in connection with this. I think we, as members, need this and I am sure that the people that will go out to sell the program will need it and most likely will have the information, so I feel that the information should be given to us as members here while we're discussing these particular questions in the estimates.

I would request that we, as members, receive the assessment of each division before and after reassessment that has taken place. Not all centers have been reassessed but the

(MR. FROESE cont'd)....municipalities have been reassessed, and I would like to know the assessment of each division before and after reassessment.

Then I would like to have the figures of each division of the amount that they will now receive under the present grant system - not the one district one - under the present system, how much they would be receiving, and then also the amount that each division will receive under the one district division plan; and further, the amount of tax revenue that will be collected by the government under the new and also under the former general levy for each division. I think this information is essential, that we get it. Otherwise how can we make a realistic assessment of what is going on and what is taking place and whether we are going to benefit and to what extent? I think we should have the information as to the capital debt of each division. Here is another area that - it can vary to a large extent from division to division. I think we should also have all other pertinent information that will be made available to government staff to sell the one district division plan, so that at least we're in equal position to do the job, whether it be for or against.

As I already mentioned last night, or yesterday afternoon, I would have liked to see the Act before we discussed this White Paper in such detail because a lot more information might be in the Act that we cannot discuss at the present time, and one of the items that I would like to check in on is in connection with the authorization of religious teaching. Section 241 of Chapter 215 of the Revised Statutes applied to districts only, and certainly we wouldn't like to see a situation arise such as they had across the line in the United States where the courts overruled it. So I think this matter should be looked into. At least we should be assured and satisfied on this point that such a thing will not happen and that we won't have to try and recapture our previous position on this matter. I am sure the people of this province are also entitled to know. Maybe the government has taken care of this - I don't know. Maybe it's all okay, but I certainly would like the assurance of the Minister on this point.

The matter of adult education has been raised by the members and I certainly would like to encourage the government to give every support to those districts and divisions that are offering programs of this type. I think the City of Winnipeg, or the division, one district divisions and the City of Winnipeg should be congratulated on carrying out such a worthwhile program, and we as a province should give every support in this direction because they have been leaders in this area and I know members of rural Manitoba take advantage of a considerable number of these courses and they are appreciated.

On the matter for the mentally retarded - we will probably be dealing with those things later on under specific items, but I would like to know, what is the situation? Because if I understand correctly some of the associations or the schools that are situated in the urban centers such as Winnipeg or the cities, they are getting support from the department whereas others are not, and recently I was told by a member of one of these associations that they were being asked by their particular division board to take on older students, and they felt if this was the case they needed larger premises, more room, and this would mean capital expenditures. I would like to know from the Minister, what is the score on this? Are we just supporting the city associations or the city programs on this matter, and how soon, if support will be coming to the others, how soon can they expect support and to what extent? Or is it just now a matter for the division board? Are they responsible? Because I think this situation should be clarified because we have associations that are doing a good job; the people are making voluntary contributions on this; and we should, as a province, certainly support them.

The matter of aid to private schools has been raised by one of the members of this House and I feel if we are going into this plan of one district divisions for the whole province that there should be an alternative, and like other provinces in Canada I think they are deserving of support and that we should work out some system of support for the private schools of this province. I am sure if they had only part of the funds that we are spending in education they could do a job - I think as good a job, and much more economically. I think we need a yardstick in this direction because we will be spending, under this new program, millions of dollars, and who is to say whether we are spending them wisely and economically or efficiently. I think these schools that we have at present -- I think there would be more of them if they did receive some financial support. These are a few of the matters, Mr. Chairman, that I wanted to raise under the Minister's salary. Certainly I will have more to say when we also get into the detailed items.

MR. DOERN: Would the honourable member submit to a question?

MR. FROESE: If I can answer it, why not.

MR. DOERN: You did say that it was natural for teachers to gravitate to heavy population areas and centres and I think that's true; but don't you think there's also a sort of natural advantage in the sense that teachers who come from rural Manitoba prefer to return to their original districts and prefer to remain in their original district and that not everybody comes running into the cities and into the heavy population centres? Some of them naturally return and so on. There isn't this terrific magnet.

MR. FROESE: I think a very small number return to their formal localities. I'm sure that the divisions or the districts operating in the more heavily populated areas they get far more applications from teachers wanting positions, by far.

MR. MOLGAT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to apologize to the Honourable Member for Rhineland, I had frankly forgotten that he had the floor prior and certainly was not trying to prevent him from continuing his speech.

My comments will be brief, Mr. Chairman. There are a few matters I want to check with the Minister with regard to his plan. I appreciate that, some of it he is not in a position to say until the plan goes into effect and I was pleased to note his comment that he will be happy to consider changes once we see how in fact it is working out.

Insofar as the broad principle of the Foundation Program, I certainly favour the principle as such. The equalization of taxation structure across the province is something that I have pleaded with the Minister on a number of occasions because of the particular problems of the constituency which I represent, which are very similar to those of the Interlake as he well knows. So I would hope that the proposal will in fact make for that equalization which is necessary if we are going to provide equality of opportunity to the children of the province.

To be successful, however, it seems to me that the Foundation Program must do two things, Mr. Chairman. At the outset it must of course cover the basic and actual costs. So I would ask the Minister to give us the assurance that this is so. When I look at the salary schedule which the Minister has appended to his submission, I find that he has been pointed out by others, that in certain categories I believe that the schedule is already below what some of the existing agreements are, but worse than that, it is far below what the indications of new agreements are at the moment.

I understand that at this time the requests in the suburban areas for the new agreements by the teachers amount to something like 20 to 35 percent increase over the previous agreements, and this it seems to me would put the new schedules substantially above the proposed schedule here by the Minister. I'm told for example that in the case of say, Winnipeg, comparing it to the proposed schedule in the case of P1A1 as listed by the Minister, he shows \$3,700 as the starting salary, that the present offer by the Board - this isn't the request by the teachers, this is actually the offer by the Winnipeg Board - at the moment is \$4,000 and yet the basic suggested by the schedule is \$3,700.00. The maximum suggested by the Board is, \$5,000 and the maximum suggested by the schedule is \$4,900; it's so \$300 below at the beginning and \$100 below at the end.

When you move to the P1A4 which I think is by far the largest number or the category that encompasses the largest number of teachers in the City of Winnipeg, we find even a greater disparity because the Minister proposes without any experience a basic beginning salary of \$5,200 and the Winnipeg School Board is presently offering to the teachers \$6,000, so there's already a discrepancy of \$800.00, something almost, well not quite 20 percent but well over 15 percent, discrepancy there. The maximum figure proposed by the Minister is \$8,000 under P1A4 and we find the Winnipeg School Board offering at this time \$9,500 a difference of \$1,500 - again just almost 20 percent, Mr. Chairman.

So based on the Winnipeg School Board - and I could give figures as well for others - they compare pretty well the same, not quite as high. We find for example that Assiniboia south and Midland, and Beautiful Plains which is a rural constituency or a rural division encompassing the Neepawa district, they're offering on P1A4 \$5,800 to \$8,900. as compared the Minister's proposal of \$5,200 to \$8,000.00. So it seems to me from the outset, at least insofar as the salaries are concerned, the Foundation Program does not in fact cover the present costs that the divisions are going to have to face. Now my honourable friend the Minister knows that the poor divisions are going to have to meet these costs, and they're going to have to meet these salary schedules being offered if they are going to get teachers. And yet they are not going to have under the Foundation Program the amount that is presently being asked. Now what will this mean then insofar as the local levy? Are we not going to find ourselves back in exactly the same position, that the Foundation Program does not meet the costs

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd)..... and the local levy is going to have to be substantially higher, when obviously it will once again bring us back to the situation of inequality of opportunity because of inequality of the ability of the school divisions to produce the necessary income.

Going to the other items on the Foundation Program, I can only ask there if the Minister has checked these, and if he can give us some answers. In the case of the maintenance grants, the government proposes 100 percent of the approved expenditure up to \$1,200 per authorized teacher. How does this compare with the actual costs today? In the case of the instructional supplies grant, 100 percent of the approved expenditure up to \$400.00 per authorized teacher. Same question. How does that compare with the actual costs today. Keeping in mind that we are going to be faced presumably with some higher costs as we go into specialized courses. If you're going to have additional courses in some of these high schools such as chemistry and physics, any of the other household arts, and so on, that these are expensive things to go into in many cases.

Grants towards administration again 100 percent up to \$450.00. How does that compare with the present costs today?

Transportation costs. He proposes 100 percent up to \$175 per pupil transported. Well we have great variations obviously in the transportation costs. To make sure that this is sufficient we have to take the extreme case and I would presume that this is in fact either the Interlake or Duck Mountain Division or Turtle River. How in fact does this tie in? So I would like the Minister to give us the information on this matter; exactly where we stand; does the Foundation Program in fact cover them.

Then the next question is what does the Minister propose insofar as keeping from then on the Foundation Program in line with the costs that the school divisions are actually going to have to cover? I know the Minister is aware that from 1958 when he brought in - or not he, when his colleague brought in the division plan and brought in the schedule for teachers' salaries, that there was no increase at all in the government grant until last year, or was it the year before, I think it was - whatever it was - within the last two years, and yet during that period of time the salaries had advanced very substantially. So the costs had to be borne then strictly at the local level. There was not in the previous formula, and there was no action taken by the government to make sure that the schedule kept pace with the advancing costs. Now what does the Minister propose insofar as this program? How does he propose to do this? Will he have a yearly review? Will he come back to the House annually with new proposals to meet the additional costs? Who is going to make the proposals in this regard or is there going to be an outside board, is the board that he is setting up the ones who will do this? I imagine that it cannot be done if in fact by statute we're going to set this matter up so I would like to make sure that there will be no delay in ensuring that the Foundation Program does in fact continue at all times to be a Foundation Program.

On a specific question outside of this, I would like to ask the Minister what he proposes to do in the matter of capital costs? The new plan is for 100 percent that the capital costs be borne by the province itself. So we would have for example a division that has say, undertaken no construction - and I suppose that the ones who came very recently under the division plan are probably in that category. They haven't built any schools so there's no local indebtedness at this moment. The government is going to come along and build the schools, presumably, at 100 percent government expenditure. What then does it propose for those other divisions who went ahead in past years and built their schools and presently have a substantial indebtedness that they have to meet because they have their debentures scheduled over a 20 year period. Is he going to pick up, in those cases, the outstanding debentures? I don't know what he proposes but unless he has some scheme then we find ourselves in the position that any who proceeded to improve their schools are in fact penalized under the new system.

So I hope the Minister can give us that information and assure us in fact that the program will continue to be an effective Foundation Program covering the basic costs.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): There's a question I'd like to ask on the White Paper. My Leader touched on part of it but I'd like to expand it a little more. The White Paper specifies that the Foundation Program takes care of 100 percent of approved capital costs -- the word "approved". Now I would like to know whether the Minister has the regulations governing or outlining the portion of the budget that is covered by this foundation program. We have for example, the paper does not specify what this involves. I think it should include, and hope it does, the construction of say administrative offices and certain teaching aid centres and so on. I think a paper like this, or a table showing us what the capital cost covers, what may be expected to improve. I'm sure that the Minister does have that. We know now that Winnipeg is drafting its new budget and I believe that pretty soon it will be finalized and I'm sure Winnipeg would like to know what portion of school costs would have to be levied by the City of Winnipeg itself.

Now there's another question which probably I could raise later on but I may not be in tomorrow, I have other duties, so I'd like to raise it at this time. On Page 51 I notice that as far as University Entrance is concerned there's one short sentence and I'll quote: "some minor modifications were made in Ukrainian 300." And that's all it mentions. As the members know, in the past I had a resolution here requesting that the government urge the University of Manitoba to accept the Ukrainian language as a University Entrance or Matriculation course and I believe that there has been some progress made in that. I really believe in this because I think it's the right thing to do. I believe it's good for Manitoba and I also believe that it is good for the Province of Manitoba. True, that resolution some two years ago was unanimously accepted by this House after some modification and I could have pursued it further last year but I purposely refrained from this question any more because I did not want to portray the fashion that I may be trying to use this legislature as a pressure group. Therefore last year I didn't enquire more into it. I hope that the government will do something about it at the university. We know that the governors and the senate in the university are responsible men and they are reasonable men so I thought that with the help of the government urging them there will be further steps taken.

But we can't expect the university or the Department of Education to act on any new projects or any projects without sufficient demand for these projects. Now we know that there are other groups, Ukrainian groups, who have met with government officials and one such group I know met on Monday, January 6th, 1966, with the Honourable Premier and the Honourable Minister of Education and this group was the Ukrainian-Canadian Committee who met with the Minister at that time. And after presenting their submission the delegation discussed among themselves -- I think recently there was a press release in the Ukrainian periodicals -- and I would just like to read the three main resolutions or topics discussed at that time, and one was, "that the teaching of Ukrainian language be extended to the elementary level in the public schools of the Province of Manitoba." That was one of the resolutions.

Another one was "that the Government of Manitoba continue to persuade the authorities of the provincial university to accept the Ukrainian language on par with Latin, German, French and other languages that are accepted at the present time at the university level."

Now there was a third one: "that the Department of Education, through its correspondence branch, provide correspondence courses in Ukrainian commencing with the 1966-1967 academic term as there is a definite need for such courses." That's what the resolution says.

Now as far as the first is concerned, there may have been some action taken but not too much so far. As far as the second one is concerned, I would like a report from the Minister stating where we stand. I realize that there was some progress made and I'm not trying to be critical at the present time. I realize that there has been some progress made but I would urge the government to continue its efforts in this because it is vitally important to a great portion of the people of Manitoba and especially the City of Winnipeg. The Ukrainians constitute the second largest ethnic group in the Province of Manitoba. And as far as the correspondence -- Ukrainian by correspondence -- I understand there has been some headway made and at the present time children who wish to take advantage of it may do so. So that part of it was fine.

Now this press release also states in regard to the situation at the University of Manitoba the Premier told the delegation that this government is well aware of the inequities in connection with the Ukrainian language at the university level and feels that the existing restrictions should be removed.

Well I hope that the government has this under active consideration and I hope that

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.) something is done. I would urge the government to continue its efforts in this respect.

MR. USKIW: Speaking as a rural member of this House and indeed as a farmer I'm sure I speak for all of rural Manitoba. I wish to say at the outset that I wish to compliment the Honourable Minister for introducing various progressive ideas within his White Paper on education. I think the compliment will be shared by most people, in particular in the rural parts of Manitoba.

I suggest to the people of Manitoba that they do support the single district board concept of elementary and secondary education. I think it has been too long that we have, you might say, dilly dallied in the field of education over the years and that as a result we have now problems where we have to go into upgrading people that haven't had sufficient education over the past 20 or so years. I think this is a very significant point. We don't want to be in this position 20 years hence.

There are two main reasons why I suggest to the people of Manitoba that they should support the single concept and one is, of course, economics. I don't think that there is a difference of opinion on this score, I think we all agree that under the Foundation Program they would be foolish not to accept the single board concept, just from that standpoint alone - the standpoint of economics. And of course all the academic advantages also. And I don't think it's important that I relate those to you in that this would simply be thrashing old straw if you may.

Some years ago, I think this was 1958, I had challenged a certain speaker on a certain platform on the question of the standard of education in Manitoba. It happened to be election time at that particular time and of course the then Liberal Government was defending its position over the years and I raised the question of secondary education in rural Manitoba and the guest speaker of that day told me that in his opinion the facilities, the educational facilities in the secondary level were second to none in Canada. They were second to none in Canada. And of course I don't hesitate to tell you that I quarreled with him on that score. But in fact there was no blueprint for secondary education for rural Manitoba -- and of course I was speaking on behalf of an area that was sort of disgusted at the time that their children had to go to non-resident schools or that they had to go as non-residents, pay non-resident fees and that as a result of this particular situation many of our rural people didn't receive their secondary education.

I think it's timely that I might point out to my colleagues on the right that if there was ever a time in Manitoba history where there should have been a question put in this Chamber as to the indemnities of government members, I think that was the proper time. I think the question would have been well put at that time. I can't sympathize with the review in that score and I think the government recognizes our position was rather on the methodology of increasing their indemnities, so therefore there is quite a distinction. Certainly we're not prepared on this side of the House to, as it has been mentioned before, merit rate anyone. But I thought it was important to bring these facts to light because the years sort of tend to go rather swiftly and we sort of tend to forget the past. I suggest that we all agreed a short time ago -- the 56 of the 57 -- that we want to progress in education, that we support the single board concept and that we should forget about questions of -- the single division concept I should say -- we should forget about worrying whether or not the Minister's salary is adequate or inadequate at this particular time. I think there are more important things to discuss.

In 1958 of course if we recall when we had the new government elected Manitoba was then faced with a crash program in education in setting up the divisions and I believe that was a credit to them, I think it is a credit to them today. I don't think that they should take a back seat in that respect. This is a very bold measure and it required an awful lot of work and certainly I was one of those at that particular time that did support that measure.

However, my criticism of the government, of that day, and today incidentally, is they didn't quite see the light all the way, that what we should have had in fact at that particular time was the proposition of the single district division. Because we didn't accept this proposition at that time, because we went only half way, we actually got ourselves into a mess in the building of schools, transportation problems -- I don't think I needn't remind anyone in this Chamber that has been connected with various school boards that these are indeed serious problems of today and that had we adopted the single concept then we would of not only removed these problems but we would have been more efficient in their operation.

I think it's true that we should have had a Boundaries Commission 20 years ago in this

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) province so that we didn't go ahead with construction of educational facilities in the wrong places at the wrong times and so forth. In my particular area we have built a school which was recently opened -- in fact the Honourable Minister of Highways was at the opening -- which is two miles from the secondary school. As a result of this you have transportation problems. You have to load your children on one bus, unload them at the school, another bus comes and picks them up, takes them to the other school, this type of inefficiency. All these inefficiencies would have been removed or avoided I might say had we adopted the single district division concept at that particular time.

So my suggestion to the Government of Manitoba is that I hope that they continue in the field of research in this department to assure Manitoba that we don't make the costly mistakes of the last number of years -- and the reason I suggest this incidentally is because I don't want Premier Paulley some time in 1970 or 1971 to be handed down a system of education that is very much in disrepair. So I hope that the government will take note and avoid the costly mistakes of the past and let's have some research in the field of education as is required, tomorrow -- especially in the fields of technical and vocational. Thank you very much.

MR. CLEMENT: Mr. Chairman, oh I'm sorry

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (St. Vital): I would just like to briefly continue what I began yesterday. First of all I think I should take the opportunity to congratulate the Minister on the White Paper which he has introduced into the Legislature. I think this is a very forward looking manuscript and I think it is very timely. With regards to some of the aspects of the White Paper, as a past member of a school board and having a considerable interest in education and having in fact been involved in the field myself for some time, I'd like to say first of all as a school board member that this White Paper does the essential things which we wanted to see in the education field. First of all we wanted to see equality provided for opportunity in education and this essentially does that. I'm not sure that there won't still exist small anomalies between districts or between the divisions. I don't think they're serious. I think that the special levy will handle these without difficulty.

The second item of course and probably the major item in the White Paper is the provision or the incentive for the forming of the single district divisions. When I first became active on school board our division had just recently amalgamated the districts in the area in which I live and I think that this had been done about three years prior to the time I became involved in the work, but any little disturbances that may have been experienced during the forming of the division were completely forgot about by that time and we resulted with a seven man board with a total of 14 schools and 270 teachers or so and the division was running very harmoniously.

I would like to say that probably the largest benefit for the forming of the divisions has to -- or the whole White Paper really is going to benefit the country to the largest extent, naturally of course because this is where the districts are now existing, and when the Honourable Member for Rhineland was talking about merit rating I couldn't help but think of the merit system that has existed in many of the districts when you have a condition where there are more school board members than there are teachers. The teachers are under the continuous daily scrutiny of the members of the board and I think probably this is what he was saying when he was talking on the subject of the merit rating system.

Now we've had considerable contributions from the new members of the NDP party as to what should be done in education and many of the ills that now existed in the system. And I'd like to harken back just briefly to an experience I think that is very important and point out some of the fundamentals of the education system. During the period I was at the university we had formed a committee whose job it was to go out to the high schools from the university and act as liaison and keep up the communication between the university and the high schools. I made a special effort to try and get to some of the country high schools because the country high schools have always been at a disadvantage in maintaining the flow of capable students from these high schools into the university, and we made special efforts to do this. I'd like to recall one particular example one day driving out some distance from Winnipeg and in the morning went to one particular high school and addressed a groups of 20 students in Grade XI and Grade XII. And after the address and the question period I was to interview these students, if they had questions regarding their academic aspirations or regarding their need for financial assistance because there is a bursary system and a scholarship system that does exist in this province and which has been belittled in certain cases in this House here, and I'd like to come

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) back to this as well. Now, out of those 20 students, to make my point, there were 13 of them that were going on to university. This school was live from the bottom right to the top -- those children, those kids coming out of Grade XI and Grade XII at that time they could go from eleven still into the old first year course -- they were motivated, they knew where they were going and they knew largely how they were going to get there. Some of them had financial problems but these were largely being sorted out.

Well at the end of the morning I carried on, I went to the second school, which was only 20 miles from that school, and in this group there were 40 Grade XI and Grade XII. The school was about the same sort of age, it was the same sort of quality of building, it had the same general physical facilities and I addressed the group and after went through the same sort of pattern, called for questions, there was a few questions, and after I interviewed the ones that were interested in going to university, out of the group of 40 there were three students that were interested in going to university; and through the interviews it looked like one of them likely would carry through. Now, the obvious question is, what happened between those two schools that were physically the same within a distance of 20 miles apart. Well, in analyzing the situation, you couldn't help but feel that one of the very large factors was the quality of the teaching staff that was in the schools. In the first school I mentioned, the principal had the interest of his community at heart, he had the interest of the students at heart, he knew the students and he was dedicated to their cause. Now, I don't think really that you could ever compensate that person for his work in the community and to those students, I think you could probably pay him as much as a cabinet minister and he'd still be underpaid.

In the second school, in the course of conversation it became perfectly obvious that the principal in that school was interested in two things, he was interested in drawing his paycheck and drawing his breath. I don't mean to be cruel but I imagine that he's still rattling around our school system some place. He had done nothing to motivate the students. Now I'm not saying it's his fault. There's a community problem and there's also this other bigger one which I think is the attitude of the teachers. There are two fundamentals here, there's attitudes of teachers and motivation of students, and the motivation of the students is what you want. It's the key to the whole situation. We can bring in research -- and this research term is a very broad term, it's never very well defined, the last speaker was talking about research here too but it's something like motherhood, we're in favour of it, it's virtuous and we're against sin; we'd like research but. . . .

You'd better start thinking about what you mean by research when you're talking about it because research can provide you a service but unless you've got your front end working properly, that is your teachers in your schools with the proper attitudes, your research service is going to do you absolutely no good. Let's not get the cart out in front of the horse, let's keep them in the right positions because this is I think the very very important part. Now I'm sure that a lot of the statements here that have been made, particularly on the NDP side have been taken to heart by these ones that like to draw their paycheck and their breath. I'm sure they love to eat this up; I'm equally sure that the first principal I mentioned could not be bothered reading the tripe as it came out, he's too busy looking after his tribe in his school.

MR. DOERN: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. CRAIK: After I'm finished thank you.

MR. DOERN: Later?

MR. CRAIK: Fine, sure. Now I'd like to drive this point home. Motivation is the biggest single factor and all power does not flow from this assembly to those school boards and those schools and the school rooms and the teachers. The secret is in the community and if we provide the general framework for them to operate in, which we're essentially doing now through the provision of a good financing system to provide the equality to make sure they're not burdened down with an exceptionally great local load and particularly in the residential areas then I think we've essentially provided our service. That and the guidance provided by the general guide lines put on curriculum.

Now I'm going to harken back to another statement that has been made across here, which I took great exception to, and was made by the Honourable Member for Inkster. I know he's a knowledgeable man and I know he's dedicated, but he came into the House here and he made the statement that our education system is essentially geared to the rich. I'm pretty sure that he's not one of these people; I'm pretty sure I'm not either. As a matter of fact I

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) spent ten years in one of those one room country schools just like so many other people probably did that are in this room. Now, education for the rich, I don't just exactly know what he means by this sort of generalization, it is gain not a matter of money in many cases in providing this motivation that takes children on through your educational system, through on all your steps to the university degree or whatever it might be - the technology certificate or the trades training - it is a matter of communication largely and providing the motivation in the students. As a matter of fact the member which I referred to mentioned the great lack of financial support to these students and called for the abolition of tuition fees. Now as a rough generalization - and he was referring really there to the university setup - as a rough generalization you can count on a student from rural Manitoba costing him when he comes into the city to live about \$1,500 or in that order and somebody that lives in the city around \$1,000.00. The tuition fees are roughly \$400.00, plus or minus give or take, and this \$400.00 represents about 20 percent of the cost of giving that person the education. This is borne by the community. And I'll say right now that I'm against the abolition of the fees at university level. I think that our community, our Manitoba community can be fairly proud of the fact that they breed and bring up a fairly independent lot of people and that they are highly motivated enough that if they want to go on, carry on and get their education that when they have the desire for it their will becomes great enough and most of them, this is something they have to develop for themselves or with help, that they will then go on and the tuition fee is not an extreme burden. I'd like to point out the fact that last year I believe - although I wasn't at the university, there was a referendum held and the students themselves turned down the bid for free tuition at the university. There's one province in Canada that does it, in Newfoundland, and I think they have special reasons for doing it. I don't believe I'm nit-picking here. The bursaries do exist, there's some \$400,000 a year given out in bursaries.

I would like to point out to the Honourable Member for Inkster that a good deal of these bursaries have traditionally been supplied by the alumnae association and as I recall I think he was president of the alumnae association back two or three years ago, I'm just a bit curious to know what he said to them about raising money to provide bursaries compared to what he has added to our conversation in the House.

With these comments, Sir, -- they haven't been too well prepared, but they are some observations that I've compiled over a period of time which I believe are fairly correct -- I would like to not dwell longer on this. I think while I'm here though I would like to mention to the Leader of the Opposition, I don't know the exact legal position, not being in that profession, but I wonder if you're really on side when you're quoting salaries from the school division in Winnipeg that hasn't completed negotiations, and I wonder if in fact this should be done. These are tabled here, what the Minister of Education or the Department of Education has suggested, but until salary negotiations are completed, I don't know that we could really compare the two schedules. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Was it a question you had, Sir.

MR. DOERN: No. I want to make a few comments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. CLEMENT: Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to say a few words with regards to education. I must compliment the Honourable the Minister of Education on his White Paper, I think it is excellent. Like I'm sure all members in this Legislature I'm vitally interested in education and the future of Manitoba and our young people. I'll assure you this that I am serious, if I wasn't I'll assure you I would not be in this Legislature.

I want to just say one or two words about the districts, the larger districts that are going to be voted on. I think it's excellent, although I have one or two reservations and I have made these perfectly clear at home. First of all it is going to take an enormous amount of money. This, according to our estimates is going to be forthcoming, I was kind of hopeful that the Minister or the First Minister would have enlightened the Legislature by this time just how he proposes to raise this sum of money; however, undoubtedly he knows how he's going to do it, and he is going to do or these estimates wouldn't be before us. Education has become very costly and I'm very sure it is very very important; however, being a practical businessman as well I know that there are only two things one can do when you're in business; if you need more money you either borrow it and if you're unable to borrow it you stop spending for a little while till you find it somewhere. However, for this coming year I'm sure we're going to have the money and for this reason I think the White Paper is excellent. I am sure that the

(MR. CLEMENT cont'd.) vote will pass.

Now, in the Pelly Trail School Division which represents Russell, Rossburn-Angusville, we are most fortunate in having, I think, perhaps one of the best rural school teachers in Manitoba who has been appointed superintendent. Now this is important. If each one of these school districts has a first class superintendent I am sure the job will be done very well, but unfortunately, by doing this we're taking out of circulation I suppose it would be some -- well we're going to vote on 33 -- it'll be 48 districts, 48 of the topnotch, the best school principals we have in Manitoba, are probably going to be superintendents. Now this is important but at the same time it's quite a loss to the pupils because these teachers are no longer teachers, they are superintendents; they have a full time job; they are on the go continually. However, to make the districts satisfactory and perform properly they have to have good superintendents. Therefore I suppose this is the way it has to be. I suppose it has to be a school principal to be a superintendent. This, of course, I'm not sure but they have to make sure that they have the right teachers in the right schools and keep everything in harmony. I am sure that the Minister himself, although not a school teacher by profession, could make an excellent superintendent. What I'm trying to point out, if in the various areas there are men with these qualifications, perhaps they shouldn't have to be school teachers. This is just a suggestion.

I know that also, as a businessman, I have quite a few I would say superintendents, and I know that the first qualification they should have - they don't always have it - is a smiling face as the Minister of Education; it's pretty hard to say no to him, and I know, even though he's got daggers behind him, he can still smile and this is very important for sitting on the front bench of the government.

Well now, I rose at this time particularly on one point. I want to support, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member from Emerson here with the resolution that he had brought in some time before and he just discussed - the use of Ukrainian; to make Ukrainian be accepted as a full credit language at the University. This, I think, is very important, particularly for the area that I represent. There are now fourth and fifth generation Ukrainian people in our area. Many of the younger people - in fact the majority of the younger people perhaps - speak the Queen's English better than I do, but there are still the parents, the people behind who would be very proud of their children if they would learn their own language, and this I think many of them try to do and would do much better if they were allowed to use it as a full credit at the university level. I received a resolution, a copy of a letter - a copy I'm sure the First Minister and the Minister of Education and Mr. Saunderson, the President of the University, has received, and I do not have to read it because the Member for Emerson went over it. It would be the same thing, a repeat. But I think that if the university would accept this language that it would be to our advantage. I'm sure there are many other languages that they can use. There are very few people really have to have that language. In my particular case, as is well-known, I was in the Legislature for some ten years before, and along with the ex-Social Credit Member from Dauphin, he and I took Ukrainian lessons every morning for several months, two or three years. We didn't become really conversant, but believe it or not there are still many older people out in the rural areas - and I'm sure the Honourable Member from Dauphin knows this - who have trouble with English and if you can help them out with a few words it is to your advantage and to their advantage as well and they appreciate it.

So without anything further, I want to congratulate once again the Minister of Education. I'll assure him that in the Birtle-Russell constituency I will help explain this and do what I can to see that it passes, and once again compliment him on the White Paper. A great deal of work went into this paper. Somebody must have burned a lot of candlelight and I'm sure it was a big decision. I think it will be well worthwhile and I hope it passes. Thank you.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the remarks of the Honourable Member for St. Vital. As one who comes from the profession of a high school teacher I notice quite a contrast in our styles. He tends to lecture and this is sort of a different method than we have in high school. Nevertheless, he points out that we are bandying about terms like "motherhood" and other platitudinous terms so he thinks, or suggests, like "research". Well it's a very interesting analysis but I'd like to point out that I don't know if he takes this seriously or not, but if he doesn't, that he should, because this province's record in this area is shameful.

I think we have all learned by now that we are going to spend \$100 million in education, that the provincial government will spend \$61.5 million, and to the best of my knowledge - and I stand to be corrected by the Minister - I think that his department, within this building at

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . least, or within other buildings of the government, only has one or two people engaged in this process. For a business of this size to spend, say \$10,000 - which is all that I can determine they are spending, although they may be giving a few little grants here and there - on \$100 million or on their portion of it - \$61.5 million - is absolutely ridiculous. I think American industry tends to spend in the area of three percent and I think that Canadian industry seems to spend about one percent of their gross, so if we look at those figures, if the government was going to, say, spend what would be comparable to three percent, they would spend either \$3 million on the \$100 million on research, or roughly \$1.845 million on the \$61.5. If they were going to follow the Canadian example and spend one percent, they would spend either a million on the whole, or \$615,000. But even if we went down to maybe a more realistic figure, maybe one that the present Minister would accept and endorse, say a quarter of one percent, that would be a massive step forward. If it was on the \$100 million that would be \$250,000, or \$62,500 in the case of his own department's actual spending.

My honourable colleague from Inkster refers to education as being primarily for the rich. I wasn't here when he made that speech, or I don't recall it, but I know what he means. He means if you look at the average person at university they tend to come from the higher socio-economic category and that's not surprising. If your parents are professional people you have all sorts of advantages: the vocabulary of association, of table talk that you hear from the time that you're a youth, etc. On top of all that you have economic advantages. You don't need bursaries and so on. I remember going to United College one time when I was a student. I was introduced to a young girl when I was in first year. She was in the collegiate department, 16 years old, brand new car, all expenses, going to United which cost \$300 or \$400 a year. Well, I never had those opportunities, and the Honourable Member says he didn't, and I know the Honourable Member for Inkster didn't. But many people do, and if you look at where these people come from, from Winnipeg, well they tend to come from the south end. We're not surprised at that. Only we just don't believe that the brains are all in the south end. I think a lot of them are in the north end and the west end and the east end. Now he suggests that we have it backward, that you don't set up your goals and then implement them, but what you do is you find the goals, if I understand him correctly, in the teachers or in the divisions or something like that. Well, I think he's partly right. Undoubtedly teachers know a great deal about education and they should be consulted on the formation of goals, but ultimately I think the department itself must set these goals with the aid of research and with the aid of professional educators, psychologists, etc.

And on a final point, and I speak no further than this at this particular time, he says there are a lot of bad teachers because he ran into some. And he's right. There are bad teachers in the profession; there are people who shouldn't be in it; who should be broken out and never let in. But this is his government's responsibility. This is the old case of supply and demand.

We're just throwing bodies into some classrooms. We can't pick and choose from qualified people; there's a shortage of teachers. When the Minister finally tells us how many permit teachers and how many people on letters authority, etc., then we'll have a pretty good idea. He's got to actually throw bodies into classrooms, baby-sitters and so on, because he doesn't have professionally qualified people. Why? Partly because of the work load, partly because of the lack of salary or competitive salary - and the Minister has made a great step forward in this paper; he's going to bring salaries up and we're going to be able to compete with other professions and other provinces.

But it's the Minister's responsibility to provide the necessary attraction to attract people into teaching. When you talk to a young boy, go and talk to a young boy in an average high school and say to him, "What are you going to be, son, when you grow up?" he'll never say "a teacher." He'll say, "I want to be a lawyer, a doctor, a businessman or an engineer." The girls say, "I want to be a teacher," and the isolated young boy says, "I want to be a teacher." Maybe his father's a professor. But the average young student with ability doesn't want to be a teacher, because it just doesn't have the aura of the professions and it doesn't have the salary and the prestige. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, maybe he'd like to be a Cabinet Minister. So the point is, until teaching is more attractive - and the economic factor is a big factor - then we are not going to have enough people, and until we have more people applying than jobs available we're not going to have a high standard of people in the classrooms.

I look at a lot of my colleagues and I don't like some of them either. I don't think they

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . have -- I'm sorry. My honourable leader, of course, points out that I should be careful of my wording. Naturally I was speaking of the teaching profession; I wasn't alluding to this distinguished, highly qualified and capable group of which I'm a member. I was referring to the group that I was a member of - the teaching profession. So until the Minister and the government, in conjunction with the teachers and the trustees, makes teaching more attractive and we get more and more people applying, more people applying than jobs available, we're going to have people in the profession who shouldn't be there.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I just have three or four brief comments that I wish to make and a couple of questions directed to the Honourable Minister of Education.

Firstly, with reference to the comments made by the Honourable Member for St. Vital. He had intimated that the criticism that the New Democratic Party had offered of the White Paper was one that would appeal mostly to the teacher whose prime interest is one of merely drawing his pay cheque and drawing his breath. I'm sorry that this is the interpretation that the Honourable Member for St. Vital has drawn from our speeches. I do believe that we have made our points clearly enough. I would also be quite happy to assist him in re-reading some of the speeches that were made and he will find that what we really were saying is that we wished to see an education program devised which would enable teachers to draw out the best in their students.

Secondly, with respect to the ability of students to finance a university education. Now in brief, Mr. Chairman, all I wish to say is this -- that this is no secret, this is common knowledge to all, there has been all kinds of research done on this matter and it all points to the fact that there is a direct relationship between the level of income and the number of students attending university. There are facts to prove that, there are facts to prove that just across the hall over there, which the honourable member can go down and read any time he wishes and he'll find facts to support that.

Now I have two questions that I wish to direct to the Honourable Minister of Education. One is this: I understand that there is considerable concern amongst teachers and school trustees over the lack of information with respect to the single district school division system. This matter is being discussed, questions are being asked of teachers and of school trustees. They haven't the answers to the questions. I understand that the Honourable Minister plans to launch a campaign to publicize the single division system, but some of these people have attempted to get the answers to their questions within the Department of Education but there does not appear to be any one office or any one individual or any designated individual or individuals capable of giving these people the answers that they want with respect to many of the details concerning the single district division system.

My second question to the Honourable Minister of Education is one dealing with an item appearing in the Throne Speech which states "that a measure will be placed before you to authorize the use of the French language in public school instruction under certain conditions." Now I feel, Mr. Chairman, that the proper time to introduce this matter is now when we're dealing with the estimates because certainly if this is going to be introduced it's going to involve a cost item which no doubt must be included somewhere in the items listed in the estimates. Now surely if we're going to deal with the estimates, if we're going to deal with the estimates concerning the Department of Education we ought to know exactly what the \$119 million is going to buy in terms of education services for the people of Manitoba. If it's going to buy what is stated in the Throne Speech then we ought to have some information about it.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I think it's also important that this question do be answered by the Honourable Minister at this time and that is this: that there is a resolution on the Order Paper asking for the teaching of other languages in the public school system and there are members in this House who are prepared to debate this, who are prepared to discuss this but we are being held back until we hear an announcement from the government on this item in the Throne Speech.

Now those are the matters, Mr. Chairman, that I feel are of crucial importance, in particular the last two that I have mentioned, the one with respect to information with respect to the single division school system and the announcement from the Throne Speech providing for French as a language of instruction.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, this has been a very wide ranging debate and it's very difficult at times to cover in rebuttal all the points made by the honourable members, but I am certainly heartened by the debate and I hope before too long every member will stand up and make the kind of contribution made by the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell, namely,

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) . . . that he is behind this scheme. I think most of the members except one have said in principle they agree with this White Paper and the principles involved in it, the philosophy behind it, that it is an attempt to do two things mainly, as we have said repeatedly, to put quality into the system by giving the proposed new single district divisions the resources to do the kind of job that we think is needed. The program as the White Paper states is a realistic program based on what we consider a reasonable program for 1967 - the figures, the grants and so on.

I think I would like to just deal with some of the points on that White Paper now. As the Leader of the Opposition got up and said he believed implicitly in the principle, the equalization across the province, that it was really out to do two things: to develop a basic realistic program for the year and that's what we think those figures are as listed under administration, supplies and so on. On the basis of the estimated costs in 1967, these amounts we think will cover these costs in most divisions and allow for enrolments and expansion in most multi-district divisions the costs are presently below the figures proposed in the Foundation Program. In a few divisions the costs like administration, supplies, maintenance, especially our costs are above the proposed levels. The program is not designed to cover entirely the highest costs in the province, it will however, cover all costs in most divisions from our research and give a great deal more support in the few high cost divisions as mentioned in the report. We believe more flexible and efficient transportation arrangements will be made possible by the figure of \$175.00 per pupil to cover all costs. Frankly, this is not being spent in many divisions now. It's up to around one division to \$120.00, and the idea would be to, through our school finance board who receive these budgets, to note those that are out of line. They may be very justifiably out of line but I think it will give us a review from time to time to see how realistic our program is.

I think if the Leader of the Opposition believes, and I know he does, in the principle of this amendment, the factor of equalization, there's a beginning and an end to everything, and the proposed program is that with respect to capital costs all debenture payments on schools which have been built it is intended will be included in the new Foundation Program 100 percent and all debenture payments on debentures issued on those schools built after the first of this year will, of course, be included in the program. The idea being that you have to start somewhere and I think you run into this in any program of equalization such as when the hospital scheme came out, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose had a very excellent 70 bed hospital while some of us had lesser type facilities but the equalization principle in that scheme is granted the same thing. So I was very happy to hear he believes in the principle and the philosophy. Having purchased that, it naturally follows that the principle with respect to capital cost must be faced realistically by the inclusion in this program. I think that it is a good scheme. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition did mention the category especially the PLA4 and the department are doing another run on this for me, looking at the PLA4 scale to see whether adjustments are in order; but we think it is a realistic program in total. We think in balance and being as candid and honestly as we can, education costs are rising across this province. If we're going to introduce these multi-course patterns, if we're going to give the kind of supervisory staff that the Member from Birtle-Russell says is necessary, and we certainly concur in certain supernumeraries, we want to give the resources to do it and yet we want each division through this method to have flexibility to pick their priorities at the local level. And we're saying that last year the total cost of both special levies and the other were \$90 million and in projecting a basic program we think it will cost \$95 there are certain, we think in most divisions, at the beginning at least the mill rates will be very low. I'm not going to be put in the position of saying a special levy rather is going to be "X". We've all experienced the problem we faced with that before. But I have a lot of confidence in the good sense and responsibility of the trustees of this province and I believe that they will with a program that gives this kind of support do their best to keep these costs and special levies within reach of our people.

I cannot - and I'm going to take a different tack. I'm going to take my target off the Honourable Member from Rhineland and my tracer and I'm going to hopefully hear that he will stand up and made the same contribution in this debate as the Member for Birtle-Russell. Because the honourable member made a couple of points, for example, he says merit rating and so on. This is a matter which has been looked at in the department for some years. As a matter of fact a study of merit rating wherever it was taking place in the whole world was conducted by our staff and came up with no answers. No one has yet devised a satisfactory

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) system of merit rating in this area except our trustees and through team inspection in the Southwest corner, now spread in most parts of the province in the past year, we have specialists in different fields going out throughout our schools with an attempt in this way to give realistic reports to trustees on the state of the education within their schools and I think the trustees find this very helpful and a progressive step.

The Member from Rhineland calls it a bribe. I am so happy to see not one other member of the House agrees with him because as a member of, I believe, at one time of the MAST Association I commend him to the resolutions of that body presented to me a few weeks past and of the teachers of Manitoba who are by and large crying for just the kind of scheme that is before us at this time. I think he's alone. Everything is bad; it's ill-timed. Well philosophically he follows a Party line and I don't begrudge him that, but the Father of his Party imposed this system without a vote in the Province of Alberta in 1937 -- a very progressive move but it hasn't rubbed off on my honourable friend yet. He says it's going to cost them more. Well a good system may cost them a little more at the local level, but surely the equalization factor in here, surely the kind of 35 - 65 formula we're proposing in the enhanced Foundation Program should make it acceptable to his people. I will try and give him any certain figures I can. I don't know if I can pull them out but I'm not going to -- I want to be careful about this because I don't want somebody saying the Minister said this and this is what happened to you because I can just see him speaking next year on this matter. I do hope though that he also wouldn't continue to harp on the fact that -- and I have nothing against private schools, many of them do an excellent job -- but he keeps saying that they are far more efficient and economical than the rest of the schools in the province and I think the implication on trustees is serious, I wouldn't like to impute that to him, but he must realize that the trustees of this province are doing a job second to none in the Dominion of Canada, in my opinion, and they will continue to do so. I wouldn't use that comparison if I were he.

Now having dealt with this White Paper, I would like to just mention a point raised by the Honourable Member from Burrows. As I have announced previously in the House, in Room 38 in this building downstairs is Mr. Stan Smith, an Inspector who is now in charge of the publicity campaign, and has been for a couple of months; the teacher appointee to that committee is George Strang, Tom Wall is representing the Trustee Association. They're in constant contact. We met this morning for two hours planning radio spots, television coverage on four outlets in Brandon and Dauphin -- some television time. Our brochures or kits that are for speakers will be distributed to each member of the House to give you an idea of the material we have, in the kits we're putting the White Paper, a summary of the White Paper for speakers, the principals in favour of single district divisions, an editorial -- and I put myself in the hands of the publicity committee and lo and behold I'm a little reluctant to pass this thing around to you because they put my face on a brochure in a couple of places and I hope that doesn't detract from the vote.

With respect to French, this French bill will be brought in shortly during this session. I think we can deal with some of the items but I think I can explain the other points the member brought about. I was encouraged by my neighbour from Brokenhead, from the Happy Thought school, a marvelous consolidation which took place recently in the past couple of years, with the work of the trustees and the department, and I think he appreciates what a wonderful job is being done in education in his area. I'm glad he supports this principle in this way. When he says it should have happened a few years aback, well my friend I was around in those days and I honestly don't believe that at that time in the evolution of our province you could have gone that far that fast.

However, I want to direct my attentions for a moment -- and I don't do so in any malicious sense -- but the Honourable Member from Elmwood speaks at times like that lady from the East that I encountered this fall, however, the sort of chaos and confusion in the system and speaks of advising the Minister of what is really happening on the inside. I was a country physician, as you know, and because I didn't have all the latest laboratory facilities in a country hospital it didn't mean that medicine was a mess in Manitoba. That's what my honourable friend comes through to me like, in this way. I think he has a danger -- and I say this respectfully because I think he's a bright -- and he is a school teacher, one of the highest professions, and his knowledge and views, however, have a danger from the inside possibly of being limited in insular. In any event I'm not moved to appoint him the Deputy Minister as yet. Or I haven't got it in mind as yet. He might well be advised to consider that his advice could be possibly more effective if he could supplement that given constantly and endlessly by the teachers society both

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) generally and in detail the Manitoba Association of School Trustees, individual boards to the executive, the department inspection staff who visit all schools and classrooms in the province regularly, by other members of departmental staff who cover the province from north to south, east to west, unceasingly, in the normal course of their duties. By reports from over 400 teachers throughout the province who are on curriculum committees, plus additional 400 or more conducting pilot courses in classrooms throughout the province, plus the additional hundreds with whom we are in contact via the wide range of in-service programs of all kinds. If the honourable member can supplement or complement this information, his assistance will always be welcome - and I respect this, as a member of the Legislature, he has every right to bring up these points. I'm just saying to him, wide adjectives such as "chaos" and the imputation that we really don't know in the department through the Minister what's really happening in the schools of Manitoba is not a statement that I can accept my friend. And I'm going to deal with this at more length, because your beaming in on an area where I haven't really had an opportunity in this debate to talk about, namely, the question of research.

In the last seven years in this province there's been greater curricular activity than at any time in our history. There's never been so great attention in the planning of courses, the development of programs and the writing, the revision and sampling of texts and the use of texts in courses in experimental and pilot classes before their introduction as formal parts of the program. Never have the teachers been so generously supplied with detailed teaching guides, outlines, briefing sessions, summer school, in-service courses, T. V. radio, specifically designed to assist them in the effective introduction of new courses. All of this, under the advice, direction and guidance of teachers, supervisors, professors, administrators. One or two quick examples to illustrate my point, for example the junior high school French program, tested, evaluated, for more than two years before introduction. It was in pilot use in 47 Grade VII classes, 22 Grade VIII classes, the curriculum committee assessed its effectiveness by a detailed questionnaire to all pilot teachers. As a result, supplementary exercises were produced to accompany the course and modify the Manitoba edition of the text used then later which was authorized. This was complemented by nine regional meetings for teachers of the course, summer courses, seven complete T. V. programs this fall and evaluation is continuing.

I mention this, Mr. Chairman, to point out that in one program, in one grade, this is the kind of examination that's taking place in the field. When we say there's no research, research is a wide subject and its important. It is being contended that so many of our programs have been introduced without proper research. Of pure research this may be true. At the same time in no other period as I say has so much been done to insure that authorized programs are validated. The methods used here in Manitoba are similar to those that have led to the construction of some of the best programs now widely used in North American and elsewhere. That is trial in the classroom, feed back, modification, implementation.

Now, I don't want to take the time of the committee but I have in the book here, this kind of detailed work through in all the sciences courses - as a matter of fact right now the whole elementary science program is being looked at for the next five to seven years in view of the change and speed with which knowledge is changing. Hundreds of people involved in this. And methods are used such as meetings with teachers, questionnaires, testing, reading, feed back and all this here - certain visits by curriculum branch personnel to teachers in the classroom. When we say there's no research, -- (Interjection) -- well the evaluation of each individual program. What is research? My honourable friend said at one time here, why go to San Francisco. Well we've made use of millions and millions of dollars of research done in the sciences; not only Manitoba, Saskatchewan, the whole of Canada, the whole of North America. Millions and millions. It's like the Doctor at Gimli giving a treatment. He hasn't got a research centre there but he's receiving the sum total, and he knows that, of the world's knowledge in research as applied to the patient or to the school.

Now, in the department with respect to research, this kind of - the department has conducted or has assisted research at many levels, mostly applied or action research and a few examples as I say are the Curriculum Branch from textbook selection, testing new courses as we've outlined - and I can give him examples of this but I don't want to take all the time of the committee. I would do it if honourable members thought it would earn my salary, I'd be happy to, but it is a long detailed complex matter and it's awfully hard for the Minister to translate this to this committee effectively. I'll be honest about it, I can do it, I can give you

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) outlines of it, I'd be happy to table them just to show the kind of detail. I'll take one course, the physics course. And I'd like to put it in to show you what happens — the staff is going full-time in many areas in this area.

Now we've had a department of Research and Examinations in the department for many years and we have our teacher training branch and all of these are doing a form of research into our local situation reviewing research programs in other jurisdictions and so on; and in the Vocational Branch we have hired consultants in such areas as television, in vocational training, in data processing, in food services. For example, our research into the Institute of Applied Arts involved as the member over yonder from Kildonan will know, the Advisory Committee to the Manitoba Institute of Technology. Every single course, 55 trades in the 12 technologies have an advisory crew. These men are — our Chairman is now — we had a meeting the other day for example on data processing computer centre which will be a feature of that new institute. We've hired a top consultant. This chap's involved the top people in Winnipeg here, from the Great West Life for example and different companies who have had some experience and are working at this. They are designing the courses and going to advise us as to the kind and type of equipment. Through this we've used the Manitoba Economic Council; we've used the Economic Council of Canada's work, The Department of Labour who do this for the whole of Canada. All this sum total of knowledge goes into this and is reviewed by our federal counterparts in sharing. This is the kind of research. We give grants to the Canadian Education Association, the Manitoba Education Association, the Canadian Council of Research in Education and the M. E. R. C. our local Manitoba Education Research Council which is just starting. We use outside research and of course we should make — our people are quite aware through several meetings with other directors and other provinces on every single course in the program today. This past year, television — and I'd like to talk on that after the supper hour, the exciting developments in this area.

But I want to announce that the department already has moved Research and Examinations from downstairs here over to the Ford building near the Curriculum Development Branch and we have planned for some months now to bring in a Director of Research. The salary my honourable friend saw the other day was an assistant to the administrator of some — what he saw in the paper the other day was — O.K. I haven't got it here, but that wasn't a Director of Research appointment, that was an assistant or research worker. The Deputy Minister has had two research assistants attached to him for some time, and we hope to absorb these people so the money is spread out over four appropriations which I can outline; the idea being that we would have a director, an assistant director, a clerical position and place under this director the supervisor of research and examinations, his staff and functions, and additional staff of eight and that budget will be moved over there as soon as things are straightened out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's 5:30, I leave the Chair until 8 o'clock this evening.